

GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD**SEPTEMBER 20, 2017**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, September 20, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Marc Isaacson, Chair; Steve Allen, Vice-Chair; Day Atkins, Daniele Brame, Richard Bryson, Carol Carter and Homer Wade. City staff present included Steve Galanti, Hanna Cockburn, Sheila Stains-Ramp, Shayna Thiel and Lucas Carter. Also present were Terri Jones, City Attorney's Office, and Caitlin Bowers, Neighborhood Development.

Chair Isaacson welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board. He also welcomed Carol Carter as the newest Board member.

1. Meeting Minutes**a. Approval of Minutes of August 16, 2017 Planning Board Meeting**

Board Member Bryson moved approval of the August 16, 2017 meeting minutes, as written, seconded by Board Member Allen.

The Board voted unanimously (5-0-1) in favor of the motion, with Ms. Carter abstaining from the vote.

2. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2017-18

Mr. Isaacson was nominated to continue serving as Chair of the Planning Board; Mr. Allen was nominated to continue serving as Vice Chair of the Planning Board. They were re-elected by the unanimous vote of those present (6-0).

3. Public Hearing:**a. 2016-2017 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) (Receive Comments)**

Caitlin Bowers, Grant Administrator for Neighborhood Development, presented the Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER), which is prepared annually by the City for submission to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The CAPER measures performance in one fiscal year toward the goals of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan, and the hearing before the Planning Board to hear public comments is in aid of fulfilling the citizen participation requirements outlined by HUD.

Ms. Bowers identified the HUD funding sources, the programs the funds are used for, and the program accomplishments during the FY 2016-2017, in community development and improvement, rental assistance, homelessness prevention, housing rehab and construction and brownfields remediation. She noted the report also includes programs from the City of Burlington, Alamance County, Guilford County, as participating agencies in the HOME Program and Housing Consortium, of which Greensboro serves as the lead agency. The draft CAPER narrative was available for public comment August 31 through September 20, and the final report will be submitted to HUD by Wednesday, September 27.

The Public Hearing was opened.

Comments from the Public: No one attended to make comments on the Report.

Board Comments:

In response to a Board question Ms. Bowers clarified that the CAPER does not go to City Council before being submitted to HUD; the opportunity for public comment and Board comment is the present meeting.

Board Member Bryson asked if the information was provided to the residents and businesses on the east side of Greensboro so that they are as aware of the opportunities as they could be. Ms. Bowers stated that CAPER itself is a reporting tool for the prior fiscal year, and that enrollment in the programs is actively sought at a different point in time, but she would be happy to make a more concerted effort to relay this reporting to the community resources in those areas.

Board Member Allen asked about how the money was allocated, and how the bond funds would be used. Ms. Bowers agreed to provide a summary to the Board members showing what monies were spent in the past fiscal year, and in a future presentation would provide narrative information about the programs that are being funded by the Bonds.

No action was necessary.

Board Member Brame arrived at 4:16 p.m. for the remainder of the meeting.

4. Street Closing:

a. PL(P) 17-17: Closing of a Portion of East February One Place (Approval Recommended)

Shayna Thiel, Planner, stated that the request is for closing the portion of East February One Place from its intersection with South Davie Street, west for a distance of approximately 133.0 feet, containing an area proposed for closure of approximately 0.103 acre or 4,378 square feet. The applicants who signed the petition (City of Greensboro and Elm Street Center) own 100% of the road frontage requested for closure.

Ms. Thiel reminded the Board that the City has two findings to make to be able to close the street, i.e., that the closing to vehicular traffic is not contrary to the public interest, and that no property owner is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress.

Ms. Thiel stated the Technical Review Committee (TRC) had reviewed the request and recommended approval of the street closing with the following conditions:

- 1) The City shall retain 20-foot-wide utility easements over existing utility lines until such time as the lines are no longer needed for public use;
- 2) The applicant shall dedicate to the City of Greensboro a 20-foot wide public access easement, or combine the entire portion of the street to be closed with property under the City's ownership
- 3) The applicant shall provide a minimum of 15' clearance height underneath the proposed deck within the portion of the street to be closed; and

4) The street closure is to become effective upon the recording of a plat in the Guilford County Register of Deeds that depicts the portion of the street to be closed being combined with the abutting property and the dedication of the 20-foot public access easement. The plat shall be signed by each property owner who has an ownership interest in the portion of street to be closed. (The applicants intend to combine the entire portion of the street to be closed with the City's parcels on the north side of East February One Place, such that the public access easement will be unnecessary.)

Staff recommended approval of the request.

After a short discussion, Board Member Allen moved it be recommended to City Council that the required findings could be made and the street closing be approved with the conditions as noted by staff, seconded by Board Member Wade. The Board voted unanimously, 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Allen, Brame, Bryson, Atkins, Wade and Carter. Nays: None.)

