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STANLY COUNTY, NC PERMIT PROCESS REVIEW

A Review of Stanly County’s Permitting Process for New and Expanding Small and Medium-Sized Businesses and Its Alignment with Best Practice Models

What UNCC Found
The methodology for assessing the Stanly county permitting process included email, telephone, and in-person interviews, Web site reviews, and literature reviews. Departmental interviews with the Central Permitting supervisor were conducted. Email surveys were employed for the department directors of Inspections, Environmental Health, and Planning and Zoning. The team telephonically surveyed stakeholders identified by the county manager and fellow stakeholders. Additionally, surveys were emailed to comparable North Carolina one-stop permit shops. These counties included Catawba, Chatham, Harnett, Lee, Lincoln, and Mecklenburg. Finally, the team reviewed previous research on one-stop permitting throughout the United States.

The UNCC team examined the results of the various sources reviewed in this study and analyzed them in coordination with the objectives given. In sum, the team found that Stanly County’s one-stop permitting process aligns with many best practice permitting models. A common theme throughout the responses was that the consolidation into a one-stop shop and the implementation of BluePrince® has improved the customer’s experience. Areas of improvement suggested by stakeholders and department directors included additional BluePrince® training, establishing a single point of contact for each customer, and increased communication with the customer in all phases of the permitting process. These suggestions align with the best practices found in comparable North Carolina counties and best practice models in the literature.

What UNCC Recommends
In summary, UNCC found many of Stanly County’s practices to be comparable to the benchmark counties in this study. However, the following areas of improvement are offered:

1) Appoint a dedicated IT staff member to serve as the BluePrince® expert
2) Offer additional BluePrince® training for staff
3) Assign each customer a case manager from Central Permitting
4) Better educate customers through pre-planning meetings or classes, additional Web site information, and Central Permitting pamphlets
5) Implement an updated and continuous customer satisfaction survey program
6) Address the delay in the BluePrince® Environmental Health implementation
7) Utilize the BluePrince® Internet-based modules
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Up until July 2006, Stanly County citizens and businesses would have to approach a variety of departments separately in order to apply for and receive the necessary permits for new and expanding building projects. In July 2006, the county merged elements of the Inspections, Planning and Zoning, and Environmental Health departments to create the Office of Central Permitting. The County hoped that the creation of Central Permitting as a one-stop shop for permitting would improve the customer’s experience. Central Permitting was staffed with three clerks, each originally from the individual departments. Each clerk was cross-trained for approximately six weeks on the processes of all three departments.

In 2008, Stanly County contracted with BluePrince® to provide a software package to streamline the permitting business process. As of the presentation of this report, the Environmental Health module has not been completed. BluePrince® has not advised the county of an expected completion date.

The above process changes and software integration prompted the Stanly County Manager, Andy Lucas, to approach the Masters of Public Administration (MPA) program at UNC Charlotte in early January 2009. The goal of this assessment was to evaluate and examine Stanly County’s one-stop permit process for new and expanding small and medium-sized businesses in the areas of 1) customer service, 2) efficient and effective use of personnel and resources, 3) effective use of information technology, and 4) best-practices. In order to meet these goals, the UNCC team focused on the following objectives:

- Assess the current permitting process, identifying gaps and alignment between it, comparable counties, and best practice one-stop permitting models
- Assess BluePrince®’s alignment with the permitting process
- Assess the new and expanding small business owner's customer experience with Stanly County's one-stop permit shop
Methodology

The methodology for assessing the Stanly county permitting process included email, telephone, and in-person interviews, Web site reviews, and literature reviews.

Departmental interviews with the Central Permitting supervisor were conducted. Email surveys were employed for the department directors of Inspections, Environmental Health, and Planning and Zoning. The team telephonically surveyed stakeholders identified by the county manager and fellow stakeholders. Additionally, surveys were emailed to comparable North Carolina one-stop permit departments. These counties included Catawba, Chatham, Harnett, Lee, Lincoln, and Mecklenburg. Finally, the team reviewed previous research on one-stop permitting throughout the United States. Table 1 outlines which methods provided insight to the corresponding team objectives for the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Objectives</th>
<th>Central Permitting Interview</th>
<th>County Survey</th>
<th>Web Site Review</th>
<th>Department Director Survey</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Stakeholder Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess the current permitting process, identifying gaps and alignment between this process, comparable counties, and best practice one-stop permitting models</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess BluePrince®’s alignment with the permitting process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the new and expanding small business customer experience with Stanly County's one-stop permit shop</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Study Objectives Addressed by Specific Study Methods
Findings

Central Permitting Supervisor Interview

The team met with Carol Almond, Stanly County’s Central Permitting Supervisor at the Central Permitting office in Albemarle, North Carolina. Ms. Almond provided 1) background on the Central Permitting office and the BluePrince® implementation, 2) a review of the permitting process for new and expanding small businesses in Stanly County, 3) evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses, and 4) customer satisfaction rates.

Ms. Almond provided the history of the Office of Central Permitting. It was created in July 2006 after merging elements from each department involved in the permitting process: Inspections, Environmental Health, and Planning and Zoning. Administrative support from each department joined the Office of Central Permitting with the exception of the Inspections administrator who remains with the Inspections Department. The clerks in the Office of Central Permitting were cross-trained for six weeks in order to become more knowledgeable on the other department processes. In July 2007, the Central Permitting supervisor position was created and the Office of Central Permitting became its own department with its own budget. The department reports directly to the county manager.

Combining the input from Ms. Almond, process maps created during the design of Stanly County’s BluePrince® software, and feedback from department director surveys, the team created a complete current permitting process map for new and expanding businesses (see Appendix IV). Ms. Almond’s responses to questions posed, similar to those in the department director surveys, are included in the next section.

Department Director Surveys

The team also surveyed the three department directors of those departments involved in the permitting process: Inspections, Environmental Health, and Planning and Zoning. These directors were contacted via email and answered questions posed to them.
See Appendix I for the survey items. Their responses, including Ms. Almond’s, Stanly County’s Central Permitting Supervisor, appear below in three categories: Stanly County’s Permitting Process, BluePrince® Implementation, and Customer Satisfaction.

**Stanly County’s Permitting Process**

What the department directors said:

- The permitting process requires more than one stop in some cases
- Central Permitting staff are not trained to answer technical questions (particularly Environmental Health regulations and applicable state laws)
- BluePrince® has improved the permitting process and made data collection more uniform
- Data collection via BluePrince® can sometimes limit the permitting staff’s ability to comprehend the full scope of a particular project and collect all required information

Despite the use of the phrase one-stop permitting, the process requires more than one stop in some cases. In particular, additional stops are often required if the project involves Environmental Health plan reviews or if land use and zoning reviews are required. Projects involving food, wells, or on-site waste water treatment require Environmental Health plan reviews which may require additional visits.

Central Permitting clerks are not trained to address technical questions regarding the permit process. When clerks do not know the answer to a question, they must refer the client to the particular department which can reduce the continuity of the customer experience.

Overall, BluePrince® has improved the permitting process and made data collection more uniform. BluePrince® provides a consistent method for data collection and allows data sharing which was difficult under the former spreadsheet system. While BluePrince® makes the data collection process more uniform, it
also can limit the permitting staff’s ability to comprehend the full scope of a particular project. For instance, if the BluePrince® forms do not ask for certain pieces of information, the clerks will likely not collect that data. This results in the process being software driven rather than project driven and important information may not be collected.

BluePrince® Implementation

What the department directors said:

- Permitting staff are using BluePrince® (with the exception of Environmental Health) for all permitting requests
- There is a lack of understanding and use of the full capabilities of the BluePrince® software
- There is a need to provide additional BluePrince® training to:
  - Help eliminate frustrations using the software
  - Increase staff confidence and make BluePrince® more user friendly
  - Ensure all features are being used to maximize their return on investment
- Repeat customers were impressed by smooth transition to BluePrince®

Despite some initial installation issues, BluePrince® has improved the overall permitting process. The Environmental Health module has yet to be installed, but future integration is planned. Since staff can now view the progress of inspections and other information in one system, the customer experience has improved because staff has more information to give to customers on the status of their project.

Surveys indicated that all staff except Environmental Health are using BluePrince® for all new projects. Projects initiated before the implementation of BluePrince® are still tracked via the former spreadsheet system. Data migration from the old system was not
available with the new software. Upon completion of all older projects, BluePrince® will become the sole software in use for the permitting process. This is expected within the next two years.

The department directors advised that some features, such as an internal messaging feature, are not being used. Use of all features would help increase the return on investment with the product. According to the directors, the zoning process using BluePrince® is slower than the previous method. It reduces customer satisfaction due to increased wait times for processing.

Customer Satisfaction

Department directors indicated that:
- The customer experience lacks continuity
- Most complaints pertain to compliance with state regulations
- Miscommunication of the term “one-stop shop” can be misleading to customers

Department directors advised that the amount of customer interaction depends on the department. For instance, the Planning and Zoning department typically has no customer interaction while Environmental Health and Inspections have substantial contact with the customer. The Inspections Department stated that customer satisfaction is at a "good" level and that most complaints pertain to code enforcements as outlined by General Statues. Environmental Health interacts with the customer mostly during the planning review process.

One of the problems expressed is that the Stanly County permitting process lacks continuity and customers feel like they are being shuffled around various departments. This is usually due to the permitting clerks inability to address technical questions and the need to refer customers to the appropriate department.

To alleviate these concerns, the department director surveys indicated that customers are looking for a single point of contact
within the Central Permitting Department. This point of contact would guide the customer through the entire process and would be cross-trained among the various departments to be more knowledgeable across the board. Department directors believe that cross-training would better equip the Central Permitting clerks to answer cross-departmental questions, bringing more continuity to the process. Instead of shuffling a client among various departments, the assigned staff person would serve as the “bureaucratic navigator” and guide them through the process. If there are questions to which the staff person does not have the answer, they would research them and find the answer, rather than the current process of sending them to the specific department and forcing clients to navigate the bureaucracy individually. Additionally, the staff member assigned to each case should provide each client with a timeline of the process, timely updates on the status of their applications, and provide direct contact information including phone and email.

The phrase “one-stop shop” can be misleading to some customers and result in the assumption that only one visit will be required. The phrase actually pertains to a centralized location. Department directors noted that often times, there are code compliance issues that must be met before permits can be issued. These delays would likely result in one or more stops at the Office of Central Permitting.

**Stakeholder Surveys**

Stakeholders were interviewed to gauge their experience with the Stanly County permitting office. Those interviewed include two private developers, a builder, the president of the Chamber of Commerce, and the director of the Albemarle Downtown Development Corp. The developers and the builder do direct
business with the Stanly County permitting office on a regular basis. The president of the Chamber of Commerce’s experience is through interaction with those who have done business with the county. The director of the Albemarle Downtown Development Corp assists businesses locating in the area, and therefore interacts both directly and indirectly with the Stanly County permitting office. All respondents were interviewed via telephone using the same survey instrument (see Appendix I).

What stakeholders said:

• Information requests are redundant
• Customers feel that there is a lack of communication between departments
• Customers feel that there is a lack of communication between the customers and the staff
• Customers like having one location in which to complete permit process
• Customers feel that Stanly County is better than other locations with which they have had experience

The most common complaints amongst the stakeholders were those related to the processes involved in applying for and obtaining a permit. Respondents felt that there was a redundancy in information requests and a lack of communication between staff members, which makes obtaining information difficult.

The most common suggested improvements for Stanly County’s Office of Central Permitting were more effective communication between staff members and improved training for those in central permitting.

Of the stakeholders interviewed, only two respondents have had permitting experience outside of Stanly County. Stakeholders claimed that the Stanly County permitting process was easier than most counties.

