PARTIAL MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD MARCH 15, 2017

The Greensboro Planning Board met Wednesday, March 15, 2017 at 4:01 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Steve Allen, Vice Chair, Richard Bryson, Day Atkins, Homer Wade, John Martin, Celia Parker, and Danielle Brame. City staff present included Mike Kirkman, Hanna Cockburn, Sheila Stains-Ramp, Nicole Smith, Lucas Carter, Valerie Moore, Caitlin Bowers, Cynthia Blue, Jeremy McCall and Andrew Kelly.

Vice Chair Allen welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Land Development Ordinance (LDO) Text Amendment:

Amendment to Land Development Ordinance, Article 8, Table 8-1 and Section 30-8-10.1, to allow Assisted Living Facilities within C-M and C-H zoning districts, with Use Standards. (FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION WITH CHANGES)

Nicole Smith, Senior Planner, stated that the text amendment would add Assisted Living Facilities as a permissible use, with use standards, to Commercial-Medium and Commercial-High zoning districts. Assisted Living Facilities are presently allowed in most multifamily (RM) and mixed use (MU) districts, as well as Office, Central Business and Public/Institutional districts. The proposed use standards include inter-connectivity (both vehicular and pedestrian) between residential and non-residential components, satisfaction of the minimum dimensional requirements for the district, compliance with buffer planting yard standards, and compatible architectural design and materials.

Ms. Smith noted the proposed amendment would allow for additional redevelopment options in appropriate sites where significant infrastructure already exists, in line with other City efforts to expand housing and job opportunities in areas already served, such as the recent ordinance change to include multifamily uses in certain commercial districts.

Ms. Smith stated that in developing the amendment language staff had consulted with the applicant, TREBIC, the development community, and Neighborhood Congress representatives. Conversations have been on-going, and changes made since the Planning Board agenda mailout were earlier provided to the Board.

Vice Chair Allen opened the public hearing and asked anyone wished to speak on the matter.

Judy Stalder, representing TREBIC, 115 S. Westgate Drive, stated that her organization supported the addition of Assisted Living as a permissible use to the C-M and C-H districts, by right; however, they did not support the requirement for review of architectural design or materials. She stated doing so was appropriately the prerogative of the developer and would limit creative materials use while opening up a conversation about architectural design features more appropriate to a separate conversation. She stated that TREBIC would like to see a recommendation by the Board to adopt a text amendment for Assisted Living in Commercial developments, but with edits to make it more along the lines of the recent change

allowing multifamily development in Commercial districts. She also noted that the State also heavily regulates assisted living projects, which provides another layer of community security.

Dick Franks, Vice President of Design and Planning for Koury Corporation, stated that he had served on the Citizens Advisory Committee to develop the LDO, and one of his concerns at that time had been to keep discretionary design choices and aesthetic standards for the developer, not City staff. He stated the 'look', the materials and architectural features chosen for a project should be up to the developer and their design staff. He stated he agreed with the amendment except for the provision requiring City staff to judge aesthetic matters such as the architectural design or color scheme of projects submitted for approval.

Mr. Martin asked if Mr. Franks was looking for all of Section D to be deleted or just the subsection on materials. Mr. Franks indicated any reference to City determination on aesthetics was what he wanted deleted.

Mr. Wade asked why the language was added. Michael Kirkman, Co-Manager, responded that the idea was to allow a new use in these districts while ensuring some community protections in exchange. Mr. Wade stated his fear was that the architectural standards would bleed to other circumstances, and he saw no need for them, particularly as Assisted Living facilities typically are institutional or office-like in appearance.

There being no other speakers on this matter, the public hearing was closed.

Board Comments

Vice Chair Allen stated that staff had recommended the text change and he agreed with allowing this additional use in the noted districts, given that it would allow additional flexibility and development options.

Mr. Bryson suggested the wording in Section G be adjusted to say the proposed architecture and materials should "compliment" or "enhance" the existing commercial.

Mr. Atkins state the goal of the architectural controls was worthy but it also seemed a bigger idea than the proposed ordinance. He noted he would support use of the language used with the recent amendment allowing multifamily in commercial districts.

Mr. Martin asked Ms. Stadler if TREBIC would accept that change; she acknowledged they would.

Mr. Atkins moved to recommend approval of the proposed text Amendment, substituting in the language used in the recent multifamily and mixed use residential, seconded by Ms. Brame. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Bryson, Atkins, Brame, Parker, Wade, Martin. Nays: None.)

TYPE 4 MODIFICATION: 3235 Horse Pen Creek Rd (APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)

Jeremy McCall, Water Resources, stated that the Watershed Critical Area regulations applicable to 3235 Horse Pen Creek Rd limit the maximum density to 40% built-upon area. The components of this site plan related to parking and the building are required and cover 49.2% of the site. The site currently has 0.15

acres of built-upon area that is not being treated by a stormwater device. The developer is proposing to treat all new built-upon area, which exceeds the requirements, providing for equal or better performance. Staff asks that the Board recommend approval of the Type 4 Modification to allow additional density for this site.

Mr. Bryson moved to recommend the Type 4 Modification to City Council, seconded by Mr. Martin. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Bryson, Atkins, Brame, Parker, Wade, Martin. Nays: None.)

ANNEXATION:

PL-(P) 17-05: Proposed Annexation of 3911 Hickory Tree Lane, approximately 0.47 acres (APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)

Lucas Carter stated that the satellite annexation, requested by Jafonda Watkins, is in the Tier 1 Growth Area of the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The Technical Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed annexation. The Zoning Commission will hear the associated zoning at their April 17, 2017 meeting, and City Council will hear both requests on May 16, 2017 for a final action. The service providers have reviewed the request and indicated services can be provided with little additional impact on operations.

Mr. Bryson moved to recommend approval of the annexation to City Council, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Bryson, Atkins, Brame, Parker, Martin, Wade Nays: None.)

PL-(P) 17-06: Proposed Annexation of 4403 and 4405 Pine Vista Lane, approximately 0.98 acres (APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)

Lucas Carter stated that the satellite annexation, requested by AFC Rehab Solutions, is in the Tier 1 Growth Area of the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The Technical Review Committee recommended approval of the proposed annexation. The Zoning Commission will hear the associated zoning case at their April 17, 2107 meeting, and City Council will hear both requests on May 16, 2017 for final action. The service providers have reviewed the request and indicated services can be provided with little additional impact on operations.

APPROVAL OF ABSENSES

The absences of Mr. Isaacson and Mr. Mossman were excused.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm. Respectfully submitted,
Sue Schwartz, FAICP
Planning Department, Director