

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JANUARY 8, 2024

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, January 8, 2024, beginning at 5:33 p.m. Members present were Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, Zac Engle, Paul Gilmer, and Andrew Egbert. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Luke Carter, and Andrew Nelson (Planning), Noland Tipton and Kym Smith (GDOT), and Brent Ducharme (City Attorney).

Chair O'Connor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Chair O'Connor advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Chair O'Connor noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. She further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair O'Connor acknowledged the absences of Commissioners Glass & Peterson.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on all land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Mr. Kirkman stated there were no withdrawals or continuances.

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 18, 2023 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Chair O'Connor requested approval of the December 18, 2023 meeting minutes. Mr. Engle made a motion to continue approval of the November meeting minutes to next month's meeting and to approve the December meeting minutes, seconded by Ms. Magid. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JANUARY 8, 2024

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Chair O'Connor noted there were several items that did not have opposition signed up to speak and were eligible for the expedited agenda. These items were Z-24-01-001 for 3511 Randleman Road, Z-24-01-003 for 701 Kirkman Street, Z-24-01-004 for 693 Brigham Road, Z-24-01-005 for 5226 Summit Avenue and a portion of Summit Avenue Right-of-way, Z-24-01-006 for 5309 Hilltop Road, and Z-24-01-007 for 1816 and 1820 New Garden Road and 1803 Strathmore Drive. Chair O'Connor asked if anyone in attendance or online wished to speak in opposition to any of those items. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor noted the Commission would address these items through expedited review and reordered the agenda accordingly.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NEW BUSINESS:

PL(P) 24-01 & Z-24-01-001: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the property identified as 3511 Randleman Road, generally described as east of Randleman Road and north of Ashcroft Road (0.36 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-3 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to 3 dwelling units per acre. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Ms. Magid. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-01-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 3511 Randleman Road from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JANUARY 8, 2024

Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, February 20, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Z-24-01-003: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) for the property identified as 701 Kirkman Street, generally described as south of Kirkman Street and west of Memphis Street (0.26 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban Central on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to increase access to community facilities and create equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district limits the subject property to only a day care use or single-family dwelling. These uses are compatible with the adjacent low-intensity residential uses in proximity to the subject property and are suitable with the zoning and development pattern of the neighborhood at large. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-01-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 701 Kirkman Street from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JANUARY 8, 2024

reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday February 20, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-24-01-004: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-RM-18 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 18) for the property identified as 693 Brigham Road, generally described as west of Brigham Road and south of Eric Road (4.25 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan currently designates this property as Urban General. The Western Area Plan designates the subject property as Employment Area. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places strategy to meeting housing needs and desires with a sufficient and diverse supply of housing products, prices and locations. The proposed CD-RM-18 zoning district allows uses that are compatible with existing varied residential uses and densities surrounding the request and supports the employment-oriented character of the larger area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-01-004, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 693 Brigham Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-RM-18 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 18) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-18 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of the surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 8, 2024**

of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday February 20, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-03 & Z-24-01-005: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the property identified as 5226 Summit Avenue and a portion of Summit Avenue Right-of-way, generally described as east of Summit Avenue and north of Hicone Road (0.86 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-3 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to 3 dwelling units per acre. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Skenes made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Ms. Magid. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-01-005, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property identified as 5226 Summit Avenue and a portion Summit Avenue right of way, described as east of Summit Avenue and north of Hicone Road, from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JANUARY 8, 2024

Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, February 20, 2024 City Council Meeting.

PL(P) 24-04 & Z-24-01-006: An annexation and original zoning request from County AG (Agricultural) to City CD-RM-18 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 18) for the property identified as 5309 Hilltop Road, generally described as south of Hilltop Road and east of Charles Street (3.24 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed CD-RM-18 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate duplexes, twin homes, townhouses, cluster housing, and other residential uses at a density of 18.0 units per acre or less. The request allows uses that are compatible with existing residential uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Nick Blackwood, 804 Green Valley Road, Suite 200, stated he was available to answer any questions.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Magid made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-01-006, the Greensboro

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 8, 2024**

Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 5309 Hilltop Road from County AG (Agricultural) to City CD-RM-18 (Conditional District – Residential Multi-family - 18) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-RM-18 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Engle seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, February 20, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Z-24-01-007: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-RM-5 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 5) for the properties identified as 1816 and 1820 New Garden Road and 1803 Strathmore Drive, generally described as southeast of New Garden Road and northwest of Strathmore Drive (7.03 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the conditions associated with the request

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map. The New Garden Road Strategic Plan designates the properties as Low Residential (3 to 5 Dwelling Units per Acre). Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density, mixed-use, walkable infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places strategy to meeting housing needs and desires with a sufficient and diverse supply of housing products, prices and locations. The proposed CD-RM-5 zoning district limits negative impacts on surrounding properties. This rezoning request allows uses that are compatible with existing varied residential uses and densities in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Marc Isaacson, 804 Green Valley Road, on behalf of Simaan Market Street, LLC stated that the request is a straightforward request for a similar townhome community to those adjacent to it.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JANUARY 8, 2024

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle stated that the Board had received an e-mail in opposition to the request. He believed this request is a low-intensity use fitting to the surrounding area, and he can support it.

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-01-007, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 693 Brigham Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-RM-18 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 18) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-5 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday February 20, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-02 & Z-24-01-002: An annexation and original zoning request from County AG (Agricultural) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) and consideration of the associated Unified Development Plan for the property identified as 1873, 1875 and 1879 Cude Road and 8110 Tanya Lane, generally described as west of Cude Road and south of Ballard Road (110.36 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Z-24-01-008: An original zoning request from County AG (Agricultural) to City R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) for the property identified as a portion of 1879 Cude Road and a portion of the Cude Road right-of-way, generally described as east of Cude Road and south of Ballard Road (0.23 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request

Vice Chair Magid asked to confirm motion language for the second case associated with the request. Mr. Kirkman stated that the PL(P) 24-02 annexation covers the entirety of the tracts. The

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 8, 2024**

Planned Unit Development Request only covers the portions of the property on the west of Cude Road, with the R-5 request being only the small remnant piece on the east side of Cude Road.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the properties as Exurban on the Future Built Form Map. If this original zoning request is approved, the Future Built Form designation for the subject site is considered to be amended to Urban General in order to ensure an appropriate fit between future land use designation and zoning. The Western Area Plan's Preferred Land Use Concept designates the properties as Agricultural. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Building Community Connections goal to maintain stable, attractive, and healthy places to live and raise families. The proposed PUD zoning designation, as conditioned, allows a mix of residential uses that are complimentary to the surrounding area and expands housing choices in close proximity to a major highway. The proposed development is compatible with the scale and design of the adjacent road and nearby uses. Investment in City services to this area will promote the land uses proposed in this request. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Kirkman stated that the proposed R-5 zoning district for the remainder of the subject properties is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to five dwelling units per acre. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Tom Terrell, 230 North Elm Street, on behalf of Pulte Home Company, stated that this area has eclipsed its previous agricultural character and the proposed development is very low density and suitable for the neighborhood. He displayed aerial photography and an illustrative sketch plan of the site and stated that the proposed development devotes a significant portion of the property to stormwater management and environmental protection. Mr. Terrell stated that they sent a letter to neighbors, and the traffic modeling for the proposal suggests a very limited impact on the surrounding area. They conducted two meetings with six neighbors in attendance.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the request. Seeing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Ms. Magid. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-01-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 8, 2024**

for the property identified as 1873, 1875 and a portion of 1879 Cude Road and 8110 Tanya Lane from County AG (Agricultural) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City PUD zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None).

Mr. Engle then moved to approve the associated UDP, seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None).

Mr. Egbert then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-01-008, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property identified as a portion of 1879 Cude Road and a portion of the Cude Road right-of-way from County AG (Agricultural) to City R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-5 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Engle seconded the motion. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Downing, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: None). Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, February 20, 2024 City Council Meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

Z-23-12-001: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 18) for the properties identified as 318 and 320 Dolley Madison Road, generally described as east of Dolley Madison Road and south of Dobson Road (1.836 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 8, 2024**

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that are compatible with existing uses on adjacent tracts. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Joe Jenkins, 1819 Rolling Road, on behalf of Toledo Homes, LLC, stated that they held a neighborhood meeting and believe that the request will have a minimal impact on the surrounding community.

Ms. Skenes stated that the Commission continued this request for more neighborhood outreach and asked about the Summary of Neighborhood Communications. Mr. Jenkins stated that they submitted the summary last week, and they had originally not scheduled a neighborhood meeting to avoid interfering with the holidays. Mr. Carter stated that the Summary was incorrectly omitted from the Board members' packets and displayed the document for review.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

James Ford, 303 Falling Leaf Lane, stated that he opposes the request, as he believes the applicant has not explained the stormwater control mechanisms sufficiently. There is an existing severe stormwater runoff issue onto his property, and he wishes for this proposal to return to engineering review to account for this. He stated that the illustrative material shown by the applicant also shows an insufficient amount of parking for the requested density. Mr. Ford stated that the proposed 45-foot height and grade changes would mean that the new development would be 30 feet taller than any structures in proximity.

Zilmond Strader, 319 Dolley Madison Road, stated that the request is not fitting with the character of his neighborhood. He feels the outreach measures taken by the applicant have been insufficient, and that his community has not had enough time to do sufficient research to respond to the request. Mr. Strader stated he is concerned about the traffic the proposal will generate given the pre-existing issues with traffic on Dolley Madison Road and the intersection of Tower Road. He is concerned that the proposed stormwater control mechanism will harm the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 8, 2024**

neighborhood and wildlife in the area. Mr. Strader stated that the height of the proposed structures is not suited to the dwellings in proximity, and the applicant has proposed insufficient landscape buffering.

Mr. Engle asked to confirm that the Commission cannot consider stormwater as a determining factor in land use, and Mr. Ducharme stated that was correct. Mr. Engle then asked what the maximum height permissible in the existing R-3 zoning district is, and Mr. Kirkman stated it was 50 feet.

Mr. Ducharme reiterated that the Commission could not consider tenure of a subject property as a facet of land use.

Ms. Magid asked about the required minimum buffer in the requested zoning district, and Mr. Kirkman stated it was a Type C buffer yard with an average width of 15 feet.

Mr. Ford stated that the official notice letter sent to him mentions stormwater infrastructure as a land use consideration, and again requested further engineering work on the proposal to account for the impact on his and other adjacent properties.

Mr. Engle asked about the Commission's role in considering stormwater impacts in land use. Mr. Kirkman stated that stormwater is a site plan consideration addressed by the Technical Review Committee in site plan review. Under State law, new development, when completed, cannot generate more stormwater runoff than exists currently.

Ms. Magid asked if this review would happen after the rezoning, and Mr. Kirkman stated that was correct. Ms. Magid asked if the applicant had provided an illustrative rendering of the site, and the applicant displayed a conceptual plan of the site.

With opposition speaking time expired, Chair O'Connor advised that the applicant had five minutes for rebuttal.

Mr. Jenkins stated that they have attempted to preserve existing vegetation to enhance buffering, and they have tried to keep proposed structures away from existing dwellings as much as possible. He stated that they are utilizing a bio-retention basin to mitigate stormwater runoff. Mr. Jenkins stated that the width of the townhomes proposed requires a third story.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, she advised that anyone wishing to speak in opposition had five minutes for rebuttal. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 8, 2024**

Mr. Downing stated that while the Commission cannot consider some of the concerns expressed tonight, he understood the neighborhood's concerns.

Ms. Skenes stated that she travels on Dolley Madison Road every day, and that there are intense uses in the area, and the request is less dense than some existing developments.

Mr. Gilmer stated he can support the request, and he thinks it fits in with the character of the area.

Mr. Egbert then stated regarding agenda item Z-23-12-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 318 and 320 Dolley Madison Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Magid seconded the motion. The Commission voted 6-1, (Ayes: Skenes, Engle, Egbert, Gilmer, Vice Chair Magid, Chair O'Connor; Nays: Downing). Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday February 20, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

None.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair O'Connor adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, February 19, 2024, beginning at 5:35 p.m. Members present in person were Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, Zac Engle, Paul Gilmer, Sr., Andrew Egbert, Erica Glass and B. Keith Peterson. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Andrew Nelson and Carla Harrison (Planning), Noland Tipton (GDOT), and Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office).

Chair O'Connor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Chair O'Connor advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Chair O'Connor noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. She further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair O'Connor acknowledged the full attendance of Commissioners and noted that Commissioner N. Keith Peterson was attending virtually.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Chair O'Connor requested approval of the November 20, 2023 and January 8, 2024 meeting minutes simultaneously. Mr. Engle made a motion to approve the November and January meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Egbert. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass) Commissioner Peterson was experiencing technical difficulty online and did not vote. Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

FEBRUARY 19, 2024

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Mr. Kirkman stated that agenda item Z-24-02-009, a rezoning request for a portion of 603 North Elm St was withdrawn by the applicant.

Mr. Engle made a motion to approve withdrawal of the rezoning request, Ms. Magid seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass) Commissioner Peterson was experiencing technical difficulty online and did not vote. Nays: (None).

Mr. Kirkman noted that there are no continuances.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to item Z-24-02-003 for 2005 Michelle Avenue and 3910 Yanceyville Street. There was an email received in opposition however no registration in person or online, hearing none she proceeded to announce the expedited agenda.

Chair O'Connor noted there were several items that did not have opposition signed up to speak and were eligible for the expedited agenda. These items were: **PL (P) 24-05 and Z24-02-002** for 3444 Randleman Road and a portion of the Randleman Road right-of-way; **Z-24-02-003** for 2005 Mitchell Avenue and 3910 Yanceyville Street; **PL (P) 24-06 and Z-24-02-004** for 5226 Carol Avenue; **Z-24-02-007** for 7901 Thorndike Road; **Z-24-02-010** for 4822 Koger Boulevard; **Z-24-02-012** for 1205 Arlee Street; 919, 921, 923, 1001, 1003, 1007, 1009, 1011, 1013, 1015, and 1017 Bluford Street; 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, and 406 Boyd Street; 1006, 1100, 1102, 1108, 1200, 1202, 1204, 1206, 1208, and 1210 Salem Street; 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 412, and 425 Stedman Street; and 311, 400, and 402 Stewart Street; and **Z-24-02-013** for 910 Salem Street.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone in attendance or online wished to speak in opposition to any of those items. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor noted the Commission would address these items through expedited review and reordered the agenda accordingly.

PL (P) 24-05 and Z24-02-002: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the property identified as 3444 Randleman Road and a portion of the Randleman Road right-of-way, generally described as west of Randleman Road and north of Old Randleman Road (1.574 acres, of which approximately 1.387 acres lies outside street right-of-way). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Mr. Kirkman noted that the 1.574 acres is the combined acreage of the subject property and the right-of-way. He then reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-3 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to 3 dwelling units per acre. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Ms. Magid. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Commissioner Peterson was experiencing technical difficulty online and did not vote. Nays: (None).

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 3444 Randleman Road and a portion of the Randleman Road Right-of-way from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Commissioner Peterson was experiencing technical difficulty online and did not vote. Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Z-24-02-003: A rezoning request from CD-RM-12 (Conditional District – Residential Multi-family - 12) and R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-12 (Conditional District – Residential Multi-family 12) for the properties identified as 2005 Mitchell Avenue and 3910 Yanceyville Street, generally described as east of Yanceyville Street and south of Lees Chapel Road (22.49 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

1. Permitted uses are limited to Religious Assembly and a maximum of 146 dwelling units.

Mr. Kirkman stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates these properties as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places strategy to meet housing needs and desires with a sufficient and diverse supply of housing products, prices and locations. The proposed CD-RM-12 zoning district, as conditioned, allows uses that are compatible with existing varied residential uses and densities surrounding the request and are also appropriately located along a major thoroughfare. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Mark Isaacson, 804 Green Valley Road, explained that the rezoning is an expansion of an existing affordable housing project. He stated that a neighborhood meeting was held and about 10 to 12 persons attended and were in acceptance of the proposed rezoning.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 2005 Mitchell Avenue and 3910 Yanceyville Street from CD-RM-12 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 12) and R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-12 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 12) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-12 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Magid seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Commissioner Peterson was experiencing technical difficulty online and did not vote. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-06 and Z-24-02-004: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-R-5 (Conditional District - Residential Single-family – 5) for the property identified as 5226 Carol Avenue, generally described as west of Carol Avenue and northwest of Sumner Church Road (0.542 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request.

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to Single-family Dwellings.

Mr. Kirkman stated The GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed CD-R-5 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Magid made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle,

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Commissioner Peterson was experiencing technical difficulty online and did not vote. Nays: (None).

Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-004, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 5226 Carol Avenue from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-R-5 (Conditional District – Residential Single-family -5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: 1) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map. 2) The proposed City CD-R-5 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties. 3) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Commissioner Peterson was experiencing technical difficulty online and did not vote. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Chair O'Connor noted that the technical issues were resolved and Commissioner Peterson is participating online.

Z-24-02-007: A rezoning request from CD-BP (Conditional District – Business Park) to CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) for the property identified as 7901 Thorndike Road, generally described as south of Thorndike Road and east of Pegg Road (3.02 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

1. Permitted uses shall include all uses permitted in the Light Industrial zoning district except Cemeteries.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the property as Planned Industrial on the Future Built Form Map and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Goal to attract world-class development to transform underutilized sites and buildings

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

into valued assets that complement their surroundings. The proposed CD-LI zoning district, as conditioned, allows uses that are compatible with existing uses present on adjacent tracts. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

The applicant was present and passed on speaking.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Glass then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-007, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 7901 Thorndike Road from CD-BP (Conditional District - Business Park) to CD-LI (Conditional District - Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-LI zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses which fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Engle seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass and Peterson) Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-24-02-010: A rezoning request from BP (Business Park) and CD-C-M (Conditional District – Commercial – Medium) to CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) for the property identified as 4822 Koger Boulevard, generally described as north of Koger Boulevard and south of I-40 (9.32 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

1. Uses shall be limited to all uses permitted in the LI district except uses within the Industrial and Manufacturing Use Category; Vehicle Sales and Service uses;

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Funeral Homes and Crematoriums; Animal Shelters; Truck Driving Schools; Taxi Dispatch Terminals; Garden Center/nurseries; Manufactured and Modular Homes Sales; and Truck Stops.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness strategy to increase and preserve the inventory of developable sites compatible with corporate and industrial uses. The proposed CD-LI zoning district allows uses that are compatible with the existing workforce and manufacturing uses and higher intensity commercial uses adjacent to the subject property. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if there were any questions for staff and Ms. Magid noted that there is a trend of BP (Business Park) districts rezoning to LI (Light Industrial) and asked about the square footage requirements for both districts.

Mr. Kirkman explained that in the LI zoning district more warehouse use is allowed, and the proposed rezoning is for additional warehouse space.

Mr. Engle asked if the City has plans to update the LDO (Land Development Ordinance) to address the limitation of warehouse space in the BP (Business Park) district. He also said that consideration should be given as this can be supported by the changes in the real estate market.

Mr. Kirkman said there has been some consideration. He further clarified that there is no limit on the square footage for warehouse space in the LI (Light Industrial) district and there is a cap on the square footage in the BP (Business Park) district.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

S. Leigh Rodenbough, 230 N Elm St, stated notices were sent to surrounding property owners and a meeting held with no attendance. He said that the request is to create more warehouse space.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-010, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 4822 Koger Boulevard from BP (Business Park) and CD-C-M (Conditional District -

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

FEBRUARY 19, 2024

Commercial – Medium) to CD-LI (Conditional District - Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-LI zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses which fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass and Peterson) Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-24-02-012: A rezoning request from PUD (Planned Unit Development), RM-12 (Residential Multi-family -12), RM-18 (Residential Multi-family -18) and R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to PI (Public and Institutional) for the properties identified as 1205 Arlee Street; 919, 921, 923, 1001, 1003, 1007, 1009, 1011, 1013, 1015, and 1017 Bluford Street; 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, and 406 Boyd Street; 1006, 1100, 1102, 1108, 1200, 1202, 1204, 1206, 1208, and 1210 Salem Street; 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 412, and 425 Stedman Street; and 311, 400, and 402 Stewart Street, generally described as north and south of Salem Street, west and east of Boyd Street, and west and east of Stedman Street (11.55 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Municipal, Institutional or Office Campus on the Future Built Form Map and Planned Campus on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Building Community Connections strategy to build on efforts that make neighborhoods around campuses strong and vibrant and make institutional spaces and programs easily accessible to residents. The proposed PI zoning district allows uses that are compatible with the existing university uses and the Planned Campus Future Land Use designation and supports the higher educational character of the area in proximity. Staff recommended approval of the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

FEBRUARY 19, 2024

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone wished to speak in favor of the request. Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant is present and noted that Vice Chair Magid has questions for the applicant. Ms. Magid said that the proposal is an amazing concept consisting of 429 units, retail and parking spaces. She asked if there were drawings associated with the proposal that could be added to the record.

Mr. Bill Barlow, 1601 E Market Street, spoke on behalf of the NC Agriculture and Technical State University. Mr. Barlow explained that the proposed rezoning is to accommodate growth of the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University community. He said he did not have any drawings for the proposal with him but drawings could be provided if needed.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-012, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 1205 Arlee Street; 919, 921, 923, 1001, 1003, 1007, 1009, 1011, 1013, 1015, and 1017 Bluford Street; 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, and 406 Boyd Street; 1006, 1100, 1102, 1108, 1200, 1202, 1204, 1206, 1208, and 1210 Salem Street; 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 412, and 425 Stedman Street; and 311, 400, and 402 Stewart Street from PUD (Planned Unit Development), RM-12 (Residential Multi-family – 12), RM-18 (Residential Multi-family – 18) and R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to PI (Public and Institutional) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed PI zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass and Peterson) Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

FEBRUARY 19, 2024

Z-24-02-013: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to PI (Public and Institutional) for the property identified as 910 Salem Street, generally described as south of Salem Street and east of North Dudley Street (0.14 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Municipal, Institutional or Office Campus on the Future Built Form Map and Planned Campus on the Future Land Use Map. The proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Building Community Connections strategy to build on efforts that make neighborhoods around campuses strong and vibrant and make institutional spaces and programs easily accessible to residents. The proposed PI zoning district allows uses that are compatible with the existing university uses and the Planned Campus Future Land Use designation and supports the higher educational character of the area in proximity. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

The applicant passed on speaking on the item.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-013, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 910 Salem Street from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to PI (Public and Institutional) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed PI zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass and Peterson) Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

REGULAR AGENDA:

Z-24-02-001: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-O (Conditional District – Office) for the property identified as 1223 Summit Avenue, generally described as northwest of Summit Avenue and south of Meadow Street (0.22 acres). (APPROVED).

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall include all uses allowed in the Office zoning district except for the following: Clubs and Lodges and Hotels and Motels.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban Central on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed CD-O zoning district, as conditioned, allows uses that are compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area. The subject property is located on the periphery of a residential neighborhood and along a major thoroughfare. Care should be taken to provide an appropriate transition to the adjacent lower density residential uses. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Kim Dao, 509 Buffalo Tom Drive, referenced aerial photography of the area and stated that despite some residential use in the area, there are already similar uses in close proximity along Summit Avenue. She said adequate onsite parking will be provided and the turn lanes along Summit Avenue will allow for direct access to the subject property therefore limiting the use of Meadow Street. She also stated that the intended professional office use would be an insignificant addition to noise in the area.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Michael and Patricia (Patty) Galligani, 1305 Summit Avenue, expressed concerns regarding the potential accidents due to increase vehicular traffic in the area; pedestrian safety and the lack of

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

sidewalks; lack of buffer separation from the residential area and losing the historic significance of a quiet residential community. He said that there are other residents in the neighborhood who were not in support of the rezoning. Mr. Galligani also mentioned a large tree which was cut down.

Ms. Dao said that the large tree was removed as recommended by her insurance company. Regarding the historical significance she said that the area is already mixed use neighborhood.

Corey Coleman, 1202 Meadow Street, rebutted Ms. Dao comments and stated that the rezoning would increase traffic to the area and negatively impact pedestrians mostly school children. He noted that given the existing structure on the property access to the parking area would be along Meadow Street and not along Summit Ave.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle asked City staff what measures would be in place to address the concerns expressed by the opponents. Mr. Kirkman said that the change of use permit would evaluate the proposed use to ensure public safety. He also clearly outlined what uses are allowed and not allowed in the Office district.

Chair O'Connor asked if there would be parking requirements and Mr. Kirkman said there would be based on the use and the square footage.

Vice Chair Magid asked about signage and Mr. Kirkman explained that there are several options which would be vetted at the permit stage to ensure public safety.

Ms. Skenes asked for clarifications on the provisions of sidewalks along Summit Avenue and Meadow Street. Mr. Kirkman said that usually sidewalks would be required for this type of change of use but given the small lot size this may not be the case. He added that permitted plans would ensure safe access to the property.

Mr. Tipton noted that sidewalk is along Summit Avenue and there is no sidewalk along Meadow Street. He said that the sidewalk requirement depends on the square footage of the disturbed area.

Ms. Skenes also noted the need for a buffer and additional landscaping in the parking area. Mr. Kirkman stated that a Type B landscape buffer and vehicular screening as per the LDO would be required.

Mr. Downing acknowledged the existing street scape along Summit Avenue and that the rezoning could continue this trend. He asked about the community outreach as it relates to the rezoning.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

FEBRUARY 19, 2024

Ms. Kim Dao said that notices were mailed based on the list provided by the City. She stated that there was no meeting and that she provided her contact information. She also said that she had telephone conversations with the two opponents who attended the meeting. Mr. Galligani notified that there were other neighbors who had concerns but were unable to speak or attend the meeting.

Mr. Engle said that the rezoning is in a transitional zone with low impact on the neighborhood therefore he supported the rezoning. Mr. Gilmer Sr. concurred.

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend [approval/denial] of the rezoning request for the property at 1223 Summit Avenue from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-O (Conditional District - Office) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-O zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties. (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-1, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Peterson) Nays: (Glass).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-07 and Z-24-02-005: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-R-5 (Conditional District - Residential Single-family – 5) for the property identified as 4452 Sumner Church Road and a portion of Sumner Church Road right-of-way, generally described as north of Sumner Church Road and north of Old Randleman Road (10.65 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to Single-family detached homes.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed CD-R-5 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Scott Wallace, 3708 Alliance Drive, stated that the proposed rezoning is to facilitate another phase of single-family homes development. He said a community meeting was held with about 12 persons in attendance. He noted that the meeting was cordial and concerns such as traffic, fear of annexation of surrounding properties and the possibility of apartments built instead of single-family homes were addressed.

Mr. Engle asked about the access to the proposed development.

Mr. Wallace said that access will be from Winsland Street and there would not be any access from Sumner Church Road.

Ms. Magid asked about the number of units in the existing phase and Mr. Wallace said there are about eighty-one (81) units. Mr. Kirkman confirmed that the previous approval is for a maximum of 85 single-family dwelling units.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Skenes made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Mr. Egbert then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-005, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 4452 Sumner Church Road and a portion of Sumner Church Road Right-of-way from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-R-5 (Conditional District - Residential Single-family – 5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-R-5 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Glass seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Commissioner Peterson departed the meeting and did not vote. Mr. Engle made a motion seconded by Mr. Gilmer Sr. for his departure. The Commission voted all in favor 8-0 (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting.

The meeting took a break at 7:15PM and resumed 7:35PM

Z-24-02-006: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-18 (Conditional District – Residential Multi-family – 18) for the property identified as 2207 Jones Road, generally described as south of Jones Road and west of US 220 (0.94 acres). (APPROVED).

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to a maximum of 12 dwelling units.
- 2) Maximum building height shall be limited to 45 feet.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places strategy to meeting housing needs and desires with a sufficient and diverse supply of housing products, prices and locations. The proposed CD-RM-18 zoning district, as conditioned, allows uses that are compatible with existing varied residential uses and densities surrounding the request and limits potential negative impacts on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

William and Pauline Johnson, 2406 N Elm Street. Ms. Johnson discussed the ownership history of the property and Mr. Johnson spoke about the neighborhood outreach and stated that they had

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

door to door meeting with neighbors mostly along the street. He talked about the neighbor's concerns including increased traffic and noise, and parking along the streets. He stated that to alleviate the parking concerns more than the required parking would be provided.

Ms. Magid asked the applicant to provide more information on the community outreach. Mr. Johnson displayed the flyer shared during the outreach meeting and he stated that the same flyer was placed in mailboxes along the street and in close proximity.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Han Ksor, 2212 Jones Road, expressed that the proposed rezoning is associated with increased traffic and noise. He pointed out that the subject property is directly across from his single-family home.

Dwayne Ellis, 2200 Jones Road, Mr. Ellis said the rezoning will generate increase traffic and would not be good for the significant number of elderly living in the area.

Felicia Donnell, 2222 Jones Road, stated that the narrow roads would not be able to accommodate the increase traffic and also expressed concerns for pedestrians.

Keisha Scott, 2205 Jones Road, said that the scale of the proposed use is atypical to the use on the street. She said that the dead-end street would prevent smooth maneuvering of vehicles and pose threats to the pedestrians.

Mr. Johnson addressed the concerns raised by the opponents and stated that the rezoning is for townhomes with associated parking spaces. He said that the street is not dead-end but continues onto another street. He also said that he is committed to continued conversation with the neighbors.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle inquired about the parking requirements. Mr. Kirkman stated the required parking as per the LDO. Mr. Engle also asked about the zoning for the property at 2201 Jones Road and Mr. Kirkman said that it is zoned CD-RM-18.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr. commented that the proposal is an enhancement to the community and he supported the rezoning. Mr. Downing concurred with Mr. Gilmer, Sr. and emphasized that both parties should continue working together.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Mr. Gilmer Sr. then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-006, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 2207 Jones Road from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-18 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 18) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-18 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Engle seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 7-1, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Egbert.) Nays: (Glass).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-08 and Z-24-02-008: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-R-7 (Conditional District - Residential Single-family – 7) for the properties identified as 3849 Lewiston Road and a portion of 1908-ZZ Hackamore Road, generally described as west of Lewiston Road and north of Hackamore Road (24.197 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to a maximum of 76 lots.
- 2) No vehicular access shall be permitted on Hackamore Road.

Mr. Kirkman notified the Commissioner that the second condition which was subsequently added by the applicant. Mr. Engle made a motion to accept the addition, seconded by Ms. Magid. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan currently designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed CD-R-7 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that are compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Marc Isaacson, 804 Green Valley Road, PowerPoint presentation addressed the conditions for the rezoning and mentioned the mixed uses including relatively similar multi-family developments and commercial high in close proximity as well as noted the I-840 in the south of the subject properties. He showed a site layout plan and said that thirty percent (30%) of the site would be built on and the remaining seventy percent (70%) will be preserved as open space (unbuilt). He stated that at the neighborhood meeting rigorous discussion took place hence the second condition is added to address some concerns. He said that he would continue working with the neighbors to address concerns. He noted that there were some neighbors in support of the annexation and the rezoning. He pointed out that the subject properties are located in "Growth Tier 1" and have access to the relevant utilities and services.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Diane Stevio, 4930 Hackamore Road, presented a video of the area and said that the proposed use is incompatible with the character and density of the neighborhood. She said that the proposal is not in consistent with the GSO 2040 Vision. She also pointed out the differences in lot sizes in Residential R3 and R7 districts.

Emily Leonard, 4942 Hackamore Road, referenced the GSO 2040 Plan as it relates to community preferences and neighborhood choices. She said that a significant percentage of residents in Greensboro prefers larger lots and that there is a demand for such. She talked about the watershed zone in the area and potential contamination.

Karen, Sawyer, 3847 Lewiston Road, stated that the intended use is out of character with the existing neighborhood and outlined the historical and the sentimental value of the area. She said she would be mostly affected since her property adjoins the subject properties and fears that she would lose privacy.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant would like to speak further in support of the request.

Mr. Isaacson emphasized that the proposed use would preserve a significant portion of the property as open space and therefore is in accordance with the GSO 2040 Plan. He briefly talked about site issues, management and the retention of storm water.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Ms. Magid inquired about provisions for landscape buffer between the proposed use and the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Isaacson said that provisions are made and additional buffer will be provided if needed. He mentioned that he would continue meeting with the residents to address concerns.

Ms. Skenes asked about an alternative plan to provide Single-family R3 lots versus the proposed Single-family R7.

Mr. Chuck Truby, 502 Waycross Drive, stated that the terrain of the land dictates the site layout. He said that a smaller area is suitable for development and they are constrained to preserve a significant portion of the land. He pointed out that the presence of city utilities such as water and sewer encourage the compact development.

Chair O'Connor inquired if anyone would like to speak further in opposition to the request.

Ms. Stevio said that the proposed rezoning is clearly different from a Single-family R3 development and is more dense, and unfit for the existing community.

Ms. Leonard referenced Ms. Isaacson's presentation and stated that the existing mixed use developments shown are not in close proximity. She said the applicant failed to show the surrounding neighborhood. She also said that the proposal is maximizing the developable area and creating a dense development. Ms. Leonard mentioned discussions which took place at a previous meeting with the applicant, the Assistant City Attorney interrupted and explained that the meeting discussion as explained is not under the purview of the Commission.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle said that he did a site visit and stated that the area has a lot of historical and topographical interest. He acknowledged emails received from the opponents and said that he is aware of both sides and noted that the subject properties are topographically challenged. He urged continued dialog between the applicant and the neighbors, and said that he supported the proposed rezoning.

Ms. Magid concurred with Mr. Engle and highlighted the need for buffer separation.

Mr. Downing, stated the he did a site visit and noted the area has high historical value. He said that the proposal would not diminish the beauty of the area. He also said that the proposal took into consideration the natural and historical value of the area. He acknowledged emails received

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

FEBRUARY 19, 2024

from the opponents and encouraged both parties to continue communications. He said he supported the proposal.

Mr. Gilmer Sr. applauded the developer and acknowledged concerns raised by the opponents. He said the proposal is well planned.

Chair O'Connor asked City staff for clarification on the Water Shed Tier 3 as it relates to the proposed rezoning. Mr. Kirkman said that there will be limitations on the impervious surfaces and the stream buffer will be protected. He stated that such concerns will be addressed during the site plan review process and evaluated by the relevant agencies and experts. Chair O'Connor said that the proposed infill is appropriate and encouraged continued communication between the parties and noted that she supported the proposal.