Regarding the one-stop permitting shop, stakeholders unanimously agreed that one location for permitting has enhanced
customer service. Suggested improvements included continuing education for the inspectors as well as customer service training for all staff. Another suggestion was to establish a meeting room where customers could interact with staff to address violations.

County Surveys

Six North Carolina counties were surveyed to determine their processes, forms, software, and benchmarks related to permitting and inspections. These counties utilize the one-stop permitting process and were chosen by Mr. Lucas as comparable counties to Stanly County. Those surveyed were Catawba County, Chatham County, Harnett County, Lee County, Lincoln County, and Mecklenburg County. See Appendix I for the questions sent to county representatives.

What the counties taught us:
• All counties have customer service standards
• Web sites are a major source of information for customers
• Information technology is a critical component of the permitting process

All counties surveyed have customer service standards that must be followed. Most of these standards require customer service training on a regular basis as well as defined maximum waiting times until deliverables are issued. For example, Chatham County seeks to conduct inspections within 48 hours after the inspection is requested. They also complete residential plan reviews within seven working days and commercial plan reviews within 14 working days.

Counties rely on their Web sites to provide resources for new and expanding businesses, including downloadable forms, directions for obtaining permits, frequently asked questions, and staff contacts. This information is also available in hard copy at the central permitting office.

Appendix VI contains county provided process maps, organizational charts, customer service benchmarks, and a sample
how-to document for obtaining a building permit for commercial jobs. See Table 2 for information on the software systems used, as well as customer survey information.

**Table 2. County Survey Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Software</th>
<th>Customer Satisfaction Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catawba</td>
<td>Tidemark Permitting System by Aceela</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>CityView</td>
<td>11 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnett</td>
<td>HTE by Sungard</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee County</td>
<td>EverGov Solutions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>AS 400</td>
<td>No (they have some, but they are rarely filled out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>Posse 6.1.11; Internal system - Land Development</td>
<td>Survey responses on Web site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
County Web Site Review

The Web sites for those counties surveyed (Catawba County, Chatham County, Harnett County, Lee County, Lincoln County, and Mecklenburg County) were reviewed for clarity, content, and ease of use in finding information about permitting processes in each county.

What we learned about other counties’ Web sites:

• Web sites are modern and simple.
• Contact information is on main page.
• User-friendly instructions for obtaining permits are easily accessible.
• Users have the option to download and submit forms online and access permit status.

A majority of the Web sites were modern and simple, which aided in navigation and efficiency while looking for information. Some features that make navigation easier include contact information on the main page, department links on the main page, and a direct link to the inspections and permitting department from the home page of the county Web site.

Once on the pages dedicated to permitting and inspections, all had easy to find, user-friendly instructions for obtaining permits, either via a link to a PDF or direct instructions on the Web site. All also had easy to find forms that could be submitted online. Several counties had user login capabilities, which allow customers to access their permits online, check their status, and schedule inspections.

The same analysis was conducted for Stanly County. The Web site appeared dated but well organized. Department information is easily accessed from the main page, as is contact information and frequently asked questions. Required information for each type of permit is included along with a series of statements regarding the process. There is also a Frequently Asked Questions section and downloadable forms are available to print and mail in or hand deliver. However, these forms cannot be submitted online, nor can users access their permit information online. There are no easy to access, user-friendly instructions for obtaining a permit, and there
is no fee schedule online. Table 3 compares characteristics of all seven counties’ Web sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web Site Characteristic</th>
<th>North Carolina County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chatham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward links on homepage</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact information easily accessible</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User friendly instructions for obtaining permits</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee schedule</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAQ section</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to access permits online</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms available online</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form submission online</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Practices Literature Review**

When beginning the research on the permitting and development review processes, the UNCC team consulted the UNC School of Government’s Report on Development Review in North Carolina (2008). This document examined the permitting and review processes across the state of North Carolina, looking at both common best practice characteristics and common areas needing
improvement. Beyond simply surveying and interviewing offices from around the state, this benchmarking project found and identified models of development review and permitting that could provide unique and cost-effective solutions from outside of North Carolina.

Borrowing from documentation and site visitations of Henderson, Nevada; San Diego, California; and Tallahassee, Florida, the authors of this document isolated five common characteristics among leaders in development review and permitting:

- A commitment to delivering services at a level and cost that match the scale of development in their community
- Customer-focused services
- Transparency
- Reliance on high-functioning technology
- Extraordinary relationship with Information Technology support personnel

Many of the ideas and strategies presented in the UNC School of Government report are also supported by a wide array of national research in academic and practitioner research journals.

**Best Practice:** A commitment to delivering services at a level and cost that match the scale of development in their community

The report examines the administrative functions most apparent in leading jurisdictions of the development review and permitting process. Those who run the most ideal organizations are those that are able to organize and adjust their operations to meet the demands of their communities. The report stressed that efficient operations that meet the development demands of their communities means more than just expansion of operations in boom times, but also means making adjustments when demand is low. (UNC School of Government, 2008)

This type of strict awareness of the needs of the department provides the government agents with better operating conditions.
and users of the system with an easier and more proactive partner for their development needs. Since timing and approval are crucial in the expensive development of a project, the scale of a department’s operations can help dictate things such as: time to complete reviews, submission protocols for documentation and forms, waiting times for approvals, and adequate and timely feedback of issues and concerns. Thus, developers and their agents need to be able to count on the timetables they are given. (UNC School of Government, 2008)

Further research provides additional insight into successful permitting and development review processes. The two guiding principles demonstrated throughout the research are the need for strong leadership to not only oversee and guide the transformation, but also staff inside the department to have the authority to monitor and track the process. The reform initiative should be managed like any other administrative project, so it will fit within the overall structure of government and lend familiarity to its design and expectations. (Newfarmer et al, 2003)

Beyond the government influence, Newfarmer et al (2003) found that it is important to incorporate user knowledge of the process. The number one element affecting community involvement is the ease of access to the applicable customers. Those businesses that have the most trouble accessing the permitting process are often the key expanding and new businesses that the administration most wants to avoid passing around in an inefficient system. It is imperative to minimize bureaucratic obstacles and restructure the permit process into a cost-effective, time saving, and customer focused process (Wettenhall et al, 1997). Without such innovative measures, many processes can leave many with the unintended perception that a jurisdiction is unfriendly to business (Shah, 2001).

*Best practice: Customer-focused Services*

Throughout the UNC School of Government’s report (2008), those cities that incorporated best practices into their organizations (1) stress the importance of customer-focused services, (2) have
carefully identified their customer base, and (3) have attempted to honestly assess the strengths and weaknesses in their approach to serving their customers. Reforming development services should always see an equal improvement in the services rendered to the public.

Scholars emphasize an enhanced role for the public in the process. The UNC School of Government (2008) report recommends educating the public in the permitting and development review processes. Published materials, instructional seminars, formal and informal meetings with developers, required pre-application meetings for projects, provision of reliable service timelines and even requiring developers to pass a class demonstrating that they know the ins and outs of the system are all examples of different ways best practice cities have tried to improve customers’ experiences (Bingham et al, 2005).

**Best practice: Transparency**

According to the report, best practice agencies make great effort to share information, explain their recommendations and decisions, and communicate clearly and fully with all parties—management, the council, the public, and applicants. They believe they have a professional obligation to keep the applicant and customers fully informed. These actions are aimed at recognizing that by keeping all affected customers informed, their service quality and efficiency are enhanced. (UNC School of Government, 2008)

Without the connection to the department and knowledge of organizational practices, customers may lack the understanding to grasp that some projects require other jurisdictions approval prior to submittal to the local municipality. Complicated or redundant forms lead to lost authority and lost time. Being passed around from expert to expert leads to a lack of researching and applying codes pertinent to the project due to conflicting information and crossed communications. It is imperative to have a clear understanding of the codes and processes to avoid potentially numerous rounds of comments from multiple departments. (Eustoce, 2007)
Best practice: Reliance on high-functioning technology

All of the cities studied in the UNC School of Government’s (2008) report strive to make the use of technology paramount in all of their processes. Some examples of the uses of technology included electronic submission of documents, up-to-the-minute status of applications, access to and sharing of reviewer comments, and departmental and employee performance measures.

Best Practice: Extraordinary relationship with Information Technology support personnel

As indicated by the UNC School of Government (2008), all best practice cities had outstanding working relationships with IT staff members. Whether permanently assigned to the development review operation or remaining in the IT department, the relationship of the IT specialists to the development review process was extraordinary. The IT personnel encountered on the site visits were committed to development review success—not simply to the successful installation of IT products in development review.

One of the key problems in permitting departments can be linked to the failure of staff to be able to maximize technological capability, not only through process design, but from lack of assistance from technological support. The expedited access to training and assistance aids any best practice department in their overall mission, which in turn trickles down to the customer. Without this key support, as government processes and procedures change, employees will not receive the needed routine training through formal and informal means to remain up-to-date with the technology. (Fleming, 2008)

Discussion

The UNCC team examined the results of the various sources reviewed in this study and analyzed them in coordination with the objectives given. In sum, the team found that Stanly County’s one-stop permitting process aligns with many best practice permitting models. A common theme throughout the responses was that the consolidation into a one-stop shop and the implementation of BluePrince® have improved the customer’s experience. Areas of
improvement suggested by stakeholders and department directors included additional BluePrince® training, establishing a single point of contact for each customer, and increased communication with the customer in all phases of the permitting process. These suggestions align with the best practices found in comparable North Carolina counties and best practice models in the literature.

Below the team presents specific conclusions for each objective studied.

1. Assess the current business process, identifying gaps and alignment between this process, comparable counties, and best practice one-stop permitting models

The UNCC team found Stanly County’s permitting process for new and expanding small businesses to be comparable to benchmark North Carolina counties and best practice one-stop permitting models. The implementation of BluePrince®, while still in the early stages, aligns with the use of technology in comparable jurisdictions. While Stanly County does not yet utilize the Internet-based application review and status request process, the county’s plans to do so in the future are consistent with best practices.

As noted in the forthcoming discussion regarding customer service, Stanly County’s move to a one-stop permitting department better aligns its process with best practices. However, some customers expressed that communication with the Office of Central Permitting could be improved, as they often feel passed around amongst departments. This is usually due to permitting clerks being unable to answer technical questions and then referring the customer to the appropriate department.

2. Assess BluePrince®’s alignment with the business process

BluePrince® is a community development database that tracks and organizes the permitting process for municipalities. Like most software, its purpose is to streamline and organize the data associated with the permitting process which enables live access to the status of each permit application as it is processed through the
required departments. Software like BluePrince® can improve the internal processes of each department, increase information sharing, and improve the customer experience. Customer satisfaction can be increased by providing updated status information on permit applications and increasing communication through modern technologies such as the internet and email. The ability to track a permit through the process should therefore increase efficiency and more importantly, improve the municipality’s reputation as being business friendly. This, in turn, can attract new jobs and industry and reduce client complaints.

With the exception of the Environmental Health module which BluePrince® has failed to provide to Stanly County, the rest of the BluePrince® modules went live in Stanly County on October 20, 2008. Surveys distributed to the department directors involved in the permitting process indicate that the initial installation and learning curve for the software was challenging. BluePrince® staff was on hand for two days to setup the software, but limited assistance was subsequently offered since site visits from BluePrince® were not included in their service contract. Most of the interaction with BluePrince® staff occurred through conference calls and much of the software configuration was left up to the Central Permitting office staff. Most of the staff training consisted of online instructional videos from BluePrince.com. Initially, this was difficult for staff to adjust to since normal business operations were expected immediately after BluePrince® was installed. Now that staff have experience with BluePrince®, the overall impact of BluePrince® appears to have significantly improved the permitting process internally, which in turn allows better information to be shared with clients externally.

