

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
October 21, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, October 21, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Steve Allen, Vice Chair, Day Atkins, Richard Bryson, Richard Mossman, Celia Parker, John Martin and Homer Wade. City staff present included Mike Kirkman, Sheila Carmon, Shayna Thiel, Jeff Sovich, Dana Clukey and Sheila Stains-Ramp. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

Vice Chair Allen welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board. He also welcomed the Board's newest member, Homer Wade.

1. MEETING MINUTES:

Mr. Bryson moved approval of the September 16, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Bryson, Mossman, Martin, Atkins, Parker and Wade. Nays: None.)

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- a) Street Name Change: Recommendation on a Street Name Change from Spring Oak Drive to Carter Woods Drive. **(APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)**

Sheila Carmon, GIS Analyst, summarized the proposed street name change as initially presented to the Planning Board in September, noting the Board was being asked to make a recommendation on the change from Spring Oak Drive to Carter Woods Drive. Ms. Carmon stated that Spring Oak Court and Spring Oak Drive are adjacent to each other and have the same number range, which has caused confusion for Emergency Management to dispatch and deliver services. She noted that of the two Spring Oak Drive is the more recently recorded street and has fewer homes on it, which factored into the recommendation that Spring Oak Drive be the name changed. She noted that letters had been sent to property owners and residents asking for re-naming suggestions and no responses were received.

Ms. Carmon also noted that there were two people at last month's meeting providing a petition indicating opposition to the change from residents on the street. In response, the Board had requested that a representative of Emergency Services attend the October meeting to address the concerns raised. Ms. Carmon stated Glen Lanham, Metro 911 Support Services Manager, was in attendance to comment and answer questions the Board might have.

She summarized that the City considered the change in the interest of public safety by eliminating a source of confusion for Emergency Services, and stated that the change is in accordance with the City's Addressing and Street Naming Manual. She stated the Technical Review Committee (TRC) had also recommended the street name change. If approved, the City will notify the utility companies and services agencies as well as the post office. Residents would still have to make their own changes.

Glen Lanham, Metro 9-1-1 Support Services Manager, stated that a review of their call tracking system indicated 5 or 6 instances where addresses had been confused in responding to calls. He noted that these may or may not be life-threatening situations. Their staff supports the street name change for safety reasons.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter. No one from the public was in attendance for the item.

After a short discussion and questions by the Board members, Mr. Martin moved that this street name change be recommended to City Council, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Atkins, Bryson, Parker, Martin, Mossman and Wade. Nays: None.)

- b) LDO Text Amendment: Recommendation on a Land Development Ordinance Text Amendment regarding Section 30-8-10.1 (H) Multi-Family Dwellings and 30-11-4.10 Parking Reduction to expand the permitted multifamily options in the CC-M, C-H and BP districts. **(APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)**

Mike Kirkman presented a brief overview of the reason for the requested amendment and the basics of the proposed changes to the LDO. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan actively supports mixed development (residential and non-residential uses) from perspectives of housing choice, quality infill development, best use of public infrastructure and support to economic development. He further noted that while the Comprehensive Plan encourages mixed development throughout the City, it particularly identifies key areas such as reinvestment corridors/areas and activity centers and areas with Mixed Use future land use classifications as spaces best suited for such development. Mr. Kirkman then reviewed the current provisions in the Land Development Ordinance that allow multifamily dwellings, from residential multifamily zoning districts to limited options for residential development in commercial zoning districts. These options may either be done by right or following a rezoning conversation.

RM- zoning districts allow multifamily development with density ranges of 5 to 40 units per acre. The PUD zoning district basically allows for and encourages a mixture of uses in a planned setting and provides a lot of flexibility in terms of development standards in exchange for having unified development. There is no maximum residential density listed in a PUD district and there are various PUD districts throughout the City. There are also mixed use (MU-) zoning districts, included those recently applied to the Gate City Boulevard reinvestment corridor. In the mixed use districts there is no maximum residential density, but at least 30% of the gross square footage must be residential and at least 30% must be non-residential. A rezoning may be needed to get to one of these districts. Additionally the Commercial Medium (C-M), Commercial High (C-H) and Business Park (BP) zoning districts allow multifamily development, but caps the amount of residential to a maximum of 33% of the overall square footage of the development. Mr. Kirkman further added that there are two variations to this standard. One is no cap for residential development if it is part of a vertical mixed use building where there is ground-floor commercial or office and residential uses are limited to upper levels. The other is tied solely to the C-M district where a 100% residential project could be developed if the site is less than 1 acre in size and there are commercial services in immediate proximity (no more than 1/8 mile) and directly accessible to the residential development.