Mr. Downing asked for assurance with the buffer zone and Mr. Kirkman said that the proposed Conditional Zoning allows for additional conditions.

Ms. Downing made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Engle. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-008, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend [approval/denial] of the original zoning request for the properties at 3849 Lewiston Road and a portion of 1908-ZZ Hackamore Road from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-R-7 (Conditional District - Residential Single-family – 7) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-R-7 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Magid seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Z-24-02-011: A rezoning request from O (Office) and C-M (Commercial – Medium) to CD-C-M (Conditional District – Commercial – Medium) for the property identified as 814 Summit Avenue, generally described as southeast of Summit Avenue and southwest of Sullivan Street (0.89 acres). (APPROVED)

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised of the condition associated with the request:

- 1) Permitted uses shall include all use permitted in the Commercial – Medium zoning district except Sexually Oriented Businesses and Outdoor Advertising Signs.
- 2) Building height shall be limited to a maximum of thirty (30) feet.
- 3) Maximum area of the building shall be limited to 3,200 square feet.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed CD-C-M zoning district allows uses that are compatible with existing varied commercial and office uses surrounding the request and addresses a previous non-conforming situation that has existed for some time. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Gary Wolfe, 301 N Elm Street, referenced handout material and stated that the proposal is to make the parking area and the intended use one. He said that the proposal is consistent with the Summit Avenue Plan and will continue landscaping, and provide ADA and pedestrian friendly areas. He said that notices were mailed to neighbors and he received no objections.

Ms. Skenes asked for clarification on zoning classification for parking lots associated with use on separate property. Mr. Kirkman said that as per the LDO the area used for parking and the property with the associated use need to be the same zoning classification. Ms. Skenes further clarified that the proposed rezoning is to bring the use in conformity with the LDO, Mr. Kirkman concurred.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

David Wharton, 667 Percy Street. Mr. Wharton made a PowerPoint presentation and stated that the subject property is part of the Strategic Plan for the Aycock Neighborhood and the Summit Avenue Corridor Plan. He said that the intended use is auto intensity and is not in harmony with the plans for enhanced pedestrian environment and low intensity mixed-use district. In closing he said that the rezoning is not in keeping with the GSO 2040 Plan and is inconsistent with the surrounding use.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak further in favor of the request.

Mr. Wolfe emphasized that the request is to rezone the parking lot in order to bring it into compliance with the LDO, and to continue an existing use. He also said that the subject property is adjacent to an existing shopping center and surrounded by predominantly offices.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Michael Galligani, 1305 Summit Avenue, said that the same business exist in close proximity to the subject property and that from what he understands this is an intense commercial use.

Mr. Wharton said that the proposed use is an expansion to the existing use. He stated that the intended use will greatly intensify the commercial use and that it is an inefficient use of the space.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle clarified that the rezoning is to bring the existing parking lot into compliance with the LDO, thus making it the same zone classification as the associated use, Mr. Kirkman concurred. Mr. Engle acknowledged the pleasing street scape along Summit Ave and stated that the proposed rezoning is not contrary to the Area Plans. He said he supported the request.

Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-02-011, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 814 Summit Avenue from O (Office) and C-M (Commercial – Medium) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-C-M zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr. seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, March 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 19, 2024**

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman notified the Commissioners that at the next meeting the Department would present a text amendment related to ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Unit Standards).

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair O'Connor adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MARCH 18, 2024**

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, March 18, 2024, beginning at 5:30 p.m. Members present in person were Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, B. Keith Peterson, Paul Gilmer, Sr. and Erica Glass. Members participated remotely via zoom were Zac Engle and Andrew Egbert. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Luke Carter, Andrew Nelson, Carla Harrison (Planning) and Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office).

Chair O'Connor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Chair O'Connor advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Chair O'Connor noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. She noted that there was one case on the agenda and a Land Development Ordinance (LDO) text amendment. She further explained that rezoning request had no opposition and would be expedited. Therefore, the applicant and speakers in opposition would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted the Commissioners to know.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair O'Connor acknowledged the full attendance of Commissioners.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Chair O'Connor requested approval of the February 19, 2024 meeting minutes. Vice Chair Catherine Magid made a motion to approve the meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Gilmer Sr. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass and Peterson) (Nays: None).

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MARCH 18, 2024

Chair O'Connor inquired if there were any withdrawals or continuances. Mr. Kirkman said that there are no withdrawals or continuances.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Chair O'Connor asked if there were anyone in attendance or online wished to speak in opposition to item PL(P) 24-09 and Z-24-03-001 for 4629 Hicone Road and a portion of the Hicone Road right-of-way. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor noted that the Commission would address the item through expedited review.

PL (P) 24-09 and Z24-03-001: An annexation and original zoning request from County AG (Agricultural) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the property identified as 4629 Hicone Road and a portion of the Hicone Road right-of-way, generally described as north of Hicone Road and east of Pearview Drive (1.03 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding area. He stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General and within a Neighborhood-scaled Activity Center on the Future Built Form Map. The GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan also designates this site as Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework Strategy to invest in building and maintaining quality, accessible public recreation centers, libraries, neighborhood park facilities and other services to sustain livable neighborhoods and the Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-3 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to 3 dwelling units per acre and permits uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. The R-3 zoning district also permits certain governmental uses, such as the existing fire station, that are also complimentary to uses existing in the surround area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked the commissioners if they had questions or comments. Hearing none, she then asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Brent Sievers, 8518 Triad Drive, informed that he is the engineer for the project and was present to address any concerns or questions.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone had questions for the applicant or to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Magid made the motion to recommend approval of the annexation request, seconded by Mr. Peterson. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MARCH 18, 2024

Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Glass, Peterson, Engle and Egbert.) (Nays: None.)

Vice Chair Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-03-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 4629 Hicone Road and a portion of the Hicone Road Right-of-way from County AG (Agricultural) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O’Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Glass, Peterson, Engle and Egbert.) (Nays: None.)

Chair O’Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, April 16, 2024 City Council Meeting.

REGULAR AGENDA:

TEXT AMENDMENT: Zoning, Planning and Development Text Amendment: Amending sections 30-8-11.1 Accessory Uses and Structures (Customary), 30-8-11.2, Accessory Dwelling Units, related to dimensional and use standards for Accessory Dwelling Units, and the title of Subsection 30-8-11.5 related to the renting of rooms as a home occupation. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Chair O’Connor introduced the text amendment and said that speakers in support of or in opposition to the revision had up to 3 minutes to speak.

Mr. Chris Andrews, Planning Department - Land Development Division Manager, provided context for what an Accessory Dwelling Unit is. He explained that the text amendment is a response to the City Council Strategic Priority to have an “Abundance of Attainable Housing” and is recommended as part of routine maintenance of the Land Development Ordinance. He defined ADU. He also showed the relationship between the existing housing trends and the need for permitting soft increases in density. He said that the overall goal is to provide more housing options. In his overview he displayed photographs and illustrations of different types of accessory dwelling structures. He stated that the significant number of variance requests granted by the Board of Adjustment is an indication for the need to revise the ADU standards.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MARCH 18, 2024**

Mr. Andrews stated that there are provisions for ADUs in residential districts under the current LDO standards and it is not a new item. He noted that the text amendment is geared towards increasing the square footage for accessory structures thus making ADU's allowed more equitably. He stressed that the revision focuses on the dimensional standards and is not linked to short term rentals or taxation. He outlined the amendment as follows: ADUs meeting the standards of accessory buildings and should not be considered as a principal dwelling; owner occupancy is not required; the size of ADU increased to 50% of the square footage of the primary dwelling; additional parking is not required; and eliminating the single-family appearance. He also noted that the review and permitting process will not change and this would be one way of maintaining quality ADU's.

He concluded by stating that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation is required prior to presenting the text amendment to the City Council. He further outlined the staff's recommendation for the proposed text amendment to be: 1) more user friendly, flexible and supportive of the City's Adopted Plans; 2) providing access to a variety of housing types; 3) reasonable and in the public interest and providing necessary changes in respect to enforcing the standards; and 4) allow for more flexible placement of accessory dwelling units within the city.

Chair O'Connor asked the commissioners if they had questions or comments regarding the proposed text amendment.

Mr. Peterson asked if an ADU can be used as a rental. Mr. Andrews said that ADU's could be rented. Mr. Peterson also asked what mechanisms are in place to ensure ADU's are built to standards. Mr. Andrews restated that the review and permitting process is not changing which would monitor the standards.

Ms. Skenes requested clarification for floor area and building coverage. Mr. Andrews explained that floor area is the entire floor area of a building and pointed out that in the case of two stories it would be the combined floor area of both stories. He said that building area is the building coverage for all structures on the property and it is like an aerial view of a structure. Mr. Kirkman further explained that in order to determine the square footage of an ADU the floor area looks at the relationship between the ADU and the principal dwelling. He continued to explain that the building coverage takes into account all structures other than the principal dwelling existing on a property. He said that there are instances of other accessory structures such as shed or garage which would be included in the allowable square footage for accessory structures.

Ms. Skenes asked for further clarification and pointed to Section 30-8-11.1 A of the LDO (size and proportion). Mr. Andrews explained that the Section speaks to all accessory structures and

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MARCH 18, 2024**

not just ADUs, he said that the size of an ADU would depend on whether there are existing accessory structures.

Ms. Skenes also asked about the impact of deed restrictions on the ADU standards. Mr. Andrews said that ADUs would be subjected to the restrictions and said the same applies to Historic Districts. The City Attorney clarified that deed restrictions and such private agreements would not be enforced by the City. Mr. Kirkman also added that private agreements are private matters and are not enforced by the City and stated that the City could only enforce matters of the LDO.

Mr. Engle asked if zoning conditions would apply to ADUs and Mr. Kirkman confirmed that zoning conditions would apply to ADUs.

Ms. Skenes expressed concerns with the text amendment not including the owner occupancy standard, and said that it is not in accordance with the short term rental regulations. Mr. Andrews said that for an ADU to be used for short term rental it would be reviewed and permitted under the respective standards.

Mr. Peterson concurred with Ms. Skenes and said that removing the owner occupancy would not be in keeping with the short term rental requirements. Mr. Kirkman clarified that the short term rental regulation does not speak to owner occupancy, and that the regulation requires the owner or manager to be present locally. The City Attorney added that the City cannot and does not regulate the ownership of properties.

Vice Chair Magid questioned the standards pertaining to ADU's affixed or part of a permanent foundation. Mr. Andrews said that ADU's are to be built to the standards of the North Carolina Building Code. She also asked about the transfer rights of ADU's and principal dwellings. Mr. Andrews explained that ADU's are subject to the presence of a principal dwelling and cannot exist on its own. He further explained that a subdivision to allow an ADU on its own parcel under different ownership from the principal dwelling is prohibited. Vice Chair Magid pointed to Section 30-8-11.2 (F) of the LDO and asked about removing the single family identity in the text amendment. Mr. Andrews explained that the referenced Sections focused on the architectural appearance of ADU's. He stated that single-family architectural appearance has a wide variety of designs, character and building materials. Mr. Kirkman referred to the LDO and noted that by definition an ADU is only associated with single-family residential use.

Chair O'Connor asked about whether an ADU would be allowed in front of the principal dwelling. Mr. Kirkman stated there would not be any changes to the existing setback standards.

Chair O'Connor then asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on the text amendment.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MARCH 18, 2024**

Judy Stalder, 115 South Westgate Drive, said that ADU's are part of the solution for our current housing needs and expressed gratitude to staff for the text amendment.

Dan Curry, 1311 Oak Street, supported the text amendment and said that encouraging ADU's was a welcomed housing provision for the rapidly expanding older population. He continued to say that it promoted safe and decent housing given the current state of high housing costs and homelessness. He specified that vast areas of Greensboro were dedicated one dwelling per lot. The ADU revision was an efficient way of allowing an additional dwelling. He also said that the proposed amendment was a small step in the right direction and urged the commissioners to support the revision.

David Wharton, 667 Percy Street, said that his community unanimously supported the text amendment. He stressed that the revision allowed for economic gain on an individual level with the flexible use of property. The amendment would also increase the tax base and use the existing public infrastructure more efficiently than new development. He highlighted that the text amendment met the City Comprehensive Plan's goals for housing provisions.

William Furlow, 1801-C Brassfield Road, said that the text amendment allowed for gentle infill and was one way to provide affordable housing. He supported the text amendment and urged the commissioners to do the same.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else would like to speak in favor of the text amendment. She also asked if anyone had objections or questions for the revisions.

Scott Allen, 2801 Grasmere Drive, had a question regarding setbacks for flag lots and the placement of ADU in relation to the principal dwelling. Mr. Andrews responded that flag lots would be reviewed on a case by case basis and guidance would be provided by staff.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak on the revision.

Mr. Downing echoed the benefits of the text amendments as pointed out by the speakers. He also expressed concerns over the text amendment removing the single-family appearance standard. Overall he supported the text amendment and said that he anticipated additional changes to ensure high standards for ADU's to eliminate slum conditions.

Mr. Gilmer Sr. supported the text amendment and said it would address some of the housing shortages in Greensboro. He also said that the revision was timely and it was a great change.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak to the request. Hearing none she closed the public hearing.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MARCH 18, 2024

Ms. Skenes then stated regarding agenda item Zoning, Planning and Development Text Amendment, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the proposed text amendment language regarding Accessory Dwelling Units to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest. Mr. Downing seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Glass, Peterson, Engle and Egbert.) (Nays: None.)

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, April 16, 2024 City Council Meeting.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan Year 4 Update presented by Russ Clegg (Long Range Planning Division Manager) and Dana Clukey (Senior Planner). Mr. Clegg gave a brief overview on the annual update of the Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives. He stated that the Plan was adopted in June 2020, came into effect in September 2020, and the purpose of the presentation is to highlight some of the land use trends observed in the past year. He stated that the Plan received National and State awards. He stated that he only mentioned this because it was indicative of the plan being reader-friendly. He talked about how some of the big ideas influenced land use. He also said that the adopted small area plans are tools for reinvestment into an area advocating for change within the respective community. He mentioned the upcoming launch of Phase 2 of the Randleman Road Area Plan. He said that the Randleman Road plan focuses on revitalization of the road between I-40 and I-85. He also mentioned the Greater South Greensboro Area Plan.

Ms. Clukey presented the maps of the approved annexation and rezoning requests throughout Greensboro for the period 2020 to 2023. She said that the industrial rezonings increased and were concentrated on the periphery of the city along the interstates. She pointed out that the large amount of land rezoned for industrial uses over the three (3) year period warranted the City keeping its title of "Gate City". She also highlighted that multi-family residential uses increased significantly in the City through annexation and rezoning approvals. She concluded by making reference to the City's website for additional studies on the growth and development of the city.

Chair O'Connor asked if the commissioners had comments or questions for the presenters. She then expressed that she is pleased with the Plan, its implementation, and achievements. Chair O'Connor thanked the presenters.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

None.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MARCH 18, 2024**

ADJOURNMENT:

Before adjourning the meeting Chair O'Connor congratulated Mr. Engle on the new addition to his family and expressed appreciation for his attendance.

Chair O'Connor adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, April 19, 2024, beginning at 5:33 p.m. Members present in person were Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, Zac Engle, Paul Gilmer, Sr., Erica Glass and B. Keith Peterson. Andrew Egbert participated online via zoom. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Luke Carter, Andrew Nelson and Carla Harrison (Planning), Noland Tipton (GDOT), and Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office).

Chair O'Connor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Chair O'Connor advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Chair O'Connor noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. She further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair O'Connor acknowledged the full attendance of Commissioners and noted that Commissioner Andrew Egbert was attending virtually.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Chair O'Connor requested approval of the March 18, 2024 meeting minutes. Mr. Peterson made a motion to approve the meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Vice Chair Magid. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass and Peterson). Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Chair O'Connor inquired if there were any withdrawals or continuances. Mr. Kirkman advised there were no withdrawals or continuances.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Chair O'Connor noted there were two items that did not have opposition signed up to speak and were eligible for the expedited agenda. These items were **Z-24-04-001** for 2123 Byrd Street and **Z-24-04-003** for 1014 Tarrant Road.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone in attendance or online wished to speak in opposition to any of those items. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor noted the Commission would address these items through expedited review and reordered the agenda accordingly.

Z24-04-001: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-12 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 12) for the property identified as 2123 Byrd Street, generally described as north of Byrd Street and west of Shaw Street (0.22 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to a single-family dwelling or a duplex.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban Central on the Future Built Form Map. The Jonesboro/Scott Park Neighborhood Plan designates this property as Low Residential (3 to 5 dwelling units per gross acre.) This rezoning request includes a request to amend the Jonesboro/Scott Park Neighborhood Plan to designate this property as Moderate Residential (5 to 12 dwelling units per acre). Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places strategy to meeting housing needs and desires with a sufficient and diverse supply of housing products, prices and locations. The proposed CD-RM-12 zoning district, as conditioned, allows uses that are compatible with existing varied residential uses and densities surrounding the request and limits potential negative impacts on adjacent properties. This request would also permit an existing nonconforming use to become conforming. Staff recommended approval of the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

Mr. Carter informed that if the rezoning request was recommended for approval, it would be forwarded to the City Council because of the associated plan amendment.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

David Turner, 1601 Swannanoa Drive, stated the rezoning request would bring the property into conforming status.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-04-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 2123 Byrd Street from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-12 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 12) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-12 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass and Peterson). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, May 21, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Z-24-04-003: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-HI (Conditional District - Heavy Industrial) for the property identified as 1014 Tarrant Road, generally described as west of Tarrant Road and south of South Chimney Rock Road (5.56 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) All uses permitted under HI zoning except: Cemeteries.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates these properties as Planned Industrial on the Future Built Form Map and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Prioritizing Sustainability goal to build economic resilience, expanding the local economy's ability to withstand and adjust to disruptions and changes at the regional, national and global scales. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness strategy to increase and preserve the inventory of developable sites compatible with corporate and industrial uses. The proposed CD-HI zoning district, as conditioned, allows uses that are compatible with the existing higher intensity industrial and manufacturing uses located in the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

The applicant passed on speaking on the item.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Peterson then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-04-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 1014 Tarrant Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-HI (Conditional District - Heavy Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-HI zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Vice Chair Magid seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert, Glass and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, May 21, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

REGULAR AGENDA:

Z-24-04-002: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-O (Conditional District – Office) for the property identified as 4117 Lawndale Drive, generally described as west of Lawndale Drive and north of Benton Lane (0.58 acres). (APPROVED).

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to: All uses permitted in the Office, Personal and Professional Services, Religious Assembly, Cultural and Community, Indoor Recreation, Day Care, Medical Facility use groups, and Upper Story Residential uses.
- 2) Ground floor office area shall not exceed 6,000 square feet, and residential dwellings shall not exceed 7 units.
- 3) Maximum building height shall not exceed 50 feet.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to encourage higher density, mixed-use, walkable infill development. It also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed CD-O zoning district permits lower intensity retail, office, and service uses as well as residential dwellings that are compatible with uses existing in the surrounding area. Additionally, the proposed conditions limit the negative impacts of the development on the adjacent properties. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if commissioners had questions.

Vice Chair Magid asked for clarification on upper story residential use. Mr. Carter explained that upper story residential is a development type which has nonresidential on the ground floor and the upper floors could be residential.

Chair O'Connor asked if the building had to be owner occupied and Mr. Carter replied that owner occupancy is not regulated.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

Graham Fripp, 1400 Colonial Avenue, said that a seven (7) feet high privacy fence was built, in addition to landscape buffer, in the rear of the subject property to create separation from the adjoining residential lots. He pointed to an illustration and said that he intended to build a three (3) story building with architecture features of residential appearance. He continued to explain that the first floor would be offices and the upper floors used as residential.

Mr. Engle examined the neighborhood meeting communications and questioned the applicant about the location of the fence and the landscape buffer. Mr. Fripp said that they are located on residential properties in the rear of the subject property. Mr. Fripp added that he would establish an agreement for the maintenance of the fence and the landscape buffer.

Mr. Peterson asked about parking for the intended use. Mr. Fripp talked about a sketch plan review meeting with staff and he said that the future site layout would reflect recommendations received from staff.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Jennifer Mencarini, 4120 Lawndale Place, objected to the rezoning request. She said her property directly abuts the subject property and would be most impacted by the request. Ms. Mencarini stated that the GSO 2040 Plan supported her views of preserving the neighborhood identity and protecting homeowners. She urged the commissioners to preserve the character of the neighborhood by declining the rezoning request. She pointed out that the illustrated three (3) story building in addition to the elevation of the subject property would have adverse visual impacts. She said the illustration was out of character to the neighborhood given the single-story commercial development on either side of the subject property.

Michael Anderson, 4122 Lawndale Place, endorsed Ms. Mencarini's concerns since his property also abuts the subject property. He emphasized that the fence and the landscape buffer should be maintained. He pointed out that the residential character should be preserved. He stated he would continue to work with the applicant to minimize the negative impacts on the residential neighborhood.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone else to speak in opposition.

Jennifer Mencarini, 4120 Lawndale Place, noted for the record that she had no issues with Mr. Stevens, the owner of one of the neighboring commercial developments.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone else to speak in opposition. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor advised the applicant had 5 minutes for rebuttal.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

Graham Fripp, 1400 Colonial Avenue, stressed that he wanted to preserve the residential neighborhood identity and to ensure maintenance of the fence and landscape buffer. He said that he would continue to work with the neighbors.

Mr. Engle expressed concerns with the illustrated building height being almost double the surrounding commercial development height restrictions. Mr. Fripp responded that the building height could change and be less than the fifty (50) feet shown in the illustration.

Mr. Peterson asked the applicant to address the privacy issue as it relates to the illustrated building. Mr. Fripp said the sides of the building would face the adjoining residential properties and the street along Lawndale Drive. He continued to say that the bulk of the building, the front and the rear, would face the commercial properties.

Mr. Downing asked the applicant for more information on the neighborhood outreach. Mr. Fripp said he met with the owners of the adjoining commercial properties on a few occasions. He added that he met with the abutting residential property owners once on separate occasions. He stated he mailed twenty-four (24) letters to the surrounding neighbors. Mr. Dowling mentioned that the subject property is elevated and asked if there were plans to level the property. Mr. Kirkman advised that site issues would be addressed under the site plan review process.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone else in support wishing to speak. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Jennifer Mencarini, 4120 Lawndale Place, highlighted that the illustration showed a building at fifty (50) feet in height. This could appear as seventy (70) feet tall because of the site elevation. She reiterated that the building shown is out of character with the surrounding neighborhood and is not supported by the GSO2040 Plan. She pointed out that there would be additional residential development on the street in the coming months.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Chair O'Connor asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners regarding the request.

Ms. Skenes asked for clarification on the maximum allowable height in the current zoning district. Mr. Kirkman advised that the maximum height allowed is fifty (50) feet or three (3) stories. Ms. Skenes noted that the request would not change the allowable building height.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

Mr. Engle opposed the rezoning request and expressed concerns about the height of the building as presented. He also said that there should be a more defined landscape buffer.

Mr. Egbert concurred with Mr. Engle and said he would not support the rezoning request.

Chair O'Connor supported the request and stated that the illustration presented was a concept and not a requirement for the rezoning request. She acknowledged the commissioners' and neighbors' concerns about the height shown on the illustration. However, she emphasized that the use of the subject property is in keeping with the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Magid concurred with Chair O'Connor and stated that the potential impact from the rezoning request would be no different from the surrounding commercial developments. She also said that the proposed mixed use is a perfect example of infill development. She urged the applicant to continue working with the neighbors.

Mr. Downing also supported the rezoning request and emphasized the need for the applicant to work with the neighbors. He acknowledged the concerns raised by the neighbors and stressed the need to preserve privacy for the neighboring residential developments.

Mr. Gilmer, was in support of the rezoning request and stated that the rezoning request would provide additional housing. He said the concerns raised could be resolved between the applicant and the neighbors.

Chair O'Connor asked commissioners if there were any further comments. Hearing none, she asked for a motion.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-04-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 4117 Lawndale Drive from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-O (Conditional District - Office) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-O zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 6-3, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Glass and Gilmer Sr.,) Nays: (Engle, Egbert and Peterson).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

APRIL 15, 2024

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, May 21, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman reported that there were no items from the department.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Vice Chair Magid shared an article reflecting on items approved by the Commission and the City Council for the period of January and February of this year. She said that eight hundred and eighteen (818) housing units were approved across all the council districts. She stated a significant portion of the housing would be built on annexed property. Chair O'Connor was delighted and said that with the current housing availability and affordability it was refreshing news.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair O'Connor adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, May 20, 2024, beginning at 5:32 p.m. Members present in person were Chair Sandra O'Connor, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, Zac Engle, Paul Gilmer Sr. and Erica Glass. Andrew Egbert participated online via zoom. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Luke Carter, Andrew Nelson and Carla Harrison (Planning), Kym Smith (GDOT), and Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office).

Chair O'Connor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Chair O'Connor advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Chair O'Connor noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close captioned for the hearing impaired. She further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair O'Connor acknowledged the absence of Vice Chair Catherine Magid and Commissioner B. Keith Peterson. Chair O'Connor also acknowledged that Commissioner Ingle would arrive late to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Chair O'Connor requested approval of the April 15, 2024 meeting minutes. Mr. Gilmer Sr. made a motion to approve the meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 6-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass). Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Chair O'Connor inquired if there were any withdrawals or continuances. Mr. Kirkman advised there were no withdrawals or continuances.

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Chair O'Connor noted there were several items that did not have opposition signed up to speak and were eligible for the expedited agenda. These items were **Z-24-05-002** for 2411 Stanley Road, **Z-24-05-004** for 3420 North Church Street, **Z-24-05-005** for 3302 Sandy Ridge Road, **Z-24-05-006** for 3021 Pacific Avenue and **Z-24-05-009** for 5228 Hilltop Road. Chair O'Connor asked if anyone in attendance or online wished to speak in opposition to any of those items. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor noted the Commission would address these items through expedited review and reordered the agenda accordingly.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NEW BUSINESS:

Z24-05-002: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) for the property identified 2411 Stanley Road, generally described as east of Stanley Road and south of Huntmaster Trail (0.58 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling In Our Framework goal to arrange our land uses to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-5 zoning district permits similar uses to the existing R-3 zoning but allows for greater flexibility on individual lot configuration and a small increase in residential density. The request is consistent with the residential zoning designations on surrounding properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present but passed on speaking on the item. Having no opposition to the request Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-05-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 2411 Stanley Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to R-5 (Residential

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Single-family – 5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed R-5 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. **Mr. Gilmer Sr.** seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 6-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, June 18, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Commissioner Engle arrived at the meeting.

Z-24-05-004: A rezoning request from CD-C-L (Conditional District – Commercial - Low) to R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) for the property identified as 3420 North Church Street, generally described as east of North Church Street and east of Berryman Street (0.45 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling In Our Framework goal to arrange our land uses to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-5 zoning district permits similar uses to the surrounding R-5 zoning and maintains the existing use. The request is consistent with the residential zoning designations surrounding the subject property and the residential character of the area. Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Ms. Skenes mentioned that the request is downzoning and is consistent with the surrounding uses therefore she supported the rezoning request.

Ms. Skenes then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-05-004, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 3420 North Church Street from CD-C-L (Conditional District - Commercial – Low) to R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed R-5 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. **Mr. Engle** seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, June 18, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-24-05-005: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) for the property identified as 3302 Sandy Ridge Road, generally described as east of Sandy Ridge Road and north of Triad Drive (1.38 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall include all uses allowed in the LI zoning district except: Animal Shelters; Cemeteries; Amusement and Water Parks, Fairground; Shooting Ranges, Archery, Skeet; and Waste Related Services.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General within a District Scale Activity Center on the Future Built Form Map. The Western Area Plan designates the property as Commercial/Mixed Use on the Future Land Use Map. While this request is not directly supported by the recommendations of the Western Plan, it would permit uses that are similar to those permitted on adjacent tracts that are also located within this planning area. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MAY 20, 2024**

Prioritizing Sustainability goal to build economic resilience, expanding the local economy's ability to withstand and adjust to disruptions and changes at the regional, national and global scales. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness strategy to increase and preserve the inventory of developable sites compatible with corporate and industrial uses. The proposed CD-LI zoning district, as conditioned, allows uses that are compatible with the existing residential and industrial uses located in the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Engle inquired if the Western Area Plan should be amended to accommodate the request. Mr. Carted responded that an amendment to the plan is not required and he said final action could be made by the Commission.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-05-005, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 3302 Sandy Ridge Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to CD-LI (Conditional District - Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-LI zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest.

Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, June 18, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Z-24-05-006: A rezoning request from LI (Light Industrial) to HI (Heavy Industrial) for the property identified as 3021 Pacific Avenue, generally described as southeast of Pacific Avenue and east of Blue Bell Road (0.49 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Planned Industrial on the Future Built Form Map and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed HI zoning district allows uses that are compatible with the existing workforce and manufacturing uses adjacent to the subject property. The request also supports the employment-oriented character of the area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor inquired if the request would involve the use of chemicals and whether a special use permit would be required. Mr. Kirkman explained that a special use permit would be required for industrial uses involving chemicals or hazardous substances even within the Heavy Industrial (HI) districts.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

The applicant was present and passed on speaking on the item.

Having no opposition to the request Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-05-006, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 3021 Pacific Avenue from LI (Light Industrial) to HI (Heavy Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed HI zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties. (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. **Ms. Skenes** seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, June 18, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-24-05-009: A rezoning request from CD-RM-12 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 12) to CD-O (Conditional District – Office) for the property identified as 5228 Hilltop Road, generally described as north of Hilltop Road and west of Bridford Parkway (8.85 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall include all uses allowed in the O zoning district except: Single-family Detached Dwellings; Duplexes; All Group Living; Libraries, Museums, and Art Galleries; Physical Fitness Centers; Sports Instructional Schools; Funeral Homes and Crematoriums; and Hotels and Motels.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined that the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Prioritizing Sustainability Big Idea to have a strong leadership role in environmental stewardship, social equity, and a resilient economy. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Becoming Car Optional strategy to encourage new development that is compatible with the intended use of the adjacent roadway. The proposed CD-O zoning district, as conditioned, would permit uses that are compatible with the existing uses on adjacent tracts. Also the change in zoning for this property is appropriate given its location at the intersection of two thoroughfares. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Engle mentioned that Residential Multi-family 12 (RM-12) is allowed in the Office district and wanted to know if there was another intended use for the request. Mr. Carter answered that the rezoning request would include general office use to the list of permitted uses.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Alex Hill, 1007 Battleground Avenue, said he has no additional comments.

Having no opposition to the request Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing.

Mr. Gilmer Sr. then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-05-009, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

the property at 5228 Hilltop Road from CD-RM-12 (Conditional District – Residential Multi-family – 12) to CD-O (Conditional District – Office) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-O zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. **Mr. Engle** seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O’Connor, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Chair O’Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, June 18, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

REGULAR AGENDA:

NEW BUSINESS:

PL(P) 24-10 & Z-24-05-007: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) for the property identified as a portion of 431 O’Ferrell Street, generally described as east of O’Ferrell Street and south of Naco Road (9.15 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL).

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Planned Industrial on the Future Built Form Map and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. In this case significant environmental constraints limit options for future industrial development so other uses are more appropriate. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan’s Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro’s citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Building Community Connections strategy to work to ensure the quality, quantity, and diversity of housing choices across and between neighborhoods. The proposed R-5 zoning district would allow uses that are compatible with those uses existing on adjacent tracts. The uses permitted in the proposed zoning district also support employment opportunities in nearby industrial locations and are appropriate at this location given the existing and planned road network. Staff recommended approval of the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant passed on speaking on the item. Then Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Mr. Richard Collins, 425 O'Ferrell Street, opposed the request and inquired about access for the proposed residential development on the subject property. He said that O'Ferrell Street is narrow and could not accommodate the additional traffic the proposed use would generate. Mr. Collins pointed out that a portion of the pond is on his property and asked if the applicant would be draining the pond. Mr. Collins spoke about the wildlife habitat in the area and mentioned that beavers live around the pond.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone else wished to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant would like to speak on the item.

Mr. Wiley Sykes, 110 Elgin Place, said that he had no plans to drain the pond. He talked about the future development of the portion of the subject property behind the pond having access from Ward Road or Naco Road if possible. He stated that he planned on having three (3) residential lots on the portion of the subject property along O'Ferrell Street. He added that there would not be significant traffic generated by the proposed development.

Ms. Skenes asked for clarification on the number of residential lots that would be on the subject property.

Mr. Wiley Sykes clarified that he planned to have three residential lots on the portion of land that is already within the city limits along O'Ferrell Street. He said the portion of land east of the pond is the subject for future development and would have access from Ward Road.

Ms. Skenes asked staff if draining the pond would be an environmental concern and mentioned the shared rights of the pond. Mr. Kirkman acknowledged that the pond traverses several properties. He said that draining the pond would be a site plan issue which would be reviewed by the Technical Reviewed Committee. Brent Ducharme said that it was irrelevant to discuss shared rights of the pond.

Chair O'Conner asked the applicant about neighborhood outreach for the request.

Mr. Sykes said that letters were mailed to the neighbors within the City's 750 feet notification boundary. He stated that they met with some neighbors along O'Ferrell Street.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by **Ms. Skenes**. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-05-007, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at a portion of 431 O'Ferrell Street from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-5 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, June 18, 2024 City Council Meeting.

PL(P) 24-11 & Z-24-05-008: An annexation and original zoning request from County AG (Agricultural) and County HB (Highway Business) to City CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) for the properties identified as 3530 and 3534 McConnell Road, generally described as south of McConnell Road and west of Stanfield Road (19.945 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL).