Some features of BluePrince® have not fully been implemented. However there are plans to use features such as the online portal in the future. This would allow permit applicants the ability to track their applications through the approval process. In preparation, the Office of Central Permitting plans to test this part of the system and the corresponding process with routine customers (generally contractors) for miscellaneous permits.
Inspectors are now able to print their daily list of inspections appointments once entered into BluePrince®. This feature has improved efficiency. The Stanly County Fire Marshall is also connected to BluePrince® and is automatically informed when inspections are ready to be performed.

One concern from county management was that all staff are not using BluePrince®. However, upon review of the department director interviews, this does not seem to be the case. Essentially, permitting cases that were started before the implementation of BluePrince® were not transferred over and thus still maintained using the old system of spreadsheets. This is not uncommon for new database installations, which typically do not import data from the old system, but rather start from the launch date and include all records from that point forward. Once those older permitting cases have been fully closed (one or two years), then BluePrince® will be used and use of the old system will cease.

Since the staff was involved with the BluePrince® design specific to the Stanly County Central Permitting BluePrince® application, the system aligns well with the current business process. Benchmark counties use similar technology tools to support their one-stop permitting shops, allowing customers to track and sometimes actually apply for permits through their offices. As the capabilities of BluePrince® are better realized through future training, Stanly County may find it useful to implement an option of electronic permit applications.

The staff also suggested adding additional training from BluePrince® to ensure the software is being used to its full capabilities. In line with the research reviewed, having a highly trained BluePrince® technician on-site to modify the program or answer any staff questions throughout the business day could also benefit the efficiency and effectiveness of the process. This may be a current Stanly County IT professional who becomes an expert on the BluePrince® system.
(3) Assess the new and expanding small business owner's customer experience with Stanly County's one-stop permit shop

While the UNCC team was unable to survey a wide variety of customers due to time constraints with this study, stakeholders (as identified by Mr. Lucas and by fellow stakeholders) as well as the department directors were able to provide a picture of customer experiences. Those surveyed believe customers enjoy having all departments in one central location. However, the idea of a one-stop shop has not provided all of the desired improvements. Some customers misunderstand the purpose of the office, believing that they only must appear once (“one-stop” = “one visit”) at Central Permitting. Other customers still feel passed around as many questions are not able to be answered by Central Permitting and must be addressed directly by the other departments. Also, some would-be customers, based on anecdotes provided, are unaware of the procedures involved and required in the permitting process. Stanly County has recently reestablished a customer satisfaction survey program. Continuation of this program and evaluation of the survey responses will increase the external validity of this study (if the findings are consistent with the result of this report).

Recommendations

In summary, UNCC found many of Stanly County’s practices to be comparable to the benchmark counties in this study. However, the following areas of improvement are offered:

1) Appoint a dedicated IT staff member to serve as the BluePrince® expert
2) Offer additional BluePrince® training for staff
3) Assign each customer a case manager from Central Permitting
4) Better educate customers through pre-planning meetings or classes, additional Web site information, and Central Permitting pamphlets
5) Implement an updated and continuous customer satisfaction survey program
6) Address the delay in the BluePrince® Environmental Health implementation
7) Utilize the BluePrince® Internet based modules
Recommendation 1: Appoint a dedicated IT staff member to serve as the BluePrince® expert

As indicated in the literature, a best practice of successful one-stop permit shops includes an extraordinary relationship with IT support personnel. Ideally this person or team would have an IT background, and their job description would focus on information technology. This position should be fully trained on the BluePrince® implementation and all of its capabilities (including those not currently utilized). This position would serve in a support function to the staff, both in times of technical difficulties as well as for needed training.

Recommendation 2: Additional BluePrince® training for staff

The department directors advised that additional BluePrince® training for staff is needed. Additional training may better educate the staff on all of BluePrince®’s capabilities and how best to utilize them. Refresher training may also help.

- Additional BluePrince® training would:
  - Help eliminate frustrations using the software
  - Increase staff confidence and make BluePrince® more user friendly
  - Ensure all features are being used to maximize return on investment

Recommendation 3: Assign each case a central permitting staff member

Assigning a case manager or central point of contact for each customer was suggested by department directors, stakeholders, and best practices. Instead of directing a customer to the other departments when questions arise, the assigned staff person would serve as the “bureaucratic navigator” and guide them through the process. If there are questions the staff person does not have the answer to, the point of contact would research them and find the answer. Ideally, the staff would be cross-trained to be better prepared to answer additional questions. Additionally, the staff
member assigned to each case should provide each client with a timeline of the process, timely updates on the status of their applications, and provide direct contact information including phone and email. This recommendation may require additional staff be assigned to Central Permitting.

**Recommendation 4: Better educate customers**

All methods utilized in this study suggested that better educating customers can greatly improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the process as well as customer satisfaction. Customer education can occur through pre-planning meetings or classes, additional Web site information, and Central Permitting pamphlets explaining the process in full.

**Recommendation 5: Implement an updated and continuous customer satisfaction survey program**

The Office of Central Permitting has recently reinitiated the customer satisfaction survey program. This team recommends continuing the program with the following suggestions: include the surveys at the back of the permit application packet to ensure that all customers receive a survey, reduce the size of the survey, and have a box for anonymous survey submission. The Office of Central Permitting should consider adding a customer satisfaction survey electronically to the Web site, making it available to a wider audience of customers.

**Recommendation 6: Address the delay in the BluePrince® Environmental Health implementation**

While the majority of the BluePrince® modules are currently functional, the Environmental Health module has not yet been completed. Although Environmental Health utilizes the system to maintain records of fees paid, a complete assessment of the permitting process’s alignment with BluePrince® can not be determined until this portion of the system goes live. The sooner this occurs, the sooner the technology and the process will be best aligned.
**Recommendation 7: Utilize the BluePrince® Internet-based modules**

A theme found across the best practice literature and North Carolina benchmark counties was the utilization of Internet based elements of their software. This included both application submission and tracking of a customer’s permit request. The Office of Central Permitting advised that they plan on testing the Internet-based module with repeat customers specifically with the application for miscellaneous permits. Upon review of the results of that implementation, the Office of Central Permitting should strongly consider continuing and expanding this function.
Appendix I: Survey Questions

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR SURVEY

1) What is the permitting process for Stanly County?
2) How much customer interaction do you have? If substantial, what do you think is the customer satisfaction level?
3) What steps could be taken to improve the customer experience?
4) What are the strengths of the one-stop permitting system?
5) What are the weaknesses of the one-stop permitting system?
6) How well has BluePrince® been received?
7) Are people using BluePrince®? To what extent?
8) Has BluePrince® helped the process?
9) What are BluePrince®’s shortcomings? Do you think that the organization for inspections should be changed?

STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

1) What is your overall impression of Stanly County’s permitting process?
2) If you could change anything about Stanly County’s permitting process, what would you change?
3) Have you had any permitting experiences outside of Stanly County? If so, is there anything you experienced with those counties that you would like to see implemented in Stanly County?
4) How has the process changed with the creation of the one-stop permit shop? Has the process improved?
5) What suggestions do you have for benchmarks for the Stanly County permitting office?

COUNTY SURVEY

1) Do you have a process map of your current permitting system? If so, please include.
2) What types of forms are required to obtain permits? Please specify type of permit.
3) Do you use permitting software? If yes, what type?
4) What are your benchmarks for customer service?
5) Have you conducted customer/stakeholder satisfaction surveys? If so, what were the results?
6) Do you have an organizational chart? Please include.
7) Do you have resources for new and expanding businesses to assist them with the permitting process.
Appendix II: County Web Site Review

Catawba County
The Catawba County Web site (www.catwabacountync.gov) appears modern and easy to read. A news column with current announcements dominates the central portion of the Web site and there is a quick links section on the left side and a newsletter/newsfeed signup section along the right side. The quick links section has link to the Online Permit Center which provides easy access to permitting information. The Online Permit Center homepage has two columns of links – the left column has applications and the right side has forms, policies, and procedures. The links are appropriately labeled with easy to understand titles such as “Application for Building Permit” and the second column has a link for the “Procedure for Acquiring Permits” which includes detailed instructions on the process such as submitting plans and zoning information. The Online Permit Center also has online inspections scheduling and fee schedules listed. Overall, the Web site is easy to navigate and the information is organized relatively well.

Chatham County
The Chatham County Web site (www.chathamnc.org) appears modern, yet simple and easy to understand at first glance. Key informational links are listed along the top of the home page including Departments and Programs, Resident Information and Business Information among others. Access to recent news and a primary contact number for Chatham County is clearly visible on the main homepage and easy to find. A click on the Departments and Programs icon along the top of the homepage reveals all county departments and a link to Central Permits provides easy access to relevant information for new and expanding businesses to gather information on required permits. The main page of Central Permits has a quick overview of the mission of the department, services offered, and location with contact information. The major services of the department include issuing residential and commercial building permits, inspecting residential and commercial construction additions and renovations, reviewing plans for construction work, scheduling required inspections, releasing utilities such as gas and electricity and issuing Certificates of Occupancy. A section entitled “Obtaining Building Permits” provides user friendly step-by-step instructions on the process of obtaining required permits with descriptions and links to the appropriate forms that must be completed. There is also a fee schedule that clearly lists permit costs for new and expanding businesses based on the total cost of the construction project. Also of note is a useful list of situations when a permit or license is required which serves as resource similar to a Frequently Asked Questions section in some respects.

Harnett County
The Harnett County Web site (www.harnett.org) appears modern and simple. Four main links across the top of the page include online services, public information, job opportunities, and employee information. There are three links on the left column including news, departments, and contact us. The contact us feature provides easy access to contact information to the county manager’s office. Below these three links are a series of quick links that are mostly recent county news links. The center portion of the page has changing photos of Harnett County with a phrase on the economic development opportunities in Harnett County.
The Departments section of the Web site appears to be the best choice to find permitting information. The Departments link takes you to an alphabetical listing of all the departments of Harnett County. Near the top is the Central Permitting/Community Development Department with contact information listed. The main homepage for Central Permitting/Community Development is divided into two sections – Web sites and downloads. The Web sites section provides links for office directions, contact information, staff directory, and a listing of all departments that Central Permitting handles including environmental health, inspections, public utilities, planning, fire marshal, and E-911 addressing. The right column of the page called Downloads provides useful information on the permitting process. For instance, the first section has information on starting the process and has separate step-by-step instructions for both residential and commercial projects. The remainder of the page has downloadable application forms for the departments involved in the permitting and inspections process. Overall, the Harnett County Web site is very easy to use and provides quick access to the information needed by new and expanding businesses to start the permitting process.

Lee County

The Lee County Web site (www.leecountync.gov) appears modern and updated with recent news in the center column of the homepage. A series of links appear on the left side (many of which are duplicates) of the page for various information including departments, job opportunities, and a phone directory. The upper right corner of the page has a pull down menu entitled “How do I?” which when clicked reveals a series of topics including register to vote, renew or obtain a passport, and view or pay taxes online. Interestingly, none of the links on the homepage or the “How do I?” section include anything about obtaining permits. The next logical place to check based on the links available would be county departments. A click on this link from the homepage takes you to a listing of 34 departments, but interestingly, there is still no department for permitting that seems logical to click. The closest department that one might think to click is the Economic Development department, but no information is present on this site regarding permitting. Additionally, there is no search feature to search for permitting so at this point, one would need to call or email the county to determine where permitting information can be found. Strangely, no main contact information phone number can be found. There is a phone directory listed on the main Web site, however it is listed by department and there is no permitting department listed.

Some permitting information was found under the Office of Fire Marshall. Anyone with knowledge of the permitting process knows that the building must be inspected to ensure it meets proper fire standards. For new businesses, this may not be known, so more clear links to the permitting information should be made on the main Lee County homepage or at least under the Departments section. From the Fire Marshall homepage, two links appear to be relevant to the permitting process including “Plan Review and Submittal Information and Requirements” which provide detailed instructions on the permitting process. Another link entitled “Online Permit Applications” seems to imply an online permitting process, but this link points to a page with downloadable forms to complete.
by hand. Perhaps a label such as “Forms” would be more appropriate so it does not indicate an online process.

