

**MEETING OF THE  
ZONING COMMISSION  
January 12, 2015**

**Z-15-01-003** East Cone Boulevard and Nealtown Road Extension (south of Brame Road and south and west of White Elder Road) – An original zoning from County-AG (Agricultural) to City-R-5 (Residential Single-Family) – for property located south of Brame Road and south and west of White Elder Road (12.41 acres) – City of Greensboro. **(FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION)**

Ms. Smith described the subject property, as well as surrounding properties, and noted issues in the staff report.

Chair Pinto asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request.

Mike Kirkman spoke on behalf of the applicant, the City of Greensboro. He stated that this is property the City has purchased for the construction of an extension of East Cone Boulevard. The configuration is to incorporate property that is needed both for the road construction itself as well as some engineering for stormwater and other features that will be associated with the road construction. Because of the funding to be used for the construction of the roadway as well as to make sure there is a consistent design review process, the City is requesting annexation and original zoning to the City's jurisdiction. The proposed R-5 district is the zoning district that is closest to the County AG and County RS-30 districts that exist now and is also consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designations for the area.

**In Opposition:**

Wayland Shepherd, 2128 McKnight Mill Road, described the location of his residence and noted traffic concerns associated with the request and a large number of collisions reported in the area of the request.

Chair Pinto informed Mr. Shepard that the City is not rezoning anything with this request. Rather this is an original zoning request and the City is asking that this property come into the City limits. The request will go before the City Council and the Zoning Commission will only recommend a zoning classification to City Council to be attached to the property if annexed.

Mr. Kirkman reiterated that this property was purchased for the purpose of the extension of the roadway from East Cone Boulevard to White Elder Road and onto McKnight Mill Road. The property was purchased by the City for the road extension, not for residential development.

Mr. Shepherd asked if the City was planning on using White Elder Road to bring traffic through Brame Road and onto McKnight Mill Road. Carrie Reeves, Greensboro Department of Transportation, replied in the affirmative and noted the plans for the roadway extension are available for review by the public. Mr. Sheppard was in opposition to these plans citing traffic concerns.

Gloria Lighting lives at 2815 Brame Road which is a dead end approximately one-third of a mile from White Elder Road. She described the configuration of roads in the area and the school bus traffic associated with the three nearby schools. Chair Pinto commented that these matters and associated matters should be taken up with City Council as part of the annexation discussion. He noted that if the property is brought into the City by City Council, some zoning classification needs to be placed on this property. He further explained that the City has requested that R-5 zoning be placed on this property and he asked if she felt another City zoning designation would be more appropriate. Ms. Lighting indicated they would be fine if it stayed Agricultural because they are so overpopulated in the area.

Mr. Blackstock asked if this request had any connection to the I-840 Loop. Mr. Kirkman did not believe it had any connection with the proposed loop. It is part of the City's effort to increase east/west and north/south connections. Staff then noted there was a public meeting most recently in June 2014 to discuss the extension.

Responding to a question from Ms. Lighting, Ms. Reeves said that they did not know how far the road will be extended at this time. It is currently planned to connect into White Elder Road. Ms. Reeves offered to share sketches and studies relevant to the extension with any interested neighbors and noted construction is planned to begin this summer.

Jenna Butner, 2618 Brame Road, described the community and asked questions about uses under the proposed zoning. She felt that a traffic study should be conducted due to the high volume of traffic.

Nancy Wade, 2412 Minor Wood Road, asked if anyone had considered the close proximity of the City dump to the site. Ms. Reeves indicated that was part of the environmental study that was done for determining the extension of East Cone Boulevard. Ms. Wade stated that she was supportive of the zoning remaining the current Agricultural designation.

#### **Rebuttal in Support:**

Mr. Kirkman reiterated that this is property the City has acquired for the purpose of construction of a roadway. The zoning district that is requested is the closest match to the existing zoning districts in the area and the Generalized Future Land Use Map designation of Moderate Residential. Any future development in the area would come through as a separate request. Because City bond funds are being used for the construction of the roadway, the properties must be brought into the City's jurisdiction for review.

Ms. Reeves clarified for Mr. Parmele that based on the roadway concept plan, the current four-lane configuration of Cone Boulevard will taper down to a two-lane section. No nearby additional properties are planned for rezoning and if that did occur, it would be a separate request.

Responding to questions from Chair Pinto, Mr. Kirkman explained why the staff feels City R-5 zoning is the closest and most appropriate zoning classification. He said that the City actually does have an Agricultural district; however, it must be used for agricultural purposes and it is not a reasonable option for this project. Under the Land Development Ordinance, there are three Residential zoning districts, R-3, R-5, and R-7. The number speaks to the density of those residential districts. The City's Generalized Future Land Use Map designates this area as Moderate Residential, with residential development generally in the 5-12 units per acre range. To be consistent with that scale and to be close to other single-family development in the area, staff determined that R-5 was the most appropriate zoning to request.

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

#### **Staff Report:**

Mr. Kirkman stated that this site is designated as **Moderate Residential** on the City's Generalized Future Land Use Map. The Moderate Residential designation accommodates housing types ranging from small-lot, single-family detached and attached single-family dwellings such as townhouses to moderate density, low-rise apartment dwellings generally in the density range of 5-12 units per acre. The proposed request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growth at the Fringe goal to provide a development framework for the fringe that guides sound, sustainable patterns of land use. The proposal also supports the Community Facilities Goal to provide community facilities, services, and infrastructure in a cost-effective manner to meet citizens' needs, contribute to quality of life, and support desired land use patterns. The proposed City-

R-5 zoning district allows moderate to higher density residential dwellings; however, this specific request is solely for the development of a roadway. Staff is recommending approval of this request.

**Comments:**

None.

Mr. Gilmer moved that in the matter of **Z-15-01-003**, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to approve the zoning amendment located at East Cone Boulevard and Nealtown Road Extension from County-AG (Agricultural) to City-R-5 (Residential Single-Family) is 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 Growth at the Fringe goal to promote sound and sustainable land use patterns; and the request is consistent with the Community Facilities goal to provide community facilities, services, and infrastructure in a cost-effective manner to meet citizens' needs, contribute to quality of life, and support desired land use patterns; seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Commission voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Pinto, Placentino, Parmele, Gilmer, Bachmann, Griffin, Blackstock, Marshall. Nays: None.)

Ms. Bachman clarified after the vote that this request was for zoning for street right-of-way, not the adjacent properties. She asked staff to make sure the plans and feasibility studies for this request are shared with concerned individuals so they can be well-prepared if they feel they need to come to the February 3, 2015 City Council meeting.