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties and advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall include all uses allowed in LI zoning district except: Cemeteries; Auditoriums, Coliseums, and Stadiums; Bus and Rail Terminal; Shooting Range; Amusement or Water Park, Fairgrounds; Hotels and Motels; Single Room Occupancy Residences; Inert Debris Landfill, Minor (Temporary Use); and Animal Shelter.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Planned Industrial on the Future Built Form Map and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Growing

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed CD-LI zoning district, as conditioned, would limit permitted uses to those that are similar to existing uses present in the surrounding area. The change in zoning for this property is appropriate given its proximity to the McConnell Road and I-40 interchange. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Amanda Hodierne, 804 Green Valley Road, said she was present on behalf of the contract purchaser and potential developer which is Wiley Capital. Ms. Hodierne pointed out the total acreage of the subject properties is just under 20 acres. She stated that the request is for a conditional district which prohibits some of the heavier industrial uses allowed in the light industrial district. Ms. Hodierne displayed an aerial view of the subject properties and neighboring communities and stressed the proximity of the interstate. She stated that the proximity of the interstate played a critical role in the land use designation as set out in the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan and is behind the successful implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Hodierne spoke on the zoning pattern along McConnell Road and showed on a land use map that there were growing light industrial activities in the area. She noted the county single-family and multi-family residential activities present in the area. Ms. Hodierne said that the development on the McConnell Road corridor is in keeping with the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She also pointed out that the GSO 2040 Future Land Use Map and Future Built Form Map designated the subject properties as industrial zone. She stated that the planned industrial districts are allocated as employment centers or for uses that support the need for employment. She affirmed that the request is consistent with the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan and what is happening in the area.

Ms. Hodierne showed a Feasibility Layout for the proposed development on the subject properties and said that the layout was reviewed by the Technical Review Committee. She mentioned that as part of the feasibility plan a traffic impact analysis was carried out, and there was the need for a dedicated left turn lane. She stated that most of the vehicle trips generated by the request would be going to the interstate making a right turn and coming from the interstate turning left into the site. She noted that the feasibility plan addressed the surrounding residential uses on either side of the request and said that the most protective transitional yard, which is a 45 foot – Type A planted protective yard, would be implemented along all the property boundaries. Mr. Hodierne mentioned that onsite storm water management systems would be applied for any imperious surface built.

Ms. Hodierne talked about the community outreach and said that letters were mailed to neighbors within the city's 750 feet notification boundary and a zoom meeting held. She stated that she spoke with the HOA of the Creek Side Subdivision which is north of the request. She mentioned that she made a call to the management office for the manufactured homes development to the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MAY 20, 2024**

north of the request. She concluded that she is in continued dialogs with the neighbors.

Ernie Reinstein, 10 Parkway North Blvd, Illinois, introduced himself as a development manager with the applicant. He said that they were first time investors in Greensboro.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Joseph Carter, 1160 Waterlyn Drive, expressed concerns of freight vehicles in the area and said that McConnell Road is narrow and could not accommodate additional freight vehicles that the proposed rezoning would generate. He noted that existing industrial developments access the interstate further east and away from the residential communities. He asked if he would be notified of the request should it go before the City Council. Mr. Kirkman said he would be notified.

Mary Feeny, 3453 McConnell Road, echoed Mr. Carter's concerns about McConnell Road being narrow and the high volume of freight traffic in the area. She talked about the possible traffic conflicts of farming and CDL training vehicles with the freight vehicles. She urged the Commission to consider the accumulative effects of the industrial developments in the area.

JoAnna Lowe, 1130, 1125, 1125 ZZ, 1123, 1123 ZZ and 1119 Stanfield Road, opposed the rezoning request and talked about the adverse impacts surrounding industrial properties have on her properties. She said her properties are downstream from the industrial developments and runoff flooded her properties including the lakes resulting to wildlife disturbances. She pointed out that the request would increase the environmental disturbances to her properties. She asked about the videos and attached documents submitted as part of her presentation. Mr. Carter assured Ms. Lowe that the videos and documents were sent to the Commissioners prior to the meeting. Mr. Engle and Chair O'Connor confirmed access to the videos and attached documents.

Gwendolyn Crump, 1216 Waterlyn Drive said that the request would make the residential community less desirable and lessen home value. She expressed concerns and concurred with earlier speakers that McConnell Road could not accommodate the freight vehicles and added that she witnessed several vehicular accidents on the road.

J.C. Barnett, 3520 McConnell Road emphasized the importance of the vegetative buffer along the perimeters of the subject properties. He stated that his property abuts the subject properties and he would be most impacted by the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in support of the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Amanda Hodierne acknowledged the speakers concerns and stated that continued communications with the neighbors and adherence to the feasibility plan would mitigate the negative impacts of any future development on the subject properties. She reiterated that the request is consistent with the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She talked about the positive spillover effects of having the rezoning and said that extending water and sewer to the subject properties would greatly benefit the area. Ms. Hodierne addressed Ms. Lowes' concerns regarding stormwater runoff and said that the subject properties drained southwest towards the interstate and away from Ms. Lowe's properties.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Dori Mondon, 5095 Millpoint Road agreed with the other neighbors and said that McConnell Road could not accommodate the high volume of freight vehicles. She noted the lack of sidewalks and mentioned the need for a supermarket in the area. She said the area was experiencing various kinds of pollution and decreased property values. She opposed the request and stated that the request should be planned for property closer to the interstate.

Darlene Wilson, 1206 Waterlyn Drive, concurred with Ms. Mondon and said the narrow road and high volume of freight vehicles would increase pedestrian and vehicular conflicts due to the lack of pedestrian access. She noted that property values would be negatively impacted.

Al-Nisa Sherman, 1214 Waterlyn Drive, talked about the visual impact of the proposed development. She agreed with Ms. Mondon that a supermarket would greatly benefit the neighborhood.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing. Chair O'Connor noted that the videos and documents submitted were distributed and reviewed by the Commissioners.

Mr. Engle inquired if there was any staff from GDOT. He then pointed out that the Commissioners received the summary of the Traffic Impact Analysis which considered all the industrial properties along McConnell Road and the build year of 2025 with an additional year relating to the growth in traffic. He said that the Summary is public record and can be viewed by anyone. He highlighted that the request would generate two (2) truck trips per day. He then looked to staff for verification on the two (2) trips per day to be generated by the request. He asked staff if it was correct to say that the request would not generate massive amount of truck trips per day. Ms. Smith said that he was correct. Mr. Engle said that traffic was a major concern for the neighbors and pointed out that there are a lot of activities on McConnell Road because of the highway interchange and the area is under transition. He said he sympathized with the neighbors and noted that both the GSO 2025 and GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan slated McConnell Road as a Business Park and for light industrial use. Mr. Engle said he previously supported residential use in the area which was declined and is now light industrial use. He reiterated that the City's plan for the area is Business Park and for this reason he supported the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Mr. Gilmer Sr supported the request and said that he was involved with the GSO 2025 and GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plans. He said that there has always been a push for development in East Greensboro. He said he sympathized with the neighbor's concerns but concurred with Mr. Engle that McConnell Road is planned Business Park. He added that the Commission held community meetings along the McConnell Road corridor under the GSO 2025 Comprehensive Plan, and said that what is happening now is a continuation of what they planned in the past. He stated that economic development is needed in East Greensboro, and the request is part of the process and he supported the request.

Mr. Downing pointed out that the proximity to the interstate warranted industrial zoning, which made sense, and the GSO 2040 Plan promoted growth. Nonetheless, he stated he had the sentiments of the public's interest and noted some of the concerns raised by the neighbors such as flooding, traffic impacts and noise. He mentioned the residents presented earlier by their names and said that the request is directly adjacent to people's homes. He stated that if the request should move forward it would be good to have buffer yard in place. He emphasized that he is listening to the residents because they live in the area. He also said that he commended the existing industrial developments east of the request closer to the interstate exit which is a great location. He mentioned that what he heard from the neighbors was "not in front of my yard or not in my backyard". He said from his perspective he would not be supporting the request.

Mr. Gilmer Sr said that there are times when a housing development is highlighted amongst other developments and explained that in the case of the request there are existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to undeveloped industrial zoned properties. He said such occurrence would continue to happen throughout Greensboro. He said that it might be necessary for developers to have deed conditions to inform the public of potential development. He stated that the conflicting development and uses put the Commission in the situation where they understand the resident's concerns and emotions however, they must address the land use and its designated zone.

Chair O'Connor concurred with Mr. Gilmer, Sr sentiments and noted that the residential communities have needs but the request is moving in the direction set. She said if instead the request was for residential development there would be the probability of objections because the subject properties are for industrial use. She said she respected Mr. Downing for carefully listening to the neighbor's presentation. Chair O'Connor then stated that the Commission could not be concerned with traffic issues because such matters are addressed outside their expertise. She said that the Commission should look at how the land is being used. She stated that she is satisfied that the applicant demonstrated that the request is for the best use, and she supported the rezoning request.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by **Mr. Gilmer Sr**. The Commission

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

voted 5-2, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Egbert). (Nays: Downing and Glass).

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-05-008, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the properties at 3530 and 3534 McConnell Road from County AG (Agricultural) and County HB (Highway Business) to City CD-LI (Conditional District - Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.)The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-LI zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. **Mr. Gilmer Sr.** seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-2, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Egbert). (Nays: Downing and Glass).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, June 18, 2024 City Council Meeting.

PL(P) 24-13: Street Closure Request for a portion of Robin Hood Drive from Westmoreland Drive southward approximately 110 feet to its terminus. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the street closure and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is considering a recommendation on closing the following street:

- 1) A portion of Robin Hood Drive from Westmoreland Drive southward approximately 110 feet to its terminus.

The total area of R-O-W that is requested to be closed is identified as approximately 5,494 square feet (0.13 acres). The signee makes up 100% of the road frontage along the R-O-W requested to be closed.

Mr. Carter stated that the City must make two determinations in order to close the street: (1) that closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to the public interest; and (2) that no property owner in the vicinity is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress. He noted that the Technical Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed street closure with the following condition:

- 1) In order for the street closure to be final a plat must be recorded recombining the area within the right of way with the property identified as 1411 Benjamin Parkway.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

MAY 20, 2024

Ms. Skenes inquired about the dedication of the road parcel, noting the parcel should be shared between the properties on either side. Mr. Carter agreed and stated that usually the road parcel is divided along the center line. He mentioned that the applicant owns the properties on either side of road and indicated that the road parcel would be recombined with the larger property identified as 1411 Benjamin Parkway.

Chair O'Connor had a similar concern to Ms. Skenes and said that the property with the parsonage would not have direct access to Robin Hood Drive. She added that since the applicant owns the properties on either side of the road the closure is acceptable and she supported the request.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of the street closure. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle made a motion to recommend the street closure request with the condition referenced seconded by **Mr. Downing**. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, June 18, 2024 City Council Meeting.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman reported that there were no items from the department.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

There were no items from the Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair O'Connor adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, June 17, 2024, beginning at 5:35 p.m. Members present were Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, Zac Engle, Paul Gilmer, Sr., Erica Glass and Andrew Egbert. Present for City staff were Luke Carter, Andrew Nelson and Carla Harrison (Planning) and Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office).

Chair O'Connor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Chair O'Connor advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Chair O'Connor noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. She further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair O'Connor acknowledged the absence of Mr. Peterson. She also noted that Mr. Downing would be late to the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (CONTINUED)

Chair O'Connor requested a motion to delay approval of the May 20, 2024 meeting minutes and said there were last minute changes to be reviewed. Vice Chair Magid made a motion to continue the approval of the meeting minutes to the July meeting, seconded by Mr. Engle. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass). Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Chair O'Connor inquired if there were any withdrawals or continuances. Mr. Carter advised that the applicants for the following items requested continuance:

- 1) **Z-24-06-003** for 1322 Bothwell Street: The applicant requested continuance to amend the Unified Development Plan and to continue neighborhood outreach. Item continued to the August 19, 2024 meeting.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the continuance. Hearing none, Mr. Egbert made a motion to approve the continuance to the Monday, August 19, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, seconded by Vice Chair Magid. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Carter advised the item would be heard at the Monday, August 19, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Chair O'Connor noted that the Commission received communications on the items to be continued and urged the public or anyone who sent emails or communicated on the continued items to resend communications. She stated that once items are continued there could be changes. She advised that new notices would be mailed to residents and asked for comments to be resent even if the comments remains the same or new comments.

Mr. Carter confirmed that staff would be resending notices to residents within the city's notification buffer and posting signs at the subject properties.

- 2) **Z-24-06-004** for 2313 Stanley Road: The applicant requested continuance for additional neighborhood outreach. Item continued to the July 15, 2024 meeting.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the continuance. Hearing none, Mr. Engle made a motion to approve the continuance to the Monday, July 15, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, seconded by Vice Chair Magid. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the item would be heard at the Monday, July 15, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

- 3) **Z-24-06-006** for 1620-YY and 1626 Lovett Street: Mr. Carter noted that the application was deemed incomplete. He stated notices were sent hence the item remained on the agenda. He advised the case would not be heard and said that the item would be on a future agenda when the application is completed. The Commission did not vote on the item.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Chair O'Connor noted that item **Z-24-06-002** for 3319 Sandy Ridge Road and 8503 Cider Road did not have opposition signed up to speak and the request was eligible for the expedited agenda.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone in attendance or online wished to speak in opposition to item Z-24-06-002. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor noted the Commission would address the item through expedited review and reordered the agenda accordingly.

Z24-06-002: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) and C-L (Commercial – Low) to LI (Light Industrial) for the properties identified as 3319 Sandy Ridge Road and 8503 Cider Road, generally described as west of Sandy Ridge Road and south of Cider Road (0.79 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Nelson reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties.

Mr. Nelson stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map currently designates the subject properties as Urban General. The subject properties are located with the area covered by the Western Area Plan, which designates this location as Employment Area. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness goal to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed LI zoning district allows a variety of warehouse, industrial, distribution and office uses that are consistent with existing uses on nearby properties. The request also supports the employment-oriented character of the area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she then asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present but did not speak on the item, hearing no further comments Chair O'Conner closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-06-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 3319 Sandy Ridge Road and 8503 Cider Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) and C-L (Commercial – Low) to LI (Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed LI zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, July 16, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-15 and Z24-06-001: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City R-7 (Residential Single-family - 7) for the property identified as 3196-ZZ Stonypointe Drive, generally described as north of Stonypointe Drive and east of Liberty Road (2.426 acres). (CONTINUED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

The GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Building Community Connections strategy to work to ensure the quality, quantity, and diversity of housing choices across and between neighborhoods. The proposed R-7 zoning district would permit uses that are compatible with those existing on adjacent tracts. This request allows for greater flexibility for individual lot configuration with a small increase in residential density. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Carter made corrections to the staff report and said that the report listed the properties south and east of the request zoned as RS-12 in the County. He said that the properties south and east of the request are zoned as County RS-3.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions from the Commissioners. Vice Chair Magid asked if the properties along Stonypointe Drive are also zoned as County RS-3. Mr. Carter confirmed that the properties along Stonypointe Drive are zoned County RS-3.

Chair O'Connor asked for any further questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she then asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Hugh Latham, 2500 Wilpar Drive introduced himself as the developer for the Stonypointe Drive property. He stated the request is conditional proposing nine (9) single-family dwellings even though the Ordinance allowed for fifteen (15) dwellings. He said he planned on implementing separation buffers of about 20ft to 30 ft along the two adjoining property boundaries south of the request. He mentioned that he could not define the buffer boundaries. He stated the topography of the subject property made it difficult and that he would have better understanding at the final site plan approval stage. He emphasized that the request would have no more than nine (9) dwellings.

Ms. Skenes asked Mr. Latham if he was adding a condition to the request to limit the number lots.

Mr. Latham responded that he noted on the application that the request is for conditional zoning and looked to staff for verification.

Mr. Carter said staff would verify and at the same time advised that the request was advertised as straight zoning district. He stated that as advertised the request would be attributed all the uses permitted in the R-7 District.

Ms. Skenes inquired if the applicant could add the condition limiting the request to nine (9) single-family dwellings.

Mr. Latham reiterated that he included the condition on the application form. He stated that he did not want the neighbors to feel overcrowded and so he reduced the proposed number of dwellings. He stated he planned on providing space between the proposed dwellings and the adjacent properties.

Ms. Skenes addressed staff and said that in the past the Commission added conditions to request during the public hearing.

Mr. Carter advised that usually such requests were advertised as conditional zoning districts.

Mr. Engle explained to the applicant that there are two types of zoning. He said there are straight zoning which allowed for whatever the standards are for the zone district, and conditional district zoning which allows the applicant to add conditions that would restrict uses, densities or buffers associated with the zone. He stated typically if request was advertised as one it could not change to the other. He then asked staff to clarify the type of request applied for.

Mr. Carter advised the application indicated R- 7 and there was a condition noted on the Conditional District application which stated uses should be limited to ten (10) single-family

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

dwellings. Mr. Carter said that the application should have been advertised as a Conditional Zoning District with use limiting to ten (10) single-family dwellings.

Chair O'Connor asked Mr. Ducharme for clarification on how to proceed with the request.

Ms. Skenes continued questioning the applicant and asked if there would be two conditions for the request.

Mr. Latham said he applied one condition which is to limit the request to nine (9) single-family dwellings. He explained that limiting the request to nine single-family dwellings would create space for a landscape buffer. He stated he could not determine the size of the buffer until the plan design stage. He noted that the buffer would be the size as specified in the Ordinance.

Ms. Skenes restated that the buffer would not be a condition, it would be as required by Ordinance.

Mr. Latham concurred with Ms. Skenes.

Vice Chair Magid asked the applicant if the buffer would be close to Stonypointe Drive.

Mr. Latham responded that the buffer would be along the boundaries of the two single-family dwellings which are adjacent to the subject property. He stated he spoke with the owners of these two properties about the buffer. He mentioned the other adjacent properties and said that one lot was empty, and the others had development setback at least 100 feet from the subject property.

Vice Chair Magid asked if the buffer would be along the property boundaries of the single-family dwellings along Spring Mill Road.

Mr. Latham clarified that the buffer would be along the two adjacent property boundaries at the end of Stonypointe Drive.

Ms. Skenes asked if the request was continuation of Liberty Valley or a separate subdivision.

Mr. Latham said that the request was a separate subdivision.

Chair O'Connor addressed the neighbors and the public and stated that the concern was how the land would be used. She advised that the application was advertised as straight zoning to R-7. Chair O'Connor explained that while the conditions were attractive restrictions, the conditions could not be added without public notice.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Mr. Engle suggested a recess while the staff researched on how to proceed with the request. Mr. Ducharme agreed.

Chair O'Connor then announced a short recess at 6:00p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 6:12p.m.

Chair O'Connor called Mr. Latham to the podium and apologized and said that staff made an error not noticing the condition to be included with the request. She stated the request was presented and advertised as a straight R-7 zoning. Chair O'Connor offered two options to the applicant, one of which to continue the presentation as straight R-7 rezoning since the request was advertised as such. The other option was to continue the request for thirty days so it could be advertised and presented as conditional zoning. Chair O'Connor emphasized that the commission could not discuss the request as conditional zoning as presented.

Mr. Latham said that he would proceed as straight R-7 and stated that he would not build to the maximum density.

Chair O'Connor inquired if staff would like to add anything further.

Mr. Ducharme supported the options and stated that conditional zoning district is different from conventional zoning district. He said he understood the commission choice to proceed with the two options.

Chair O'Connor advised that the commission would consider the request as straight R-7 rezone. She stated that they would hear the intentions of the applicant and stressed that his plans cannot be part of the decision. Chair O'Connor advised that the outcome of the request would be forwarded to the City Council the following month and the request would be debated again. She stated that the commission would make a recommendation and not a final decision.

Chair O'Connor apologized again and then asked the applicant for further comments in support of the request.

Mr. Latham said that he was taking the opportunity to add housing to the City and noted that he builds houses.

Chair O'Connor asked for any further questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor asked the applicant about neighborhood outreach especially with the two neighbors at the end of Stonypointe Drive.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Mr. Latham said he met with the two neighbors adjacent to the request since they would be mostly impacted. He said he showed the preliminary plans and explained that buffer would be implemented. He noted that the neighbors were not present at the meeting and assumed they accepted his plans.

Chair O'Connor asked for any further questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Gilmer Sr expressed concerns that the applicant's plans are not in writing and stated that the neighbors do not have anything in writing. He said he could proceed based on the discussions but felt that since the plans were not in writing issues could arise later. Mr. Gilmer Sr. said he wished the applicant to reconsider continuing the request to next month's meeting. Mr. Gilmer explained that the continuance would allow enough time to have plans in writing and to continue meeting with the neighbors.

Ms. Skenes agreed with Mr. Gilmer Sr, and said that the request as presented allowed for sixteen houses, which was almost twice the amount he intended to build. She said there seems to be a communication issue and that the commission owed it to the neighbors to ensure they are all saying the same thing.

Mr. Latham stated the Technical Review Committee (TRC) determined that only nine single-family dwellings could be built given the constraints of the land. He mentioned that he was trying to expedite getting approval and building the road before the bad weather. He said he wanted to proceed with the request and asked if he could present additional documentation at the City Council meeting. He expressed concerns that if the request is delayed another thirty days he would only start road construction around October or November.

Mr. Engle asked staff if the request could be advertised, as conditional zoning, the following day and heard at a special meeting to keep it on the targeted July City Council meeting. He asked staff if his suggestion was reasonable given the situation.

Mr. Carter indicated Mr. Engle's suggestion was reasonable given the situation. Mr. Carter explained that the request had to be advertised twice and the first had to be at least ten days before the meeting.

Mr. Engle looked to the commissioners to express their thoughts on his suggestion.

Ms. Skenes supported Mr. Engle's suggestion and added that as presented the commission would need to consider the request for sixteen houses.

Chair O'Connor pointed out that the request had been reviewed by TRC and asked whether TRC had determined there could be nine houses due to the topography of the land.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Mr. Latham explained that at the TRC meeting it was determined that the property could accommodate less than ten houses owing to setbacks, the topography of the land and amongst other requirements.

Chair O'Connor restated that the request had been through TRC, and a limitation placed on the number of units.

Mr. Latham mentioned that the request was reviewed at the meeting in May.

Mr. Egbert expressed concerns on the financial implications of delaying the request and specifically that it was the staff oversight of the condition on the application.

Mr. Engle concurred with Mr. Egbert and indicated that was the reasoning behind his suggestion.

Chair O'Connor inquired if anyone from TRC was present at the meeting.

Ms. Skenes inquired if there was minutes of the TRC meeting.

Mr. Nelson noted that TRC comments were issued on May 21st.

Chair O'Connor asked if there were any deliberations on the total number of units allowed on the subject property.

Mr. Nelson said that the sketch plan showed nine lots.

Mr. Egbert asked staff if the nine lots were approved by TRC.

Mr. Nelson noted that the meeting was a sketch plan review and not a full site plan review.

Mr. Latham pointed out that TRC was unable to approve the plan until the subject property was annexed.

Mr. Downing asked if the commission could consider Mr. Engle's suggestion.

Chair O'Connor asked staff if the notice period is counted by calendar days or business days.

Mr. Carter advised that a special Planning and Zoning Commission meeting could be held on July 3rd which would allow sufficient time for advertising of the request. However, he expressed concerns that the City Council meeting would be advertised before the commission made recommendation on the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Ms. Glass advised that additional time should be allowed for the notice period in the event of mishaps in providing the notice. She said she understood the applicant's concerns and suggested that the item moved to the next meeting stating it would provide adequate time for the notice.

Mr. Ducharme agreed with Ms. Glass and added that looking at the calendar there is no clear way other than the request presented at the next meeting, if the request needed to be considered with conditions.

Mr. Egbert noted the Commission needed to take two actions, a vote on the annexation and a vote on the rezoning. He inquired if the commission could vote on the annexation and not on the rezoning.

Mr. Carter said both items needed to be heard concurrently.

Mr. Engle stated that zoning is a recommendation and wanted to know if changes could not be made to the recommendation before adopted by the City Council.

Mr. Ducharme pointed out that the request was advertised as a different zoning district than what it appeared the applicant intended for the subject property. He said the best approach was to ensure the request is processed correctly.

Mr. Engle noted that for his nearing six-year tenure on the commission there were times when the commission's recommendations were different from what was presented at the City Council meeting. He said he was hoping the same could happen for the request.

Vice Chair Magid stated that the request could be carried forward to the July meeting and mentioned of a situation when a rezoning application was not heard at the scheduled City Council meeting and was moved to another date. She could not recollect the specific case but said that the applicant could not attend the scheduled meeting. She inquired of the two dates for the City Council meetings in July.

Mr. Ducharme clarified with Ms. Magid if she wanted the City Council meeting dates for August.

Vice Chair Magid said the July meetings, and asked if the request could be heard by the City Council in July if they voted on the request with the conditions added.

Chair O'Connor advised that there are advertising guidelines and requirements and said that the City Council schedule cannot be changed. She looked to staff for guidance on a possible date outside of the July 16th City Council meeting.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Mr. Ducharme said he understood Ms. Magid's question to mean changing the Council meeting date. He stated that the July dates are not suitable and that the July meeting dates are already determined.

Chair O'Connor asked for any further questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none she said to the applicant that she understood his decision to proceed with the request. She explained that the request as straight R-7, and as pointed out by Mr. Gilmer Sr., the commissioners were sympathetic and open to the applicant's comments and restrictions, but the commissioners could not vote on the restrictions as they are not part of the process before them.

Mr. Latham asked if the technical review documents submitted could be considered.

Chair O'Connor explained that the technical review recommendation was not final outcome for the total number of units that could be built and that it was in response to the plan submitted. She said as she understood it was not final.

Mr. Latham said that a decision could not be made by the TRC until the subject property was annexed so he felt he was in a peculiar situation.

Chair O'Connor concurred with Mr. Latham that he was in a peculiar situation.

Mr. Downing asked Chair O'Connor if there was anyone opposing or in support of the request.

Chair O'Connor stated that the discussion was for the applicant to decide how to proceed.

Mr. Latham pointed out that the document submitted to the TRC would be the final document. He stated that his civil engineer worked with TRC to place setbacks restriction and other development standards. He said that the document is already set and could not change.

Chair O'Connor told Mr. Latham she understood his peculiar situation. She noted that whether a positive or negative outcome the request would go before the City Council on July 16th. Chair O'Connor asked staff if the applicant could add conditions to the request before July 16th.

Mr. Latham asked if the next TRC meeting would be before July 16th and said he was trying to reinforce that he intended to build the number of units shown on the technical review submission.

Chair O'Connor explained to the applicant that there were situations when changes were made to conditional zoning to add more restrictions. She advised that the changes were acceptable because the requests were conditional zoning, and it was not in his case. She continued to explain that she was asking staff if conditions could be added before taking the request to the City Council meeting.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Mr. Ducharme stated the Ordinance contemplated the recommendation for the Commission, and there was still the issue of how the request was advertised. He recommended that the commission continue to discuss the request based on the two options stated earlier that is the item to proceed as straight zoning or for continuance. He expressed concerns that how the request was advertised could invalidate the Commission's decision.

Chair O'Connor again asked Mr. Latham if he would like the commission to proceed with the hearing.

Mr. Latham agreed to proceed. He said he wanted to meet his construction deadlines this fall before the bad weather.

Chair O'Connor stated that the public hearing would continue, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in support of the request.

Michael Westcott, 125 S Elm Street said he is a civil engineer and pointed out that he did not work for the applicant. He stated that he sat on the Guilford County Planning Board for eight years, and he understood the discussion. He said he wanted to provide insight on the discussion, and stated he has been designing subdivisions since 1998. He referenced the Guilford County GIS map and noted that according to zoning the subject property could accommodate sixteen (16) lots but geometrically it is not possible. He said that the subject property could physically contain only ten (10) lots due to minimum lot width. He stated that weather there was a condition of having nine or ten units physically there could be no more than 10 units.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions from the Commissioners.

Ms. Skenes stated that there was the assumption of a straight road as opposed to a "T".

Mr. Westcott said there was not enough space for a "T".

Mr. Latham indicated he proposed a "T".

Mr. Westcott asked about the road dimensions and stated that geometrically a T road was not achievable.

Chair O'Connor asked for any further questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked Mr. Westcott if he had further comments, hearing none she asked Mr. Latham if he wished to speak further.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Mr. Latham stated that the site layout allowed for development on only one side of the street, therefore restricting the number of lots to less than ten. He said as proposed by his engineer one side of the street would be vacant and would provide buffer closer to the adjacent properties.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in support of the request.

Mr. Carter confirmed that with the subject property having lot width of 518 ft and with minimum lot width for R-7 being 50ft only 10. 36 lots would be allowed. He noted that the applicant could not get more than ten lots.

Chair O'Connor asked Mr. Carter to repeat his findings.

Mr. Carter stated that the subject property is 518 feet wide, the minimum lot width in the R-7 zoning district is 50 feet which would allow ten lots.

Mr. Engle clarified that ten lots was allowed if on one side of the street.

Mr. Carter concurred with Mr. Engle and said that the subject property does not have enough lot depth to allow for additional lots on the other side of the street.

Mr. Engle recalled there was a request with similar circumstance and that the applicant could reduce the area of land to be rezoned to a size that allows only ten lots. He said that the applicant could make the change before the scheduled City Council meeting in July, and stated he was willing to consider the request as proposed.

Chair O'Connor asked if there were anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the rezoning for straight R-7.

Mr. Nelson notified Chair O'Connor that Earline McRaye was online to speak in opposition to the request.

Chair O'Connor advised that the commission would hear the speaker in the chamber and then the speaker online.

Wayne Clapp, 3211 Stonypointe Drive, said he lived at his address for over 35 years. He stated he was in opposition until he met the owner at the meeting. He said if had met with the owner prior to the meeting he could have rescinded his objection. He stated he was concerned with traffic impacts since children in the neighborhood played in the street. He said that portions of the street in Liberty Valley has sunken and felt that bringing heavy equipment into the area would worsen the situation. He expressed concerns that the homeowners in the area would incur the cost if more damages were done to the street. He said that being at the meeting he realized the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

impact would not be significant. Mr. Clapp mentioned he did not receive notice of the request nor was any neighborhood meeting held to notify the Stonypointe residents.

Chair O'Connor asked if the Commissioners had any questions.

Mr. Engle addressed staff and stated that 3211 Stonypointe Drive should be in the notification buffer. He asked if Mr. Clapp should be notified of the hearing.

Mr. Carter said Mr. Clapp should have received notice of the meeting and clarified with Mr. Clapp whether he referenced a meeting with the applicant.

Mr. Clapp said he referred to a notice of meeting with the applicant. He also stated he did not receive notice in the mail and that he received a notice from one of the neighbors.

Mr. Carter confirmed that 3211 Stonypointe Drive is within the notification buffer and the owner should have received notice of the hearing. Mr. Carter advised that notice was mailed to the address found on the County records.

Mr. Gilmer Sr asked staff if there was any community input, or any meeting held by the applicant.

Chair O'Connor called Mr. Latham to the podium.

Mr. Latham referenced the subdivision plan and stated he had one-on-one meetings with the residents of the neighboring properties. He noted they discussed the subdivision plan, and thought they understood the proposal. He said that neighborhood meeting was not held and stated there were about seventy names on the notification list. He stated that the proposal has limited impacts with nine housing lots and having green space on the entire side of the street.

Chair O'Connor asked Mr. Gilmer Sr if his question was answered, and he indicated it was.

Mr. Latham repeated that the subject property could not accommodate fifteen lots.

Chair O'Connor inquired if Mr. Clapp had further comments.

Mr. Clapp pointed out that the applicant focused on the two houses closer to the proposed subdivision and stated that the applicant should have included all the residents on Stonypointe Drive. He mentioned that there are only fifteen houses on the street and having a meeting would allow for more clarity on the request.

Chair O'Connor called for the speaker online.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Mr. Nelson advised that Earline McRaye was online and would like to speak.

Ms. Glass indicated to Chair O'Connor that she had a question.

Chair O'Connor asked to whom the question was for.

Ms. Glass said she had a question for the Commission and Mr. Ducharme. She asked if it was possible for the commission to make a motion to continue the request. She stated that legal issues may compile due to the missing information as well as the legal concerns about the notification. She noted that she understood the applicant's concerns and wanted to continue the request and said she understood that the person online wanted to speak in opposition.

Chair O'Connor indicated she understood Ms. Glass's concerns and added that the procedure is important. She thanked Ms. Glass for her question.

Mr. Ducharme said he perused the Land Development Ordinance as it pertains to notification. He stated that given the peculiarity of the situation the Commission could vote for the continuance of the request. He noted that there should be clear reasons for the decision taken by the Commission. He advised that the concerns of the content of the application could be a valid reason to move in that manner.

Chair O'Connor agreed and said that the Commission was in an unusual space and expressed appreciation to Mr. Ducharme and Ms. Glass for their insight.

Chair O'Connor then said the Commissioners should listen to the speaker online since she was prepared to talk. Chair O'Connor indicated to Ms. Glass that she could prepare a motion for the continuation of the request. She again asked for the speaker online.

Mr. Nelson told the speaker online to unmute the microphone.

Chair O'Connor asked the speaker online to turn on the camera and unmute the microphone. She asked the speaker to state her name and address.

Mr. Nelson stated that the speaker online was not responding to his messages. He said the speaker indicated the microphone could not unmute.

Chair O'Connor said the Commission would forgo the speaker online and then looked to Ms. Glass for a motion.

Ms. Glass then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-06-001 and PL(P) 24-15, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission recommend to continue the rezoning request for the property

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

at 3196-ZZ Stonypointe Drive from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City R-7 (Residential Single-family – 7) for the following reasons: (1) in light of the issues with notices to be given regarding the advertising for the conditional zoning request with the relevant conditions; (2) to ensure proper notification to adjoining properties owners as per the North Carolina General Statutes. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

Assistant City Attorney Ducharme amended the motion and stated the required notices had been sent. He stated that it was a matter of additional communications between the neighbors and the applicant. He explained that the legally required notices were sent by the City and that the nature of the advertising is a procedural issue.

Ms. Glass thanked Mr. Ducharme. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the amended motion.

Hearing no further comments Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing. She concluded by expressing appreciation and apologizing for the lengthy deliberation. She stated that the discussion allowed for the motion which gave the applicant the opportunity to speak with the neighbors and for the request to be properly advertised as conditional zoning district. She said while the commission is sympathetic to the delay, the continuation could be an advantage for greater communication with the neighbors. She stated that in the end a more solid plan would come before the commission, and they would be able to quickly hear the request.

Mr. Engle stated that he appreciated the direction of the commission. However, he said he would not vote for the continuation of the request. He said the applicant did his work, there was a plan in place, yet the request would be delayed for another month. He said as a group they should work to ensure such a mistake does not occur again. He mentioned that staff should figure out if the request could be heard earlier. He indicated again that he would not be supporting the motion.