Upon searching through Google, it was discovered that Lee County permitting and inspections are actually done through a joint Stanford (city) and Lee County office. This Web site was found at www.sanfordnc.net. From the homepage, the user could click on the Departments tab and find the link to the Inspections Services office. This Web site provided information on how to find construction code information, the permitting (Inspections) office location and office hours, as well as important phone numbers to know for the process. A link for “Online Permits, Plan Reviews, & Inspections” led the user back to the same link provided on the Lee County Web site for electronic applications.

From the Inspections Services site or back at the homepage, the left hand column has an option for Applications. From that menu, the user may click on Inspection Services. This link provides all applications needed (assumedly) for the permitting process. There are numerous links breaking down the process into Residential or Commercial permits providing detailed guidance on how the process works. It also includes a Fee Schedule, Announcements, and Permit Reports dating back to 2002. Overall, this site, once found was very useful—however, it was very difficult to find if a Lee County resident did not know to look at the Sanford Web site.

Lincoln County

The Lincoln County Web site (www.lincolncounty.org) appears modern with a traditional aesthetic appeal. Colorful photos of Lincoln County change regularly in the center of the page and the occasional use of a calligraphy-style font for column headings gives the site a somewhat old-fashioned feel, but does not detract from the ease of use or organization of important information. Four main links appear at the top of the page which expand when you scroll your mouse over them, revealing the various sub-pages under each category. The upper left corner of the page has two quick links to Services and Departments, which reveal a majority of the business of the county and provide easy access to most informational needs. Like the icons along the top, a scroll over the links reveals the sub-pages for each of these categories. News and Announcements dominate the center portion of the page followed by a Quick Links section and Calendar for the county. Along the right side of the page there is a search feature, notification signup, e-service access, and a contact us link.

The most logical place to start looking for permitting information appears to be the Departments link on the left side of the page. When you move your mouse over this link, a sub-menu of Departments A-M and Departments N-Z appear. Moving your mouse over either options reveals the respective departments in alphabetical order. While a permitting department is not listed, the closest department appears to be Building and Land Development. Moving your mouse to this department reveals sub-departments of Inspections, Zoning, and Planning. Each of these sub-department sites provide detailed information on necessary processes and procedures. For instance, the inspections department is divided into commercial and residential which provides easy access to new and expanding businesses to the necessary information. A frequently asked questions section is helpful, but directed towards residential users. Overall, the Lincoln County Web site is excellent. The site is well organized and thought out.
Easy to navigate menus allow information to be found quickly and contact information is clear and visible on each site for any questions users might have.

**Mecklenburg County**

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg County Web site (www.charmeck.org) has a compact design with a lot of information but is organized well. Two columns on the left side of the page divide the services of the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County. Building Permits and Inspections is the second link listed on the Mecklenburg County column which provides easy access to permitting information. This link takes you to the Code Enforcement homepage which divides information into three main categories: Contractors, Homeowners, and Architects and Engineers. The right side of the page has links to apply for permits online and also check the status of open projects. The left side of the page contains a list of links to the services offered including commercial building, residential building, mechanical-plumbing, electrical, and fire marshal. It is rather unclear which link a new or expanding business owner would click to learn about the permitting process, however the commercial building link appears to be most logical. A click on this link shows an alphabetical listing of all commercial services available. While all relevant information commercial permitting appears to exist, an alphabetical listing of the services could potentially be confusing for those not familiar with the process. For instance, plan submittal requirements is listed ¾ down the list, but would be the first step in the process. Someone new to the process would have to click on each individual link before discovering that plan submittal is the first step. Once they have determined this, the plan submittal package includes step-by-step directions on the process. Perhaps having the links listed in process order would make it more logical for the first time user.

Once you have located the information you need, it is very detailed and easy to follow with step-by-step instructions. The site also has a frequently asked questions section and a designated Commercial Technical Answer Center (CTAC) with phone numbers and email addresses listed to answer any questions users might have.

**Stanly County**

The Stanly County (www.co.stanly.nc.us) Web site appears somewhat dated and confirmed by the 2001, 2002 copyright at the bottom of the page, but organized well. Along the top of the webpage there are six main links that reveal their contents when you place your mouse over each link which include Home, Departments, Calendars, Job Opportunities, Boards and Commissions, and Frequently Asked Questions. There is also a search box next to these links for easy access to information on the site. The left side of the homepage has a history section followed by a news section in the center of the page. Along the bottom of the site are important links for Visitors, Residents, and Business.

From the links available, the Departments link at the top of the page seems to be the best choice for locating information on permits. From the list of Departments, either Inspections – Buildings or Planning and Zoning seem to be the logical choices for permit information. A click on the Inspections – Buildings reveals the Building Codes Enforcement site which is organized by seven file folder like tabs.
including General Information, Codes Enforced, Types of Inspections, Permit Requirements, Permit Application Process, Forms, and Staff. Along the left side of the page have the office hours listed and a contact phone number which is helpful. The information provided on this site is useful and lists what is required for each type of permit. The permit application process section could be improved to include a step-by-step process and which forms are needed at each step. Currently, the page just has a series of statements regarding the process without any direction as to the order of the steps. Downloadable forms for Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing, and Fuel Piping are available, however these must be completed by hand and mailed in or returned personally.

Overall, the site has some useful information but improvements could be made to outline the process more clearly and make reference to the Central Permitting Office and its resources. A step-by-step outline of the process would also be helpful.
Appendix III: In Depth Best Practices Literature Review

When beginning the research on permitting and development review processes, the UNCC team consulted the UNC School of Government’s Report on Development Review in North Carolina (2008). This document examined the intricate permitting and review processes across the state of North Carolina, looking not only for common best practice characteristics, but also for common areas needing improvement. Beyond simply surveying and interviewing offices from around the state, this corporate-style benchmarking project found and identified models of development review and permitting that could provide unique and cost-effective solutions from outside the state.

Borrowing from documentation and site visitations of Henderson, Nevada; San Diego, California; and Tallahassee, Florida, the authors of this document isolated five common characteristics among leaders in development review and permitting:

- A commitment to delivering services at a level and cost that match the scale of development in their community
- Customer-focused services
- Transparency
- Reliance on high-functioning technology
- Extraordinary relationship with Information Technology support personnel

Many of the ideas and strategies presented in the UNC School of Government report are also supported by a wide array of national research in academic and practitioner research journals.

Best Practice: A commitment to delivering services at a level and cost that match the scale of development in their community

The report examines the administrative functions most apparent in leaders of development review and permitting and determined that those who run the most ideal organizations are those that are able to organize and adjust their operations to meet the demands of their communities. The report stressed that efficient operations that meet the development demands of their communities means more than just expansion of operations in boom times, but also means making adjustments when demand is low. (UNC School of Government, 2008)

This type of strict awareness of the needs of the department provides the government agents with better operating conditions and users of the system with an easier and more proactive partner for their development needs. Since timing and approval are crucial in the expensive development of a project, the scale of a department’s operations can help dictate things such as: time to complete reviews, submission protocols for documentation and forms, waiting times for approvals, and adequate and timely feedback of issues and concerns. Thus, developers and their agents need to be able to count on the timetables they are given. (UNC School of Government, 2008)

In guiding this transformation process to mirror the UNC School of Government’s report, further research provides additional insight into the details necessary for successful permitting and development review processes. The two guiding principles demonstrated throughout the research are the need for strong leadership to not only oversee and guide the transformation, but also inside the department to
have the authority monitor and track the process. The reform initiative should be managed like any other administrative project, so it will fit within the overall structure of government and lend familiarity to its design and expectations. (Newfarmer et al, 2003)

Further, since development review is almost always shared among different departments, it is imperative that leadership and employee engagement are essential, because local government administrators are often the only people with the full scope of what goes on in the locality. A view of the operation that incorporates the largest perspective is ideal. (Newfarmer et al, 2003)

Beyond the government influence, Newfarmer et. al (2003) found that it is important to incorporate user knowledge of the process. The number one element affecting community involvement is the ease of access to the applicable customers. Those businesses who have the most trouble accessing the permitting process are often the key expanding and new businesses that the administration most wants to avoid passing around in an inefficient system. It is imperative to minimize bureaucratic obstacles and restructure the permit process into one that is cost-effective, saves time, and fosters customer relationships (Wettenhall et al, 1997). Without such innovative measures, many processes can leave many with the unintended perception that a jurisdiction is unfriendly to business (Shah, 2001).

Of the myriad of components pointed to in organizing and leading a successful organization, the key suggestion was that of the permit manager, who is the single point of contact for developers to work with. With one point of contact, conflict resolution with developers is simplified. Also, complaints are not the only thing to be channeled through the system in this manner, so is feedback of all kinds. (Shah, 2001) Guiding developers through the system efficiently should be the goal of any permitting department, and managing this process should be the concern of a single person even when considering that the entire effort may be split among several different departments.

**Best practice: Customer-focused Services**

Throughout the UNC School of Government’s report (2008), those cities identified as incorporating the very best practices into their organizations stress the importance of customer-focused services, have carefully identified their customer base, and have attempted to honestly assess the strengths and weaknesses in their approach to serving their customers. It is this focus of serving the customers that should complement the organization’s efforts to reform. While easing the burden and increasing the effectiveness of the office staff are always on the mind of any manager, the efforts when related to reforming development services should always see an equal improvement in the services rendered to the public. Without this balance, unintended consequences can be forced upon the public, or worse yet, there can be a misapprehension into believing that changes have improved the customer experience when they really have not.

Current research argues that the face of new governance is one that involves the citizenry (Bingham et al, 2005). Scholars call for a field that recognizes an enhanced role for the public in the process. These same scholars recommend that systems be set up to encourage citizens to be participatory in the process of affecting the government that serves them. (Bingham et al, 2005) The UNC School of Government (2008) report demonstrates these principles through the system of practices to educate the public in the permitting and development review processes. Published materials, instructional seminars,
formal and informal meetings with developers, required pre-application meetings for projects, provision of reliable service timelines and even requiring developers to pass a class demonstrating that they know the ins and outs of the system are all examples of different ways best practice cities have tried to engage their respective citizenry into improving their experiences (Bingham et al, 2005).

*Best practice: Transparency*

According to the report, best practice agencies make great effort to share information, explain their recommendations and decisions, and communicate clearly and fully with all parties—management, the council, the public, and applicants. They believe they have a professional obligation to keep the applicant and customers fully informed. These actions are aimed at recognizing that by keeping all affected customers informed, their service quality and efficiency are enhanced. (UNC School of Government, 2008)

When asked, developers specifically point to permit expediting as the final means of significantly reducing the level of effort in their interaction with the government. Without utilizing some of the customer service examples listed above and maintaining an environment that is open and available to concerns, it becomes unrealistic to think developers will just understand or adapt to organizational practices. The only valid method of expediting the permitting process includes a combination of arduous research, timing, process knowledge, and patience; all of which the permitting authority has a role in helping facilitate to the customer. (Eustoce, 2007)

Without the connection to the department and beforehand knowledge of organizational practices, customers may lack the understanding to grasp that some projects require other jurisdictions approval prior to submittal to the local municipality. Complicated or redundant forms lead to lost authority and lost time. Being passed around from expert to expert leads to a lack of researching and applying codes pertinent to the project due to conflicting information and crossed communications. After all, it is imperative to have a clear understanding of the codes and process to avoid potentially numerous rounds of comments from multiple departments. (Eustoce, 2007)

Clear and open communications provided from those fully capable of answering questions are the cornerstones of best practice permitting and development review departments. Customers should not be expected to submit or receive anything from anyone inside the department who is not fully capable of clearly explaining the issues in their entirety to the customer.