5. Annexation:

a. PL(P) 17-18: Proposed annexation of 4622 McKnight Mill Road, approximately 65 acres (Approval Recommended)

Chair Isaacson was recused from the matter. Vice-Chair Allen took the agenda item.

Lucas Carter, Senior Planner, stated that the proposed satellite annexation request is for property within the Tier 1 Growth Area of the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The service providers had responded to the request for their input, indicating they can provide the necessary services. The TRC reviewed the annexation request and recommended its approval, as submitted. The initial zoning for the area proposed for annexation is scheduled to go to the Zoning Commission on October 16, 2017. Both the annexation request and the initial zoning request will go to the City Council for final action.

Mr. Carter reminded the Board that the finding they make is whether the City can provide services to the location. He also noted that any utility extensions are at the cost and responsibility of the applicant/developer, and that there would be a relatively lengthy water line extension involved.

Board Comments:

In response to a question from Board Member Bryson, Mr. Carter stated that the waterline extension to Hicone Road would be located within the right-of-way of McKnight Mill Road.

In response to a question from Board Member Carter, Planning Manager Steve Galanti explained why this was a satellite annexation and reiterated that the applicant would be responsible for all costs associated with the utility extensions. Ms. Carter requested more information concerning the impacts to provide services to the site.

In response to a question from Board Member Allen, Mr. Galanti stated that access to the site would not be from Rankin Mill Road, that the Technical Review Committee would evaluate access from the subdivision to the south of the site and along the site's frontage on McKnight Mill Road as part of any eventual site plan review.

After a short discussion, Board Member Atkins moved it be recommended to City Council that the required finding could be made and the petitioned annexation be approved to City Council, seconded by

Board Member Bryson. The Board voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Brame, Bryson, Atkins, Wade and Carter. Nays: None. Abstained: Isaacson)

Mr. Isaacson returned to the dais.

6. Amendment to Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLUM)

- a. CP-17-07: 2200 through 2206 Pisgah Church Road, 3004 through 3008 Trull Avenue, and 3005 Martinsville Road, from Low Residential to Mixed Use Commercial, 3.13 acres**

Hanna Cockburn, Planning Manager, presented the requested Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM) amendment from Low Residential to Mixed Use Commercial for the identified location, submitted in conjunction with a rezoning request. She indicated the intent of the current and proposed designations, presented mapping showing the area around the site as well as the larger context, provided photos of the site and area, and provided guidance on evaluating proposed amendments. She asked the Board to try to keep the considerations for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and a specific rezoning to particular uses separate, and reminded them that the Board offers comments to the Zoning Commission on the prospective GFLUM change, not a recommendation. She also reminded the Board that notification was provided as part of the rezoning hearing before the Zoning Commission, when a public hearing was held and public comment sought, but not for this Board-comment-only item.

Ms. Cockburn also reminded the Board they had recently provided comments on another Comprehensive Plan amendment for property just north of the site under review.

Board Comments:

Planning Board members provided the following comments:

- Concern about the request in context of the update to the Comprehensive Plan
- The Lawndale Corridor is under pressure; where does the line stop? Concern generally about where non-residential development stops.
- Concern expressed about the impact to established neighborhoods in the vicinity
- This location should be considered for further evaluation as an area ripe for development
- The request won't be a complete change for the area
- The request coincides with the mixed use growth pattern in the vicinity.
- The location is no longer low residential, and changes have occurred in the vicinity over the last few years.
- The requested change is a positive for the area.

Steve Shofferty, Koury Corporation (applicant) stated that they were relying on the Corridor Study done in 2013 in pulling together property for a proposed development of the type identified as desirable in the location. He stated they were moving ahead with the development at this time because of some of the work Koury Corporation has done in the planning process over recent years with regard to the traffic patterns in the area and some of the changes the City is considering in roadway widenings for the area. He also noted they own all of the property in question and have preserved the property for many years until they were prompted by several City actions that have taken place recently.

Board Member Carter stated that she would like to have a more complete analysis by staff and additional information in the agenda packet.

Chair Isaacson asked that he be recused from Items 6B (CP-17-08) and 6C (CP-17-09) for potential conflict. Chair Isaacson was recused by unanimous vote.

b. CP-17-08: 3900 through 3908 Baylor Street, 504 through 510 Greenbriar Road and 3501 North Elm Street, from Moderate Residential to Mixed Use Commercial, 7.3 acres

Hanna Cockburn presented the requested GFLUM amendment from Moderate Residential to Mixed Use Commercial, filed in conjunction with a rezoning request for the properties. She indicated the intent of the current and proposed designations, presented mapping showing the area around the site as well as the larger context, provided photos of the site and area, and provided guidance on evaluating proposed amendments. Ms. Cockburn noted the associated zoning case is tentatively scheduled for the October Zoning Commission meeting and November City Council meeting, should that be required.