Chair O'Connor asked for any further comments from the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Magid expressed that she too would not be supporting the motion.

Ms. Skenes supported the motion and said she felt the applicant needed the opportunity to present the case as he intended for the development to unfold. She stated specifically limiting the number of units, exploring buffers, and to present a sketch plan like the TRC submission. She stated that having the time to revise the request would give the Commission a better understanding of what is intended. She added that the same goes for the neighbors. She emphasized that the continuation would benefit everyone to have a hard copy and not just relying on TRC comments. She felt there were too many variables present and said she would be supporting the continuance in order for the applicant to demonstrate what he intended.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Mr. Dowling stated that he would vote in favor of the continuance, he felt the neighbors needed additional clarity. He mentioned he understood the applicant's timetable, but the continuance would allow for more conversations. He stated that the documentation could prevent a legal battle and allow for clearer presentation of what was planned for subject property. He supported the motion and noted that it would interfere with the applicant's timetable but overall, it would benefit the masses.

Chair O'Connor asked for any further comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Gilmer Sr. concurred with Mr. Downing and Ms. Skenes and said that the continuance would give the applicant the chance especially to communicate with the neighbors. He noted he was bothered by Mr. Clapp not being able to communicate with the applicant. He said he hoped in the future the commission would think twice before continuing cases and noted that in this case it is necessary to do so to stay out of a legal battle.

Vice Chair Magid requested to rescind her earlier comments and said she would vote for the continuance.

The Commission voted 7-1, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass). Nays: (Engle).

Chair O'Connor advised that the item is to be continued. She apologized to the applicant and said in the end there would be a better outcome. The item is continued to the July 15th Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting.

PL(P) 24-18: Street Closure Request to close Corsair Lane from Airport Center Drive northwestward approximately 604.68 feet to its terminus. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the street closure and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is considering a recommendation on closing the following street:

- 1) Corsair Lane from Airport Center Drive northwestward approximately 604.68 feet to its terminus.

The total area of R-O-W that is requested to be closed is identified as approximately 40,730 square feet (0.935 acres). The signee makes up 100% of the road frontage along the R-O-W requested to be closed.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

The City must make two determinations in order to close a street: (1) that closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to the public interest and (2) that no property owner in the vicinity is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress. He noted that the Technical Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed street closure with the following conditions:

- 1) That the City shall retain 20-foot utility easements over existing utility lines until such time as the lines are no longer needed for public use.
- 2) In order for the street closure to be final a plat must be recorded recombining the area within the right of way with the adjacent properties.

Chair O'Connor asked if the Commissioners had questions. Hearing none she asked if the applicant had further information.

Joseph Caraher, School Director for Cornerstone Charter Academy, 7800 Airport Center Drive, said they are reconfiguring the campus to increase parking and to improve stacking to ensure picking up and drop off are safer. He stated that they are not increasing the school size, they are just making it safer for the students.

Chair O'Connor asked if there were anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Michael Westcott, 125 S Elm Street, said he is the civil engineer for the project. He stated he was present to answer any questions.

Chair O'Connor asked the Commissioner if they had questions. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle then made a motion to recommend the street closure request with the condition referenced seconded by Mr. Egbert. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Egbert and Glass. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, July 16, 2024 City Council Meeting.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Carter reported that there were no items from the department.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Chair O'Connor said that on behalf of the Commissioner she expressed sincere condolences to Mr. Peterson and his family on the recent loss of his son.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JUNE 17, 2024

Chair O'Connor asked the commissioners if they had anything further to say.

Chair O'Connor thanked everyone and said she appreciated everyone's efforts and patience during the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair O'Connor adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, July 15, 2024, beginning at 5:30 p.m. Members present were Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, Zac Engle, Paul Gilmer Sr., B. Keith Peterson and Betty Turner. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Luke Carter, Andrew Nelson and Carla Harrison (Planning), Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office) and Nolan Tipton (GDOT).

Chair O'Connor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Chair O'Connor advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated that the Commission reviews all original zoning and rezoning requests for the City of Greensboro. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Chair O'Connor noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. She further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know.

Chair O'Connor recognized Mr. Andrew Egbert's three years of service on the Planning and Zoning Commission and said they appreciated his contribution as part of the commission. She noted that he was not reappointed as he is moving out of state and acknowledged his replacement and the new commissioner Ms. Betty Turner.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair O'Connor acknowledged the absence of Commissioner Glass.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Chair O'Connor requested approval of the May 20, 2024 and June 17, 2024 meeting minutes. Vice Chair Magid made a motion to approve the May and June meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Engle. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson). Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Chair O'Connor inquired if any items were withdrawn or needed to be continued. Mr. Kirkman advised that the applicant withdrew item Z-24-06-004 for the property identified as 2313 Stanley Road, and no action as needed by the Commission. He also noted that item Z-24-07-004 for the properties identified as 1741, 1763, and 1765 Mt. Hope Church Road, 558 Old Birch Creek Road, and 928 Near and 930 Knox Road is continued until the application is deemed complete.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Chair O'Connor noted that there was only one person signed up to speak in opposition to item Z-24-06-001 for the property identified as 3196-ZZ Stonypointe Drive. She inquired if there were anyone else in attendance or online to speak in opposition to any other items on the agenda. Chair O'Connor noted there were several items that did not have opposition signed up to speak and were eligible for the expedited agenda. These items were **Z-24-06-006** for 1620-YY and 1626 Lovett Street; **Z-24-07-001** for 2701 East Market Street; **Z-24-07-002** for a portion of 5909 West Gate City Boulevard; **Z-24-07-003** for 215 Standard Drive, a portion of Standard Drive right of way, and a portion of railroad right of way; **Z-24-07-005** for 2003 Generations Lane, 1915 and 1931 Little Valley Way; and **Z-24-07-006** for 1915 and 1915 ZZ Harris Drive and 4924 Old Randleman Road. Chair O'Connor noted that the Commission would first address the expediated items and reordered the agenda accordingly.

OLD BUSINESS:

Z-24-06-006: A rezoning request from CD-C-L (Conditional District - Commercial – Low) and R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) for the properties identified as 1620-YY and 1626 Lovett Street, generally described as west of Lovett Street and north of Freeman Mill Road (2.94 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Uses shall be limited to: A maximum of 18 Single-family Attached (Townhome) Dwelling Units.

Mr. Carter noted that a Unified Development Plan (UDP) is associated with the request. He said that the UDP was approved by the Technical Review Committee (TRC) with the following condition: (1) show vehicular access points.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban Central on the Future Built Form Map. The Glenwood Neighborhood Plan's Future Land Use Map designates the subject property as Commercial and Residential. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed PUD zoning district, as conditioned, would allow new residential uses appropriately placed along a major thoroughfare and compatible with adjacent existing residential uses. The proposed use can provide a good transition from the more intense uses found along Freeman Mill Road to the lower density residential uses along Lovett Street. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

The applicant was present but did not wish to speak.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle noted that the Commissioners received an email pertaining to traffic concerns and wanted to offer feedback to the sender of the email. He stated that the request is a downzoning moving from a commercial property to residential, which is less intense. He said the downzoning should address any traffic concerns.

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-06-006, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 1620-YY and 1626 Lovett Street from CD-C-L (Conditional District - Commercial – Low) and R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed PUD zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Mr. Engle made a motion to approve the UDP with the conditions approved by TRC, seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, August 20, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

NEW BUSINESS:

Z24-07-001: A rezoning request from LI (Light Industrial) to O (Office) for the property identified as 2701 East Market Street, generally described as north of East Market Street and east of Holt Avenue (0.13 acres) (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property as Urban Central within an Urban (Mixed-Use) Corridor and the East Market Street Reinvestment Corridor on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community and the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness strategy to improve conditions throughout the city, and impact social inequity and economic disparity by focusing public investments and services in areas of greatest need. The proposed O zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate office, institutional, supporting service and residential uses. The uses permitted in the proposed O zoning district are compatible with existing uses on adjacent tracts and are appropriate within the mixed-use context of the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Cieraca Rhodes, 1303 San Antonio Boulevard stated she is the realtor representing the owners of the subject property. She said that she was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Engle thanked Ms. Rhodes for the community outreach and said that not having anyone in opposition showed the efforts placed in the neighborhood outreach.

Chair O'Connor hearing no further comments closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-07-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 2701 East Market Street from LI (Light Industrial) to O (Office) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed O zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, August 20, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-19 & Z-24-07-002: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-O (Conditional District - Office) for the property identified as a portion of 5909 West Gate City Boulevard formerly being a portion of Marion Elsie Drive right of way, generally described as west of Marion Elsie Drive and north of Scotland Road (0.257 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter informed the Commission that the applicant requested to revise the conditions associated with the request and stated that the conditions presented in the staff report were different. He said that condition 1 was revised having the last sentence replaced, and condition 7 was added to the list of conditions.

Mr. Engle made a motion to accept the revised list of conditions for the request, seconded by Mr. Gilmer Sr. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor clarified that the request is for a portion of Marion Elsie Drive and not the entire parcel. Mr. Carter concurred and said that the same portion of Marion Elsie Drive is an approved street closure by the County which was equally divided between the subject property and the residential properties to the north. He stated that the request would assign the same zoning to the acquired portion of Marion Elsie Drive as to that of the adjacent property to the south.

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He then advised that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

- 1) Uses. Permitted uses shall be limited to the following: Forestry and Crops; Daycare Centers; Elementary/Secondary Schools; Medical, Dental, and Related Offices; Religious Assembly; Parks and Open Areas; Office Use Group; Accessory Uses and Structures (Customary); and Temporary Construction Office. No elevated structures will be permitted on the parcels identified as 5800 Scotland Road and 5810 Marion Elsie Drive (Lot 24 and Lot 25 as shown on Plat Book 7, Page 154).
- 2) Buffers. (a) The applicant shall erect an opaque fence no less than 6 feet in height adjacent the western and northern boundaries of tax parcel 156251 (5806 Scotland

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

Road) and 8 feet in height adjacent the northern and eastern boundaries of tax parcel 156252 (5804 Scotland Road); (b) except for vegetation necessary to be removed for parking, bioretention cells, and drainage swale on tax parcel 156284 (5810 Marion Elsie) and tax parcel 232721 (5800 Scotland Road) and to construct a fence adjacent the northern and eastern boundaries of tax parcel 156252 (5804 Scotland Road), all vegetation on tax parcels 156284 and 232721 shall remain natural and undisturbed; (c) the applicant shall increase the street planting yard along the southern boundary of tax parcel 156250 from 10 feet to 20 feet in width, with a planting rate of 2 canopy trees and 8 evergreen trees per 100 linear feet. Evergreen trees used will not be less than 6 feet in height at time of planting and have a mature height of no less than 20 feet.

- 3) Lighting. Except for walls facing W. Gate City Blvd., internally illuminated wall signs shall be cut off no later than 11:00 p.m.
- 4) Signage. Freestanding signage shall be prohibited on Scotland Road, Queen Alice Road, and Marion Elsie Drive.
- 5) Hours. Office uses shall not be accessible to the public between the hours of 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.
- 6) Transportation. The applicant shall design access to Scotland Road to prohibit right-in and left-out movements.
- 7) The subject property shall be developed in conjunction with the portion of 5909 W. Gate City Boulevard that was annexed by the Greensboro City Council on September 9, 2023.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General and within an Urban Mixed-Use Corridor on the Future Built Form Map. The Future Land Use Map designates the property as Commercial and Residential. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Filling In Our Framework goal to ensure every neighborhood is safe and has convenient access to first-rate schools, services, shopping, parks, and community facilities. The proposed CD-O zoning district, as conditioned, limits negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. The uses permitted in the proposed CD-O zoning district are compatible with existing commercial, civic, and residential uses located on adjacent tracts. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak in favor of the request.

Bruce Cantrell, 1000 N Eugene Street said he was the architect representing the owner of the property. He stated he was mainly present to answer questions and did a brief presentation. He said the second access to the subject property via Queen Alice Road was in response to neighborhood requests. He stated that the street closure was also to facilitate the neighborhood concerns. Mr. Cantrell noted that closing a section of Marion Elsie Drive allowed for the second entrance to directly connect to Queen Alice Road, and to increase the separation buffer between the subject property and surrounding neighborhood. He said that the adjacent property owners

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

are in favor of the request and pointed out that the lengthy list of conditions for the request was responding to the neighborhood concerns.

Chair O'Connor hearing no further comments closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Magid made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Vice Chair Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-07-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at a portion of 5909 West Gate City Boulevard from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-O (Conditional District - Office) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons:(1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-O zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of the surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, August 20, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Z24-07-003: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to HI (Heavy Industrial) for the property identified as 215 Standard Drive, a portion of Standard Drive right of way, and a portion of railroad right of way, generally described as east and north of Standard Drive and south of Little Santee Road (25.85 acres) (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property. He stated that the property description includes the right of way on the property as well as the northern boundary extending to the centerline of the railway, and that they are subjected to the rezoning request. Mr. Carter then reviewed the summary information for the surrounding properties.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map. The Western Area Plan's Future Land Use Map designates this property as Employment Area. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to transform underutilized sites into valued assets that complement their surroundings and the Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed HI zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate a wide range of assembling, fabricating and manufacturing activities. The proposed zoning district allows uses that are compatible with the existing workforce and manufacturing uses adjacent to the subject property. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Brian Pearce, 800 Green Valley Road described the request as filling in the donut hole. He indicated he was present to address questions or concerns.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Peterson then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-07-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 215 Standard Drive, a portion of Standard Drive right of way, and a portion of the railroad right of way from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to HI (Heavy Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed HI zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, August 20, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z24-07-005: A rezoning request from PUD (Planned Unit Development) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) for the properties identified as 2003 Generations Lane, 1915 and 1931 Little Valley Way, generally described as north of Green Valley Road and east of Lendew Street (11.977 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and noted that a UDP is associated with the request. He then reviewed the summary information for the surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

- 1) Residential Dwelling Units shall not exceed 300 Units.
- 2) Uses for the commercial outparcels shall be limited to: All uses allowed in the Commercial – Medium zoning district except: Eating and drinking establishments with drive through facilities, movie theater, and bowling alley.
- 3) Total Eating Establishment Square Footage shall not exceed 12,000 square feet.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed PUD zoning district, as conditioned, would allow a mix of appropriately dense uses that have an intensity generally compatible with the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners, she then asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle clarified that the rezoning is basically to add 2,000 square feet of patio space for future eating and drinking establishments and Mr. Carter concurred.

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-07-005, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 2003 Generations Lane, 1915 and 1931 Little Valley Way from PUD (Planned Unit Development) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed PUD zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Mr. Engle made a motion to approve the UDP, seconded by Mr. Gilmer Sr. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, August 20, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-20 & Z-24-07-006: An annexation and original zoning request from County PI (Public and Institutional) and County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-PI (Conditional District - Public and Institutional) for the properties identified as 1915 and 1915 ZZ Harris Drive and 4924 Old Randleman Road, generally described as south of Harris Drive and west of Old Randleman Road (20.94 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He then advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to: the Educational Facilities Use Group.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Exurban on the Future Built Form Map. If this original zoning request is approved, the Future Built Form designation for the subject site is considered to be amended to Urban General in order to ensure an appropriate fit between future land use designation and zoning. The Future Land Use Map designates the property as Residential and Commercial. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed CD-PI zoning district would limit permitted uses to the Educational Facilities Use Group. The uses permitted under this request are broadly compatible with the existing uses in the area and support the community. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak in favor of the request.

Donna Bell, 617 W Market Street stated she represented the Guilford County Schools Planning Department. She said she did not have any additional presentation and was present to answer any questions. She noted that the subject property is the Sumner Elementary School site.

Mr. Engle commended Ms. Bell and her team for the outstanding community outreach.

Ms. Bell expressed appreciation of the Commission's support.

Chair O'Connor hearing no further comments closed the public hearing.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

Mr. Downing made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Engle. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-07-006, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 1915 and 1915 ZZ Harris Drive and 4924 Old Randleman Road from County PI (Public and Institutional) and County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-PI (Conditional District - Public and Institutional) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-PI zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, August 20, 2024 City Council Meeting.

REGULAR AGENDA

OLD BUSINESS

PL(P) 24-15 and Z24-06-001: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-R-7 (Conditional District - Residential Single-family - 7) for the property identified as 3196-ZZ Stonypointe Drive, generally described as north of Stonypointe Drive and east of Liberty Road (2.426 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to a maximum of 10 single-family lots.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Building Community Connections strategy to work to ensure the quality, quantity, and diversity of housing choices across and between neighborhoods.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

The proposed CD-R-7 zoning district, as conditioned, limits uses to a maximum of 10 residential lots. This request would permit uses that are compatible with those existing on adjacent tracts. This request allows for greater flexibility for individual lot configuration with a small increase in residential density. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak in favor of the request.

Hugh Latham, 2500 Wilpar Drive stated he mailed notification letters to property owners within the City's 750 feet notification buffer. He said a zoom meeting was held on July 10th with two people in attendance. He noted some of the questions and concerns raised during the zoom meeting as follows:

- 1) Separation buffer from the properties at 3196 and 3197 Stonypointe Drive - the applicant said that including the landscape buffer, the street and setbacks within the proposed development the distance between the proposed dwellings and the aforementioned properties would be approximately 85 feet and 65 feet respectively.
- 2) Lighting - the applicant said that lighting would be provided at the end of the street which is at the entrance of the proposed development.
- 3) Turnaround – the applicant said that the turnaround shown on the plan is as per the Greensboro Fire Department requirements and it would be able to adequately accommodate the city garbage trucks and other service vehicles.
- 4) Condition of Stonypointe Road – he stated that the road is state owned, which he had no control over.

He then explained that the letters mailed to the property owners within the notification buffer included specifications for the proposed development as follows: there would be nine single-family homes; large greenspace acting as landscape buffer; and environmental protection to process the storm water runoff before discharge. He stated that he planned on starting road construction this year if weather permits, therefore expediting the process.

Ms. Magid, asked for clarification on the number of accesses to the proposed development and pointed to the turnaround east of the proposed entrance in front of Stonypointe Drive.

The applicant said that the turnaround is for the maneuvering of service trucks, and only one entrance is proposed.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she invited anyone wishing to speak in opposition to come forward.

Dacia McCarthy Grant Jefferies, 3197 Stonypointe Drive raised the following concerns:

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

- 1) The turnaround is close to her backyard and the possibility of storing vehicles in the area is of great concern.
- 2) Traffic congestion on Stonypointe Drive in the evenings is an issue and the additional dwellings would worsen the situation.
- 3) Possible traffic conflict with children playing in the neighborhood.
- 4) The heavy-duty construction truck and related equipment would deteriorate the already poor road conditions on Stonypointe Drive.
- 5) Noise disturbances during the construction phase of the proposed development.
- 6) Currently service trucks (garbage, fire) could only back in and out of Stonypointe Drive and the proposed turnaround would not be sufficient.
- 7) Absence of traffic impact study for the proposed development and she mentioned multiple traffic accidents on Liberty Road and Edgemont Road.
- 8) She felt that the community outreach was not properly conducted and was the cause for only two people attending the zoom meeting.
- 9) She expressed that she would lose the peaceful environment of her backyard.
- 10) She stated that the proposed development would increase the tax value of her home.
- 11) She felt the neighborhood should be more involved during the community outreach process.

Mr. Engle clarified with Ms. McCarthy Grant Jefferies the two dates shown on the notices. He explained that the request was being heard at the Planning and Zoning meeting tonight and would then be heard the following day at the City Council meeting. He pointed out that the Commission could only make recommendations for the annexation and original zoning request. He said that the City Council meeting scheduled for July 16th would make the final approval. He explained that it was unusual for request going to the Council so quickly, but the situation came about from issues aroused from last month's meeting.

Ms. McCarthy Grant Jefferies pointed out that one of the notices had last month's date and so she was a little confused.

Mr. Engle explained that the request was scheduled to be heard at last month's meeting and noted that the applicant and persons from the neighborhood were present.

Ms. McCarthy Grant Jefferies said she was present online at the last meeting but was unable to connect via zoom.

Ms. Magid advised Ms. McCarthy Grant Jefferies that she could attend the City Council meeting scheduled for the following day and express her concerns as well.

Chair O'Connor then advised that the applicant had five (5) minutes for rebuttal.

Mr. Latham stated that the proposed road (Stony River Drive) would allow for the turnaround of buses and service trucks and would no longer need to back in and out of Stonypointe Drive.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

Mr. Peterson asked if the turnaround would be at the entrance of the proposed development or to the right (east) of the entrance.

Mr. Latham stated the turnaround would be to the right.

Mr. Ducharme reminded the Commissioners that the request is related to land use, and it was not necessary to discuss the site specific issues.

Chair O'Connor agreed with Mr. Ducharme and advised that the plan presented was conceptual and is not final.

Mr. Latham pointed out that the plan was reviewed by the Technical Review Committee, and the design was for the subject property. He said there would not be much deviation from the plan.

Mr. Tipton advised that for such proposal a turnaround would be required and noted that the plan is conceptual.

Ms. Skenes asked for clarification on the mails sent to the property owners within the city's notification buffer.

Mr. Latham said he sent mails based on the list he received from the City and had one returned mail. He noted only two people joined the zoom meeting.

Ms. Skenes asked if the zoom link was in the letter mailed to the property owners.

Mr. Latham stated the zoom link and QR code were in the letter mailed to the property owners.

Ms. Skenes restated that seventy-four people should receive the mail and should have logged on to the zoom meeting, however only two people logged on.

Mr. Latham stated she was correct.

Mr. Downing asked if there would be any consideration for the separation buffer adjacent to 3196 and 3197 Stonypointe Drive.

Mr. Kirkman advised that separation buffer are based on land use intensities. He stated that the proposed single-family residential use is adjacent to single-family residential therefore no minimum tree conservation or buffer is required under the Ordinance.

Mr. Latham noted that the proposed development would provide a thirty-two feet separation buffer.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone had further questions. Hearing none she asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the request.

Ms. McCarthy Grant Jefferies implied that the zoom link and QR code were only sent to the two people present at the zoom meeting. She also stated that the size of the landscape buffer changed on several occasions and expressed concerns that it could continue to change. She concluded that there should be better community outreach.

Chair O'Connor then invited the person online to speak.

Carla Jackson, 3196 Stonypointe Drive said that Stonypointe Drive is patched up and is not in good condition. She said that there should be two zoning signs for the notification of the request. She stated that a zoning sign should be placed on Liberty Valley Road which would allow more residents to be notified of the zoning meeting. She mentioned the zoning sign was placed on her property and not on the subject property. She noted that children play on the street and increased traffic could lead to accidents. She said that the neighborhood could possibly misunderstand the meeting schedule. She expressed storm water runoff concerns. She mentioned that the proposed play area would not benefit the Stonypointe Road neighborhood since they are not part of the proposed development. She stated that there should be another access to the proposed development and not one way in and out of the area. She talked about the need for landscape separation between her property and the proposed development and noted that only seven single-family dwellings should be allowed.

Chair O'Conner asked staff to address the placement of zoning signs.

Mr. Kirkman advised state law required that the zoning sign be placed on the subject property, therefore could not be placed at nearby intersections or on neighboring properties. He stated that the zoning sign is one way of advertising the meeting and the mailed notice to property owners within the 750 feet buffer is another way.

Mr. Engle asked for clarification on the mailing notification buffer.

Mr. Kirkman stated that the State requires mailing notification only to adjacent property owners while the City requires notification mailed to property owners within the 750 feet buffer.

Mr. Engle noted that the city's buffer would allow for notification to most of the neighborhood.

Chair O'Connor asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Ms. Magid asked staff about the required landscape buffer.

Mr. Kirkman pointed out that the request here was single family against single family therefore a buffer is not required under the Ordinance.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

Mr. Gilmer then said he would support the request and stated that the property is currently vacant and would be built up. He stated that the applicant did what needed to be done.

Mr. Engle supported the request and said that the applicant improved the proposal since the previous meeting by adding the condition. He stated that with the subject property being two and half acres and under the R-7 zoning there could be fourteen (14) to fifteen (15) dwellings. He said what is proposed is four (4) to five (5) units per acre and stated that the City's minimum is three units per acre. Mr. Engle felt that the proposal is worth supporting and said that there are opportunities for other issues to be resolved. He pointed out that a traffic impact study is only required for housing development with around one hundred (100) dwelling units. He said that the proposed development is a good infill project for the area.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone had further questions for the applicant. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Magid made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Gilmer, Sr. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-06-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 3196-ZZ Stonypointe Drive from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-R-7 (Conditional District - Residential Single-family - 7) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-R-7 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, July 16, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Mr. Engle commended the staff for their professionalism in the handling of the request in such an expeditious manner.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

PL(P) 24-21: Street Closure Request to close Ireland Street between 1020 and 1100 South Elm Street, approximately 25 feet.. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the street closure and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is considering a recommendation on closing the following street:

- 1) A portion of Ireland Street between 1020 and 1100 South Elm Street, approximately 25 feet. The total area of R-O-W that is requested to be closed is identified as approximately 6,338.25 square feet (0.146 acres). The signee makes up 100% of the road frontage along the R-O-W requested to be closed.

Mr. Carter stated that the City must make two determinations in order to close the street: (1) that closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to the public interest; and (2) that no property owner in the vicinity is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress.

Chair O'Connor asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Magid mentioned that the illustrations submitted were not clear and she had trouble navigating the area. She said nonetheless she drove around the area.

Mr. Carter stated that there are several unimproved rights of way throughout the City.

Hearing no further comments Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle made a motion to recommend the street closure request, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Peterson. Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, August 20, 2024 City Council Meeting.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman reported that there were no items from the department.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. Engle announced that he believed this would be his last meeting and expressed gratitude to the Commission and the staff for their support throughout his six-year tenure. He said he started in 2018 and around the time he met his wife, he also thanked his wife and children for their support. He mentioned Mr. Bryson and thanked him for implementing the expedited agenda which made the meeting faster. He also expressed thanks to past commissioners namely Gene Lester, Janet Mazzurco, Ray Trapp, Vernal Alford and Adam Marshall. He said each of the commissioners had different perspectives and he learned a lot during his time serving on the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

JULY 15, 2024

Commission. He stated that the City grew during his tenure and commended the Commissioners for looking at the big picture for the growth of the City. He also thanked the staff for facilitating the meeting and specifically delivering staff reports to his home. He also mentioned thanks to Hugh Holston. He concluded by saying thank you and that it has been a wonderful journey.

Vice Chair Magid mentioned that the commission would miss Mr. Engle.

Chair O'Connor asked if commissioners had further comments.

Mr. Gilmer Sr acknowledged Mr. Henry Isaacson's recent death, whom he met in 1992 or 1993 on the Planning Board. He noted Mr. Isaacson did a great job with the airport. He said that Mr. Isaacson was professional and won his cases because he did his homework. He expressed condolences from the Commission to Mr. Isaacson's family and said that he was a great man, and he would be missed.

Chair O'Connor thanked Mr. Gilmer Sr for his comments and said that in professional lives people strive to make a difference. She concurred that Mr. Isaacson made a huge difference in Greensboro.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair O'Connor adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:09p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, August 19, 2024, beginning at 5:35 p.m. Members present in person were Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, Zac Engle, Paul Gilmer Sr., and Betty Turner. Chair Sandra O'Connor and Erica Glass attended virtually via Zoom. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Luke Carter, Andrew Nelson and Carla Harrison (Planning), Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office) and Nolan Tipton (GDOT). Jana Steward (Water Resources) briefly attended virtually via Zoom to address questions and concerns raised for item PL(P) 24-24 and Z-24-08-005.

Vice-Chair Magid announced she would be chairing the meeting and filling in for Chair O'Connor who was participating virtually via Zoom. Vice-Chair then welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Vice-Chair Magid advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated that the Commission reviews all original zoning and rezoning requests for the City of Greensboro. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Vice-Chair Magid stated the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. She further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation, and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Vice-Chair Magid acknowledged the absence of Commissioner B. Keith Peterson.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Vice-Chair Magid requested approval of the July 15, 2024 meeting minutes. Mr. Gilmer, Sr. made a motion to approve the July meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Ms. Turner. The

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there were any withdrawals or continuances. Mr. Kirkman advised that the applicant requested item Z-24-06-003 for the property identified as 1322 Bothwell Street to be continued to the September 16, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Vice-Chair Magid asked if the applicant or anyone else would like to speak further on the continuance. Hearing none, she asked for a motion. Mr. Engle then asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in support or in opposition to the continuance. Hearing none, he made a motion to approve the continuance to the September 16, 2024 meeting, seconded by Mr. Gilmer Sr. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Vice-Chair Magid noted the items having persons signed up to speak in opposition as follows: **Z-24-07-004** for the properties identified as 1741, 1763, and 1765 Mt. Hope Church Road, 558 Old Birch Creek Road, and 928 Near and 930 Knox Road; **Z-24-08-003** for the property identified as 632 North Elm Street; **PL(P) 24-23 and Z-24-08-004** for the property identified as 1611 Pleasant Ridge Road; **PL(P) 24-24 and Z-24-08-005** for the properties identified as 9206 West Market Street and a portion of 118 Kidd Road; **Z-24-08-008** for the property identified as 2300 West Friendly Avenue; and **PL(P) 24-25 and Z-24-08-009** for the properties identified as 4616, 4620, 4628, and 4634 South Holden Road. Vice-Chair Magid asked if there was anyone present or online who wished to speak in opposition to any of the other items on the agenda. Hearing none she noted the items that did not have opposition signed up to speak were eligible for the expedited agenda. These items were **Z-24-08-001** for the property identified as 8805 Neville Road; **PL(P) 24-22 and Z-24-08-002** for the property identified as 5019 Summit Avenue; **Z-24-08-006** for the property identified as 3606 North Elm Street; **Z-24-08-007** for the property identified as 3610 North Elm Street; **Z-24-08-011** for the properties identified as 706 and 730 Brigham Road; and **Z-24-08-012** for the property identified as 2201 East Market Street. The agenda was reordered accordingly.

NEW BUSINESS:

Z-24-08-001: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to LI (Light Industrial) for the property identified as 8805 Neville Road, generally described as south of Neville Road and west of Cider Road (1 acre). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map currently designates the subject property as Urban General. The Western Area Plan designates this location as Employment Area on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness goal to increase and preserve the inventory of developable sites compatible with corporate and industrial uses and the Filling In Our Framework goal to attract world class development to transform underutilized sites and buildings into valued assets that complement their surroundings. The proposed LI zoning district allows a variety of warehouse, industrial, distribution and office uses; that are consistent with other surrounding uses on nearby properties. The request also supports the employment-oriented character of the area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicants were present but had no further comments for the request. Vice-Chair Magid having no opposition to the request closed the public hearing.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr made a motion and Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 8805 Neville Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to LI (Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed LI zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-22 & Z-24-08-002: – An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the property identified as 5019 Summit Avenue, generally described as northwest of Summit Avenue and northeast of I-840 (1.97 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Mr. Carter stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and as Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present but had no further comments for the request. Vice-Chair Magid hearing no opposition to the request closed the public hearing.

Mr. Carter explained that the request is for a single-family dwelling and the annexation would allow access to City utilities.

Vice-Chair Magid hearing no opposition to the request closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 5019 Summit Avenue from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Engle seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice Chair Magid advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Z24-08-006: A rezoning request from CD-C-L (Conditional District - Commercial – Low) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) for the property identified as 3606 North Elm Street, generally described as east of North Elm Street and north of Pisgah Church Road (2.13 acres). (APPROVED)

Z24-08-007: A rezoning request from CD-C-L (Conditional District - Commercial – Low) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) for the property identified as 3610 North Elm Street, generally described as east of North Elm Street and north of Pisgah Church Road (2 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter noted that both requests (Z-24-08-006 and Z-24-08-007) are under the same ownership; have the same current and proposed zoning districts with the same zoning conditions; the subject properties are in proximity; and deliberations would be similar. He also stated that neither of the items had recorded oppositions and therefore in the best interests of time the items could be heard simultaneously.

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He then advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) All uses permitted in the C-M zoning district except: Convenience Stores with Fuel Pumps.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the properties as Urban General and within a District Scale Activity Center on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning requests support both the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework goal to encourage higher density, mixed-use, walkable infill development. The requests also support the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness strategy to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed CD-C-M zoning district, as conditioned, would permit uses that are compatible with those existing on adjacent tracts. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Engle indicated he had questions and asked if the current zoning districts were done under the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), and Mr. Carter agreed. Mr. Engle stated that the UDO was the former City's Ordinance prior to 2010. He also asked if the requests were to bring the zoning districts in accordance with the current Land Development Ordinance (LDO) and to incorporate another use. Mr. Carter agreed with Mr. Engle and explained that the existing conditions were done under the UDO which did not allow specific uses that are currently allowed.

Vice-Chair Magid asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present but had no further comments. Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Mr. Engle asked if there should be separate motions for the items. Mr. Ducharme advised that there should be a motion for each request.

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-006, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 3606 North Elm Street from CD-C-L (Conditional District - Commercial – Low) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-C-M zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Ms. Turner then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-007, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 3610 North Elm Street from CD-C-L (Conditional District - Commercial – Low) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-C-M zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Engle seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Z-24-08-011: A rezoning request from CD-LI (Conditional District - Light Industrial) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) for the properties identified as 706 and 730 Brigham Road, generally described as east of Brigham Road and south of Pleasant Ridge Road (19.68 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. Mr. Carter advised that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

- 1) The permitted uses shall be limited to a maximum number of 90 townhouse units.
- 2) Maximum building height shall not exceed 50 feet and three (3) stories.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map. The Western Area Plan's Future Land Use map designates this site as Employment Area. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district, as conditioned, would allow for multi-family dwellings. The proposed uses are compatible with uses present on adjacent tracts. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she then asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present but had no additional comments. Hearing no further comments and without opposition, Vice-Chair Magid closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-011, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 706 and 730 Brigham Road from CD-LI (Conditional District - Light Industrial) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-24-08-012: A rezoning request from C-M (Commercial - Medium) and RM-18 (Residential Multi-family – 18) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) the property identified as a portion of 2201 East Market Street, generally described as north of East Market Street, west of Durham Street, and south of Charlotte Street (1.02 acre). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. Mr. Carter advised that the applicant had the following conditions:

- 1) Vehicular access to East Market Street will be limited to right-in and right-out only.
- 2) Limited to all uses allowed in the C-M (Commercial-Medium) zoning district except any use with a drive-thru or fueling stations.
- 3) Total all uses allowed in the C-M (Commercial-Medium) zoning district except any use with a drive-thru or fueling stations.
- 4) Eating and Drinking establishment area, including accessory uses, shall not exceed 2,500 square feet total.
- 5) Vehicular access to Charlotte Street will not be permitted.
- 6) There shall be a 50' wide street yard along Charlotte Street with a planting rate of 4 canopy trees, 10 understory trees, and 33 bushes per 100 linear feet.
- 7) Where permitted, a minimum 6 (six) feet tall opaque fence shall be erected and maintained along the eastern property line from Charlotte Street to East Market Street.