*Best practice: Reliance on high-functioning technology*

All of the cities studied in the UNC School of Government’s (2008) report strive to make the use of technology paramount in all of their processes. Whether the technologies applied are commercial or proprietary, each best practice organization strove to make technology applicable as wide and deep within every function of the process as possible. Some examples of the impressive uses of technology included electronic submission of documents, up-to-the-minute status of applications, access to and sharing of reviewer comments, and departmental and employee performance measures.
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Lubell (2004) conducted a survey of state and local government techniques for document submittal revealed seriously outdated procedures in need of revamping to incorporate the advantages of technology in local government. The main reasoning behind every example of best practice permitting technology was linked to increases in approval speed, cross-departmental accuracy, job-site safety from thorough checks of plans, codes, and licenses; and economic benefits from lost time (Lubell, 2004). The incorporation of technology provides citizens with an easy way to connect with their local government and offers a means to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of programs and services. (Fleming, 2008)

A tech-enabled government should strive to use technology to improve internal and external business operations (Singer, 2003). The UNC School of Government (2008) report and industry research point to the fact that critical technology integration works best when viewed as an enterprise being undertaken by the whole permitting operation, not a separate department unto itself. Problems arise when technology is not applied correctly to departmental practices due to inflexible and under-trained staff. (Fleming, 2008)

**Best Practice: Extraordinary relationship with Information Technology support personnel**

As indicated by the UNC School of Government (2008), all best practice cities had outstanding working relationships with IT staff members. Whether permanently assigned to the development review operation or remaining in the IT department, the relationship of the IT specialists to the development review process was extraordinary. The IT personnel encountered on the site visits were committed to development review success—not simply to the successful installation of IT products in development review.

Stressed within the research is the fact that information technology specialists inside the government need be knowledgeable about the development processes. Another important characteristic is the ability of IT staff to have the ability not only to maintain the technology being utilized, but also to identify and assist with process improvements. IT agents need to understand the day-to-day functions of different local government departments in order to fully be able to help apply their expertise in improving and furthering the agency’s mission (Fleming, 2008).

One of the key areas of failure in permitting can be linked to the failure of staff to be able to maximize technological ability, not only through process design, but from lack of assistance from technological support. The expedited access to training and assistance aids any best practice department in their overall mission, which in turn trickles down to the customer. Without this key support, as government processes and procedures change, employees will not receive the needed routine training through formal and informal means to remain up-to-date with the technology. (Fleming, 2008)
Appendix IV: Stanly County Process Maps
Stanly County Permitting Process Map for New and Expanding Small and Medium Sized Businesses (2009)
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Appendix V: Stanly County Application/Permit Request Forms
County of Stanly
Zoning and Building Commercial Application for Permits

Property Owner
Mailing Address
City/St/Zip Phone
Applicant Name Phase Lot #
Mailing Address Subdivision Name
City/St/Zip Phone
E911 / Site Location

DIRECTIONS TO SITE:
Public Water Supplier Public Sewer Supplier Well Septic

TYPE OF STRUCTURE OR DEVELOPMENT SETBACKS FROM PROPERTY LINE / ROW
Front
Side/Corners
Rear

NCDOT Driveway Permit
If more than 1 dwelling enter # TYPE WORK:
Change of Occupancy UPFIT
From COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION
To
Business Retail Sq Ft:
Home Occupation: TOTAL SQ' FEET
Animals: Total Sq Feet

Comments:

MULTI FAMILY # Floors Foundation Type Const Type
COMMERCIAL # Floors Foundation Type Const Type
INDUSTRIAL # Floors Foundation Type Const Type
Other # Floors Foundation Type Const Type
NON-RESIDENTIAL # Floors Foundation Type Const Type

WILL BUILDING/STRUCTURE INVOLVE LAND-DISTURBING IN EXCESS OF 1 ACRE?

IF NO ANSWER IS YES WE WILL NEED AN AUTHORIZATION FROM SOIL CONSERVATION OFFICE AND THE AGENT CHARGED WITH ENFORCEMENT BEFORE ISSUING THE BUILDING PERMIT.

I, the undersigned, certify that the work designated in this application will be done according to Building laws and Health Regulations of the State of North Carolina and Stanly County and will comply with the Zoning Ordinance of Stanly County. If said building is to be erected in Fire Limits as established by a County or Municipal Ordinance then such Building Permit is issued subject to the approval of the Insurance Commission of State of North Carolina, G>S> 153-A375 Establishment of Fire Limits.

LICENSE# CLASS:

▲ Please Print Your Name ▲

▲ Please Sign Your Name ▲ Date ▲

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

TAX RECORD LOT SIZE
DEED JURIS
PAGE DODGE #
ZONED EH #
PIN ▲ ▲ ▲ ▲ ▲
AFFIDAVIT OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION COVERAGE
N.C.G.S. § 87-14

The undersigned applicant for Building Permit # __________ being the

___________ Contractor

___________ Owner

___________ Officer/Agent of the Contractor or Owner

do hereby aver under penalties of perjury that the person(s), firm(s) or corporation(s) performing the work set forth in the permit:

______ has/have three (3) or more employees and have obtained workers' compensation insurance to cover them,

______ has/have one or more subcontractor(s) and have obtained workers' compensation insurance covering them,

______ has/have one or more subcontractor(s) who has/have their own policy of workmen's compensation covering themselves,

______ has/have not more than two (2) employees and no subcontractors,

while working on the project for which this permit is sought. It is understood that the Inspection Department issuing the permit may require certificates of coverage of workers' compensation insurance prior to issuance of the permit and at any time during the permitted work from any person, firm or corporation carrying out the work.

Firm name: ____________________________________________

By: ____________________________________________________

Title: __________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________

Please complete for projects over $30,000 1/24/96
ELECTRICAL PERMIT APPLICATION

STANLY COUNTY CENTRAL PERMITTING
INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT
1000 NORTH FIRST STREET, SUITE 13C
ALBEMARLE, NC 28001

PERMIT #
FAX# 704 986 3783 PHONE# 704 986 3667

PERMIT IS NOT VALID UNTIL ALL FEES ARE COVERED AND THIS APPLICATION
IS DETERMINED TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROPERTY OWNER</th>
<th>JOB LOCATION ADDRESS AND DIRECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHECK APPLICABLE POWER COMPANY AND EXPLAIN TYPE OF USE FOR THIS SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY/ARE</th>
<th>TYPE OF USE</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHECK TYPE WORK/GIVE AMPS & VOLTS EXPLAIN ANY PERTINENT INFO BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF WORK</th>
<th>AMPS</th>
<th>VOLTS</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHG OF SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAW SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># SUB PANELS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER RIG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPAIR</td>
<td>MISC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-CONNECT</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPIRATION DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-CH WI</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: ALL INFORMATION MUST BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR</td>
<td>AUBRG</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPLETED TO PERMIT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(COMMERCIAL WITH NO SERV WORK) PLEASE GIVE TOTAL NUMBER ELECTRICAL OUTLETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELECTRICIAN NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Commercial with no serv work) Please give total number electrical outlets.

I hereby agree to act under permit applied for in full accordance with all state laws and codes and
ordinances of Stanly County, NC and I agree that no work will be done contrary to the same, else
the permit issued hereunder to be void — GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

GENERAL CONTRACTOR MUST SUBMIT SUBCONTRACTOR PLANS AND PAY FEES AT TIME BUILDING
PERMIT IS ISSUED. ONLY MISCELLANEOUS PLANS MAY BE MAILED WITH FILE OR TAIRED IF THEY CARRY A
HAND WITH STANLY COUNTY'S INSPECTION DEPARTMENT.

Signature (Electrician)
PLUMBING PERMIT APPLICATION

STANLY COUNTY CENTRAL PERMITTING
INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT
1000 NORTH FIRST STREET, SUITE 13C
ALBEMARLE, NC 28001

PERMIT #

FAX# 704 986 3783  PHONE# 704 986 3667

PERMIT IS NOT VALID UNTIL ALL FEES ARE COVERED AND THIS APPLICATION IS DETERMINED TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROPERTY OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB LOCATION, ADDRESS AND DIRECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE CHECK PUBLIC OR PRIVATE PROVIDER IF AVAILABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC WATER</th>
<th>WELL</th>
<th>SEPTIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SEWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHECK TYPE WORK GAS SUPPLIER NAME (NOTE NATURAL IF APPLICABLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF FIXTURES ADDITIONAL NOTES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISPOSAL</th>
<th>TOWELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISHWASHER</td>
<td>WASHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICE MAKER</th>
<th>WATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRAIN LINE</td>
<td>PURIFIER SYS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOOR DRAINS</th>
<th>WATER CLOSETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRRIGATION SYSTEM</td>
<td>(WATER HEATERS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMIDIFIER SYS</td>
<td>STORAGE TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVATORIES</td>
<td>INSTANT TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFRIGERATION LINES</td>
<td>RADIANT HEAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINKS</td>
<td>PIPING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOWERS</td>
<td>GASLINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUBS</td>
<td>FIRE SPRINKLER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUBS</td>
<td>OTHER MISC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NC STATE LICENSE# CLASS CERTIFICATION EXPIRATION DATE:

NOTE: ALL INFORMATION MUST BE COMPLETED TO PERMIT.

I hereby agree to act under permit applied for in full accordance with all state laws and codes and ordinances of Stanly County, NC and I agree that no work will be done contrary to the same, else the permit issued hereunder to be void. GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

GENERAL CONTRACTOR MUST SUBMIT SUBCONTRACTOR PERMITS AND PAY FEES AT TIME BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED. ONLY MISCELLANEOUS PERMITS MAY BE MAILED WITH FEE OR FAXED IF THEY CARRY A BOND WITH STANLY COUNTY'S INSPECTION DEPARTMENT.

Signature (PLUMBER)
MECHANICAL PERMIT APPLICATION

STANLY COUNTY CENTRAL PERMITTING INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT
1000 NORTH FIRST STREET, SUITE 13C
ALBEMARLE, NC 28001

PERMIT #
FAX# 704 986 3783    PHONE# 704 986 3667

PERMIT IS NOT VALID UNTIL ALL FEES ARE COVERED AND THIS APPLICATION IS DETERMINED TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROPERTY OWNERS NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB LOCATION, ADDRESS AND DIRECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECK TYPE WORK</th>
<th>GAS SUPPLIER NAME (NOTE NATURAL IF APPLICABLE):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL NOTES:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOTE HOW MANY AND TYPE OF UNITS TO BE INSTALLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOILER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURNACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAT PUMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMIDIFIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT HEATERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THRU WALL HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOD SYSTEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIRCLE CORRECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>with out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>Ductwk</td>
<td>Ductwk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NC STATE LICENSE #:
CLASS CERTIFICATION:
EXPIRATION DATE:
NOTE: ALL INFORMATION MUST BE COMPLETED TO PERMIT.

MECH CONTRACTOR

COMPANY NAME

ADDRESS

FAX#   PHONE#

I hereby agree to act under permit applied for in full accordance with all state laws and codes and ordinances of Stanly County, NC and I agree that no work will be done contrary to the same, else the permit issued hereunder to be void. GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

GENERAL CONTRACTOR MUST SUBMIT SUBCONTRACTOR PERMITS AND PAY FEES AT TIME BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED. ONLY MISCELLANEOUS PERMITS MAY BE MAILED WITH FEE OR FAXED IF THEY CARRY A BOND WITH STANLY COUNTY'S INSPECTION DEPARTMENT.