Board Comments:

- Concern about the request in context of the update to the Comprehensive Plan
- The Lawndale Corridor is under pressure; where does the line stop? Concern generally about where non-residential development stops.
- Concern expressed about the impact to established neighborhoods in the vicinity
- This location should be considered for further evaluation as an area ripe for development
- The requested change is in keeping with development trends.
- The requested location is an example of a mixed use node
- Mixed use in this location is needed to meet growing demand for services in an area in dire need of additional development

c. CP-17-09: 4622 McKnight Mill Road, from Mixed Use Commercial and Moderate Residential to Low Residential, 65 acres

Hanna Cockburn noted the Board had already seen the annexation information for the request, which will go to City Council along with the initial zoning and GFLUM amendment. The associated zoning case is tentatively scheduled for the October Zoning Commission meeting and November City Council meeting. She presented the requested GFLUM amendment, from Mixed Use Commercial and Moderate Residential to Low Residential, indicating the purpose and intent of the various designations, and provided the localized and broader-context mapping along with site and area photos and the guidance on evaluating proposed amendments.

Board Comments

- The size of the request is positive, with additional low residential to the south and mixed use residential to the north, the proposed change will allow residential development to catch up to demands in the area
- The requested change is a perfect way to bridge existing land uses, will benefit the City for years to come.
- The request is a great thing for the area

In response to a question from Board Member Allen, Steve Galanti noted that access to Rankin Mill Road was not feasible from the site.

Chair Isaacson returned to the dais for the remainder of the meeting.

d. CP-17-10: 3522 and 3524 Lawndale Drive, from Low Residential to Mixed Use Commercial, 1.33 acres

Hanna Cockburn presented the requested GFLUM amendment from Low Residential to Mixed Use Commercial, filed in conjunction with a rezoning request. She indicated the intent of the designations, presented mapping showing the local area and the broader context, along with site and area photos and the guidance for comments evaluating the proposed amendment. The associated zoning case is tentatively scheduled for the October Zoning Commission meeting and November City Council meeting, should that be required.

- NOTE: The Planning Board requested that the GFLUM amendment be expanded to include the adjacent parcel to the south (triangle shape) and marry to the boundary to the north.
- The area is in transition; driveways and access may be an issue
- The requested properties are awkward, zoning commission may wish to consider appropriate conditions
- The requested change is in line with development patterns, seems like a great idea
- Additional development in the area is great to see, the location is conducive for additional growth

7. Unified Development Plan

a. UDP for Spartan Crossings – 606 Granite Street (Approved)

Lucas Carter noted that a Unified Development Plan (UDP) is the final step in the approval of Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning, establishing the setbacks, any phasing and other development standards for the site. During the zoning process, a Concept Plan is developed and approved by the Technical Review Committee; staff compares the UDP to the Concept Plan, and if it conforms brings it to Planning Board for approval. The UDP is recorded after the Planning Board has approved it.

Mr. Carter presented the UDP for the property located at 606 Granite Street, for Spartan Crossings, which are student apartments. He noted that staff had compared the Concept Plan and UDP and found them consistent, and that TRC has similarly reviewed the document and recommended approval.

In response to a question from Board Member Carter, Mr. Galanti stated that staff and TRC verifies whether the UDP is consistent with the Concept Plan before they make a recommendation; that the current PUD process was developed when PUDs were much larger, whereas they now have a tendency to be smaller; and that the UDP converts the Concept Plan and rezoning conditions into a recordable format to put all subsequent developers or builders on notice of the standards.

Board Member Carter stated she was not willing to approve the UDP without also seeing the Concept Plan.

Board Member Wade commented that having done a number of UDPs, the step was simply putting on record the agreed conditions and development standards developed during the rezoning process for the benefit of the adjoining landowners and subsequent interests in the property. He noted he saw no value in UDPs coming to the Planning Board as it was a formality and there really was no role for the Board with them; instead, the plat should simply be recorded.

Board Member Wade moved to approve the UDP for Spartan Crossings; Mr. Brame seconded the motion. The Board voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Allen, Brame, Bryson, Atkins, Wade. Nays: Carter.)

Items from the Department:

None.

Items from the Chair:

None.

Items from Board members:

Mr. Bryson stated that he would ask staff continue to reach out to GTA with news on petitioned annexations, as GTA is working on a Mobility Study and being able to estimate ridership coming from newly annexed areas of Greensboro is important. Newly annexed areas may have populations that need Fixed Route or Paratransit bus services, the demand for which has grown tremendously over the last 5 years.

Ms. Carter stated that she felt that there was not enough information attached with the agenda. She would like to see more information included so she does not have to spend so much time asking questions.

Speakers from the Floor on Items under Planning Board Authority

None.

Approval of Absences

The absence of Mr. Martin and Mr. Cooke were acknowledged as excused.

Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz, FAICP
Planning Department, Director

SS:/jd