Mr. Carter noted changes to the conditions: condition 3) changed to have the total building floor area to be 7,000 square feet; and an additional of three conditions (5, 6, and 7). He stated that the applicant might add more conditions.

Mr. Engle asked if the conditions should be added before voting on the changes. Mr. Carter responded they should.

Vice-Chair Magid asked the applicant to come forward to the podium.

Bruce Cantrell, 1000 North Eugene Street stated he is an architect representing the owner of the property. He spoke about the neighborhood outreach and stated that initially there were oppositions. He said that working with staff and the neighborhood, the applicant was able to make the relevant changes to the request such as adding fences and vegetation buffers. He said the applicant was able to achieve development in East Greensboro and at the same time minimize the impacts on the surrounding residential neighborhoods. He noted the conditions were based on the neighborhood's concerns and that he would address any questions about the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Mr. Engle asked if there were additional conditions for the request.

Bruce Cantrell said there were no additional conditions.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for clarification on the floor area change and noted that the initial request had a floor area of 8100 square feet and changed to 7000 square feet.

Bruce Cantrell said that due to site changes because of the neighborhood concerns such as eliminating access onto Charlotte Street led to reduction in the parking spaces. He mentioned that after meeting with staff concerns were raised about the increased traffic directly onto East Market Street and Durham Street and recommended reducing the floor area. Hence the building floor area was reduced to 7000 square feet.

Ms. Skenes then made a motion to accept the changes to the conditions and noted there were three additional conditions; and reduction in the building floor area to 7000 square feet. Seconded by Mr. Engle.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Carter noted that the request had extensive community involvement therefore it would be appropriate to open to opposition though the item was expedited. Vice-Chair Magid concurred with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Carter then stated that the GSO2040 Future Built Form Map designates this location as Urban Central and located in an Urban Mixed Use Corridor and in the East Market Street Reinvestment Corridor. The Jonesboro/Scott Park Neighborhood Plan designates this property as Mixed Use Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to encourage higher density infill development and to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the Community. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness strategy to improve conditions throughout the city, and impact social inequity and economic disparity by focusing public investments and services in areas of greatest need. The proposed CD-C-M zoning district, as conditioned, allows uses that are compatible with existing varied commercial, and office uses surrounding the request and supports the employment-oriented character of the area in proximity. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Engle inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Mr. Downing acknowledged the applicant's involvement with the Economic Development Organization for East Greensboro and working alongside the residents in finding solutions. He said that the request is in line with the framework of the GSO2040. He thanked the applicant for the community outreach.

Mr. Engle agreed with Mr. Downing and commended the applicant's community involvement in achieving the request.

Hearing no further comments and hearing no opposition to the request Vice-Chair Magid closed the public hearing.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-012, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 2201 East Market Street from C-M (Commercial – Medium) and RM-18 (Residential Multi-family – 18) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-C-M zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Downing seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

REGULAR AGENDA:

OLD BUSINESS:

Z24-07-004: A rezoning request from C-M (Commercial – Medium) and PUD (Planned Unit Development) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) for the properties identified as 1741, 1763, and 1765 Mt. Hope Church Road, 558 Old Birch Creek Road, and 900 and 930 Knox Road, generally described as east of Mount Hope Church Road and north of Knox Road (55.123 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He then advised that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

- 1) The permitted uses in Site Area #1 as labeled on the UDP shall be limited to: Residential uses; not to exceed 375 dwelling units.
- 2) The permitted uses in Site Area #2 as labeled on the UDP shall be limited to: Residential uses; not to exceed 110 dwelling units.
- 3) The permitted uses in Site Area #3 as labeled on the UDP shall be limited to: Office, Retail and Commercial Use Groups; The total square footage of all uses shall not exceed 90,000.
- 4) The permitted uses in Site Area #4 as labeled on the UDP shall be limited to: Office, Retail and Commercial Use Groups: The total square footage of all uses shall not exceed 30,000.
- 5) The permitted uses in Site Area #5 as labeled on the UDP shall be limited to: Office, Retail and Commercial Use Groups; The total square footage of all uses shall not exceed 38,800.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to ensure mixed-use projects both strengthen and add value to the community and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed PUD zoning district, as conditioned, would allow residential and other supportive uses that are generally compatible with the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Engle asked staff to clarify the proposed PUD. He noted that there were no industrial uses proposed for the request.

Mr. Carter agreed with Mr. Engle that the industrial uses were eliminated. He stated that the proposed PUD has additional residential zones and noted the distinction is adding a new property and the realignment of Knox Road.

Vice-Chair Magid invited the applicant to the podium.

Amanda Hodierne, 804 Green Valley Road noted she was present on behalf of the subject properties' owners. She said the properties were annexed into the City in 2008 and assigned the City PUD designation. She mentioned the applicant hoped to use the properties to the highest and best use. She summarized the request and stated that the total area is approximately 55 acres, and a PUD revision. She noted the land has been zoned as PUD for decades in the county and was brought into the City as City PUD. She stated that the current PUD allowed for commercial and industrial uses and a small amount of residential uses. She pointed out that the proposed PUD removed all industrial uses, increased residential uses and relocated the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

commercial zones to more appropriate locations given the Knox Road realignment. Ms. Hodierno noted that the Knox Road realignment was NCDOT project, which created opportunities for growth since the early 2000's. She presented the land use summary and zoning pattern for the subject properties and surrounding areas.

Ms. Hodierno also presented the proposed Unified Development Plan (UDP) which displayed the transportation network, accesses and placements of the different land uses. She specifically pointed out the interstate adjacent to the southern property boundaries, the realignment of Knox Road and the internal road network for the PUD. Ms. Hodierno demonstrated that traffic leaving the interstate could easily access the site and internally distributed. She noted there are two residential locations comprised of multiple-family development with maximum of 375 units close to Mt Hope Church Road. She noted that east of the new spine road would be single-family development with maximum of 110 units. She stated that the south-eastern section of the site remained commercial zone, and the area surrounding the Knox Road realignment created space for retail and office uses such as grocery stores, medical office to name a few uses which would benefit the residents of East Greensboro. Ms. Hodierno noted that the request is not just a PUD revision but downzoning as the proposal eliminated the industrial areas. She said that the current PUD did not focus on goods and services which is much needed for the surrounding residential communities. She noted that the current PUD focus was envisioned as an employment center and business park type of environment.

Ms. Hodierno stated they had extensive community outreach to inform residents on the proposed and existing PUD. She said letters were mailed to property owners within the city's 750 ft. notification radius; Zoom meeting held; and emails and phone calls made outside of the meeting. She also noted that the main concerns raised during the neighborhood outreach were trespassing and stormwater runoff. She said they discussed how the concerns would be address during the Technical Review process. She noted that the applicants were open to continued dialogue.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Skenes asked the applicant to talk about the changes in the land uses. She highlighted that there were no proposed industrial uses and stated that proposal was more conducive to the area.

Ms. Hodierno agreed with Ms. Skenes and said that the request allowed for better distribution of uses using the realigned road network; better representation of the current LDO; and incorporated much needed residential and commercial uses.

Vice-Chair Magid then called the persons speaking in opposition to the podium. She reminded the group they had total 10 minutes to speak.

Valerie Dolgos, 5328 Shoffner Road said that she and her family owned land adjacent to the northern boundary of the subject properties. She stated her concerns were not fully answered during the neighborhood outreaching and listed concerns as follows: access to farmlands;

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

separation buffers around the proposed site; protection of water flow and quality of surrounding springs and streams; traffic generation, noise and congestion; and neighborhood security and safety. She noted some better suited uses for the proposed site such as parks, school or senior living community.

Wallace Andrews, 510 Old Birch Creek Road expressed concerns for his tenant's access to farmland. He also noted the need for separation buffers. He asked if the widening of Knox Road included sidewalks and bicycle lanes. He wanted to know about the stormwater control measures and if a retention pond would be in place.

Paula Andrews Murphy, 3416 Owls Roost Road, noted that the proposed UDP only showed access from Knox Road which already is negatively impacting the farms and residential neighborhood. She questioned whether the request would exacerbate the negative impacts. She noted the land use changes around the farmlands and said that they wanted to protect the farms. She needed to know the measures that would be in place to protect the farmlands ensuring the safe access to the farms and for the surrounding single-family neighborhoods. Ms. Andrews Murphy suggested separation buffers such as higher fences and natural barriers. She listed other concerns: impacts on public infrastructures; traffic and safety; protection of existing trees and water bodies in the area and noted the replanting trees would not suffice for the loss of native and established trees.

Mr. Nelson informed that Dale Kanterman signed up to speak online and requested that one of the neighbors in the Chambers speak on his behalf.

Vice-Chair Magid then asked the next resident to come forward to the podium.

Sheila Newman, 5205 Shoffner Road stated she would prefer the natural habitat to stay intact and the area remain as existing. She expressed concerns about stormwater runoff and the protection of the ponds. She stated if the request should be approved she would prefer single family dwellings and town homes instead of apartments. She also talked about controlling traffic for safety reason preventing them from entering the surrounding single family neighborhood.

Justin Webb, 5310 Land Castle Lane said that his property abuts the proposed site. He said he opposed the request and had concerns: the traffic is currently heavy and would worsen; and traffic safety. He noted that too much is happening in the area and felt that soon the City limits would expand into the surrounding neighborhood. He expressed concerns about paying city taxes and the economic impacts of being in the city. He said he lived on a private road and feared for his children's safety.

Faye Robinson, 3915 Chilton Drive, Winston-Salem said she and her brother owned properties adjacent to the proposed site. She pointed out that the area has family and historical significance.

Vice-Chair then called on the applicant for rebuttal to the opponents' concerns.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Amanda Hodierne, 804 Green Valley Road noted that North Carolina does not allow involuntary annexation therefore the request would not lead to the further annexation of the area or the expansion of the city limits. She talked about the existing traffic situation, and said with Knox Road proximity to the interstate and the surrounding industrial uses heavy trucking would be in the area. She pointed out the Traffic Study addressed trip generation for the request. She noted that the Study outlined traffic improvements such as having proposed traffic signal synchronized with the existing signals at Knox Road and Mt Hope Church Road; and adding turning and deceleration lanes. Ms. Hodierne said there would be no access from Birch Creek Road aiming to contain traffic within the proposed site. She stated tree conservation areas, landscaping separation buffer and wetland protection would be provided as part of the LDO requirements. She addressed pedestrian connectivity and said that sidewalks would be provided, and the plan is to create walkable communities where people could walk to the grocery stores and other services. She noted that the existing easement granting access to the farmlands would remain.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr asked Ms. Hodierne about the number of persons attending the community outreach Zoom meeting.

Ms. Hodierne said there were about eight to nine people at the meeting.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr asked if the same concerns were raised at the Zoom meeting.

Ms. Hodierne state she was aware of the concerns and that at the meeting they talked about access to the farmland; the buffer and tree conservation areas; and stormwater runoff. She noted that these concerns would be addressed during the technical review process. She stated she would continue talking with the residents.

Vice-Chair Magid asked the applicant to speak on the concerns raised of having single family dwellings instead of apartments.

Ms. Hodierne said that the proposal provided residential options which is in accordance with the GSO2040. She stated multi-family residential is not currently in the area and she stated it was most needed.

Vice-Chair Magid asked Ms. Hodierne to talk on the widening of the roads.

Ms. Hodierne pointed to the proposed UDP and said that at the intersection of Mt Hope Church Road and Knox Road the roads would be widened to accommodate the turning and deceleration lanes.

Ms. Skenes asked if the subject properties are located within the city limits.

Ms. Hodierne confirmed the subject properties are in the city limits and was annexed in 2008.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Ms. Skenes asked if the existing UDP was in effect since 2008.

Ms. Hoderne confirmed that the existing UDP was done in conjunction with the 2008 rezoning.

Ms. Skenes noted that the concerns with taxes and other impacts from the annexation would have been in place since 2008.

Ms. Hoderne concurred with Ms. Skenes.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request and noted they had total five minutes for rebuttal.

Faye Robinson, 3915 Chilton Drive, Winston-Salem restated that her family owned land adjacent to the subject properties. She wanted to know whether studies were done to determine how the request would affect the adjacent property values.

Mr. Engle responded that the Commission could not consider not property values zoning matters. He noted that the focus would be on land use.

Faye Robinson said her question is for the developers and again asked the question if they considered how the proposal would affect the adjacent properties. She noted that the area has historic significance since the early 18th century. She stated that the residents who spoke have roots running from generations and so they wanted to protect their farmlands.

Paula Andrews Murphy, 3416 Owls Roost Road asked about the measures that would be in place to separate the county and city limits. She wanted to know the conditions that would be added to protect the agricultural lands and the existing residential neighborhood. She said the UDP did not show how close the proposed development would be to the existing trees and to the water sources. She mentioned that there would be safety concerns.

Mr. Engle explained that prior to year 2010 properties could be annexed without the consent of property owners. He said that the Legislation has changed, and properties are only annexed if the property owners make this choice. He made it clear that the City cannot require properties in the county to be annexed.

Vice-Chair Magid explained to the resident that the request is only for the subject properties. Vice-Chair Magid assured the residents that the Commissioners recognized their concerns. She then asked staff to talk more on the annexation concerns.

Mr. Kirkman agreed with the Commissioners and said that annexation is not city initiated and is voluntary. He stated that usually annexation would be requested to gain access to city services. Mr. Kirkman explained that stormwater concerns and tree conservation would be addressed

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

during the TRC process. He noted that the Transportation Department would review the traffic safety and accesses to the proposed site.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none she inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak further in opposition to the request. Hearing none she closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chair Magid again asked the Commissioners if they had comments.

Mr. Gilmer Sr. noted that the City needed affordable housing. He said apartments and multi-family developments are part of this solution. He pointed out that apartment is affordable and not everyone could afford single-family housing. He said that multi-family is home option for some people.

Mr. Ducharme advised that there could not be differentiation between owner occupied or rental, townhomes versus apartments considered by the Commission. He noted land use does not include what or who.

Chair O'Connor said she was pleased with the request and noted that the request is considered downzoning. She noted that the industrial uses were eliminated and increased much needed housing. She mentioned the retail and office facilities were much needed to support the surrounding neighborhoods. She pointed out that the subject properties are already part of the city, and the new plan was excellent. She supported the request and said she was sensitive to the residents' concerns. She said there are mechanisms in place to protect the residents and the proposal was appropriate.

Mr. Engle said that removing the industrial use would protect the agricultural lands. He stated that the applicant should continue working with the residents on defining the landscape buffers. He assured the residents that the easement allowing access to the farms would remain.

Mr. Gilmer Sr. supported the request as presented.

Ms. Skenes agreed with Chair O'Connor and said the request is downzoning. She stated that the intense use was removed and the residential and office uses allowed for less intense zone. She supported the request and said the uses would be beneficial.

Mr. Downing acknowledged the residents' concerns: access to the farms; noise; and water flow to name a few. He felt all the concerns were addressed but the applicant should continue working with the residents. He noted the request is "forward thinking". He mentioned that there would be more housing in the area and agreed that buffers should be implemented. Mr. Downing stated the request is consistent with the GSO2040 Plan and that it supported economic competitiveness.

Vice-Chair Magid asked if there were further comments from the Commissioners.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Ms. Skenes made a motion to approve the UDP as submitted, seconded by Mr. Gilmer, Sr. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-07-004, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 1741, 1763 and 1765 Mt. Hope Church Road, 558 Old Birch Creek Road, and 928 Near and 930 Knox Road from C-M (Commercial – Medium) and PUD (Planned Unit Development) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed PUD zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Vice-Chair Magid announced a fifteen minute recess at 7:25pm.

The meeting reconvened 7:45pm.

NEW BUSINESS:

Z24-08-003: A rezoning request from R-7 (Residential Single-family – 7) to RM-18 (Residential Multi-family – 18) for the property identified as 632 North Elm Street, generally described as east of North Elm Street and south of South Park Drive (0.25 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Nelson reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Nelson stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban Central and within an Urban Mixed Use Corridor on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to provide missing middle housing and the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Creating Great Places strategy to meet housing needs and desires with a sufficient and diverse supply of housing products, prices and locations. The proposed RM-18 zoning district would allow land uses that are compatible with the general character of the area. This request would also permit an existing nonconforming use to become conforming. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice-Chair called the applicant forward to the podium.

Laura Lovelady, 2208 West Cone Boulevard stated she was representing the owners of the property. She said that the property has been a quadplex for about thirty years. She mentioned the owners recently renovated the building and the request does not include alterations. She stated they were seeking the correct zoning to make the use conforming. Ms. Lovelady said that the request is consistent with the urban use mixed corridor.

Vice-Chair Magid asked if there was anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked the applicant about the neighborhood outreach and mentioned the QR Code distributed to the neighbors.

Ms. Lovelady stated they attended the Fisher Park Neighborhood meeting, and subsequently presented at the HPC (Historic Preservation Commission) meeting and received recommendation to move forward with the request. She said they left information throughout the neighborhood (144 houses) including the QR Code. She noted that the neighbors could scan the QR code which directed to a website giving additional information about the property.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked for persons wishing to speak in opposition to come forward to the podium.

Cheryl Pratt, 910 Magnolia Street said she is a member of the short term rental coalition for the neighborhood. She mentioned she was part of the team that worked closely with the City on the short term rental (STR) ordinance. She described the current use of the subject property as the missing middle and noted that Fisher Park has 51% long term rental, and 49% owner occupied properties. She noted that the basis for the rezone request is for the owner to be approved for four short term rental permits. She stated the current zoning was grandfathered and the use could continue for long or midterm rental. She did not support having four short term rentals at the subject property.

Keisha Hadden, 404 W Bessemer Avenue said she is the president of the Fisher Park Neighborhood Association. She stated the neighborhood voted against the request for the short term rental. She stated that the request for STR did not meet the city's requirement as per the 750 ft separation buffer. She mentioned there was an unauthorized party at the property. She noted that even though the Commission was not considering the STR, she pointed out that should the request be granted the property would be available for STR.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Ann Stringfield, 1005 North Eugene Street said that the current apartment use is already grandfathered and is good for long and midterm rental. She asked the Commission not to support the request and STR, and to support Fisher Park long and midterm rental. She said an adjacent property was approved for STR.

Cheryl Pratt said the request and allowing the STR would not benefit the surrounding community. She asked for the use to remain as is and used for long term rental.

Mr. Engle asked staff to clarify what the Commissioners should consider for the request.

Mr. Ducharme advised that the Commissioners should consider the uses permitted in the proposed zone. He said that STR is a separate use in the Ordinance and could be considered along with all the other permitted use.

Mr. Engle noted the request should be conditional zoning district.

Mr. Kirkman added that the uses allowed in the RM-18 are the available options for the request.

Mr. Engle asked staff to explain 750 feet separation rule as per the LDO.

Mr. Kirkman explained that upon adopting the STR Ordinance in May 2023, the 750 feet separation requirement was included for separation between single family residential lots. He said there is another standard for multi-family residential properties which limits the number of STR units in a multi-family building based on the total number of units. Mr. Kirkman noted these are two standards associated with separation rule in the STR Ordinance. He noted the multi-family standard is applicable to the request since it is a four unit development. He stated STR that operated at any point during 2023 would obtain non-conforming status. He said the owners showed they were operating during 2023 and to allow the STR the none conforming status should be granted the request. In summary Mr. Kirkman said nonconforming status could be granted to any STR operating during 2023.

Mr. Engle asked if another option would be the applicant applying to the Board of Adjustment (BOA) to allow the STR.

Mr. Kirkman advised that the BOA could grant permission to allow a nonconforming use to another nonconforming use on the property.

Cheryl Pratt said that the Ordinance stated that the STR should be in operation for twelve (12) consecutive months in 2023 to obtain nonconforming status.

Mr. Ducharme advised that the review and approval of STR is an administrative matter as caution to the deliberation.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Vice-Chair Magid noted that STR is not an item for the Commission.

Mr. Engle said he was aware of the process and again asked for clarification on what should be considered for the request. He said during his tenure on the Commission he was told they could not consider who lives at the property, if rented or owner occupied. So, he asked if he should just consider uses permitted in RM-18 or the current use of four residential units.

Mr. Ducharme clarified that the Commission could consider the STR as a potential use. However, he noted that the administrative aspect should not be considered by the Commission.

Chair O'Connor asked for clarification and noted that the Commission was considering a nonconforming use since quadraplex is not a permitted use in the R-7 zone, which was grandfathered. She noted if the requested RM18 zoning district was granted, other uses such as a church, daycare, multi-family and single-family would be allowed. She mentioned that there was too much focus on the nonconforming use. She said that as a zoning matter it would be more appropriate to focus on the uses allowed in the RM-18 zoning district.

Mr. Kirkman inquired if Chair O'Connor had any questions for staff.

Chair O'Connor said she would like clarification on the uses allowed in the RM-18 zoning district.

Mr. Kirkman noted that religious assembly and schools are allowed in all zoning districts and would be allowed in the current zoning (R-7) as well as in proposed RM18 zoning districts. He pointed out the daycare would not be allowed in the R-7 district but is allowed in RM-18. He said, notwithstanding uses different from residential use would be considered a change of use and would trigger review under the Building and Fire Code, site review relating to parking would be considered, and any exterior changes to the building would be considered under the Historic Preservation Commission. He noted that the applicant has four units which are not currently allowed under the R-7 zoning district and was in existence for many years and therefore is a nonconforming use. He stated that if the requested RM-18 zoning district would be approved the nonconforming use would be addressed. He said that the discussion about the STR is a separate matter of an application under the administrative policy. He addressed the public information concerns and clarified that the City's public information is consistent with the STR policy. He explained that the issue of the twelve consecutive months pertained to whether a nonconforming status could be lost due to the STR not operating for twelve consecutive months. Chair O'Connor indicated the explanation was helpful.

Ms. Tuner requested further clarification about the application of the STR policy within the context of the current zoning classification of R-7 compared to the proposed zoning classification of RS-18.

Mr. Ducharme advised that they are separate decisions and that the Commission determines land use and should discuss all the land uses that would be permitted in the zone. He stated that

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

the ability to have STR at the subject property would be handled administratively through the Department.

Vice-Chair Magid restated the Commission does not consider STR. She said if the applicant would like to have STR, they would apply for a permit which would be reviewed outside of the Commission. She mentioned the request is to allow the four apartments in an appropriate zoning district. She said the applicant would like to make the use conforming. She noted that in the RM-18 zoning district on 0.25 acres four apartment units would be allowed.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if another resident wishing to speak in opposition was available online.

Cheryl Pratt indicated that the speaker was unable to get in the meeting via Zoom.

Hearing no further opposition, Vice-Chair Magid asked if the applicant wished to address the residents' concerns.

Laura Lovelady said that the request is to correct the zoning thus allowing the quadplex. She said they have documentation showing the units operating as STR during 2023, and as well as midterm rental. She stated that they would like to be in the correct zoning district since they did extensive renovations to the property.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak further in opposition to the request. Having no further opposition she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Skenes then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 632 North Elm Street from R-7 (Residential Single-family – 7) to RM-18 (Residential Multi-family – 18) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed RM-18 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

Mr. Engle did not support the request and stated that the request should have been a conditional zoning district to eliminate some of the uses allowed in the RM-18 zoning district.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any further questions or comments from the Commissioners.

The Commission voted 6-2, (Ayes: Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (Chair Sandra O'Connor and Engle).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Vice-Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-23 & Z-24-08-004: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the property identified as 1611 Pleasant Ridge Road, generally described as northwest of Pleasant Ridge Road and south of Montmartre Road (1.09 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Nelson reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Nelson stated GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-3 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to 3 dwelling units per acre. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid asked the applicant to come forward to the podium.

Jessia Candace Williams, 1611 Pleasant Ridge Road thanked staff, Luke Carter and Toi Lawson for their assistance in getting water service to her home. She said early August the well went dry and they had no other option but to connect to the City water system. She stated that there was only one benefit, and it was having city water. She said the City would greatly benefit from annexing her property while her only benefit is having water supply. She felt she was forced into annexing her property because it was the only option getting water supply.

Vice-Chair Magid asked the applicant about her current water supply.

Ms. Williams said that City staff assisted her in getting water services.

Mr. Engle asked the applicant if getting the water services resulted to the annexation petition.

Ms. Williams said that annexing her property was the only way to get city water services.

Mr. Engle explained that to access city services the property should be within the city limits hence the reason for the annexation.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Vice-Chair Magid explained that the Commission needed to vote for the annexation.

Vice-Chair Magid noted that the applicant was also in opposition and inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kirkman advised that it should be clear that the applicant signed the petition and requested the annexation to access city services.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none and having no opposition to the request she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Vice-Chair Magid. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-004, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 1611 Pleasant Ridge Road from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting.

PL(P) 24-24 & Z-24-08-005: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family), County LB (Limited Business), and County AG (Agricultural) to City CD-O (Conditional District - Office) for the properties identified as 9206 West Market Street and a portion of 118 Kidd Road, generally described as northeast of West Market Street and south of Kidd Road (20.73 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. Mr. Carter said the applicant proposed an additional condition and advised that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to: Assisted Living Facility; Nursing Home.
- 2) No more than 125 dwelling or rooming units shall be permitted.
- 3) Building height shall not exceed 50 feet.
- 4) **Vehicular access to Kidd Road shall be limited to emergency vehicles only.**

Ms. Skenes made a motion to accept the additional condition, **vehicular access to Kidd Road shall be limited to emergency vehicles only**, seconded by Chair O'Connor. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Carter then stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Exurban on the Future Built Form Map. If this original zoning request is approved, the Future Built Form designation for the subject site is considered to be amended to Urban General in order to ensure an appropriate fit between future land use designation and zoning. The Western Area Plan's Future Land Use Map designates the property as Residential. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed City CD-O (Conditional District – Office) zoning district would allow land uses that are compatible with the general character of the area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Carter added that as conditioned the request limits negative impacts on the surrounding land uses.

Vice-Chair Magid asked the applicant to come forward to the podium.

Ms. Skenes reminded the speakers that each side has a total of ten minutes to speak.

Marc Isaacson, 804 Green Valley Road, said he was speaking on behalf of Colfax Reality LLC and introduced members of the company and the Engineer working on the project. He gave background information on the company and said that they are family owned based in Cary and operated several nursing and rehabilitation facilities throughout the United States. He mentioned that the at the current location in Greensboro the lease would soon expire and would not be renewed, hence the request. He stated that the applicant evaluated several locations for replacing the nursing home and rehabilitation facilities. He said that the subject property amongst other sites went through an extensive "certificate of need" review process and the subject property met all the criteria. He stated some of the site selection criteria as follows: 1) should be in Guilford County; and 2) should be located on a major thoroughfare with access to other major throughfare and highways. He said that the subject site is located on West Market which is a major thoroughfare and is less than 2 miles from Interstate 40, less than 3 miles from Highway 68, and less than 3 miles from Highway 150.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Mr. Isaacson showed an aerial photograph of the area and talked about the uses in the area. He noted the request is conditional office zoning, however, they limit the proposed use to nursing home and related uses and would not include no other commercial uses. He stated that the proposed number of units did not trigger the need for a Traffic Impact Analysis. He mentioned the building height restrictions is 50feet which is the same as the low density single family residential zone district. He displayed zoning maps for the surrounding areas and emphasized that there are numerous industrial uses present. He noted the schools adjacent to the request is zoned City Public and Institutional. He also displayed a sketch plan for the proposed site which was designed according to the "certificate of need". On the sketch plan he pointed out the stormwater control mechanism, landscape buffers along the perimeter of the property, and one access along West Market Street. He stated after the community outreach process the site plan was revised to remove access from Kidd Road allowing access only for emergency vehicles based on staff recommendation. He noted that the access would only change if required by the TRC. He showed rendering illustrations and photographs of existing facilities operated by the applicant. Mr. Isaacson stated that the one and half story and other architectural features allowed for a residential tone.

Mr. Isaacson said letters were mailed to residents within the city's 750 ft notification buffer. He said a Zoom meeting was held, in addition to another meeting held with few residents at his office, and in person meeting at the Kernersville Public Library. He noted the main concerns raised were access along Kidd Road and access to city sewer line. He said city water supply was available but no sewer line in the area. He said to extend the sewer line would cost approximately 9 million dollars which would not be cost effective. He noted that the only option was to approach the Guilford County Schools and propose share use agreement while offering to upgrade the school's existing lift station.

Vice Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked for the speakers in opposition to come forward to the podium.

John Naylor, 133 Kidd Road, noted he was representing most of the residents on Kidd Road and asked for the rezoning request to be denied. He said that the request is spot zoning which would be improper and illegal. He said the request does not fit with the existing low density residential neighborhood. He noted concerns as follows: devaluation of property value; high stormwater runoff; pollution of aquifer; and massive tree removal all adding to environmental destabilization. He said the staff report indicated sewer services were available in the area and is not the case. Mr. Naylor referenced Water Resources policy and noted that private lift stations should serve only one property. He stated that the staff report noted that area is governed under the Western Area Plan and the area slated for residential uses. He said in accordance with the LDO medical facilities such as the proposed nursing home is not allowed in residential districts. He referenced a similar request for 22 townhomes development in the city, and noted the same Commissioner's final vote remarks stated that townhomes should be close to downtown or shopping centers and not within single-family zoning districts. He said nursing homes as defined

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

by the North Carolina General Status and North Carolina DHHS regulations should be near hospital or medical zoned areas and not within single-family zoned districts.

Jeffrey Kidd, 139 Kidd Road, asked the Commissioners to support the low-density residential community and not to support the request on the basis that the city could not provide sewer services. He pointed out that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan identified the Western Area as Growth Tier 3 where the extension of public utilities primarily water and sewer are anticipated beyond 12 years. He stated that annexation should only be considered if full utilities could be provided and noted that sewer services could not be provided for the request. He agreed with Mr. Naylor and said that private lift station is intended to serve the entity that it is owned by, and the city had policy against sharing lift stations.

Amber Belangia, 9226 West Market Street did not oppose to the request however noted there would not be sufficient land for the widening of Kidd Road in needed. She wanted to know about more about the landscape separation buffer.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if the applicant would like to speak further to the residents' concerns.

Marc Isaacson, 804 Green Valley Road, stated spot zoning would not apply to the request and noted that Public and Institutional zoning was adjacent to the property. He said that West Market a major thoroughfare with mixed uses. He suggested the Commission should consult with legal staff on the definition for spot zoning. He considered the request to be low impact use and therefore suitable to the surrounding areas. He said that the stormwater concerns would be addressed during the TRC extensive review process. He noted the proposed development would be connected to the city water supply and there should be no impact on the aquifer or wells. He said that tree buffers would be provided along the perimeter of the subject properties. He pointed out that with single-family zoning districts tree buffers would not be required. He said he would allow the staff to talk about Growth Tier 3 and the sewer services. Mr. Isaacson restated the request is for conditional zoning district limited to only one use, nursing home and rehabilitation facilities which are needed for the aging population.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition.

John Naylor, 133 Kidd Road reiterated that the request was spot zoning and was against the will of the people. He noted that the surrounding properties are low density residential zones. He said the request offered no benefits for the surrounding neighborhood, and pointed out the proposed development would be sharing the school's lift station. He noted that the biggest concern is the lack of the sewer line. He mentioned that there should be separation buffer between commercial and residential zones and should not be just few trees. He stated that trees usually take about 5 years to grow and during that period the lighting from the proposed development would affect the neighborhood along Kidd Road. He noted the proposed development is a 24 hour operating use and expressed concerns with vehicles specifically emergency vehicles. He noted he had concerns with the stormwater runoff.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Vice-Chair Magid closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chair Magid asked staff to address concerns raised by the residents.

Mr. Ducharme advised that spot zoning occurs when small tracks of land are rezoned to distinctly different zoning district from surrounding large piece of land uniformly zoned. He stated if small tracks of land are surrounded by larger land zoned for residential use, the impact on the surround properties should be considered. Mr. Ducharme said based on earlier presentations showing the subject properties and the surrounding land uses the Commission could make their own determination. He noted that spot zoning was a review process used by the Courts. He told the Commissioners that for each rezoning request the reasonableness of the request should be considered. He explained that the reasonableness factors are laid out in state laws which is part of the motion zoning statements.

Mr. Kirkman explained use definition under the LDO permitted use table and stated that Assisted Living Facilities and Nursing Facilities are considered part of group living uses and ultimately part of the residential use group. He noted that these facilities are allowed within residential zoning districts with specific development standards.

Mr. Engle asked staff about the contrast between the County AG (Agricultural District) and the City AG (Agricultural District) designation in terms of the permitted use table.

Mr. Kirkman said there are similarities and stated that the City AG was recently added to the latest City Policy.

Mr. Engle pointed out there are uncomplimentary uses within the City AG such as go-cart raceways. He stated that there are uses found within the permitted use table if not limited could become obnoxious to residential development.

Jana Stewart, Water Resource Engineering Manager said that the proposed development had two options for sewer services. She said one option would be to provide a gravity extension north which would be the 9 to 10 million dollar investment mentioned earlier by the applicant. She stated the other option would be the shared agreement for private lift station with the property south of the proposed site, owned by the Guilford County Schools. She said she was aware of such shared agreements between two non-single-family residential developments sharing one lift station. Ms. Stewart stated shared agreements between single-family residential developments would not be allowed by the City. She mentioned shared agreements would be allowed in challenging situations, such as a site bounded by interstates or railways making it difficult to service by gravity. Ms. Stewart addressed concerns regarding water and sewer services for properties located within Growth Tiers and noted that the proposed site is in a strategic location. She stated the proposed site is located at the end of one of the city's waterlines, and ample supply is available. She then inquired if the Commissioners had questions.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Skenes directed question to Mr. Kirkman regarding the required separation buffer between residential and commercial zones..