Signature (MECH CONTRACTOR)
# FUEL-PIPING PERMIT APPLICATION

**STANLY COUNTY CENTRAL PERMITTING**  
**INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT**  
**1000 NORTH FIRST STREET, SUITE 13C**  
**ALBEMARLE, NC 28001**

**PERMIT #**  
**FA X# 704 986 3783**  
**PHONE# 704 986 3667**

---

**PERMIT IS NOT VALID UNTIL ALL FEES ARE COVERED AND THIS APPLICATION IS DETERMINED TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROPERTY OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB LOCATION, ADDRESS AND DIRECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE CHECK PUBLIC OR PRIVATE</th>
<th>PROVIDER IF AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC WATER</td>
<td>WELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SEWER</td>
<td>SEPTIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECK TYPE WORK</th>
<th>GAS SUPPLIER NAME (NOTE NATURAL IF APPLICABLE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE NOTE APPLIANCES OR FIXTURES THAT GASLINE WILL BE CONNECTED TO**

---

**FUEL PIPING CON.**

**COMPANY NAME**

**ADDRESS**

**STATE LIC#**  
**FAX#**  
**PHONE#**

---

I hereby agree to act under permit applied for in full accordance with all state laws and codes and ordinances of Stanly County, NC and I agree that no work will be done contrary to the same, else the permit issued hereunder to be void. GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

---

**GENERAL CONTRACTOR MUST SUBMIT SUBCONTRACTOR PERMITS AND PAY FEES AT TIME BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED. ONLY MISCELLANEOUS PERMITS MAY BE MAILED WITH FEE OR FAXED IF THEY CARRY A BOND WITH STANLY COUNTY'S INSPECTION DEPARTMENT.**

---

Signature (FUEL-PIPING CONTRACTOR)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 5 acres</td>
<td>$100 plus $5 per adjacent land owner over 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greater than 5 acres</td>
<td>$100 plus $10/acre over 5 acres and $5 per adj owner over 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vested Rights</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Zoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP District Rezoning</td>
<td>$100 plus $10 per acre over 5 acres plus Recording Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP revision</td>
<td>$100 plus Recording Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU-PUD District Rezoning</td>
<td>$1000 plus $5 per acre over 100 acres + subdivision fee, if any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU-PUD revision</td>
<td>$500 plus Recording Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed 10/70 allocation</td>
<td>$200 per acre of 10/70 allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Home Park review</td>
<td>$300 plus $15 per space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Amendment</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Tower Overlay Application</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Tower Overlay Application Modification</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell tower annual compliance inspection</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>$15 plus Recording Fee per Register of Deeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements bonding review</td>
<td>$25 plus $5 for each additional $10,000 of bond amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond release/renewal or reduction</td>
<td>$25 plus $5 for each additional $10,000 of bond amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plat, each approval</td>
<td>$200 plus Recording Fee per Register of Deeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-Sketch, each review</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary, each approval by PB</td>
<td>$250 plus $10 per lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal/Admin/Review</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardship renewal</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Permit</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance request</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Violation 1st offense</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Violation 2nd offense</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Violation 3rd and continuing offense</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Application (Accessory buildings (less than 2,000 sq. ft.))</td>
<td>$10 (swim pools) (greater than 2K is $20) (inc. bona fide blgds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all others acc blgs</td>
<td>$20 (acc blg over 2,000 sq ft) (inc. bona fide blgds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Tower co-location (on existing tower)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of Use/Occupancy</td>
<td>$40 (additional to renovation fees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - new and additions</td>
<td>$50 plus $15 per additional 5,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$75 plus $15 per additional 10,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res/Comm/Ind. Renovations w/NO sq ft. add</td>
<td>$20 (renovations do not include change of use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNS: Free standing/wall/ground signs</td>
<td>$10 plus $0.50 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all other signs</td>
<td>$10 plus $0.50 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary signs</td>
<td>$15 for each posting and/or event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboards/off premise advertising</td>
<td>$300 plus $1 per sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured Homes</td>
<td>$50 per dwelling unit (requires minimum 2 visits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Build homes</td>
<td>$35 per dwelling unit (requires minimum 1 visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural or Customary Home Occupation</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations w/o sq/ft. additions</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinspection fee for all above permits per visit</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed/Flood Permit</td>
<td>$35 (per lot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-911 Sign acct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contact E-911)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Name Sign - Subdivision</td>
<td>$119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular (2 blades, steel post w/cap, installed)</td>
<td>$200 plus replacement sign(s) cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rename an existing road</td>
<td>$189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Deterent as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinances/Plans/Verification</td>
<td>Free if emailed, postage extra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood, Zoning, Subdivision, Watershed</td>
<td>$10 a page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Plan</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Verification Letter (DMV, ALE, etc)</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color copies (8.5'*11&quot;) per page</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color copies (11'*17&quot;) per page</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008-2009 PERMIT FEE SCHEDULE FOR STANLY COUNTY
7/01/2008-6/30/2009

BUILDING PERMIT FEES

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PERMITS
FEES ARE $4.85 PER THOUSAND OF THE TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF
THE PROJECT. (TOTAL ESTIMATED COST INCLUDES THE BUILDING,
ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL, PLUMBING AND GRADING SITE WORK.)
THIS FEE APPLIES TO ADDITIONS, RENOVATIONS OR ALTERATIONS
REGARDLESS OF COST. $50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT

COMMERCIAL MODULAR UNITS
FEE IS $325.00 PER UNIT. ADDITIONS, ALTERATIONS, PORCHES, DECKS,
RAMPS AND STEPS WILL BE ESTIMATED AT $4.85 PER THOUSAND OF
ESTIMATED COST. $50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT

RESIDENTIAL PERMITS
(ONE AND TWO FAMILY DWELLINGS & TOWNHOUSES)
FEE IS $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST OR ON CALCULATED
COST AT $85.00 PER SQUARE FOOT (WHICHEVER FIGURE IS GREATER)

RESIDENTIAL PERMITS WITHOUT ADDED SQUARE FOOTAGE
FEE IS BASED ON $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF TOTAL ESTIMATED COST.
APPLIES TO REMODELING, ANY ALTERATIONS THAT EXCEED $5000 IN
ESTIMATED COST, AND ALL CHANGES TO LOAD BEARING PARTS OF
THE STRUCTURE. $50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT

ADDITIONS TO EXISTING STRUCTURES
(HABITABLE SPACE)
FEE IS BASED ON $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST OR ON
CALCULATED COST AT $85.00 PER SQUARE FOOT. (WHICHEVER FIGURE
IS GREATER.) $50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT

ROOF COVERED ADDITIONS AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES
(NON-HABITABLE SPACE)
FEE IS BASED ON $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST OR ON
CALCULATED COST AT $35.00 PER SQUARE FOOT- (WHICHEVER FIGURE
IS GREATER)- GARAGES, CARPORTS, PORCHES, UNHEATED STORAGE
BUILDINGS, AND OTHER ROOF COVERED ACCESSORY STRUCTURES
$50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT
STRUCTURES WITHOUT ROOFS
FEE IS BASED ON $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST. FEE
APPLYS TO DECKS, PATIOS, PIERS, STEPS, SEAWALLS, AND OTHER
STRUCTURES WITHOUT A ROOF $50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT

IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS
FEE IS BASED ON $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST. FEE
APPLYS TO RESIDENTIAL SWIMMING POOLS, RE-ROOFING, SIDING, AND
ANY COSMETICS OVER $5000 $50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT

HOMEOWNER RECOVERY FEE
FEE IS $10.00 PER APPLICABLE PERMIT. APPLIES TO WORK
PERFORMED BY LICENSED GENERAL CONTRACTORS ON SINGLE
FAMILY HOMES.

PLAN REVIEW FEES
INSTITUTIONAL AND COMMERCIAL PROJECTS
ESTIMATED COST $90,001 TO $500,000. -- FEE $150.00
ESTIMATED COST OVER $500,000 -- FEE $300.00

RE-INSPECTION FEE
FEE IS $50.00 FOR PROJECTS HAVING SAME TRADE VIOLATIONS NOT
CORRECTED ON THE SECOND TRIP TO THE JOB SITE. THESE FEES ARE
REQUIRED TO BE PAID BEFORE THE THIRD INSPECTION.
THIS APPLIES TO ALL TRADES- BUILDING, ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL,
PLUMBING, MODULAR & MOBILE HOMES.

RESIDENTIAL MODULAR HOMES PERMITS
FACTORY CONSTRUCTED MODULAR UNITS- FEE IS $300.00
SITE BUILT HABITABLE ROOM ADDITIONS- FEES WILL BE $3.85 PER
THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST OR ON CALCULATED COST $85.00 PER
SQUARE FOOT (WHICH EVER FIGURE IS GREATER).
GARAGES, CARPORTS, NONHABITABLE STORAGE ROOMS & PORCHES
FEES WILL BE $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST OR ON
CALCULATED COST AT $35.00 PER SQUARE FOOT (WHICHEVER FIGURE
IS GREATER)
DECKS- FEE IS $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST
MOVED HOME PERMITS
HOMES MOVED OFF THE FOUNDATION TO ANOTHER LOCATION. FEE $300.00. ROOM ADDITIONS- FEES WILL BE $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST OR ON CALCULATED COST AT $85.00 PER SQUARE FOOT (WHICHEVER FIGURE IS GREATER) NONHABITABLE STORAGE ROOMS, GARAGES, CARPORTS, PORCHES - FEES WILL BE $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST OR ON CALCULATED COST AT $35.00 PER SQUARE FOOT (WHICHEVER FIGURE IS GREATER)
DECKS - FEE IS $3.85 PER THOUSAND OF ESTIMATED COST

MISCELANEOUS PERMITS AND FEES
DEMOLITION PERMIT- FEE $100.00
ABC INSPECTION- FEE $100.00
DAYCARE INSPECTION- FEE $100.00
RESIDENTIAL GROUP HOME INSPECTION- FEE $100.00
INFORMATION OR OCCUPANCY USE INSPECTIONS- FEE $100.00

MOBILE HOME PERMITS
SINGLE WIDE UNIT – FEE $225.00
DOUBLE AND TRIPPLE SECTION UNITS- FEE $275.00
(FEES INCLUDE DECKS, PORCHES, STEPS AND UNDERPENING.)
FOR TRADES PERMITS REFER TO ITEMIZED SECTIONS.

ELECTRICAL PERMITS
COMMERCIAL FEES
NEW SERVICE -- .55 CENTS PER AMP
CHANGE OF SERVICE-- .50 CENTS PER AMP
SUB- PANELS-- .50 CENTS PER AMP
NEW INSTALLATIONS WITHOUT NEW SERVICE OR SUB- PANELS
FEE IS $1.25 FOR THE FIRST 25 OUTLETS AND $.75 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL OUTLET. (OUTLETS ARE LIGHT FIXTURES, SWITCHES,
RECEPTICALS, DISCONNECTS, STARTERS, ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT.
CONSTRUCTION TRAILER-- .55 CENTS PER AMP
TRANSFORMERS-- FEE $50.00 (EACH)
GENERATORS-- FEE $50.00 (EACH)
SAW SERVICE-- FEE $50.00 (EACH)
SEWER PUMPS-- FEE $50.00 (EACH)
ELEVATORS-- FEE $50.00 (EACH)
SWIMMING POOLS—FEE $75.00
SIGNS-- FEE$50.00
TEMPORARY POWER AGREEMENT-- FEE $75.00
TEMPORARY POWER EXTENSION-- FEE $75.00
50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT
RESIDENTIAL FEES
NEW SERVICE -- .50 CENTS PER AMP
CHANGE OF SERVICE-- .40 CENTS PER AMP
MODULAR HOMES-- .40 CENTS PER AMP.
MOBILE HOMES-- .40 CENTS PER AMP.
WIRING MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT-- $50.00
GENERATORS-- $50.00
SEWER PUMPS--$50.00
SAW SERVICES-- $50.00
SWIMMING POOLS-- $75.00
LOAD CONTROLS--$50.00
REPAIRS-- $50.00
RECONNECT--$50.00
$50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT

