

**MEETING OF THE  
ZONING COMMISSION  
DECEMBER 21, 2015**

**Z-15-10-003** 625 Franklin Boulevard (east of Franklin Boulevard and north of Afton Drive) – A rezoning request from R-5 (Residential Single-Family) to CD-O (Conditional District-Office) with the following conditions: (1) All uses permitted in the Office district **except** drive through uses; (2) Maintain the existing structure without expansion; (3) Site shall be limited to one freestanding sign, limited to a maximum of 8 feet in height. – For the property located at 625 Franklin Boulevard, generally described as east of Franklin Boulevard and north of Afton Drive (0.38 Acres) – Ardeanna Wideman. **(FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION)**

Mr. Kirkman described the subject properties, as well as surrounding properties, and noted issues in the staff report.

Ardeanna Wideman, 625 Franklin Boulevard, is a full-time counselor. She works with students who live and go to school in the area. They teach leadership skills, skills for giving back through community service; and other useful skills as the students matriculate through school. Previously located on Homeland Avenue, she would like to move to this location as most of the youth in the program live and attend school in this area.

Valerie Farrington, 208 Heritage Creek Way, is a teacher at Bennett College. She assists students in the program who are interested in education or law school.

In response to questions, Ms. Wideman state that the hours of operation will mainly occur on Saturdays from 11:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. since most of their meetings are offsite. She also noted that the current parking area on the site can accommodate five cars; however, most of the youth are from the neighborhood and will be walking to the location. The property will be vacant and locked when not in use.

Responding to a question about possible future uses, Ms. Wideman noted that the request is conditioned to exclude drive through uses at the site and staff noted that retail is not permitted in the Office zoning district. Personal service and general office uses are allowed. Ms. Wideman is the owner of the subject property.

Ms. Wideman added she attended several Heath Park Community meetings and the proposed use was well received. She went house-to-house to speak with neighbors to explain their plans. She indicated that neighbors were very open and pleased with what they are trying to do with the youth in the community.

City Councilwoman Sharon Hightower was present to address several concerns. She indicated that neighbors are under the impression that this is a mentoring program. The neighborhood is on the upswing undergoing revitalization and they have always wanted a community center in the neighborhood. Councilwoman Hightower commented that two hours on Saturday is not a lot of time to be open while the property sits vacant the rest of the week. She relayed comments from a neighbor who could not be present at this meeting. He was concerned that the property had been being worked on since last February and many changes have occurred to the property up to the point where they are now requesting a change to Office designation. She is very much in favor of helping all youth but this program must be conducive to the area. If the two-hour per week program is not successful, the Office designation would open the neighborhood up to other uses in the future. She commented that the neighbors who live close by are not really part of the Heath Park community.

Chair Pinto stated that this property is part of the Heath Park Community Strategic Plan Overlay and as a result, the Commission can only make a recommendation to City Council regarding the designation.

There being no other speakers, Chair Pinto closed the Public Hearing.

### **Staff Report:**

Mr. Kirkman stated that this is designated as **Low Residential** on the Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM) as reflected in the Heath Park Community Strategic Plan which needs to be amended with this request. The applicant is requesting to amend the Plan to the Mixed Use Residential classification. The Mixed Use Residential classification applies to neighborhoods or districts where the predominant use is residential but where substantial and compatible local serving non-residential uses may be introduced. The proposal meets the Comprehensive Plan's Reinvestment/Infill goal to promote sound investment in Greensboro's urban areas and neighborhoods. The Office zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate office, institutional, supporting service and other uses that are generally considered to be of a

low to moderate intensity in nature. Staff is recommending approval of this request. Mr. Kirkman also noted that the Planning Board met last week to review the proposed Neighborhood Plan amendment and unanimously recommended approval to change the plan to the Mixed Use Residential classification.

### **Comments:**

Mr. Parmele asked if there was another designation that would be more subtle and transitional than going from R-5 to an Office designation. Mr. Kirkman explained that the uses allowed in an Office district tend to be lower-traffic generating with set hours of operation. Retail is not allowed in the Office designation and there are no restaurants in the Office district. While the Office district is more intense than the existing Single-Family zoning, it is a more moderate intensity district and is generally considered to be a good transition between commercial areas and residential areas.

Mr. Kirkman stated that if approved by City Council, the conditions attached to this request would stay with the property regardless of ownership.

Ms. Bachmann asked if there was really a need for this property to be rezoned considering that the business will only operate two hours per week. Mr. Kirkman said that the existing zoning is for Single-Family Residential. There are provisions in Residential zoning that include a limited office component as a home occupation. However that would require the person to live in the house so the primary use is residential. In this scenario the house is not intended to be used as a residence.

Mr. Gilmer stated that he plans to support this request. He would like to see more programs like this one in the area.

Mr. Parmele felt that it was not appropriate to drop an Office zoning in the middle of a residential district. He agrees with the goals of the program; however, it is not the highest and best use of the land.

In the matter of **Z-15-10-003**, Mr. Gilmer moved that the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to approve the zoning amendment located at 625 Franklin Boulevard from R-5 (Residential Single-Family) to CD-O (Conditional District-Office) to be consistent with the adopted Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest because it is consistent with the Reinvestment/Infill goal to promote sound investment in Greensboro's urban areas; the request is consistent with the Economic Development goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy; and the request does implement measures to protect neighborhoods from potential negative impacts of development; seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Commission voted 8-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Pinto, Duggins, Gilmer, Bachmann, Blackstock, Lester, Griffin, Marshall. Nays: Parmele.)