Mr. Kirkman advised type B buffer would be required which is 25ft landscape buffer including trees and shrubbery, street planting yards, and tree conservation. He said the tree conservation requirements are usually incentivized counting towards the buffer requirements.

Ms. Skenes stated that during the presentations, there were mention that no trees would be provided, and the lighting would disturb surrounding residential developments. She looked at the proposed site plan and asked if landscape buffer would be required along the road boundary.

Mr. Kirkman advised the minimum width for street planting yard is 10ft and would include variety of plantings.

Ms. Skenes asked if there would also be 25ft landscape buffer on all sides of the proposed site.

Mr. Kirkman said landscape buffer would be provided in addition to screening of the parking areas. He noted that the landscaping buffer would protect the neighbors from the lighting. Mr. Kirkman also pointed out that the Ordinance required outdoor lighting oriented downward and shielded keeping all the lighting on the property.

Ms. Skenes asked if TRC approved the annexation provided that all the utilities, fire and safety were met.

Mr. Kirkman confirmed TRC recommended approval of the annexation.

Ms. Skenes then made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-005, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the properties at 9206 West Market Street and a portion of 118 Kidd Road from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family), County LB (Limited Business), and County AG (Agricultural) to City CD-O (Conditional District - Office) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Vice-Chair Magid seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice Chair Magid advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Vice-Chair Magid announced a five minute recess at 9:25pm.

The meeting reconvened 9:35pm.

Z24-08-008: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-PI (Conditional District - Public and Institutional) for the property identified as 2300 West Friendly Avenue, generally described as northeast of West Friendly Avenue and southeast of North Elam Avenue (5.26 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He then advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) All uses permitted in the PI zoning district except: Elementary/Secondary Schools; Clubs and Lodges; Golf Courses; Shooting Ranges; Sporting and Recreation Camps; and Funeral Homes and Crematoriums.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map currently designates the subject properties as Urban Central and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Becoming Car Optional strategy to encourage new development that is compatible with the intended use of the adjacent roadway. The request also supports the Comprehensive Plans Filling In Our Framework goal to arrange our land uses for to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed CD-PI zoning district, as conditioned, would allow all uses in the PI zoning district except: Elementary/Secondary Schools; Clubs and Lodges; Golf Courses; Shooting Ranges; Sporting and Recreation Camps; and Funeral Homes and Crematoriums. The proposed uses are compatible with the general character of the area. Also, the change in the zoning for this property is appropriate given its location on the West Friendly Avenue. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid invited the applicant to the podium.

Thomas Terrell, 230 North Elm Street, stated he was representing Cone Health and was accompanied by few members of the Centenary United Methodist Church. He mentioned that The Church approached Cone Health and offered to sell the property. Mr. Terrell noted that Cone

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Health was unaware that that Church wanted to sell, however they accepted to purchase the property. He gave an overview of the subject property and pointed out that it is in proximity to other lands owned and operating under Cone Health and would complete a health care campus. He said that the subject property has been institutional for about 65 years and the request is seeking to transition from institutional use to another institutional use. He noted that the area has a harmonious blend of residential and non-residential uses, and that residential and institutional uses coexisted in a friendly manner for decades. He talked about the surrounding land uses and pointed to the heavily commercial center, Friendly Shopping Center, to the northwest of the subject property, the institutional health properties to the north and Grimsley High School to the northeast.

Mr. Terrell clarified the uses allowed in the Public and Institutional Zoning District and specifically noted that retail, industrial, night clubs, bars to name a few uses, would not be permitted in the proposed conditional zoning district. He explained the role of the LDO and it has standards designed and adopted to achieve harmonious neighborhoods, and separating similar and dissimilar uses.

Preston Hammock, 1200 North Elm Street, said he is the Regional President for Moses Cone, Greensboro, responsible for administration for several Moses Cone Hospital. He said his office is located at the Wesley Long Hospital located in proximity to the subject property. He stated that community stewardship is of utmost importance for Moses Cone Hospital. He mentioned the purchasing of the property as a grand opportunity they wanted to take advantage of. He stated there did not a specific use in mind, and that they wanted to acquire the land because of its proximity to one of their properties (Wesley Long Hospital). He agreed with the neighbors' concerns and stated that planning for health care facilities would take longer time due to heavy regulations. He said as they plan for the facilities there would be additional community involvement. He noted that the lengthy approval process for the certification left no choice but to rezone the subject property to a similar zone as that of the adjacent properties under their ownership. He said he was willing to continue working with the neighbors.

Reverent Kelly Gross introduced herself as the minister for the Centenary United Methodist Church. She asked the Commissioners to support the initiative.

Mr. Terrell inquired if the Commissioners had questions.

Ms. Skenes mentioned she had concerns after reviewing the LDO and the relevant district standards. She noted the Commissioners received numerous emails expressing concerns: lack of buffers and the potential removal of the mature trees. She said she understood that the LDO required 35ft buffer be provided along the perimeter of the boundary separating the subject property and the surrounding residential neighborhood.

Mr. Terrell stated that there should be 35ft building setback and referenced an illustration showing the existing "Type B" Planting Yard at the property. He noted that there is approximately 20ft

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

landscape buffer along Villa Drive which gets to about 10ft in the middle of the planting yard. He pointed out that the existing planting yard was representation of what would be required by the LDO. He stated the planting yard should be 25ft in width and could go to a minimum of 20ft but should be an average of 25ft wide. He noted that the planting should have roughly 3 canopy trees and heavy shrubbery within 100ft. Mr. Terrell noted that under the existing zoning (R-5) should the owner decided to build a parsonage the LDO requirement would allow building height of 50ft with 5ft setback from the adjacent residential properties. He said that in the proposed PI zoning district any building that is 50ft high would need to be setback minimum 35ft from the adjacent residential property boundaries in accordance with the LDO.

Vice-Chair Magid asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Vice-Chair Magid asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request to come forward to the podium. She reminded them that they had a total of 10 minutes for presentation.

Karen Arnold, 2205 Briarwood Drive, asked the residents opposing the request to stand, and stated they submitted to the City a door to door petition with 125 signatures against the request. She said that almost all the signatures are from residents living in the Centenary neighborhood and she was representing the neighborhood. She asked the Commissioners to reject the request. She stated they were concerned that the request had no associated plans or conditions, as well as no willingness to communicate with the neighborhood to add conditions. She said when she spoke with Mr. Hammock and other Cone Health representatives about adding more conditions the response was it could not be done since there were no specific plan in place. She mentioned that eventually the existing building would be demolished and without any plans was a burden for the neighborhood. She noted the top concern was public safety and mentioned incidents involving discharged patients with mental health issues lingering in the neighborhood. She stated that such incidents would increase should the request be approved. Ms. Arnold mentioned other concerns: the absence of conditions that could prevent flooding to the surrounding residential properties; privacy with having 50ft high buildings; light pollution; loss of the historic Christmas ball lights, and the architectural value of the existing church building.

Ms. Arnold said that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan states that development of downtown neighborhoods should be consistent with the general character of the area. She mentioned the building could be left vacant for couple of years resulting to problem of vagrancy and vandalism, dilapidation of property value, and other blighted conditions. She noted that the GSO2040 Plan envisioned mixed-use, walkable communities for the area and stated that using the existing building and use in other creative ways would be better fitted. She said the request would detract from the Friendly Avenue corridor and could start a trend of changing the existing character along the corridor. She stated that Cone Health current problematic stewardship towards the adjacent residential neighborhood did not earn them having the request without a plan. She said that the request needed more time and more communication.

Kristin Cheshire, 2205 Villa Drive, said she lived in the neighborhood 11 years and loved the neighborhood. She stated her immediate concerns was the property left vacant without any plans

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

for development. She noted the applicant discussed having security however, it could be challenging to monitor and maintaining the subject property.

Vice-Chair asked if the applicant wished to respond to the neighbors' concerns.

Preston Hammock, 1200 North Elm Street, recognized the neighbors' concerns stating they were valuable. He addressed the issues of discharged patients lingering in the neighborhood and explained that patients would not be released from the hospital unless cleared by medical staff. He said for patients to be discharged they need to show proof of having a destination including transportation. He stated the Hospital continued to work with the City and the County, and with non-profit organizations for the unhoused and mental health patients. He asked the neighbors to reach out to the hospital if they should encounter incidents with discharged patients from Cone Health. He noted that they had vacant properties under their portfolio and expressed that he was confident they could monitor and maintain the subject property even more so the proximity to an existing facility. He agreed that the Friendly Avenue corridor is an asset and promised that any proposed development would be consistent with and aesthetically pleasing to the surrounding neighborhood.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak further in opposition.

Karen Arnold, 2205 Briarwood Drive, pointed out the community outreach by Cone Health was poor compared to other cases presented at the meeting. She said that the security of the Health facilities have decreased due to recent staff laid off.

Joe Joplin, 2211 Villa Drive, said the neighborhood does not need another vacant property. He stated the rezoning request was not consistent with the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan. He noted that vacant properties would not encourage high density and walkable development envisioned by the GSO2040 Plan. He referenced "Big Ideas" becoming car optional and stated the proposed development would not fit in with the adjacent road. He mentioned the GSO2040 "Creating great places" and said the existing use is a great place and should remain. He noted "Prioritizing sustainability" and stated the rezoning request would be against the plan. He asked the Commissioners to let the property remain in its current use and not support the uses permitted in the rezoned district. He stated the numerous petitions signed by the neighbors showed that the request is not building community connections. He mentioned "Growing competitiveness" and stated that allowing the applicant to take over the subject property is not encouraging competitiveness.

Karen Arnold, 2205 Briarwood Drive, asked the Commissioners to allow more time for the neighbors to engage with Cone Health stating it would be good for the city and the community.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Arthur Close, 71 Kemp Road W, said that the main concern for the neighbors was a rezoning request without a plan. He noted that there would be no guarantee unless conditions are added to the request.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if anyone else wished to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr. supported the request and stated that there was no plan and therefore there could be no specific conditions.

Chair O'Connor stated that she lived in the adjacent neighborhood since 1986 and noted she received notification informing that the Church approached Cone to purchase the property. She shared the neighbors' concerns, however, she believed the request would be an appropriate use for the subject property and would benefit the surrounding communities. She supported the request.

Mr. Engle noted that his neighborhood was experiencing effects from unhoused and mental health people sleeping in their backyards. He said housing and mental health issues are items that needed to be addressed on a wider spectrum. He mentioned that by right 50ft high building could be built on properties within R-3 single-family residential zoning district. He said that churches property sales are happening nationwide. He said that as a zoning body the Commission determined compatibility of the use but could has no control over the sale or leaving the property in its current use. Mr. Engle said the request is consistent with the surrounding communities. He supported the request and indicated the applicant, and the residents should continue working together.

Ms. Skenes concurred with Mr. Engle and mentioned incidents when the existing use had traffic overspill into the neighborhoods. She said that she was aware of other church properties being sold. She noted that the current zoning could allow 25 single-family houses on the subject property. She stated that Cone Health and the residential neighborhood coexisted for decades since the 50's. She supported the request.

Vice-Chair Magid supported the request and concurred with Ms. Skenes and Mr. Engle that the request was suitable use for the subject property. She said that the Church reaching out to Cone Health indicated the path they would like for the property.

Chair O'Connor then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-008, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 2300 West Friendly Avenue from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-PI (Conditional District - Public and Institutional) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-PI zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-25 and Z24-08-009 An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) and County AG (Agricultural) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) for the properties identified as 4616, 4620, 4628, and 4634 South Holden Road, generally described as west of South Holden Road and south of Bishop Road (37.66 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He advised there is a Unified Development Plan (UDP) associated with the request, and that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to a maximum of 118 single-family dwellings.
- 2) Maximum building height shall not exceed forty-five 45 feet.

Mr. Carter stated GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Exurban on the Future Built Form Map. If this original zoning request is approved, the Future Built Form designation for the subject site is considered to be amended to Urban General in order to ensure an appropriate fit between future land use designation and zoning. The GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates the property as Residential and Industrial. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The request also supports the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed PUD, as conditioned, is primarily intended to accommodate single-family detached residential development. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Vice-Chair Magid asked staff if the annexation and rezoning request should be considered before the UDP.

Mr. Kirkman advised that the order of consideration to be the annexation, rezoning and then the UDP.

Vice-Chair Magid invited the applicant to the podium.

Amanda Hoderne, 804 Green Valley Road, said she was representing the applicant and gave a summary of the subject properties and noted that the site is just under 38 acres. She noted that the request is a single use PUD zoning district for a maximum of 118 single family dwellings. She said that the proposed density is equivalent that of R-3 single family residential zoning district. She noted the request is consistent with the GSO 2024 Future Designation Map designation of Residential. She stated water and sewer service are in proximity to the site which made the site suitable for growth.

Ms. Hoderne highlighted the existing conditions of the area and pointed out the subject properties are just south of the Interstate 85 corridor, the industrial uses north and southwest with residential neighborhood west of the request. She noted that the immediate surroundings is rural in nature with farmlands and single family homes. She pointed out the existence of another Interstate west of the properties created easy access and movements to and from the site. She stated the UPD is the governing document for the request. She said that the aim was to preserve the wooded areas, stormwater ponds and streams while keeping the dwellings concentrated in one area. She noted that there two access to the proposed site, both located on South Holden Road.

Ms. Hoderne spoke on the neighborhood outreach and stated that letters were mailed to property owners with the city's 750ft notification buffer. She said a meeting was Zoom meeting was held with roughly 8 persons attending. She mentioned that the top concern raised was traffic generation and said that a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was conducted for the request and submitted to the city for review. She informed the Commissioners that civil engineer for the project was present to answer any site design questions.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Downing asked for clarification when the Zoom meeting was held.

Ms. Hoderne informed the meeting was held on August 5th.

Vice-Chair Magid invited the speakers wishing to speak in opposition to the podium.

Jimmy Clark, 4514 South Holden Road, said he is the owner of Guy M Turner Inc. and owned several properties in the area and one just north of the request. He stated the request was not compatible with the area. He mentioned Guilford County envisioned the subject properties to be

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

heavy industrial. He said the current uses in the area are heavy industrial. He spoke of future industrial activities for his properties which would surround the proposed site. He listed other industrial uses in the area and noted that a landfill was also in the area. He said he has large fleet of 19 axle tractors trailers, he stated the trailers are the length of a football field. He explained the only way to get to his property is via Highway 220, exit Randleman Road, via Harris Street, via South Holden Road. He said that the trailers are escorted in and out of the area and traffic are at a standstill for approximately 45 to 1 hour.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Clark if Interstate 40 and South Holden could be another option.

Mr. Clark said it was not an option. He said most of the traffic in the area are heavy duty trucks. He noted the prevailing wind in the area moved west to east and an asphalt plant is west of the request.

Vice-Chair Magid asked if the applicant wished to speak further in favor of the request.

Amanda Hodierne, 804 Green Valley Road, said she understood the concerns to be compatibility between industrial and residential. She stated that the GSO2040 Plan encourages mixed uses in a compatible manner to accommodate all the uses in demand such as housing. She acknowledged the success of the existing uses in the area and stated that the applicant has extensive experience in residential site selections. She said that the applicant believed the subject properties are suitable for residential development and is aware of the land uses and activities in the area. She mentioned the request is reasonable and pointed out the that a school is south of the request. She stated that there are other areas with similar mix of uses mentioning residential neighborhoods close to the airport, to the coliseum which are intense uses bringing a lot of intense traffic, noise and visual impacts. She said that a variety of housing choices are necessary. Ms. Hodierne talked about recent redevelopment of a factory in another residential neighborhood and stated that the city has always put uses next to each other and continue to do so.

Vice-Chair Magid asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to come forward to the podium.

Lynn Clark, 4514 South Holden Road, said the applicant's attorney stating that the GSO2040 Future designation residential zone for the area was incorrect. He said the proposed site was designated heavy industrial. He referenced the staff report and said the importance of having the character, existing development and trend in the area be as is, which is heavy industrial. He pointed out that the area has always been heavy industrial and would continue to be so. He said the request was not viable.

Robert Mock, 4600 Big Poplar Lane, noted his wife sent a letter to the Commissioners expressing concerns. He said he moved to the area to escape the crowded neighborhoods. He stated the proposed site abutted his property and would change the single-family character. He

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

pointed out that the surrounding industrial uses protected his farm. He asked the Commissioners to support him in protecting the single family character.

Derek Carson, 5340 Old Randleman Road, said that the request is inconsistent with the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan noting that the existing land use in the area is industrial and the request being residential. He referenced the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and said that industrial lands should be protected for industrial opportunities. He stated should the request be approved the industrial lands in the area would be lost. He noted that the staff report stated the area future uses are residential and industrial and felt that both could not co-exist. He said industrial uses exist on all sides of the proposed site and repeated that the request is not suitable for the area.

Patrick Short, 4617 South Holden Road, stated he owned other lands surrounding the proposed site and he would like to use his properties for industrial development. He said he agreed with the presenters before him and stated the request is a satellite annexation. He asked if anyone visited the proposed site and experienced the heavy traffic in the area.

Mr. Engle said he flew over the site, and he got a feel for the traffic situation.

Mr. Short said he should be on the ground to experience the heavy traffic. He said the potential residents would not be able to get in and out of the site safely. He said the request does not fit in the area and asked the Commissioners not to support the request.

Vice-Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak further in opposition. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing. Vice-Chair Magid then asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Skenes noted that she sat on the County Zoning Board when Bishop Road experienced industrial growth including the expansion of the landfill. She stated she did site visit on the weekend and agreed with Mr. Clark that heavy industrial use exist in the area. However, she noted that almost half of the area is designated residential. She said most of the industrial uses are along Bishop Road. She mentioned that residential developments also exist in the area and pointed out Mr. Short living adjacent to the proposed site. She stated that despite having industrial uses in the area and more so on Bishop Road, having a school nearby on Harris Street, she was not convinced that the area should remain solely for industrial uses. She noted her consideration should be based on the guidelines of the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and stated the future designation for the area is residential.

Mr. Engle stated that the area falls within the mix of Exurban and Industrial, and noted that the school influenced his decision. He described the existing land uses in the area and noted the request would be compatible with the surrounding use. He said the aim of the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan is to encourage complementary uses. He supported the request and encouraged continued discussion between the applicant and the residents.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Mr. Gilmer, Sr supported the request and noted that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan future designation for the area is residential.

Mr. Downing did not support the request and said that he understood the presence of the residential and industrial dynamics. However, he is not convinced that the residential use would be suitable given the anticipated industrial use in the area. He said that the applicant and the residents should continue working together.

Chair O'Connor concurred with Ms. Skenes, Mr. Engle and Mr. Gilmer, Sr and supported the request.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Vice-Chair Magid. The Commission voted 6-2, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Turner). Nays: (Downing and Glass).

Ms. Turner then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-009, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the properties at 4616, 4620, 4628, and 4634 South Holden Road from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) and County AG (Agricultural) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City PUD zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer, Sr seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 6-2, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Turner). Nays: (Downing and Glass).

Vice-Chair Magid advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 17, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Ms. Skenes made a motion to approve the UDP as submitted, seconded by Chair O'Connor. The Commission voted 6-2, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice-Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Engle, Gilmer Sr. and Turner). Nays: (Downing and Glass).

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman informed the Commissioners there were two scheduled staff presentations, however, due to the late hour they were postponed to September 16th Planning and Zoning Meeting. He noted the presentations would be for the phase 2 Randleman Road Corridor Plan and the West

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

AUGUST 19, 2024

Friendly Neighborhood Conservation Overlay. He said the Commissioners would be provided with information on the presentations.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

There were no items from the Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT:

Vice-Chair Magid adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, September 16, 2024, beginning at 5:30 p.m. Members present were Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, Warché Downing, Zac Engle, Paul Gilmer Sr., B. Keith Peterson, Betty Turner and Erica Glass. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Russ Clegg, Luke Carter, Andrew Nelson and Carla Harrison (Planning), Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office) and Nolan Tipton (GDOT).

Chair O'Connor welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Chair O'Connor advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated that the Commission reviews all original zoning and rezoning requests for the City of Greensboro. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Chair O'Connor noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. She further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation, and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know.

Chair O'Connor announced one of the items on the agenda, the West Friendly Avenue Neighborhood Conservation Overlay. She stated the item was not a specific zoning request and turned to staff for clarification. Mr. Ducharme explained the process for the public hearing and said that the Commission's role was to provide recommendations with the aim to determine whether to adopt the conservation overlay. He stated that the City Council would make the ultimate decision. He advised that existing projects in the area were not subjected to the item under discussion.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair O'Connor acknowledged the full attendance of Commissioners and noted that Mr. Engle would be late.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Chair O'Connor requested approval of the August 19, 2024 meeting minutes. Vice Chair Magid made a motion to approve the August meeting minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Gilmer, Jr. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson and Glass). Nays: (None).

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Chair O'Connor inquired if there were any items withdrawn or to be continued. Mr. Kirkman advised that the applicant withdrew item **Z-24-09-005** for the property identified as 2003 Athena Court, and no action was needed by the Commission. He also noted that the discussion about the consideration of the **Randleman Road Corridor Plan, Phase 2** would be placed on the Planning and Zoning Commission October agenda, and no action was required by the Commission.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Chair O'Connor noted there were items on the agenda that did not have opposition signed up to speak and were eligible for the expedited agenda. These items were: **Z-24-09-001** for 3607 and 3609 Summit Avenue; **PL(P) 24-27 and Z-24-09-002** for 5101, 5101 ZZ, and 5106 Summit Avenue, a portion of Summit Avenue right-of-way, and a portion of Candlenut Road right-of-way; **PL(P) 24-30 and Z-24-09-003** for 5508 Hilltop Road; **Z-24-09-004** for 4604 and 4608 North Church Street; **Z-24-09-006** for 1915 Boulevard Street; and **PL(P) 24-32 and Z-24-09-007** for a portion of 4544 Jessup Grove Road. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor noted that the Commission would address the item through expedited review.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone in attendance or online wished to speak in opposition to any of the aforementioned items. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor noted the Commission would address these items through the expedited review and reordered the agenda accordingly.

Z-24-09-001: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) and CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) to CD-RM-12 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 12) for the properties identified as 3607 and 3609 Summit Avenue, generally described as west of Summit Avenue and north of Cherry Lane (21.52 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to: Single-family Dwellings; Duplexes; Traditional Houses; Townhouses and Twin Homes.
- 2) Development shall be limited to 185 dwelling units.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan currently designates the subject property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed CD-RM-12 zoning district, as conditioned, would allow for multi-family dwellings and uses that are compatible with the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present but did not wish to speak. Chair O'Connor having no opposition to the request closed the public hearing.

Mr. Peterson then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-09-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 3607 and 3609 Summit Avenue from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) and CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) to CD-RM-12 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 12) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-12 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Vice Chair Magid seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

PL(P) 24-27 & Z-24-09-002: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the properties identified as 5101, 5101 ZZ and 5106 Summit Avenue, a portion of Summit Avenue right-of-way, and a portion of Candlenut Road right-of-way, generally described as west and east of Summit Avenue and north of Candlenut Road (2.23 acres) (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan currently designates the subject property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-3 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to 3 dwelling units per acre. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present but did not wish to speak. Chair O'Connor having no opposition to the request closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Magid made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Peterson. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice Chair Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-09-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 5101, 5101 ZZ, and 5106 Summit Avenue, a portion of Summit Avenue right-of-way, and a portion of Candlenut Road right-of-way from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Gilmer seconded the motion.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Chair O'Connor welcomed Mr. Engle as he joined the meeting.

PL(P) 24-30 & Z-24-09-003: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the property identified as 5508 Hilltop Road and a portion of the Hilltop Road right-of-way, generally described as north of Hilltop Road and east of Chelsea Acres Court (1.41 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan currently designates the subject property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-3 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to 3 dwelling units per acre. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Chair O'Connor having no opposition to the request closed the public hearing.

Mr. Peterson made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Ms. Glass then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-09-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 5508 Hilltop Road from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City R-3 zoning district permits uses that fit the context

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Turner seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Z24-09-004: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) the properties identified as 4604 and 4608 North Church Street, generally described as east of North Church Street and north of Old Lake Jeanette Road (3.56 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to: Residential uses only

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district, as conditioned, would allow a mix of appropriately dense uses that have an intensity generally compatible with the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present but did not wish to speak. Chair O'Connor having no opposition to the request closed the public hearing.

Ms. Turner then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-09-004, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 4604 and 4608 North Church Street from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Downing seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-24-09-006: A rezoning request from O (Office) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) for the property identified as 1615 Boulevard Street, generally described as east of Boulevard Street and west of South Holden Road (1.5 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

- 1) Uses shall be limited to: Uses in the Social Service Facilities and Office use categories.
- 2) Social Service Facility uses shall be limited to forty-three (43) beds.

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework strategy to provide accessible public recreation centers, libraries, neighborhood park facilities and other services to sustain livable neighborhoods and the Creating Great Places strategy to work towards providing housing for all residents of Greensboro. The proposed CD-C-M zoning district, as conditioned, would allow uses in the Social Service Facilities and Office use categories. The proposed uses are compatible existing uses on adjacent tracts. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Chair O'Connor sought clarification from staff regarding the other type of uses that would be allowed in the zoning district for offices or social services.

Mr. Carter explained the office use category allowed for general office uses.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Mr. Kirkman further advised that social service facilities would provide social services which could include transit housing component. He listed other type of uses that would be found in the same category as the social services facilities namely shelter for the homeless and transient lodging, temporary housing shelter specific to emergency situations, soup kitchen and food banks, group care facilities and orphanages. He noted the rezoning request had a housing component, and that the applicant conditioned the bed count to address the scale of activity. Mr. Kirkman agreed with Mr. Carter and stated that the office use category allowed for a variety of office uses with set hours of operations and with limited activities.

Chair O'Connor asked for further questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Chair O'Connor having no opposition to the request closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-09-006, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at 1915 Boulevard Street from O (Office) to CD-C-M (Conditional District - Commercial – Medium) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-C-M zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Vice Chair Magid seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-32 & Z-24-09-007: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-RM-5 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 5) the property identified as a portion of 4544 Jessup Grove Road, generally described as north of Jessup Grove Road and east of Lewiston Road (3.08 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He then advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to: Duplexes; Townhouses; and Twin Homes.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Mr. Carter stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Building Community Connections strategy to work to ensure the quality, quantity, and diversity of housing choices across and between neighborhoods. The proposed CD-RM-5 zoning district, as conditioned, would limit permitted uses to residential uses including Duplexes; Townhouses; and Twin Homes. The request represents a small increase in residential density while allowing for greater flexibility on lot configuration and expanded housing types. The requested uses are compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak in favor of the request. Chair O'Connor, hearing no further comments, closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-07-007, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at a portion of 4544 Jessup Grove Road from County RS-40 (Residential Single-family) to City CD-RM-5 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-RM-5 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

REGULAR AGENDA

Z-24-06-003: A rezoning request from CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) and consideration of the associated Unified Development Plan for the property identified as 1322 Bothwell Street, generally described as south of Bothwell Street and north of US Highway 29 (1.698 acres). (DENIED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He noted that a Unified Development Plan (UDP) was associated with the request.

Mr. Carter advised that the applicant wished to revise the conditions associated with the rezoning request. He read the proposed conditions as follows:

- 1) Permitted uses **are limited to Single-family detached dwellings, Duplexes, Traditional Houses, Townhouses, and Twin Homes.**
- 2) The maximum unit count shall not exceed **34** units.
- 3) Building height shall not exceed 50 feet.
- 4) **Exterior building façade materials shall consist of no less than 70 percent wood, stone, glass, brick, cementitious material, and composite materials. Vinyl or aluminum siding shall not be permitted.**

Vice Chair Magid made a motion to accept the revised conditions, seconded by Mr. Gilmer, Sr. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Carter stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban Central on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed PUD zoning district, as conditioned, would allow residential uses that are generally compatible with the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Skenes asked for the associated UDP to be displayed.

Mr. Peterson stated that the subject property has significant dip on the property and asked the applicant if it would be built up to or above street level.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Chair O'Connor asked the applicant or anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request to come to the podium.

Joseph Rogers, 14051 Old Vermillion Drive, Huntersville, stated he was the manager director for Rogers Acquisition and Development. He said that he started community outreach since January. He mentioned that the plans was revised on several occasions to address the neighbors' concerns. He stated the project started with seventy-two (72) affordable housing units and was revised to fit the character of the neighborhood. He said the plan was to build 34 units however the current plan consisted of 29 affordable townhomes. He noted that the neighbors expressed two concerns which are still outstanding. He stated he was cognizant of the following concerns:

- 1) On-street parking – he stated the issue would be addressed through additional onsite parking. He also said that HOA would be onsite enforcing parking to prevent persons from parking on the street. He noted there is an existing no-parking zone in the area.
- 2) Turning radius – he noted he was aware that on-street parking would exacerbate the traffic conflicts and would be a safety concern. He stated the larger vehicles were already experiencing issues at the corner of Bothwell Street and South Side Boulevard.

Mr. Rogers anticipated to continue working with GDOT to put forward solutions which would address the traffic concerns. He stated the traffic concerns could only be resolved at the site design stage. He mentioned that the proposal would provide diverse housing options. He noted the proposed housing would be for sale (owner occupied) thus creating stability without jeopardizing property values. He said that the proposed affordable housing cost would be the same as the current housing cost in the neighborhood.

Chair O'Connor asked Commissioner Peterson if he had questions for the applicant.

Mr. Peterson again pointed out that the subject property has a huge dip and asked the applicant if they planned on building up to or above street level to prevent stormwater runoff.

Joseph Rogers said the stormwater concerns would be analyzed and designed by civil engineer. He stated the subject property would be graded and a detention pond would be used for onsite drainage.

Mr. Peterson asked the applicant to talk about the orientation of the buildings on the site.

Mr. Rogers stated that buildings would be facing three directions which would be toward Bothwell Street, Highway 29 east of the subject property.

Chair O'Connor asked for any further questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Engle mentioned there are several multi-family zoning districts which could accommodate the proposed development. He pointed out that RM-26 would be suitable for the proposed

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

development. He stated that the proposal is for PUD for 1.698 acres with no clear standards. He asked the applicant to talk about the proposal in the context of standards.

Mr. Rogers said his team decided on the PUD at the initial stage when the plan was for 72 units. He stated that after realizing the proposal was not suitable for the area the plan changed. He mentioned that staff advised if the application changed it would mean starting a new application process, so they decided to continue under the current application. Mr. Rogers said, however, under the PUD they were able to customize setback standards, making them closer to the property lines. He stated the customized setbacks allowed for better on-site traffic flow.

Mr. Engle stated he usually would not have favorably consider for PUD that was not in proximity to activity centers. He stated the proposed site is further away from the main road and located within the residential community. Mr. Engle made the applicant aware that the proposed setback standards was a concern and noted that it meant having development closer to the single-family developments. He mentioned that the proposed development was more than a gentle increase in density. He said what he envisioned separation buffers for such development. Mr. Engle pointed out the proposal lacked the needed separation buffers and thanked the applicant for answering his questions.

Vice Chair Magid asked the applicant about the community outreach specifically for the two neighbors closest to the site.

Mr. Rogers mentioned the two neighbors were invited to several community outreach meetings.

Vice Chair Magid inquired whether they attended the meetings.

Mr. Rogers noted he was not aware whether they attended any of the meetings. He stated there was low turnout at the community meetings. He said more neighbors from other streets, and not many from the Bothwell Street, attended the meetings. He mentioned that other than the meetings, one of his colleagues reached out on a one on one level to some of the neighbors.

Vice Chair Magid sought for further clarification on the community outreach and asked if the applicant contacted adjacent property owners.

Mr. Rogers said he did not contact the adjacent property owners.

Vice Chair Magid asked the applicant for the number of neighbors attending the meetings.

Mr. Rogers said the attendance varied between 10 to 20 persons.

Chair O'Connor asked for further questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none,

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Chair O'Connor asked for the persons wishing to speak in opposition to the request to come forward to the podium.

William Sidney Evans, 1918 Belcrest Drive, stated he opposed the request. He expressed that the main concern was for the safety of the community. He said that "no parking" zone existed along Bothwell Street fronting the subject property. He noted that should vehicles park in the restricted parking zone the transit bus would not be able to navigate the corner at Bothwell Street and South Side Boulevard as tested by the Transit Department. Mr. Evans talked about the site plan having onsite parking along Bothwell Street and being visible to the neighborhood. He stated that the road would not be able to accommodate the additional traffic. He expressed concerns for a resident who travel via wheelchair from the bus stop to home at 1306 Bothwell Street. He listed possible vehicular activities and potential conflicts within the vicinity given the nearby hospital. He concluded that the request would significantly change the character of the neighborhood.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak in rebuttal to the concerns raised by Mr. Evans.

Mr. Peterson indicated he had questions for the applicant, Chair O'Connor asked the applicant to come forward to the podium.

Mr. Peterson asked for clarification on the parking provisions for the proposed development.

Joseph Rogers, 14051 Old Vermillion Drive, Huntersville, said each unit has one car garage and driveway for additional parking. He stated they were in the process of revising the site plan to create additional onsite parking for visitors. He described the site layout as one not having parking lot. He said the idea was to fit in with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

Mr. Peterson wanted to know where the additional parking would be located on the site.

Vice Chair Magid asked if the applicant had display showing the changes on the site plan. She also asked for the UDP to be displayed again.

Mr. Kirkman cautioned the Commission on exploring the site details. He advised they could examine matters affecting the neighborhood but not on the site design details.

Chair O'Connor noted the site plan was a representation and not a requirement for the request.

Mr. Kirkman noted the LDO minimum parking requirements for the request is 2.1 space per townhome unit.

Mr. Engle asked staff to define the separation buffer requirement for the proposed PUD in contrast to the RM-26 (multi-family residential 26) zoning district.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Mr. Downing also wanted to know the separation buffer requirement from the residential properties, as well from the street property boundary.

Mr. Kirkman advised that for the RM-26 zoning district the LDO required a Type C buffer having planting yard 15feet wide for situation where Townhomes multi-family type development is adjacent to single-family dwellings. There is also requirement for 10ft wide street yard.

Mr. Engle wanted to know the type of buffer requirements for the proposed PUD and the surrounding single family dwellings.