MECHANICAL PERMITS

COMMERCIAL FEES
HEAT PUMPS, GAS FURNACES, OIL FURNACES (WITH OR WITH OUT
A/C), PACKAGE UNITS-- FEE $60.00 PER UNIT
A/C UNITS ONLY-- FEE $50.00 PER UNIT
BOILER SYSTEM -- FEE $60.00 PLUS $50.00 FOR EACH FAN COIL BOX,
VAV BOX OR TERMINAL BOX.
CHILLER-- FEE $60.00
DUCT WORK ONLY-- FEE $50.00
UNIT HEATERS-- FEE $50.00 FIRST UNIT & ADDITIONAL UNITS AT $40.00
PER UNIT
WALL HEATERS—FEE $50.00
RADIANT HEAT SYSTEMS-- $50.00
GAS LOGS, GAS LIGHT, GAS GRILL, GAS WATER HEATER-- FEE $60.00
GAS LINE ONLY-- $60.00
CHANGE OUTS / NO DUCTWORK -- $50.00 PER UNIT
CHANGE OUTS WITH DUCTWORK -- $60.00 PER UNIT
HOOD SYSTEMS-- $60.00 FIRST HOOD & ADDITIONAL HOODS-- $40.00
EACH.
REFRIGERATION PERMIT - $50.00
$50.00 MINIMUM ON ANY PERMIT
RESIDENTIAL FEES
HEAT PUMPS, GAS FURANCE, OIL FURNACES, (WITH OR WITHOUT A/C),
PACKAGE UNITS, BOILER--$55.00 PER UNIT
A/C UNITS ONLY--$50.00 PER UNIT
DUCT WORK ONLY--$50.00
CHANGE OUT--$50.00
UNIT HEATERS--FEE $50.00
WALL HEATERS--FEE $50.00
RADIANT HEAT SYSTEM--FEE $50.00
GAS LOGS, GAS LIGHTS, GAS GRILL, GAS WATER HEATER--FEE $50.00
GAS LINE ONLY--FEE $50.00
MOBILE HOME CONNECTIONS--$40.00

PLUMBING PERMITS

PLUMBING FIXTURE-- FEE $3.75 (PER FIXTURE) PLUS $30.00 FOR
WATER/SEWER LINES. FIXTURES ARE SINKS, TOILETS, TUBS, URNIALS,
BIDET, WASHERS, WATER FOUNTAINS, FLOOR SINKS, FLOOR DRAINS,
GREASE TRAPS, CLEAN OUTS, WATER HEATERS, HOSE BIBBS,
EXPANSION TANKS, BACKFLOW PREVENTERS, FIXTURES RECEIVING
WATER SUPPLY
WATER SERVICE AND/OR SEWER SERVICE ONLY--FEE $50.00
WATER HEATER CHANGE OUT--$50.00
GAS LINES--FEE $50.00
WATER SOFTNERS--$50.00
MOBILE HOME CONNECTIONS - $40.00
IRRIGATION PERMIT-$50.00
A PERMIT ISSUED PURSUANT TO G.S. 153-A-357 EXPIRES SIX MONTHS, OR LESSER TIME FIXED BY ORDINANCE OF THE COUNTY, AFTER THE DATE OF ISSUANCE IF THE WORK AUTHORIZED BY THE PERMIT HAS NOT COMMENCED. IF AFTER COMMENCEMENT THE WORK IS DISCONTINUED FOR A PERIOD OF 12 MONTHS, THE PERMIT THEREFORE IMMEDIATELY EXPIRES. NO WORK AUTHORIZED BY A PERMIT THAT HAS EXPIRED MAY THEREAFTER BE PERFORMED UNTIL A NEW PERMIT HAS BEEN SECURED. (G.S. 153-358)

THEREFORE FULL FEES WILL BE CHARGED FOR PERMITS THAT ARE ALLOWED TO EXPIRE.

1- PERMITS EXPIRE AT SIX MONTHS WITHOUT FIRST INSPECTION.
2- PERMITS EXPIRE AT ONE YEAR FROM LAST INSPECTION.

PERMIT FEES REFUNDED WITHIN SIX MONTHS WILL HAVE AN ADMINISTRATIVE FEE--$25.00
ALL PERMIT FEES RECEIVED SIX MONTHS OR LONGER ARE NON-REFUNDABLE.
### Environmental Health Fee Schedule Effective July 1, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Onsite Fees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Evaluation (two acres)</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Site Evaluation &gt;600gpd</td>
<td>$150/600gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Authorizations Type I, II and III systems without a pump.</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Authorizations Type III with a pump and Type IV Systems</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Authorizations Type V and VI Systems</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansions</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout Change</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing System Inspection (replacing home)</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing System Inspection (accessory structure) site visit necessary</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing System Inspection (accessory structure) site visit is not necessary</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra visits due to site improperly prepared</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Well Program**
- Well Permit (all except repairs)                                      $225.00

**Water Samples**
- Bacteriological                                                        $25
- Resample bacteriological                                               $10
- Inorganic/Sulfur Bacteria/Iron Bacteria/Nitrate                        $35
- Resample Inorganic/Sulfur Bacteria/Iron Bacteria/Nitrate              $20
- Petroleum or Pesticide                                                 $50
- Resample Petroleum or Pesticide                                        $30
- Flouride                                                               $10

**Other Fees**
- Swimming Pool Permit - Seasonal                                         $50
- Swimming Pool Permit - Annual                                          $50
- Tattoo Artist                                                          $300
- Plan Review                                                            $100/$200
- TFE Permit                                                             $50.00

---

Plan review fee is $100 for foodstalls, $200 for full service restaurants and swimming pools. This fee includes remodeling of existing facilities. Government agencies, school cafeterias and non-profit exempt.

** Site visits are necessary for any request for an existing system inspection to allow for the construction of an accessory structure for the following reasons:

- The square footage of the existing structure is being increased,
- The proposed structure is detached from the existing structure and requires a dug footing, slab, or buried supports.

AND

- An as-built operation permit for the existing septic tank system cannot be located.
STANLY COUNTY CENTRAL PERMITTING
INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT
1000 NORTH FIRST STREET, SUITE 13C
ALBEMARLE, NC 28001
FAX# 704 986 3783 PHONE# 704 986 3667

PERMIT IS NOT VALID UNTIL ALL FEES ARE COVERED AND THIS APPLICATION
IS DETERMINED TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

MOBILE HOME SET-UP PERMIT APPLICATION
BUILDING PERMIT #

DATE   PROPERTY OWNER

JOB LOCATION, ADDRESS AND DIRECTIONS

PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW TO INDICATE TYPE OF USE OF THIS PROPERTY
COMMERCIAL [ ] RESIDENTIAL [ ]

# OF SECTIONS IN MOBILE HOME: SET-UP MANUEL ON SITE: YES NO

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

NC STATE LICENSE #
CLASS CERTIFICATION:
EXPIRATION DATE:

NOTE: ALL INFORMATION MUST BE COMPLETED TO PERMIT.

SET-UP CONTRACTOR
COMPANY NAME
ADDRESS
FAX# PHONE#

I hereby agree to act under permit applied for in full accordance with all state laws and codes and ordinances of Stanly County, NC and I agree that no work will be done contrary to the same, else the permit issued hereunder to be void. GS 153A-357 AND 160A-417

GENERAL CONTRACTOR MUST SUBMIT SUBCONTRACTOR PERMITS AND PAY FEES AT TIME BUILDING PERMIT IS ISSUED. ONLY MISCELLANEOUS PERMITS MAY BE MAILED WITH FEE OR FAXED IF THEY CARRY A BOND WITH STANLY COUNTY’S INSPECTION DEPARTMENT.

Signature (SET-UP CONTRACTOR)
Stanly County
Environmental Health
Well Permit Application

Section 1 Please complete the following information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Telephone Numbers</th>
<th>daytime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section 2 Development Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Section/# Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

APPLICATION FOR: ( ) New Well ( ) Repair ( ) Abandonment

TYPE OF FACILITY

- ( ) Single Family
- ( ) Multi-Family
- ( ) Business/Industry
- ( ) Agricultural
- ( ) Irrigation

A site plan shall be submitted with this application. The site plan must show the following: ( ) - Location of all structures or proposed structures, ( ) - Location of any current or future potential sources of contamination such as septic tank systems, and fuel storage tanks, ( ) - Location of municipal sewer lines.

The applicant shall notify the Health Department if any of the following apply to the property in question:

If the answer is "yes" Locations must be indicated on the submitted site plan

1. Yes ( ) No Does the site contain any existing or permitted septic tank systems.
2. Yes ( ) No Are there any easements or rights of way.
3. Yes ( ) No Are there any existing wells or springs.
4. Yes ( ) No Are there any variances regarding well construction or location issued under 15A NCAC 02C .0118
5. Yes ( ) No Any current or pending restrictions regarding groundwater use as specified in G.S. 87-88(a)
6. Yes ( ) No Are there any petroleum or chemical storage tanks (above or underground)
7. Yes ( ) No Are there any landfills, waste storage, known underground contamination, or any other characteristics or activities on the property or adjacent properties that could impact groundwater quality or suitability of the site for well construction.

I have read this application and certify that the information provided herein is true, complete, and correct. Authorized county and state officials are granted right of entry to conduct necessary inspections to determine compliance with applicable laws and rules. I understand that I am solely responsible for the property identification and labeling of all property lines and corners and making the site accessible so that a complete site evaluation can be performed.

If the information in the application for an improvements permit is falsified, changed, or the site is altered, then the improvements permit and authorization to construct shall become invalid. The permit is valid for 60 months.

[Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent]

Directions to Property
## Stanly County Environmental Health
### Property Development Application

#### Section 1: Please complete the following information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Telephone Number(s) daytime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant (if different than owner)</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Telephone Number(s) daytime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 2: Development Information

**Property Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Subdivision:</th>
<th>Section#</th>
<th>Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPLICATION FOR:**

- New System: ( ) Improvement Permit ( ) Construction Authorization - required to obtain building permit
- Expansion: ( ) Improvement Permit ( ) Construction Authorization - required to obtain building permit
- Existing System: ( ) Reconnection ( ) Renovation ( ) Addition

**If applying for Authorization to Construct:**

Please Indicate Desired System Type(s): (systems can be ranked in order of your preference)

- ( ) Accepted ( ) Alternative ( ) Conventional ( ) Innovative ( ) Other ( ) Any

**TYPE OF FACILITY**

- Single Family: Type ( ) Multi-Family: Type ( ) Business/Industry: Type (See Addendum)
- # Bedrooms: ( ) Units: ( ) # Bedrooms per unit: ( ) Wastewater: ( ) Domestic: ( ) Industrial: ( )
- Garbage Disposal: ( ) Basement: ( ) Basement Water Fixtures: ( ) Check one: ( )
- Water Supply: ( ) Public: ( ) Community: ( ) Private: ( ) Other: ( )

**Existing System Approval ( Reconnection)**

- # of bedrooms in original home: ( ) # bedrooms in new home: ( )
- Type of addition: ( ) Square footage: ( )
- Type of structure: ( ) Square footage: ( )

- Will there be any water using fixtures installed in the addition or detached accessory structure? ( )
- In what name was the original septic tank permit issued? ( )
- In what year was the septic tank system installed? ( )

The applicant shall notify the Health Department if any of the following apply to the property in question:

- ( ) Yes ( ) No Does the site contain any jurisdictional wetlands?
- ( ) Yes ( ) No Does the site contain any existing wastewater systems?
- ( ) Yes ( ) No Is any wastewater going to be generated on the site other than domestic sewage?
- ( ) Yes ( ) No Is the site subject to approval by any other public agency?
- ( ) Yes ( ) No Are there any easements or right of ways on this property?

I have read this application and certify that the information provided herein is true, complete, and correct. Authorized county and state officials are granted right of entry to conduct necessary inspections to determine compliance with applicable laws and rules. I understand that I am solely responsible for the property identification and labeling of all property lines and corners and making the site accessible so that a complete site evaluation can be performed.