Mr. Kirkman then reviewed the framework for the proposed text amendment, noting the specific areas of the City that were deemed most appropriate for the desired mixed development. He also noted that if a site does not meet the proposed site requirements for staff only review there was still an option to request a Special Use Permit. This allowed for a public discussion through a quasijudicial hearing focused around information presented solely during the public hearing, with any appeals to superior court. Mr. Kirkman concluded with a summary of information that was updated after the September Planning Board discussion on this item. This included clarification on when to apply the Integrated Multiple Use Development (IMUD) provisions, clarification on the requirements for open space for new multifamily (use the more urban PUD standards versus more suburban general standards) and noted the potential location map references both minor and major thoroughfares.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Jeff Nimmer, representing Kotis Properties, 1420 Mill Street, stated that they are in support of the text amendment as drafted by staff and were directly involved in meetings held with various developers in coming up with the framework for the amendment. Mr. Nimmer also agreed that the LDO speaks directly to an attempt to foster mixes of uses and encourage infill development. However Mr. Nimmer stated that the text amendment, as currently written, does not address some of the needs of the community, as a whole. He presented a handout for the Board members' review and highlighted a site he thinks would work for new residential development tied to existing commercial development. This would be an ideal site to add multifamily to the area and satisfies the intent of the text amendment, but as written would not qualify. Mr. Nimmer then suggested adjusting the proposed text amendment to also allow new residential development if site is within 500 feet of a major or minor thoroughfare and is either within 2,640 feet (1/2 mile) and accessible to an existing or planned greenway shown on the adopted Bi-Ped Plan or located within 2,640 feet (1/2 mile) and accessible to a usable portion of the public park, as measured along a system of public sidewalks and streets. This change would maintain the spirit of the text amendment and ensure that this site could be developed in an appropriate manner by right since the site is already zoned Commercial High (C-H). Mr. Nimmer also noted that allowing multifamily on this site would generate half as much traffic as if it were developed with retail facilities. In addition, traffic is handled at the TRC level and if there are needs for additional turn lanes that would happen during their review.

Michael Pendergraft, representing the Greensboro Neighborhood Congress, stated that they represent 50-84 different neighborhoods in Greensboro and they are a coalition that tries to direct its interest only to city-wide issues. The Executive Committee of the Greensboro Neighborhood Congress has authorized him to state that they support these changes as long as they are reviewed again in a reasonable timeframe (maybe two years) to find out how successfully the provisions had been used. He stated that the public should have input as to what a developer wants to do if a proposed development is outside the box that Planning staff feels is appropriate for by right review. He added that this proposed amendment should not be evaluated based on an individual project but looked at for city-wide implications.

There being no other speakers, the public hearing was closed. Planning Board members noted that while they thought the potential site presented by Mr. Nimmer makes some sense for new multifamily development with adjacent commercial uses, they expressed concerns on the city-wide impact of the proposed changes by Mr. Nimmer. Mr. Martin also mentioned he had received an email from TREBIC expressing support for the text amendment. After additional

discussion Mr. Bryson moved to recommend the text amendment as presented by staff with the additional stipulation that it will be revisited with an evaluation within a two year period, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Parker, Martin, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Wade. Nays: None.)

Mr. Wade asked to be recused from the following item.

3. EASEMENT RELEASES:

- a. Proposed release of all of a 20' drainage easement located at 2200 Sixteenth Street, as recorded in Plat Book 60, page 121. **(APPROVED, FINAL ACTION)**

Shayna Thiel stated that all utility companies have recommended their support of this easement release.

There being no questions, Mr. Martin moved approval of the easement release, seconded by Mr. Mossman. The Board voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Parker, Martin, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins. Nays: None. Abstained: Wade)

4. GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (GFLUM) AMENDMENTS:

- a. CP-15-13: 4803 and 4807 Hardindale Drive, and 635 Muirs Chapel Road; From Low Residential to Moderate Residential; 11.83 acres. **(COMMENTS ONLY)**

Jeff Sovich stated the site, currently designated as Low Residential, is proposed to be changed to Moderate Residential. Low Residential supports densities of 3 to 5 units per acre; Moderate Residential supports densities of 5 to 12 units per acre. Mr. Sovich noted the rezoning request generating the GFLUM amendment request is for a townhome-style project under RM-12 zoning. He indicated the range of residential densities in the area, including a greater-density multifamily development north of the site, as well as the lower-density single-family development generally in the area.

The applicant, Brad Deaton, 1400 Battleground Avenue, stated that he was available to answer any questions the Board members might have.

Board Comments:

Mr. Atkins stated the request provided for a good transition from single-family to the higher-density apartments in the area. Mr. Martin agreed, noting the existing multifamily and proposed project were not immediately adjacent but were sufficiently near each other to be a nice step-down for density in the area. Other members also commented on their general agreement that this would be a good use of the property in this area.

- b. CP-15-14: 3619 and 3629 Lewiston Road, 3410 Crimson Wood Dr, from Low Residential to Moderate Residential **(COMMENTS ONLY)**

Jeff Sovich noted the change in the request from what had initially been indicated for the agenda. Initially the request was for Mixed Use Corporate Park; this has been modified to a request for Moderate Residential.

Mr. Sovich stated the site, currently designed as Low Residential with a small amount of Mixed Use Corporate Park, is proposed to be changed to Moderate Residential. Moderate Residential supports densities of 5 to 12 units per acre.

Board Comments:

Mr. Atkins felt that this is a good transition from the single family uses in the area, particularly given the airport noise cone overlay in the area, noting how the whole area is seeing changes. Other Board members agreed.

5. ITEMS FROM STAFF:

Dana Clukey, Planner, guided Board members through two demographics reports recently released by the Planning Department, the City Fact Sheet, and a Growth and Development brief highlighting the changing use of land in the City. She drew particular attention to the decrease in Heavy Industrial uses in terms of acreage, and to the change in the mix of types of residential uses, with the single family portion of total land use decreasing while the multifamily portion has increased.

In response to a question by Mr. Mossman, Ms. Clukey stated that this information is available on the City's website on the Data Analysis page.

Mike Kirkman stated that October is Community Planning Month and staff wished to express their appreciation to the Planning Board members for their service.

Sheila Stains-Ramp stated that starting on the first Monday of November, final and exempt plats will be taking in through the Electronic Plan Review system. The change will allow those interested parties to track their reviews and more immediately have access to review comments.

Items from the Chair:

None.

Items from Board Members:

None.

Approval of Absences:

Vice-Chair Allen acknowledged the absence of Mr. Isaacson as approved.

Adjournment:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Director, Planning Department
SS/jd