Mr. Kirkman stated the UDP and PUD allowed for flexibility on the buffer requirements.

Mr. Rogers displayed a revised site plan from his cell phone. He said that the displayed plan was a fit studying determining the density, access, traffic patterns and landscaping for the site. He noted the buildings might be re-oriented to provide additional parking. He emphasized the importance of the community participation in influencing the site design.

Ms. Skenes pointed out that turnaround was shown on the UDP and not provided on the plan displayed.

Mr. Kirkman explained that the area pointed out by Ms. Skenes undevelopable area and was stream buffer. He cautioned the Commission not to examine the site design issues.

Mr. Ducharme concurred with Mr. Kirkman and reminded the Commission, the plan presented was an illustration of the proposal and not final approval. He said there needed to be more detail review process to resolve the site design concerns.

Chair O'Connor then asked the applicant if he had further rebuttal comments. Hearing none, she inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Barbara Jackson, 1803 Carlton Avenue, said the plan presented at the last community outreach meeting in the past week showed three (3) extra parking spaces besides the allocated parking for the townhomes. She said concern was raised on emergency vehicles maneuvering on the site. She stated that each meeting a different plan was presented and even at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. She noted that having a second access was never part of any of the plans presented at the community meeting. Ms. Jackson described the vicinity of the subject property to be heavy traffic area. She said she observed three (3) bus cycles and on one occasion a school bus. She noted that there was a rightfully parked vehicle on the street opposite to the restricted parking zone, large trucks (linen trucks going to the nearby hospital) and determined the area is tight and high traffic conflicts. She mentioned the applicant had no solutions for illegally parked vehicle that could park in the restricted area. She said the request was not suitable for the subject property. Ms. Jackson said that the location for the proposed second access was flood prone with a nearby creek.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Kevin Truitt, 1922 Drexmore Avenue, said that while the focus was on vehicles maneuvering in the area, he felt that the narrow road should be the main concern.

Chair O'Connor hearing no further comments closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing thanked Ms. Jackson for her presentation and noted that he looked at the request in a broader context and the benefits to the neighborhood. He acknowledged the need to resolve the traffic concerns, however, he felt the request met the provisions for affordable housing and a bold vision for the community. He supported the rezoning request and stated that the concerns of parking and traffic could be resolved. He said the applicant demonstrated he met with the community and there were concessions. He stated the request could be a stimulus for growth and development of the area, while giving significance to the history of the area.

Mr. Gilmer Sr wanted to know from staff if Bothwell Street met street code requirements.

Mr. Tipton said that if applying the code at present the street would be classified as a collector street and should be minimum width of 36 feet. He stated that as development occurred along the street respective developers would be required to widen the section of the street along the property.

Mr. Gilmer Sr, asked what the additional width would be.

Mr. Tipton explained that since Bothwell Street is currently 28 feet wide and the required width is 36ft the difference would be split between properties fronting the road, therefore on one side the property owner would be required to widen the street by 4 feet.

Mr. Gilmer Sr, mentioned that the previous development on the subject property was destroyed by fire and was an eyesore. He then supported the rezoning request. He stated the request would benefit the neighborhood.

Mr. Engle commended the applicant on the proposal. He said that it was a wonderful vision but thought the location was not suited for the proposal. He stated he could have more consideration if suitable separation buffer was included on the plans. He noted that he consistently did not support PUDs that are not close to activity centers. He said there were established standards for multi-family residential zoning district and said that the proposal was for multi-family residence. He expressed that the proposal should adhere to the existing multi-family standards. He mentioned that the proposed PUD would maximize the land space. He pointed out that the proposal would be within an established single-family residential neighborhood, and not closer to the area with commercial uses. He said for these reasons he opposed the rezoning request. He encouraged the applicant to continue finding other opportunities for his proposal and agreed with Mr. Downing and Mr. Gilmer, Sr that the project is the much needed housing option.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Ms. Skenes concurred with Mr. Engle and did not support the request. She stated that the proposal revised from 72 units to 42 units and then to 34 units. She noted that the Commissioners are not designing the site, however, they did not have sufficient details for consideration. Ms. Skenes said the PUD was too vague for the small site, too many activities for such a tiny property. She said the proposal was not consistent with the surrounding.

Vice Chair Magid also concurred with Mr. Engle and said the proposal had components of the RM-26 multi-family residential zoning district. She stated that the Commission had in the past not supported similar type proposal in such established single-family neighborhoods. She too had concerns with the PUD and the UDP and did not support the request.

Mr. Peterson then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-06-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend denial of the rezoning request for the property at 1322 Bothwell Street from CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be inconsistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed PUD zoning district, even as conditioned, does not limit negative impacts on the adjacent properties, nor does it permit uses that fit the context of surrounding area; (3.) The request is not reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will be a detriment to the neighbors and surrounding community, and denial is in the public interest. Mr. Engle seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 6-3, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (Downing, Gilmer Sr. and Turner)

Chair O'Connor advised the zoning denial constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Chair O'Connor announced recess at 7:00 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 7:20 pm.

Z-24-08-010: A rezoning request from LI (Light Industrial) to C-M (Commercial – Medium) for the property identified as a portion of 2645 Randleman Road, generally described as east of Randleman Road and north of Corliss Street (0.45 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He pointed out that the current zone for most of the property is C-M (Commercial Medium). He

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

stated that approximately one-third to the rear of the property is zoned LI (Light Industrial). He explained that the request is to rezone the LI portion to C-M.

Mr. Carter stated that the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map currently designates this property as Urban General within an Urban Mixed-Use Corridor and the Randleman Road Reinvestment Corridor. The GSO240 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates this property as Commercial. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed and the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in our Framework strategy to encourage higher density, mixed-use, walkable infill development. The proposed C-M zoning district is intended to accommodate a wide range of retail, service, office, and multi-family residential uses in a mixed-use environment. The proposed uses are compatible with the existing uses on adjacent tracts. The proposed zoning request is appropriate given the property's location along a major thoroughfare. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked for the applicant or anyone else to speak in favor of the request to come to the podium.

Kameron Dozier, 143 North Main Street, Kernersville, on behalf of O'Brien Architecture said he was representing the applicant. Mr. Dozier said the applicant also owned the adjacent property which contained an auto shop. He explained that the business use on the subject property would remain, however, the applicant wanted additional parking for a special event center on the adjacent property. He mentioned that City staff advised a Traffic Impact Analysis would not be required. He said the main reason for the request is to allow shared parking which could not happen under the current LI zone.

Chair O'Connor asked Mr. Dozier if the subject property was shared with the adjacent property.

Mr. Dozier stated that was the case and it would require additional steps. He pointed out that even without the shared parking, the applicant wanted the subject property to have one zone, the C-M zone.

Chair O'Connor asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak further in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request to come to the podium.

Sharon Hightower, 6 Belles Court, stated there were improvement projects happening along Randleman Road, being a major corridor in Greensboro. She mentioned she attended several community meetings focused on revitalizing the area and wanted to know if the applicant had any community outreach. Ms. Hightower said that the area was deserving of improvements since it has been in the past underserved, overlooked and neglected. She felt that the residents of the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Randleman Road and surrounding areas should be included and should have the opportunity to talk about the request.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak further on the request.

Mr. Dozier, stated the applicant has been operating in the community for a while. He said he was unsure about the community outreach. He mentioned that they sent copy of the proposal to the notification mailing list received from staff. He stated they did online survey for feedbacks on the request. He said they did not hold a community meeting. Mr. Dozier mentioned the special event center would be beneficial to the community.

Mr. Kirkman advised the Commissioners that the applicant submitted the summary of neighborhood communications, which was found in their package.

Ms. Skenes sought for clarification of the request and stated that the applicant owned 2645 and 2649 Randleman Road. She noted that the applicant planned on using the back portion of the building on the adjacent property as a special event center.

Mr. Dozier corrected that the front portion of the building on 2649 Randleman Road would be used for the special event center. He said they intended to remodel the front of the building to improve the roadside appearance.

Ms. Skenes restated the front of the building on 2649 Randleman Road, which was not the subject of the request, would have the special event center.

Mr. Dozier concurred with Ms. Skenes and said half of the building would be a special event center and the remaining half used for the auto shop.

Ms. Skenes noted that for the special event center to operate additional parking was required. She stated that the additional parking could be allowed in the C-M zone and not in the LI zone.

Mr. Dozier agreed with Ms. Skenes and said as he understood after meeting with staff.

Mr. Kirkman explained that the parking associated with the use should be the same zone because special event centers were not allowed in LI zone.

Mr. Engle asked about the property having split zones. Mr. Kirkman advised how that could have happened.

Ms. Skenes continued to clarify the request; she said that the subject property has two zones. She stated that the request would allow the subject property to be one zone, rezoning the back portion from LI to C-M.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Mr. Kirkman concurred with Skenes about the property having one zone.

Ms. Skenes then noted the request was a “zoning cleanup” and downzoning moving from LI to C-M and looked to staff for clarification.

Mr. Kirkman agreed with the zoning cleanup but stated that for the most part both LI and C-M zoning districts allowed for similar uses.

Ms. Skenes reaffirmed that the request would make the subject property one zone and provide additional parking for the special event center.

Mr. Dozier agreed with Skenes.

Vice Chair Magid summarized that the request would make the subject property one zone, C-M. She mentioned that the subject property would be used for additional parking, and that the special event center would be in an appropriate zone and was not part of the request.

Mr. Dozier agreed and noted that he only mentioned the special event center to better explain the request.

Mr. Peterson inquired about the community feedback from the survey.

Mr. Dozier replied he was unsure of any response and stated the survey was sent out later in the previous week.

Mr. Peterson mentioned that the residents had a vision for Randleman Road, he also noted there was another special event center in proximity to the subject property. He said he would prefer the applicant to meet with the residents.

Mr. Engle noted that the letter mailed to the residents had no date and assumed it was sent the previous week.

Mr. Dozier pointed to the date on the registered mail slips.

Mr. Engle after reviewing the registered mail slips noted the letter were mailed on September 11th few days prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Engle asked the applicant if he was opened to continuing the request to allow for community outreach.

Mr. Dozier said he hoped to have feedback from the community in time for the meeting. He stated that even if they should be open to community engagement there would not be any substantial reason against the request. He expressed that the request would benefit the neighborhood in terms of making the area looks better. He mentioned he was working on design drawings for the proposed development.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Mr. Peterson asked the applicant if the plan they are working on was better than what the City envisioned for Randleman Road.

Mr. Kirkman advised the Commissioners that the special event facility use was allowed in the C-M zoning district. He pointed out that both the front section of 2645 and all of 2649 Randleman Road are C-M zone. He stated the applicant owned both properties and for the owner to have the special event facility the associated parking should be provided in the appropriate zone. He clarified the Commissioner's questions and asked if the applicant was opened to the 30 days continuance to the October Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to allow for community outreach.

Mr. Downing consented with Mr. Kirkman and added that the notices were late, and the residents would need more time to respond. He stated it would be better to have the residents' input on the request. He noted that even with the applicant's good intension of sending notices it appeared no community outreach took place. He acknowledged that the City was working on the Randleman Road corridor plan, and he felt that the request should be considered in this context.

Chair O'Connor recognized the applicant's efforts in sending notices to the residents. She explained to the applicant that the usual approach would be to hold community meetings where the applicant and the residents get together to discuss the request. However, she stated that the request was for a corner of a property which is differently zoned. She mentioned the logical approach would be to have one zone.

Chair O'Connor asked for additional questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Engle stated that the use would be permitted but the construction would not be permitted. He said should there have been community outreach he could easily support the request. He expressed that he highly value the neighborhood engagement process and there was none for consideration. He again asked the applicant if he would be opened to the continuance of the request for more community outreach.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr sought Mr. Ducharme advice on the 30 days continuance to allow for the community outreach.

Mr. Ducharme advised that the applicant had the choice to agree to the 30 days continuance or proceed with the hearing.

Mr. Dozier asked the Commissioners to proceed with the hearing.

Mr. Downing indicated he would not be supporting the request. He pointed out there were community meetings held on September 10th and 11th to discuss the Randleman Road Corridor Plan.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Ms. Glass asked staff for clarification on the requirements for the notification of adjacent property owners.

Mr. Kirkman stated that the notification would be done by city staff. He said that the notices should be sent by first class mail between 10 to 25 days prior to the Hearing. He noted there are no requirements for the applicant as it relates to communication with residents. He pointed out that the request was for straight zoning and what the LDO addresses would be for conditional zoning districts with residential uses within the notification buffer. He said in the latter case, the applicant would be required to demonstrate steps taken to communicate with the adjacent property owners. He said the Commissioner had the discretion for additional conversations, between the applicant and adjacent property owners, but he wanted the Commissioner to be aware of the LDO requirements.

Ms. Glass asked whether the applicant providing notice to adjacent property owners was a practice and not a requirement.

Mr. Kirkman agreed it is a practice that staff encouraged knowing it would be the desired approach for the Commission and City Council. He said that staff could not dictate how or when notice were done by the applicant.

Mr. Ducharme added that the matter of applicant sending notice to adjacent property owners is an established practice as opposed to Statutory requirements.

Mr. Carter addressed the split zone concerns and stated that the LI boundary followed a former property line. He explained that the property lines were revised, and the zoning would not change.

Chair O'Conner inquired if there was anyone wished to speak further in opposition to the request. She asked if the applicant had additional comments.

Mr. Dozier noted he asked staff for assistance with the community outreach. He stated the community coalition reached out asking about the community outreach. He said he wished the contact was earlier allowing for community engagement.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak further in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor asked for anyone wishing to speak further in opposition to the request.

Sharon Hightower, 6 Belles Court, highlighted that the community was working towards improving the Randleman Road corridor. She said the way in which growth and development happened in the community needed to be done in a respectful manner. She stated that with big economic project such as Toyota being in such proximity more focus was on the Randleman Road area and Southeast Greensboro. Ms. Hightower said that an event facility could be good but what

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

type of facility would it be, the resident could not say what would be the associated impacts. She emphasized that the resident's input should be respected.

Chair O'Connor inquired if anyone else wished to speak further in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Chair O'Connor then asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Turner wanted to know how the determination on the request would be affected by the Randleman Road Corridor Plan to be considered at the next meeting in October.

Mr. Clegg introduced himself as the Manger of the Land Range Division. He said staff has been working on the corridor plan since late last year. He stated that through community outreach the residents desired the revitalization and modernization, along with diverse land uses along the corridor. He stated that the straight zoning request did not call for detailed information hence it was not easy to know how the request would fit into the Corridor Plan.

Vice Chair Magid wanted to know if the Commissions determination would be a final action and whether the applicant could appeal.

Mr. Kirkman confirmed the determination would be final action and the applicant had ten (10) days to appeal. He noted the appeal would be presented at City Council meeting.

Mr. Engle stated that it appeared the applicant could not take advantage of the small area of land under the C-M nor the small area of land under the LI.

Mr. Kirkman explained that the special event use was allowed in the C-M zoning district and could have associated parking. He reminded the Commission of a similar request where associated parking for a restaurant use would be on adjacent property which was rezoned to allow the parking. He advised the Commission that the request before them was the same concept.

Ms. Skenes said that the focus was on the special event center which was not part of the request. She stated that the request would be rezoning from LI to C-M allowing the subject property to have one zone.

Mr. Engle said there would be prohibited uses on the subject property based on the current zone, and therefore required zoning change. He said that the proposed zone would allow more uses to be available. He was concerned that the surrounding property owners had no opportunity to comment on the request. He said he would be inclined to favor a conditional zoning district but as a straight zoning more scrutiny should be given.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Vice Chair Magid restated, the building for the special event facility existed and was in the appropriate zone C-M. She stated that the focus should be on the portion zoned LI on the subject property.

Vice Chair Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-010, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at a portion of 2645 Randleman Road from LI (Light Industrial) to C-M (Commercial – Medium) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed C-M zoning district permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Ms. Turner seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 5-4, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Gilmer Sr. and Turner). Nays: (Downing, Peterson, Engle and Glass).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes was less than the required six count and constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Chair O'Connor urged the applicant to improve on the community outreach and be prepared to make presentation for the request to the City Council.

PL(P) 24-33 and Z-24-09-008: An annexation and original zoning request from County AG (Agricultural) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) and consideration of the associated Unified Development Plan for the properties identified as 5936 Burlington Road and 626 Knox Road, generally described as west of Knox Road and south of Burlington Road (71.08 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He noted there was a Unified Development Plan (UDP) associated with the request and stated the Technical Review Committee recommended conditional approval of the plan.

Mr. Carter advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to: Single-family homes, Townhomes, and Accessory Uses.

Mr. Carter stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The request also supports the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed PUD, as conditioned, is primarily intended to accommodate Single-family homes, Townhomes, and Accessory Uses. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are compatible with existing uses in the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked the applicant to come to the podium.

Tom Terrell, 230 N Elm Street, said he was representing Pulte Home Company and introduced his colleagues Mr. Kenneth Blinkley and Dionne Brown. He also introduced the applicant Ms. Lois Miles. He said the subject properties were family owned for approximately 132 years since 1892. Mr. Terrell stated the request is in Eastern Greensboro in proximity to the employment area, and filling in growth gaps. He mentioned the request is consistent with the City's adopted plan and displayed a proposed site plan. He said the request is an unusual one supported by multi-generation property owners, TRC, Department Staff, Neighbors at meeting and Land Use Plans/Policies. Mr. Terrell pointed out that the proposal is in Growth Tier 1, where annexation should be encouraged. He showed a land use map highlighting the extensive Publix distribution center and other industrial uses west of the proposed site and a residential subdivision north of the proposal. He said the area is growing. He then called on Ms. Lois Miles to speak further on the proposal.

Lois Miles, 5045 Harvest Road, McLeansville, supported the proposal. She said the proposed residential use would be best suited than industrial or commercial use. She agreed with Mr. Terrell that the area was growing and mentioned that the properties are adjacent to Publix distribution center and the Stoney Creek commercial area.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, she asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Cheryl Lowe, 662 Knox Road, said she owned property at 661 Knox Road. She expressed concerns about traffic in the area. She mentioned that Knox Road is a narrow and bending country road. She stated there was no speed limit in the vicinity, only two street signs indicating approaching curve road. She spoke of a fatal accident involving a Guilford county student along the Knox Road. She stated Eastern Guilford Middle and High school are in proximity to the proposed site and noted that school traffic is in the area. She mentioned that there were three recently approved requests on big tracts of land in the area. She stressed her support for economic development and meeting housing needs; however, the support roads should be

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

improved. She noted she does not oppose the request, however, urged the Commissioners to consider conditioning the request to ensure the safety of the community noting some measures like posting speed limits and hidden driveways.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak further in favor of the request.

Mr. Terrell, thanked Ms. Lowe for her comments. He notified the Commissioners that his colleague Ms. Brown was present to address questions or concerns regarding traffic concerns and the associated Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA).

Ms. Skenes asked Mr. Terrell whether the TIA was shared at the community outreach meetings.

Mr. Terrell said the summary of the TIA recommendations were presented at the community meeting.

Chair O'Connor asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, she inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Glass asked for clarification on the community outreach and asked for the applicant's summary of neighborhood communications. Other members shared the summary with her.

Ms. Skenes made a motion to annex the property, seconded by Mr. Gilmer, Sr. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-09-008, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the properties at 5936 Burlington Road and 626 Knox Road from County AG (Agricultural) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City PUD zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Vice Chair Magid seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Mr. Engle made a motion to approve the UDP with the added conditions, seconded by Mr. Gilmer, Sr. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Turner, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting.

PL(P) 24-28: Zoning, Planning and Development Text Amendment: Amending Section 30-7-8.8 (Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Districts) of the Land Development Ordinance to add a West Friendly Avenue Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District and West Friendly Avenue Design Manual. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Clegg introduced himself as the Division Manager, Long Range Planning. He highlighted the action to be taken by the commission: 1) Hold a public hearing; and 2) Make a recommendation including changes to the City Council. He noted subsequent action would be for the City Council to hold a public hearing and consider adoption of the plan which was tentatively scheduled for the October 15th City Council meeting. He stated the plan was initiated by residents petitioning for the Overlay District.

Mr. Clegg outlined the project area which included properties fronting West Friendly Avenue from North Holden Road to Westridge Road. He said notification was mailed to residents within the 750 feet buffer. He gave a brief presentation defining the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay (NCO) and the process. He stressed that the NCO would apply to new developments and would not affect the existing or those development currently under review along the corridor. Mr. Clegg reviewed the existing land uses, standards and regulations within the study boundaries. He talked about the proposed standards including front setbacks, side setback, height, building orientation and tree conservation.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions from the Commissioners, and said she would have comments after the public hearing.

Ms. Skenes asked for clarification on the tree preservation and wanted to know about the 50 feet tree conservation setbacks mentioned in the plan. She stated that on the southern section of Friendly Avenue 50 feet would consist of the entire front yard. She cross referenced the definition of tree conservation in the LDO. She pointed out that Mr. Clegg's presentation said it would apply for new development but was not indicated in the plan. She wanted to know how the NCO would impact property owners landscaping front yard and removing trees.

Mr. Clegg explained the plan stated, "in the case of new construction", so the NCO would be applied to new construction.

Ms. Skenes emphasized that the plan should say the tree conservation would not be applied to "existing" development.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Mr. Clegg said the language could be revised.

Mr. Engle further clarified and said that 50 feet would be the conservation area. He continued and said in cases of new construction or redevelopment 75% of the vegetation in the front yard with trunks of 4 inches or larger diameter breast size would be considered under the tree conservation.

Ms. Skenes felt that the standard was not clear. She said since the tree conservation would be applied to new construction it should be clearly stated in the plan.

Ms. Skenes had another question about the nonconformities. She mentioned that the plan stated that dwellings destroyed or damaged by fire could rebuild in the same footprint. She pointed out the plan did not address “tear down”.

Mr. Clegg explained the intent of the NCO and said it would allow for exceptions in the event of occurrence such as fire.

Ms. Skenes mentioned staff previously explained that a variance would be required if rebuilding did not meet the NCO standards. She felt seeking variances would be additional work for the applicant.

Mr. Clegg continued to address Ms. Skenes questions explaining when variances would be required.

Mr. Kirkman also explained that what was proposed in the NCO is consistent with the nonconforming standards in the LDO. He stated that rebuilding could occur in the existing footprint but once expanded or additions outside a variance would be required.

Ms. Skenes expressed the language was not clear, specific to “tear down” given the age of residence in the subject area. She also mentioned that the rebuilding would also need to adhere to the tree conservation standards.

Ms. Skenes stated at 3701 Friendly Avenue at the corner of North Holden Avenue the dwelling was close to the street due to widening of the road. She wanted to know if the NCO would restrict future development as an illegal taking. She noted the taking was a concerned raised by an attorney outside of the city. She expressed concerns for the redevelopment of this particular property. She felt that the neighborhood would have control over development of the area.

Mr. Clegg advised that the NCO was not to stop new development but to allow in context of the plan and the surrounding area.

Vice Chair Magid asked about the Planning Director deciding on the tree conservation process.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Mr. Kirkman explained the Planning Director is general term referring to staff. He advised there is an arborist on staff who would review any such plans and work with the developers.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked for the speakers for the NCO to come to the podium indicating they had 3 minutes per speaker.

Nikki Kohut, 3921 West Friendly Avenue, stated she supported the West Friendly Avenue NCO. She mentioned the NCO would preserve, revitalize, protect and enhance older neighborhoods beyond the LDO. She said the request was to protect the uniqueness of the West Friendly Avenue neighborhood. She stated the subject area is one of the historical focal points and established residential neighborhood of Greensboro attracting visitors and families. Ms. Kohut said the neighborhood slightly changed since the 1950's, and the architectural designs are mostly ranch style, classic colonial and cape cod. She mentioned that there were significant support from the residents within the subject area and outside for the NCO and to preserve the area. She noted the process started more than a year and several community meetings held.

Stephen Freyaldenhoven, 4003 West Friendly Avenue, emphasized the importance of the residents' recognition and participation to preserve the unique character of the area. He stated the residents would have liked to present the NCO earlier, but the process took longer time because they wanted a broad consensus of the proposal. He noted that care was taken not to hold public meetings during holidays, or during the summer months when some residents were away. He commended the staff for working with the residents in preparing the NCO. He asked the commissioners to support the NCO.

John Drinkard, 4020 W Friendly Avenue, said he lived at this address for 30 years, and really enjoyed living in the area. He said he was present to support the NCO and mentioned that a previous rezoning request in the neighborhood initiated the Plan. He stated the rezoning request ignored the uniqueness of the area and likened the process as a battle to protect the neighborhood. He said the NCO would prevent such proposals from happening again. He told the Commissioners the community needed their help and said that the NCO would provide guidance for future proposal in fitting into the neighborhood. He noted the neighborhood was not against development. Mr. Drinkard said being an architect he could visualize the impact development designs would have on a community. He stated the NCO would provide the context in which development should follow to fit in the neighborhood. He mentioned the NCO provides the overlay to promote the unique characteristics of the neighborhood. He asked the Commissioners to support the NCO.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone else wished to speak on the NCO.

Arthur Close, 715 Kemp Road West, clarified the diameter measurements for the tree conservation.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Mr. Engle noted that he reviewed the NCO and specifically wanted to understand the tree conservation. He said he empathized with the residents and wanted to know what the impact of the tree conservation on the residents would be. He stated that working with staff he understood that the tree conservation would apply to new development and not existing ones. He mentioned that maintaining yard sometimes involve removing unsafe trees. He felt that with the tree conservation there would be an extra step of contacting the city's arborist before removing the unsafe trees, however, it would not apply to existing dwellings.

Arthur Close, commended staff and said that there were extensive discussions amongst the residents and staff in formulating the policies for the NCO. He stated the residents were reasonable with the proposed standards. He mentioned they wanted to protect the neighborhood, and at the same time cognizant of property rights.

John White, 4601 West Friendly Avenue, said he appreciated Ms. Skenes questions and concerns and noted he had the same questions. He said including himself some of the residents did not receive notification of the hearing. He noted that the County records was incorrect hence he did not receive the notice. Mr. White mentioned community outreach is crucial and noted that when he bought his property in 2021 it did not include the proposed standards. He pointed out that the residents should make more effort in communicating with the neighborhood. He said he did not oppose the NCO but required additional community outreach. He noted some of the residents who worked on the NCO are not directly impacted by the plan.

Jenny Kaiser, 201 Erskine Drive West, said the process started 18 months ago and bonded with the neighbors. She stated some residents may not have received notification of the hearing but wanted to note the methods used for community outreach. She noted there were public meetings which were publicized through email list of residents in the neighborhood; interactive updated public website; Facebook page; and text messaging service. She felt the communication was sufficient to reach as many residents as possible. She said all these methods were regularly updated with meeting dates and time, even for the hearing. She asked the Commissioners to support the NCO.

Candida Yoshikai, 5306 West Friendly Avenue, noted she once received a variance from the city for portion of building outside of the required setbacks. She said Friendly Avenue is the "prettiest" street and the NCO is designed to preserve it.

Chair O'Connor asked if there was anyone else wished to speak on the NCO. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Chair O'Connor asked for comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Skenes asked for clarification and said, should an owner of an existing dwelling wanted to remove all the trees in the front of the property, it could be done without any permission.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Mr. Clegg consented with Ms. Skenes.

Ms. Skenes restated that the 50 feet tree conservation area referred to new construction but not clear in the NCO.

Mr. Clegg said staff would revise the language to address her concerns.

Mr. Kirkman suggested that one of the recommendations could be to modify the language to address the new construction.

Ms. Skenes noted that the tree conservation and modifying the language was part of her concerns. She mentioned an email they received from a resident who compared the NCO to a neighborhood association. She felt the restricts are extreme.

Ms. Turner expressed concerns and stated they are beyond the details of the NCO. She felt the provisions of the NCO are restrictive. She stated the NCO was inconsistent with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, specific to "filling in our framework goal". She noted, in general, it would not support responsible growth which the Plan promoted. Mr. Turner said the NCO would not be an example for embracing growth but rather stifling it. She felt that "piecemeal" changes to the Plan would not cure the deficiencies if changes were inconsistent with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Vice Chair Magid pointed to an existing NCO, Westridge Road, which she thought to be similar to the West Friendly Avenue NCO. She asked staff when the Westridge Road NCO was adopted.

Mr. Clegg replied around 2008 or 2009.

Vice Chair Magid further asked staff about the community outreach for the Westridge Road NCO and what percentage of the residents supported the plan.

Mr. Clegg explained that 25% of property owners in the area were required to initiate the petition process. He stated that support of least 50% of the property owners was needed for the second stage. He said about 80% of the property owners supported the Westridge Road NCO.

Mr. Engle sought clarification and said that the NCO would typically be a matter for the Planning Board and not directly zoning matter.

Mr. Kirkman advised that the NCO would have an associated map zoning amendment, and that portion would be presented to the prior Zoning Commission to establish the boundary of the overlay district.

Mr. Engle stated he was considering what is asked of the commission and wanted to know if there were provisions in the LDO to create NCO.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Mr. Kirkman responded there were such provisions.

Mr. Engle wanted to know if the overlay district would require the commission to examine the development standards; and the history as it related to the standards to maintain the neighborhood. He felt that the changes in the setbacks and building heights were insignificant and stated that properties could be rezoned. He noted that if properties are not redeveloped the owners could make changes and not be impacted by the NCO. He pointed out that the West Friendly neighborhood was able to achieve 90% support for the overlay district. He supported the NCO and added that he felt the staff provided a plan that met the required standards. He thanked Jenny Kaiser and the staff for addressing his question and concerns about the West Friendly NCO.

Mr. Peterson asked staff whether the NCO was the best manner to preserve the unique characteristics of the West Friendly Avenue neighborhood.

Mr. Clegg stated the NCO addressed the residents' concerns in terms of the façade of the street, while allowing for rezoning.

Mr. Kirkman concurred with Mr. Clegg and said the NCO would preserve the character of the neighborhood without getting into the details of use of properties and such issues. He mentioned that the NCO is a planning tool which allowed for the base to remain as is while being developed in the context of the surrounding. He stated that for the effectiveness of the tool the staff supported the NCO.

Chair O'Connor asked for additional comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she concurred with Ms. Turner and Ms. Skenes. She stated that some of the requirements are overwhelming restrictive, and did not address potential questions. She did not see the need for the NCO and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission would address requests as they relates to the vision for growth as outlined in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She noted that the City was growing, and the commission needed to find ways for infilling empty spaces rather than promoting sprawl. She said finding the way would be a challenge, however, the 2040 Plan provide the guidance. She mentioned that residents would want to preserve neighborhood and that single family neighborhoods would not be inclined to have multi-family development. She felt that the 2040 Comprehensive Plan allowed for thoughtful growth. She stated that the proposed West Friendly NCO conflicted with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She said her vote would be with the 2040 Plan and not in favor with the West Friendly NCO as proposed.

Ms. Skenes concurred with Chair O'Connor and Ms. Turner and said the West Friendly NCO restricted the ability to "Infill" encouraged by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She noted few properties that would be affected by NCO and again stated the NCO was beyond the scope of the 2040 Plan. She mentioned that she understood the need to preserve the neighborhood, but it should be done in a manner that encourage growth.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Mr. Engle made a motion to recommend the West Friendly NCO, seconded by Mr. Peterson. The Commission voted 5-4, (Ayes: Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Downing, Peterson, Engle and Glass). Nays: (Chair Sandra O'Connor, Skenes, Turner and Gilmer Sr).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Chair O'Connor announced recess at 9:15 pm.

The meeting reconvened at 9:30 pm.

Chair O'Connor announced that Mr. Peterson left the meeting.

PL(P) 24-26: Consideration of a Type 3 Modification, a request to modify the language of zoning condition for the properties identified as 1414 West Cone Boulevard, and 2111, 2113, 2115, and 2117 Cleburne Street (south of West Cone Boulevard and west of Cleburne Street) (APPROVED)

Mr. Carter reviewed the modification request and explained the change would be a type 3 modification in condition # 4 on the conditional zoning from:

4. Buildings within thirty-five (35) to seventy (70) feet of the right-of-way of Cleburne Street shall have a maximum height of forty-five (45) feet. As viewed from Cleburne Street, these buildings shall not exceed thirty-seven (37) feet in height and may not contain more than two dwelling floors on the side closest to Cleburne Street.

to:

4. Buildings within thirty-five (35) to seventy (70) feet of the right-of-way of Cleburne Street shall have a maximum height of forty-five (45) feet. As viewed from Cleburne Street, these buildings shall not exceed thirty-seven (37) feet in height.

Mr. Carter noted that the applicant was present to further explain the modifications and to address questions the Commissioners might have.

Ms. Skenes asked for clarification and stated that the request was to eliminate the "two dwelling floors" restriction.

Mr. Carter agreed with Ms. Skenes.

Chair O'Connor asked the applicant to come to the podium.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Kaitlyn Jackson, 400 Bellemeade Street, said she represented Tuggle Duggins and was present to address questions from the Commissioners.

Chair O'Connor asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Engle made a motion to accept the modification as presented, seconded by Vice Chair Magid. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass) Nays: (None).

PL(P) 24-29: Street Closure Request to close a section of Standard Drive that bisects 215 Standard Drive by approximately 778 feet. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the street closure and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is considering a recommendation on closing the following street:

- 1) A section of Standard Drive that bisects 215 Standard Drive by approximately 778 feet. The total area of R-O-W that is requested to be closed is identified as approximately 5,494 square feet (0.13 acres). The signee makes up 100% of the road frontage along the R-O-W requested to be closed.

Mr. Carter stated that the City should make two determinations in order to close the street: (1) that closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to the public interest; and (2) that no property owner in the vicinity is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress. He advised that the Technical Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed street closure with the following conditions:

- 1) The street closure is not final until a plat is recorded satisfying the conditions below and showing the area within the closed right of way being combined in with the remainder of 215 Standard Drive.
- 2) Where required, a stormwater drainage easement shall be dedicated on the plat.
- 3) In accordance with Greensboro Department of Transportation Standards, turnarounds are required at the ends of both remaining sections of Standard Drive. If the section of Standard Drive connecting to Little Santee Road is closed, then the northwest turnaround may also be closed. If all residential structures are removed from the property and a gate is installed at the point where Standard Drive crosses the western property line of 215 Standard Drive, then the northwest turnaround is not required.