**IF THE INFORMATION IN THE APPLICATION FOR AN IMPROVEMENTS PERMIT IS FALSIFIED, CHANGED, OR THE SITE IS ALTERED, THEN THE IMPROVEMENTS PERMIT AND AUTHORIZATION TO CONSTRUCT SHALL BECOME INVALID.**

The permit is valid for either 60 months or without expiration depending upon documentation submitted. Complete site plan = 60 months; complete plat = without expiration

---

**Directions to Property**

---

**Signature of Owner or Authorized Agent**

---

**Date**

---
APPLICATION FOR WATER SAMPLES

NAME:__________________________________________

PHONE NUMBER:_____________________________________

ADDRESS:(Mailing)_________________________________________

ADDRESS OF SAMPLE POINT:_________________________________________

DIRECTIONS:___________________________________________

___________________________________________

CHOOSE TYPE OF SAMPLE:  BACTERIOLOGICAL (COLIFORM & E. COLI) $25.00
RESAMPLE BACTERIOLOGICAL $10.00
INORGANIC (METALS, ARSENIC) $35.00
(Sulfur is separate on request only)
RESAMPLE INORGANIC $20.00
PETROLEUM $50.00
RESAMPLE PETROLEUM $30.00
PESTICIDE $50.00
RESAMPLE PESTICIDE $30.00
NITRATE $35.00
SULFUR BACTERIA $35.00

TYPE OF TREATMENT SYSTEM IF ANY _______________________________________

AMOUNT & DATE PAID:________________________________________

BY:__________________________________________

COMMENTS:________________________________________

_________________________________________
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

1. What was the purpose of your visit? (check all that apply)
   a. _____Environmental Health
   b. _____Planning/Zoning/Subdivision
   c. _____Inspections
   d. _____Permits
   e. _____Other (Please describe ________________________________)

2. Who assisted you?_________________________________________

3. Was this staff member(s): Friendly? _____Yes _____No
   Knowledgeable _____Yes _____No
   Courteous _____Yes _____No
   Helpful _____Yes _____No

4. Please rate the subject matter knowledge exhibited by this staff member.
   _____Very Good _____Good _____Average _____Poor _____Very Poor

5. Please rate the quality of service you received.
   _____Very Good _____Good _____Average _____Poor _____Very Poor

6. Did the assistance you received meet your needs? _____Yes _____No

7. Were you assisted in a timely fashion? _____Yes _____No

   If No, what is the total amount of time you spent in the office? __________

8. If you could use a credit/debit card, would you? _____Yes _____No

9. If you could schedule inspections online, would you? _____Yes _____No

10. Would you like to be contacted to express your concerns in more detail?
    _____No  _____Yes  Your Name: ________________________________
Telephone Number: ____________________
Appendix VI: Samples from Benchmark Counties
How to start the process

In order to obtain a Commercial Building Permit in the Jurisdiction of Harnett County, the following steps are required where applicable and generally in the following order. Everything will be submitted through our office at 108 East Front Street in Lillington, NC.

**STEP One (if not in town jurisdiction): COMMERCIAL LAND USE WITH SITE PLAN REVIEW.**

Use Harnett County GIS to complete application. Applicant shall have the following:

a. A recorded copy of the Deed* for the property, or offer to purchase.

b. A Site Plan or Plat Map drawn to a scale meeting the requirements of site plan submittal checklist, Checklist available in Planning Section. (see notes on back)

c. Property in Highway 87 Corridor Overlay District must complete Development Review Board application & include with initial submittal for review by DRB (additional $60 site plan review fee)

NOTE: It is recommended that you meet with the Planning Department prior to submittal of site plan.

*This can be obtained at the Register of Deeds Office
Harnett County Courthouse
U.S. 401 North
(910) 893-7540

**APPROXIMATELY 7 to 10 BUSINESS DAYS FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW**

Land Use with Site Plan review fee of $175.00 will be paid at initial application
5 copies of site plan required for Planning Dept.

A copy of the NC DOT driveway permit will need to be submitted and approved to the Planning Dept. before the site plan will be released from the Planning Dept.

For sites within the jurisdiction of the County’s towns the following items must be presented prior to plan review: a zoning permit or approval letter, site plan for new buildings, and deed* or offer to purchase.

**Numbers to Remember**

Central Permitting 910-893-7525 ext 2
Inspections 910-893-7525 ext 3
Environmental Health/Health & Sanitation 910-893-7547
Planning 910-893-7525 ext 4
Fire Marshall 910-893-7580
NCDOT 910-486-1496
STEP Two:
Septic Tank Permits are applied for at the Central Permitting Department. Customer must complete the Environmental Checklist.

Fee paid upon planning site plan approval, before scheduling Environmental Health Inspection.

NEW SEPTIC TANK FEE $250.00
EXISTING SEPTIC TANK FEE $100.00
NEW WELL PERMIT $250.00
REVISION FEE $25 + $40 Site plan revision fee

If site is on public Sewer, contact Steve Ward at Public Utilities for tap fees. (910) 893-7575

STEP Three (can be done at the same time as STEP Two):
7 to 10 day plan review period for all plans. Plans are required for the following departments:
Building – 2 set of plans w/ commercial building application (for Harnett County zoning, Lillington & Coats)
Fire Marshal – 2 sets of plans w/ plan review application
Health & Sanitation – 1 set of plans w/ required application (if applicable)
Environmental Health – 1 set of plans (if applicable)

All plans are required to have a Building Code Summary and site plan.

For jobs less than $90,000 or 2500 square feet the following are required:
- a. Footing / Foundation
- b. Floor Plan
- c. Elevations (exterior view)
- d. Roof framing / roof structural drawings
- e. Any steel beams or LVL wood beams
- f. 2nd floor framing plan
- g. Electrical, Plumbing & Mechanical Plans

For jobs more than $90,000 or 2500 square feet the following are required:
- b. All electrical, plumbing, & mechanical plans
- c. Sprinkler plan (if required)
- d. All structural plans SEALED!

Commercial permits are priced by job cost for each trade-building permit based on building cost only, electrical permit based on electrical cost only, as well as mechanical and plumbing, temporary electrical poles purchased separately. Refer to fee schedule for fees or see online permit estimator. Contact Central Permitting for questions related to permit price.

REQUIREMENTS FOR A SITE PLAN
The plat must show the location of the property lines, proposed structures, driveways, parking, pools, floodplain, watershed, and existing structures along with the dimensions of each structure. This identifies what you want to do with your property, as well as aids Environmental Health in locating an appropriate location for your septic tank. Usually required to be prepared by a Land Surveyor (See Zoning Ordinance Article IV Section 21.3) but in some cases the site plan can be done by an individual to engineer scale meeting all site plan requirements, although it is recommended to be prepared by Professional Surveyor or Engineer.

NOTE: Private Deed Restrictions or Restrictive Covenants might require setbacks that exceed those required by the Planning Dept. The more restrictive requirements will govern. Consult your Deed.
Mecklenburg County Vision

To be the best local government service provider.

Mecklenburg County Mission

To serve residents by helping improve their lives and community.

Customer Service Value

Customers: We serve our customers with courtesy and respect.
CUSTOMER SERVICE STANDARDS

Customer Service Philosophy

More than any other consideration, Mecklenburg County employees should serve their customers based on the following philosophy:

We treat customers as we would like to be treated.

Customer Service Standards

To support this philosophy, Mecklenburg County has developed five customer service standards, as follows:

- Service Quality
- Ethics
- Timeliness
- Courtesy and respect
- Communication

Service quality refers to the attributes of the product or service provided, while the other four standards address how we develop and deliver the product or service and how we interact with customers.

These standards were developed by the Customer Service Coordinating Council, an employee team charged with identifying methods for increasing service value within the organization. The standards recommended by the Council reflect its research on best customer service practices already used within Mecklenburg County as well as those used by other organizations. The intent of the standards is to ensure consistency of service throughout the Mecklenburg County organization. These standards will allow the County to describe for its employees and its customers the practices the County considers excellent customer service as it strives to realize its vision to be the best local government service provider.

Supporting each standard is a series of actions that describe examples of how the standard should be applied. However, it is recognized that these actions may not be applicable in all cases and with all customers, and that it may not be feasible to monitor and track employee performance relative to every action listed. Therefore, these actions will serve as the basis for County departments and work units to tailor specific employee performance expectations to meet each standard as appropriate. It is further expected that employees will use their best judgment in serving customers, consistent with the overall customer service philosophy of “treating customers as we would like to be treated.”
1.10 Employees will consider each customer request, complaint, or suggestion as their responsibility, regardless of whether the service/response is provided by that employee or their department, and consider each customer’s satisfaction as their own responsibility.

Standard #2: Service Ethics

Ethics can be defined as “doing what is fundamentally appropriate.” We believe in the highest standards of lawful and ethical conduct. Our reputation for truthfulness, fairness, and honesty is earned by each of us in our daily work.

Customer Service Ethics Actions

2.1 Employees will adhere to the County’s code of ethics, showing no favoritism among customers, treating all customers fairly and equitably, and refusing to accept gifts from customers (and others) of more than $50 in value.

2.2 Employees will maintain customer (and employee) confidentiality and privacy where mandated and otherwise appropriate.
Standard #3: Service Timeliness

We are dedicated to meeting or exceeding customer expectations in a timely manner.

Customer Service Timeliness Actions

3.1 Services will be provided consistent with the customer’s reasonable expectations for timeliness.

3.2 Employees will respond to customer contacts within the day the contact is made if possible, and no later than the next business day.

3.3 When absent more than 8 consecutive working hours, employees will use voice and email features to provide information regarding their return to the office.

3.4 Backup staffing or an appropriate contingency will be designated for employees who are absent more than 8 consecutive working hours.

3.5 Customers with appointments will be served within 10 minutes of the scheduled time or will be kept informed of any delays due to unusual circumstances.

3.6 Employees will strive to answer incoming telephone calls within three rings.
Standard #4: Courtesy & Respect

We will show courtesy and respect for all customers while performing the services they require.

Customer Service Courtesy and Respect Actions

4.1 Employees will display dignity and respect for all customers.

4.2 Employees will be pleasant and courteous during all customer interactions.

4.3 Employees will recognize cultural and ethnic differences of customers and not let these differences interfere with providing customer service.

Standard #5: Customer Service Communication

We will communicate clearly and deliberately with customers as a key building block to excellent customer service and customer satisfaction.

Customer Service Communication Actions

5.1 Employees will confirm customer expectations with the customer prior to providing service.

5.2 Employees will use effective oral and written communication, including listening carefully to every customer.

5.3 Employees will explain to customers how decisions are made.

5.4 Employees will explain available options to customers if they disagree with a decision or have a complaint regarding service.
5.5 Employees are responsible for ensuring customer problems or complaints are resolved or, if the resolution is not within their authority, to ensure the matter is appropriately forwarded to the property authority.

5.6 Employees are responsible for communicating customer service problems and resolutions to the appropriate supervisor.

5.7 Employees are responsible for communicating to the customer the County’s authority to address the customer’s request (e.g., what is legally possible).

5.8 Employees will include footers with their contact information (name, department, address, phone number, email address) in external email communication.

5.9 Customer calls will be transferred to the appropriate person for service rather than through an operator, and connected with a live person rather than voice mail, when possible. If that individual is not available, the receptionist or operator should provide the customer with the option of leaving a voice mail or leaving a message with the receptionist or operator.

5.10 Employees will know and understand the organizational structure of their work division and department.

5.11 Employees answering customer phone calls should include their name and department/agency with their customer greeting.

5.12 Employees will close all customer interactions by asking, “Have I answered all of your questions today?”, “Is there anything else I can help you with?,” or similar inquiry.
Appendix VII: References