Chair O'Connor asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Magid asked for clarification on the location of the road closure pointing on the site plan.

Mr. Carter confirmed the location of the road closure.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Hearing no further comments Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing.

Mr. Engle then made a motion to recommend the street closure request as conditioned, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 8-0, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Downing, Engle, Gilmer Sr., Turner and Glass) Nays: (None).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting.

ANNUAL REPORT: Annual Report regarding the Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report: Public Hearing on the Draft City of Greensboro Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER).

Ms. Shantay Fleming, City staff Housing and Neighborhood Development, presented the annual report. She stated the report was for the period July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024 usually submitted to the Housing Urban Development (HUD) around the end of September or ninety (90) days after the end of the fiscal year.

Ms. Fleming talked about the 2023-2024 HUD funding and expenditure distribution namely: Community Development Block Grant (CDBG); Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME); Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG); and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA). She mentioned projects worked on during the period such as: Multi-family constructions; Homebuyers education; Homebuyer assistance; Redevelopment projects; Lead-Safe/Rehabilitation; Park renovations; and Tenant-based rental assistance, rapid-rehousing, and homeless overnight shelter.

Chair O'Connor thanked Ms. Fleming for the report and asked for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak on the annual report. Having no objection Chair O'Connor closed the public hearing.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman reported that there were no items from the department.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Chair O'Connor opened nominations for the Chair and Vice Chair for the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Chair O'Connor said she enjoyed being Vice Chair and Chair four of the five years she sat on commission. She stated she was looking forward to having a new Chair. She expressed appreciation for the persons she worked with over the years, however, felt that the current commission was the strongest and the best group she worked with. She mentioned that the commissioner demonstrated great insight and purpose to their task.

Ms. Catherine Magid was elected Chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission and Ms. Mary

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Skenes elected the Vice Chair.

Ms. Cathrine Magid thanked the Commissioner and noted she appreciated the vote of confidence. She echoed Ms. Sandra O'Connor and stated the Commission continued to do great work, provides good mentorship, terrific personalities, and providing guidance. She expressed she was thrilled to be part of the Commission. Ms. Magid specifically thanked Ms. O'Connor for her three years of wonderful leadership of the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair O'Connor adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50p.m.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, October 21, 2024, beginning at 5:30 p.m. Members present were Vice Chair Mary Skenes, Sandra O'Connor, Warché Downing, Stu Nichols, Paul Gilmer Sr., B. Keith Peterson, and Erica Glass. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Luke Carter, Hart Crane, Andrew Nelson and Carla Harrison (Planning), Brent Ducharme (City Attorney's Office) and Nolan Tipton (GDOT).

Vice Chair Skenes welcomed everyone to the meeting and extended a special welcome to the new Commissioner, Stu Nichols. She noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. Vice Chair Skenes advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. She stated that the Commission reviews all original zoning and rezoning requests for the City of Greensboro. She briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Vice Chair Skenes noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired.

Brent Ducharme, Assistant City Attorney, then advised that, when considering rezoning applications, the Planning and Zoning Commission makes determinations based on the land uses allowed under the proposed zoning district put forth in the rezoning application and, where applicable, any proposed conditions included with the application. Land use concerns can be wide reaching and, by way of example, impacts on public infrastructure such as traffic concerns may be relevant when new land uses would be allowed by a rezoning. However, concerns not related to land use and the conditions of a rezoning application, including concerns about school impacts and crime rates, are not germane to the determinations made by this body. Such issues may be referred to the Planning Department or the Technical Review Committee (TRC) as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Vice Chair Skenes acknowledged the absences of Chair Catherine Magid and Commissioner Betty Turner.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Vice Chair Skenes requested approval of the September 16, 2024 meeting minutes. Ms. O'Connor made a motion to approve the September meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Peterson. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Vice Chair Skenes, Sandra O'Connor, Downing, Gilmer Sr., Nichols, Peterson and Glass). Nays: (None).

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Vice Chair Skenes inquired if there were any items withdrawn or to be continued. Mr. Kirkman advised there were no withdrawals or continuances. He also stated there were no items eligible for the expedited agenda.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Z24-10-001: A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-18 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 18) for the property identified as 4216 United Street, generally described as northeast of United Street and southeast of Rosebriar Court (1.1 acres). (DENIED)

Mr. Nelson reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following condition:

- 1) Permitted uses shall be limited to a maximum of 18 dwelling units.

Mr. Nelson stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban Central on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed CD-RM-18 zoning district, as conditioned, would allow for multi-family dwellings and uses that are compatible with the surrounding area. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice Chair Skenes asked the applicant to come forward to the podium and noted that ten minutes was allocated for speaking.

Richard Johnson, 508 Woodland Drive, stated he has been a real estate broker for a while and recently a modular and manufactured home and tiny homes dealer. Mr. Johnson said the immediate neighborhood consisted of the boundary of United Street, West Market Street and South Holden Road. He stated the neighborhood is mixed use and on the eastern and northern boundaries there were multi-residential RM-12 with Rosebriar Court on the western boundary comprised of single-family residential. He felt that addressing the concerns of the owners for the five (5) dwellings abutting the subject property should be most considered. Mr. Johnson said that the proposed RM-18 would be a good fit for the neighborhood, having three buildings instead of five houses.

He stated he met with some of the residents on Rosebriar Court, as well as spoke to them by phone. He said that one person owned two (2) of the dwellings and one was rental investment, and the other owner occupied. He noted that he spoke with another owner by phone and the main concern was the absence of a site plan for the rezoning request. Mr. Johnson stated he was not the developer of the site and as such there was no need for the site plan. He said the site plan would be subjected to change. He mentioned he would hold the purchaser to a contingency agreement that the natural buffer along the western boundary adjacent to the single-family

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

residence would not be disturbed. He said that additional buffer could also be implemented which could be a storm water measure as well as for aesthetics. He stated that this requirement would be part of the landscape plan at the site plan review stage. He felt that the request was consistent with the neighborhood.

Ms. O'Connor asked the applicant about the neighborhood outreach specifically for residents within the city's 750 feet notification buffer. She noted the applicant made efforts to speak with the five residents on Rosebriar Court. However, she wanted to know what other methods were used to reach the neighbors.

Mr. Johnson stated that it was appropriate to focus on talking with the residents on Rosebriar Court. He felt it was not necessary to meet with the owners or residents of the multi-family residential properties since they are the same zone as being requested. He stated that other neighbors located two or three streets away from the subject property would not know that development existed on the subject property.

Ms. O'Connor clarified that the applicant did not mail letters or hold community meetings for the request.

Mr. Johnson said there was no neighborhood meeting, he only did door to door meetings.

Vice Chair Skenes asked for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Vice Chair Skenes asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request to come to the podium.

Andrew Shoffner, 4204 Princeton Avenue, looked at the mailed city notice and asked staff whether he could talk about stormwater infrastructure.

Mr. Kirkman advised that the stormwater issues would be addressed during the technical review process.

Mr. Shoffner, said there was poor communication from the applicant with the Highland Park community. He stated that the zone for the surrounding properties are R-5 and RM-12 with an average lot size of approximately 7500 sq ft, which he noted was a reasonable approach for the area. He said the request was not reasonable, leap frogging from a low single-family to multi-family about three times the current density. He spoke about a past rezoning request adjacent to the subject property. He said there is no storm water infrastructure in the area, he noted that is only a ditch in the rear of the property leading to Buffalo Creek. Mr. Shoffner noted that the gradient of the subject property would adversely affect sewer going to the property. He stated that the applicant did not talk about easements or any plans for access to sewer.

He pointed out that there were no pedestrian or bicycle facilities even though United Street is a collector street. He mentioned that the traffic safety in Highland Park has been neglected by the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

city and stated that the additional eighteen (18) units would increase the traffic dangerous conditions. Mr. Shoffner said that there are two entry points for the Highland Park community and the request would add significant strain on one of the entry points. He noted there was no traffic count data for the request and recalled past request on adjacent property where City Council had concerns about the traffic safety in the area. Mr. Shoffner said that part of his daily job is assessing risk, plans and process for mitigating risk, and delivering project on time and on budget. He then stated that the request appeared to be a zoning change in search of someone to buy. He stated that a low density request would be acceptable for the neighborhood. He said location of the subject property being close to Rosebriar Court was a concern. He mentioned a rezoned car dealership in the area having restriction to only access via United Street and West Market and not via Ashland or South Holden Road.

Thomas Marvin, 519 Rosebriar Court, thanked the Commissioner for allowing him to speak and noted that he was one of the five property owners on Rosebriar Court. He stated that the applicant spoke about implementing landscape barriers and wanted to know what kind of barriers would be used. He said it was important to know for himself and the neighbors in view of the request. He concurred with Mr. Johnson that there are no sidewalks along United Street. He said there is heavy foot and vehicular traffic in the area coming from the neighboring apartments on the other end of United Street, and the Sheetz gas station located at the intersection of United Street and West Market Street. He said there is a major concern with children waiting on school buses in the vicinity and at times in the dark given the time change. Mr. Marvin pointed out that there is significant traffic congestion, in the morning and evening peak hours, at the stoplight at Ashland and South Holden Road. He stated that for the applicant to say that the request would only affect the dwellings on Rosebriar Court was false statement. He felt the entire neighborhood would be affected by the request. He calculated that the proposed RM-18 would generate roughly 36 cars versus five (5) houses having ten cars. He noted five (5) houses would be less disruptive for the neighborhood if the subject property remain in the current R-5 zone. Mr. Marvin noted that the property is narrow, and access would be one way in and out of the site.

Douglas Wegner, 7602 Wallingford Road, said he is the owner of 602 and 608 South Holden Road. He concurred with the previous speakers. He noted that his multi-family development is located on 0.67 acres and the request would be on 1.10 acres. He calculated that his development had every unit on about 5000 sq ft of land and if it would be 18 units it would be about half the land size. He said the request would be high density for the area. Mr. Wegner pointed out the subject property slopes to the rear and there would be significant storm water runoff affect his property and the properties on Rosebriar Court. He felt the subject property would not be able to accommodate the proposed apartment and the associated buffer zones, dumpster pad and paved areas. He inquired from staff whether the developer of the request would be able to seek a variance specific to setbacks and green areas, should the zoning request be granted and building permit obtained.

Mr. Kirkman advised that the developer could seek a variance which would be a separate hearing at the Board of Adjustment.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

Vice Chair Skenes asked if the applicant wished to speak in rebuttal to the concerns raised by the speakers in opposition.

Richard Johnson, said that staff did not require a traffic study given the size of the property. He said it would be unlikely that there would be two (2) cars per units. He agreed that United Street is a cut-through road and there is significant traffic congestion at the Ashland and South Holden Road intersection. He felt that the request would not significantly contribute to the existing traffic problems in the area. He said that for development to occur on the subject property a site plan would be required. He noted that the site plan would address the setbacks, natural buffers, and other factors affecting the subject property and neighboring properties. He stated that at the point of site plan review the residents should express concerns and the issues would be addressed. Mr. Johnson said it is normal for the City to ensure the developer implement the required sidewalks.

Mr. Peterson asked the applicant about the concerns raised by the property owners of the five (5) residential single-family properties adjacent to the subject property.

Mr. Johnson said they expressed concerns about traffic and the appearance of the proposed development. He explained that the topography of the area would lessen the impact of the appearance as the proposed development would be on lower ground.

Vice Chair Skenes asked for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Andrew Shoffner, spoke on the development of the adjacent property. He said there were promises of sidewalks and landscaping. He stated that since the approvals issued for the adjacent site were only grading and paving work, renovation under a building permit to replace a door and a commode, there are no guarantees in any plans. He spoke about a traffic safety study that was to be conducted by the city due to several accidents at the Ashland Street and South Holden Road intersection. He said that such a study should be part of the consideration of this request. He stated that rezoning from R-5 to RM-18 was incredibly dense for the area. He noted that the single-family dwellings facing the subject property along United Street would be significantly impacted by the headlight glare of vehicles leaving the property.

Andrea Neese Pegram, 1916 Milan Road, said she owned six (6) rental properties in Highland Park. She stated three of her properties are facing the subject property and the request would directly affect the renters. She calculated a total of eight (8) vehicles owned and used by the persons living at these three properties. She mentioned United Street is a cut-through street used throughout the day. She said if more people are added to United Street it would be a "quagmire". She made it clear she did not support the request.

Thomas Marvin, asked the Commissioners if the request could be continued to another meeting for the applicant to provide more information.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

Mr. Kirkman advised the decision is with the Commission with the applicant's input.

Vice Chair Skenes inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Skenes noted that a traffic study would not be required for the request because of the proposed number of units on the subject property. She stated the Commission could not speak on the traffic impact study the city should undertake. She then asked staff to speak on work being done on a two year old building permit.

Mr. Tipton explained that work could be conducted as per the building permit. He said that prior to occupying the building a certificate of occupancy should be obtained. He noted that if work done was outside of the approved plans then enforcement actions could be taken.

Vice Chair Skenes confirmed that the work being done was work in progress.

Vice Chair Skenes asked for comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Glass expressed concerns regarding the proposed density for the request. She felt that density was a significant issue given that the property is 1.1 acres, and the transition from R-5 to CD-RM-18 in relation to the surrounding properties.

Mr. Peterson asked the applicant if it would be possible to do more community outreach specifically meeting with the residents within the 750 feet notification buffer.

Mr. Johnson said he could but felt there would be no further concerns different from what was discussed during the public hearing and the summary of neighborhood communications.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr stated the request was an "Infill" and supported the request. He said that the property at the corner of South Holden and United Street came before the commission for over twenty years. Mr. Gilmer, Sr. felt that a continuance would not be beneficial if the density remained, it would only be if the request was for a lower density.

Ms. O'Connor said she was inclined to support the project and agreed with Mr. Gilmer, Sr that "infill" is needed. However, she expressed discouragement due to the poor community outreach taken by the applicant. She said the residents did not have the opportunity to attend a community meeting and to discuss their concerns. She said the outreach was incomplete and did not support the request.

Mr. Downing as well stated he planned on supporting the request, however the lack of community outreach raised concerns. He felt that the community outreach is a democratic right and he did not support the request.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

Mr. Peterson then stated regarding item Z-24-10-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend denial of the rezoning request for the property at 4216 United Street from R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to CD-RM-18 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 18) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map.; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-18 zoning district, even as conditioned, does not limit negative impacts on the adjacent properties, nor does it permit uses that fit the context of surrounding area.; (3.) The request is not reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will be a detriment to the neighbors and surrounding community, and denial is in the public interest. Ms. Glass seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 6-1 (Ayes: Vice Chair Mary Skenes, O’Connor, Downing, Nichols, Peterson and Glass). (Nays: Gilmer, Sr.)

Vice Chair Skenes advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-24-10-002: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family-3) to CD-RM-5 (Residential Multi-family – 5) for the properties identified as 2814 and 2822 Fleming Road, generally described as northeast of Fleming Road and north of Brass Eagle Loop (20.95 acres). (APPROVED)

Mr. Nelson reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties. He advised that the applicant had proposed the following conditions:

- 1) The maximum number of dwelling units shall be limited to 80.
- 2) All homes shall have a covered front porch or covered front entrance.
- 3) Each home shall have a garage.

Mr. Nelson stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan’s Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro’s citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices. The proposed CD-RM-5 zoning district, as conditioned, would allow for multi-family dwellings and uses that are compatible with the development in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Amanda Hodierne, 804 Green Valley Road, said she represented the Claytons, Ms. Nellie Cox, and the contract purchaser and developer Blue Ridge Companies and Cone Custom Builders.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

She gave a summary of the request and stated the subject properties combined are just under 21 acres and asking to rezone from R-3 to CD-RM-5. Ms. Hodiernie mentioned the total number of units were limited to 80 units thus having proposed a slightly increased density of 3.8 units per acre. She talked about the type of homes that would be included in the proposed development. She stated that the request was consistent with the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She said the request was in line with the future designation of residential uses. Ms. Hodiernie stated that the proposal met the Transportation and Land Use Element of the Sustainable Action Plan. She said the overall aim of the request was to sustain a quality of life by responsibly increasing density and the mixing of land uses such as to limit sprawl and trip generations.

Ms. Hodiernie talked about the existing zoning patterns and land uses for subject properties and the surrounding properties. She pointed out that there are currently two (2) RM-5 town home development in proximity to the request. She stated that the request was in keeping with the existing land use pattern having other similar land uses in the area. She displayed a schematic layout of the site to ensure that the proposal is feasible. She said the concept plan was approved by the TRC (Technical Review Committee) which aided the developer in making the decision for development. She noted the request, being limited to 80 units, did not meet the requirement for a Traffic Impact Analysis. However, she noted that for the driveway approval for accessing Flemming Road would be determined by GDOT (Greensboro Department of Transportation). Ms. Hodiernie further explained that the stream buffer preservation, along the northeast of the subject properties, also limited the density to RM-5. She noted that the surrounding properties east of the request would be protected from the proposed development since the area would remain in its natural state. She also displayed illustrative examples of the type of homes that would be in the proposed development. She talked about the experience of the developers, and that they were familiar with the type of buildings and site layout which would complement the neighborhood.

Ms. Hodiernie talked about the neighborhood outreach, mailing letters to seventy (70) neighboring property owners. They subsequently held a community meeting with roughly 12 persons in attendance. She felt the meeting was cordial as they discussed the proposal in terms of traffic, compatibility and property values.

Vice Chair Skenes asked for any questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Vice Chair Skenes asked for the persons wishing to speak in opposition to the request to come to the podium.

Michael Corcoran, 4411 Crystal Lake Drive, opposed the request. He mentioned he lived on the property directly facing the request. He noted that he and other neighbors did not receive any mail as mentioned by the applicant. He said the immediate neighbors became aware of the request when they saw the notice posted by the City on the subject properties. He stated his main concern referencing another rezoning approval for a neighboring property granted in 2021. He said that project cleared land leaving a scar, left equipment and supplies with minimal construction to date. He noted his concern was granting approval for another request with no follow through development resulting to another eyesore. He pointed out the subtly change in

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

density from 72 units to 80 units. He said that even though a traffic report is not required it was recommended that the developer widen Flemming road and implement sidewalks. He noted the street works would change the character of the neighborhood. He wanted to know how the sidewalk would fit into the street. He felt the proposed building appearance and layout would not be compatible with the area. He noted the other multi-family developments in the area are considerably setback from the street in contrast to the request having buildings close to the street.

Kimberly McCaskill, 2504 Pleasant Ridge Road, said even though she access her property from the Pleasant Ridge Road most of her property is on Fleming Road. She said her property is in proximity to the request. She noted she received the notice from the City however she did not receive the communication, regarding the meeting, from the applicant. She too said more residents in the community was unaware of the request. She agreed with Mr. Corcoran that the proposal is not in keeping with the neighborhood. She calculated the total land in the neighborhood is 2634.93 acres zoned R-3, while 185.92 acres are zoned otherwise. She felt the presentation was deceiving to state that the request fits into the neighborhood. She said that the proposed buildings are far dissimilar even to the existing multi-family developments. Ms. McCaskill pointed out that the subject properties have beautiful vegetations comprised of matured oak trees. She also expressed concerns about the stormwater runoff from the request, and the impacts on the surrounding creek leading into Lake Higgins. She pointed out the 10% tree conservation and could not understand the relation to clearing the site. She said she was against the request.

D.J. Williams, 2824 Fleming Road, said his property is adjacent to the request. He stated that the proposed 80 townhomes would not be in keeping with the neighborhood. He stated that the current zoning district allowed for 3 units per acres therefore there was no need to ask for 3.8 units per acre. He pointed out that only the front half of the subject properties is developable because of the watershed. He noted that with the developable area the density would be much higher than 3.8 units per acre. He said there are traffic issues mainly speeding with vehicles driving at 65 and 70 miles per hour in a 45 miles per hour zone. He said adding a driveway, especially in a curve, with approximately 200 vehicles generated from the proposal would worsen the traffic concerns. He felt the best use would be the current zone, having three (3) houses per acre allowing for yard space.

Vice Chair Skenes asked if anyone else wished to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak in rebuttal to the concerns raised by the neighbors.

Amanda Hodierne apologized to the residents for not receiving the invitation to the meeting. She noted that they made significant efforts to ensure letters were mailed to all residents on the city's mailing list. She pointed out that compatibility does not mean the same, she stated that if that was the case the entire City would look the same. She stated that there would not be any provisions to mix uses or to transition into housing options. She mentioned that such an option would be in contradiction to the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She noted the Plan calls for

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

increasing density in an appropriate scale, mixing of uses and creating more housing options. She said the request adheres to the Plan and making housing provisions where residents do not need to move out of the area for other housing option. She said the request did not intend to provide the same type of development as those existing in the neighborhood. She envisioned a residential use that would be scaled appropriately and providing another housing option.

Ms. Hoderne pointed out that the RM-5 is the lowest multi-family zoning district and the first district that allows townhomes. She explained while the request called for a maximum of eighty (80) units, however if after detailed plans done and TRC review if fewer units are allowed then they would need to adhere accordingly. She noted that the proposed building design might differ from the current multi-family developments because it is geared towards the market and offering a more modern design. She noted that a stormwater runoff would need to meet best management practices. She noted that buffers would be preserved and buffers to be maintained by a HOA entity. She stated the 10% preservation area designated for tree safe. She said overall the site would not be clear cut.

Vice Chair Skenes asked if anyone wished to speak in rebuttal to the applicant's response.

Michael Corcoran stated that the proposed housing type was not what buyers are looking for in the neighborhood. He pointed out that "just because it is allowed, does not mean it is wise."

D.J. Williams stated that the applicant made efforts to reach out to the neighbors. He noted his partner received the letters at different times for the properties they owned. He said they asked for plans showing the type of units and there were no plans. He said based on the site plan displayed it showed five (5) attached units which would be five (5) units per acre as opposed to 3.8 units per acre. He stated that due to the watershed in the rear of the subject properties the development would be concentrated closer to the street. He said the existing RM-5 developments in the area are setback away from the street with high banks making them not visible. He agreed that there is affordable housing needs, however, such type of housing would not be suitable for the neighborhood. He urged the Commissioner to vote against the request.

Vice Chair Skenes inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Chair O'Connor asked for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr. said he recently attended a housing conference, and they talked about different housing types. He mentioned the City is changing and there would be times where duplex and multi-family housing are developed in single-family residential zoning districts. He stated there is a housing crisis, homelessness, affordability, shortage and he is inclined to support housing projects. He said he supported the request and noted that even in high end areas different types of housing should be provided, and throughout Greensboro.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

Mr. Downing noted there were similar zone in the area. He was satisfied with the community outreach and pointed out that the property owners being involved in the process was a good venture. The said that the schematic layout was helpful and felt that the request was good initiative for creating housing option. He supported the request.

Mr. Nichols said one key point was that compatibility does not mean the same and there needed to be diverse housing options. He pointed out that while there were concerns about clear cutting the property, the watershed areas needed to be preserved. He summarized the request to having housing compressed to one location and at the same time allowing for the preservation of the wooded area. He supported the request.

Ms. O'Connor agreed with the comments made by the commissioners and stated that the request is a responsible approach. She pointed out that she appreciated that the request is the minimum multi-family zoning district. She said the request addressed the needs of the GSO 2040 Plan.

Ms. O'Connor then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-10-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 2814 and 2822 Fleming Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family-3) to CD-RM-5 (Residential Multi-family – 5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed CD-RM-5 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses that fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Mr. Nichols seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Vice Chair Mary Skenes, O'Connor, Gilmer Sr., Downing, Peterson, Nichols and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice Chair Skenes advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 19, 2024 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

PL(P) 24-34: Street Closure Request to close a portion of McCuiston Road that fronts 3707 McCuiston Road containing approximately 0.039 acres or 1,693 square feet. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the street closure and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is considering a recommendation on a resolution closing the following street:

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

- 1) A portion of McCuiston Road right of way that runs north of 3707 McCuiston Road approximately 300.81 feet.

He noted that the total area of R-O-W that is requested to be closed is identified as approximately 1,693 square feet (0.039 acres). He noted that the signees made up 100% of the road frontage along the R-O-W requested to be closed.

Mr. Carter stated that the City should make two determinations in order to close the street: (1) that closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to the public interest; and (2) that no property owner in the vicinity is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress. He advised that the Technical Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed street closure.

Vice Chair Skenes asked for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no comments, Vice Chair Skenes closed the public hearing.

Mr. Peterson made a motion to recommend approval of the street closure request, seconded by Mr. Gilmer, Sr. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Vice Chair Mary Skenes, O'Connor, Gilmer Sr., Downing, Peterson, Nichols and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice Chair Skenes advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 19, 2024 City Council Meeting.

PL(P) 24-35: Street Closure Request to close a portion of Standard Drive that bisects 209 Little Santee Road for approximately 670 feet in length from its intersection with Little Santee Road to 215 Standard Drive. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the street closure and stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission is considering a recommendation on a resolution closing the following street:

- 1) A portion of Standard Drive that bisects 209 Little Santee Road for approximately 670 feet in length from its intersection with Little Santee Road to 215 Standard Drive.

He noted that the total area of R-O-W that is requested to be closed is identified as approximately 0.86 acres. He noted that the signee made up 100% of the road frontage along the R-O-W requested to be closed.

Mr. Carter stated that the City should make two determinations in order to close the street: (1) that closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to the public interest; and (2) that no property owner in the vicinity is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress. He advised that the Technical Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed street closure with the following condition:

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

- 1) Where required, a public drainage easement must be dedicated over any existing stormwater pipe located on the property.

Vice Chair Skenes asked for questions from the Commissioners. Hearing no comments, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Downing made a motion to recommend approval of the street closure request as conditioned, seconded by Ms. O'Connor. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Vice Chair Mary Skenes, O'Connor, Gilmer Sr., Downing, Peterson, Nichols and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice Chair Skenes advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 19, 2024 City Council Meeting.

PL(P) 24-31: Corridor Plan: Consideration of the Randleman Road Corridor Plan, Phase 2. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Crane introduced himself as a Senior Planning, Long Range and Strategic Planning Division. He highlighted the action to be taken by the commission regarding the Randleman Road Corridor Plan, Phase 2 as follows: 1) Hold a public hearing; and 2) Make a recommendation including changes to the City Council.

He gave an overview of the need for the Plan stating it was following up to Phase 1; reacting to neighborhood concerns; leveraging ongoing projections along the Randleman Road Corridor; the fact that Randleman Road is a key entryway into the City, and to upgrade and modernize the corridor.

Mr. Crane noted that the study area covers approximately 2.3 miles along Randleman Road extending from the Interstate Highway 40 to 85. He said that the focus is primarily along the Randleman Road but anticipates there would be spill off effect that would benefit the surrounding neighborhoods. He mentioned the Road is considered a commercial corridor and is a state road maintained by NCDOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation). He stated that for street improvements coordination with the state is necessary.

He explained that the Randleman Road Plan is the implementation step of broader plans and policies governing the City as outlined in the GSO 2040 Plan and as well as the City Council priorities. He noted the plan's visions as "Randleman Road is a welcoming gateway to the City and a central connection for a diverse network of surrounding neighborhoods. It is a healthy and vibrant part of the local community that attracts visitors from across the region to enjoy its strong offerings and unique flavor." In order to achieve its vision, he said working with the neighborhoods they came up with four (4) goals: Modernization; Movement; Safety; and Well-Being. Mr. Crane stated that the Plan would be a tool and resource base. He said it would be used by business owners and the neighborhoods when advocating for the area. The plan would also be a baseline for future study and projects for City staff as well as used by decision-makers when considering

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

land use changes and other issues that could affect the quality of life and development in the area. Mr. Crane spoke about the implementation of the Plan breaking it into three broad areas of immediate (jump starts); long-term projects and land-use guidance.

Mr. Crane stated that the community engagement was robust. He said there were three community engagement meetings starting in March with approximately 67 attendees; in July with approximately 130 attendees; and in September with 44 attendees. He noted the meetings were well attended and vibrant community interaction.

Vice Chair Skenes asked for any questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Vice Chair Skenes asked for the speakers wishing to speak in favor of the plan to come to the podium.

Christine Lloyd Marshall, 319 Erwin Street, said she was a member of the Oak Grove community watch as well as Randleman Road community association. She mentioned she attended the tree community meetings, and the community spoke with staff and expressed their opinions. She said they are very much in favor of passing the Plan. She stated it was long overdue to do something positive about Randleman Road. She expressed she loved the neighborhood; she loved shopping on the corridor and that she raised her family in the neighborhood. Ms. Marshall said she felt safe on Randleman Road and asked the Commission to pass the plan.

Sally Stevens, 4412 Serenity Trail, Franklinville, said she is the operator and owner of Triad Meat Company, which is family owned and operated, located on Randleman Road. She stated the business has been in operation for thirty (30) years, and they have seen a lot of changes over the years. She said she witnessed businesses moving out of the area leaving vacant buildings behind. She said she would like for the area to be revitalize bring businesses back to the area. Ms. Stevens also said she felt safe in the neighborhood, however there were issues on Randleman Road. She stated her company employed ten (10) full-time and several part-time staff from the area. She wanted to know what plans the city leaders had in place for business to thrive on Randleman Road for the next thirty (30) years. She said even though she does not live in the area, the residents in the area are her neighbors and she loved and care about them.

Ms. Stevens pointed out some immediate needs for the area such as streetlights. She noted the area is not well lit and most of the light in the area are from the business premises. She stated she told staff this was an immediate and urgent need for the area. She felt this simple first step would be a great benefit and encourage the neighborhood in believing in the plan. She felt that crime and traffic control are interrelated. She said vehicles drove at high speed on Randleman Road which is a 35 mile per hour zone. She said controlling the traffic would have enforcement in the area which would also help with the crime in the area. She stated she experience small crimes like nighttime break-ins. She spoke of a time when there was an accident due to speeding, leaving a wreck in her parking lot. She said they had to close business that day which led to staff not getting paid for the workday hours missed. She said the very next week another such accident only that they were able to work that day. She said even with these two occurrences there were

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

no police traffic patrol in the area to monitor traffic speed in the area. She stated that its little things like these which would let the community feel important and invested in.

Ms. Stevens said after thirty years they are determined to stay, however, looking for support from the city. She mentioned there was a lot of vacant buildings in the area, and neighborhood needs such as dine in restaurants. She noted the importance of Randleman Road stating it leads from Asheboro to north of Greensboro. She felt it was important to keep smooth traffic flow and make the area safe thus attracting people to the area. She noted crime and felt that property owners should be responsible for the upkeep of their property even if vacant. She said in the meantime there should be a plan in place for infill of these vacant properties. She mentioned that she does not want to see Randleman Road name change and nothing else change pointing to another road name change but the area remains same and not revitalized. She stated that the neighborhood including businesses in the area are willing to work together to obtain the best change they want.

Kerstin Wynn, 616 Forest Brook Drive, said she and her husband migrated to Greensboro in 1992. She said she and her husband are part of the Randleman Road community association. She said that the planning staff did a fantastic job in putting together the plan and engaging the community. She stated that Randleman Road has been neglected for years and would take greater effort to bring it back on track. She said that the corridor which feeds into downtown deserved a better image and the reputation of high crime, low income and other such associations. She felt that police presence in the area would initiate the vibrancy of the area in attracting reputable businesses. She mentioned empty building should be updated to code standards and zoned for prosperous outcome. She said Randleman Road needed a facelift and deserved to be a reputable area. She said it was exciting to see the Planning Board involved in the process and making this happened without band aids and fast fixes. She said the area is culturally diverse with multi-income. She envisioned the neighborhood being happy, having fresh markets and decent food sources. She stated that south and southeast Greensboro are food desert, and efforts should be made to change this. She asked the Commission to support the plan and stated it is very much needed.

James Basnight, 22 Loney Circle, said he was the executive director of the Randleman Road community association. He said that the association comprised of four (4) community watch group for neighborhoods leading off Randleman Road. He said he wanted the Commission to know that they in support of the plan. He said they were present to know what they could do to assist with materializing the Randleman Road Plan. He shared with the Commission their proposed partnership plan. He thanked the Commission for work they do with Phase 1 and said he is looking forward to working together for Phase 2.

Council Woman Sharon Hightower stated she represented Randleman Road. She said they have been working very diligently with Randleman Road. She reaffirmed that Randleman Road is one of the major corridors leading into Greensboro. She said Randleman Road has been neglected, overlooked and underserved. She said now is the time for Randleman Road to be revitalized. She said that the community has been asking for this attention for some time. She

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

emphasized that the plan was formulated with the residents in mind and what they asked for. She said the plan should be implemented and it is the City's goal to fund the plan. She said the implementation of the plan would improve the quality of life for the residents in the area. She said the residents should be able to live, work and play in the area. She said if they allowed Randleman Road to continue the path it is on, it would depict they do not care. She said approving the plan would place them on the path in achieving growth and development and uplifting the residents in the area.

Vice Chair Skenes inquired if there was anyone else wished to speak on the corridor plan. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing. Vice Chair Skenes then asked for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Peterson then made a motion to recommend approval of the Randleman Road Corridor Plan Phase 2, seconded by Mr. Downing. The Commission voted 7-0, (Ayes: Vice Chair Mary Skenes, O'Connor, Gilmer Sr., Downing, Peterson, Nichols and Glass). Nays: (None).

Vice Chair Skenes advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 19, 2024 City Council Meeting.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman announced that staff emailed Commissioners regarding the meeting date for January 2025. He explained the importance of having the date as it would impact the acceptance of applications for January.

Vice Chair Skenes asked the Commissioners if they received the email with the link to choose the date.

Mr. Carter clarified the email and link sent for them to choose the date.

Ms. O'Connor advised staff to send another email with clear subject heading.

Mr. Gilmer, Sr asked what the previous year procedure was on deciding the date for the meeting.

Mr. Kirkman stated that last year the meeting was held the second Monday of the month and the year before it was the third Wednesday of the month.

Vice Chair Skenes asked Commissioners if the second Monday of the month of January 2025 good time for the meeting, they agreed on the date.

Vice Chair Skenes announced that the January 2025 meeting would be held on the second Monday of the month.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 21, 2024

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Vice Chair Skenes asked staff for the 2025 Planning and Zoning meeting schedule and contact list for the Commissioners.

Mr. Kirkman said staff would be sending the information requested.

ADJOURNMENT:

Vice Chair Skenes adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40p.m.