

**PARTIAL MINUTES OF THE
ZONING COMMISSION
February 18, 2019**

Z-19-02-001 4500 Pine Vista Lane (South of Pine Vista Lane and east of Circleview Drive) – An original zoning request from County RS-40 (Residential Single-Family) to City R-5 (Residential Single-Family). For the property located at 4500 Pine Vista Lane and east of Circleview Drive (0.46 acres). Synergy Building Group LLC, on behalf of William C. and Angela P. Artis **(UNFAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION)**

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

Chair Lester reminded Commission members and the audience that the Commission will only make a recommendation of the zoning designation if the City Council decides to annex this property. Chair Lester then asked if the applicant was wanting to annex their property because they want to use city water and sewer. Mr. Carter stated that was correct. Chair Lester also asked if R-5 was the lowest available zoning designation that the City has in the zoning ordinance. Mr. Carter stated that the City does have an R-3 zoning designation, which is 12,000 square foot minimum lot size, whereas the R-5 zoning only requires a 7,000 square foot minimum lot size. Ms. Mazzurco asked if there was a reason why the request was for R-5. Mr. Carter stated that the applicant will have to speak on that.

Chair Lester asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in support of this matter.

IN SUPPORT OF:

Vickie Turner, applicant, stated that she is with Synergy Building Group and they are requesting the smaller lot size, because they would like to build two new homes instead of just one. Mr. Holston asked if the two homes they wish to build would look similar to other homes in the neighborhood. Ms. Turner stated that they would. Ms. Mazzurco asked what would be the size of the homes on the new lots. Ms. Turner stated that they were looking at from 1,600 – 1,800 square feet. Ms. Mazzurco asked what size homes were in that neighborhood now. Ms. Turner stated that there were some larger homes and smaller homes as well. At this point Mr. Kirkman reminded the Commission members that the development ordinance does not establish any type of minimum size for homes, just minimum lot sizes.

Chair Lester asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition.

IN OPPOSITION OF:

Sonja Scales, 1803 Willie Ellis Court, stated that she doesn't see the reason why it should be rezoned. She noted that the listing she has says they could put daycare homes and all kinds of things they don't do in this area. She then noted that this request will be an eyesore with two homes on one lot as the houses out there are big houses. She thinks that those houses are bigger than 1,800 square feet. Mr. Engle asked about the similarities between County RS-40 and City R-5. Mr. Kirkman stated that he couldn't give an exact answer on that, because he didn't have the County ordinance in front of him. However in County RS-40 the minimum lot size is 40,000 square feet. The largest single family lot in Greensboro is the minimum 12,000 square foot lot size under the R-3 district and the R-5 district uses a smaller minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet.

Chair Lester asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak, and no one came forward. The public hearing was closed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Mr. Kirkman stated that the Comprehensive Plan currently designates the site as Low Residential. The Low Residential designation includes the City's predominately single-family neighborhoods as well as other compatible housing types that can be accommodated within the density range of 3-5 dwelling units per acre. The proposed R-5 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low density single-family detached residential development with a maximum density of 5 dwelling units per acre. This request is consistent with

the Comprehensive Plan's Housing and Neighborhoods goal to meet the needs of present and future Greensboro citizens for a choice of decent, affordable housing in a stable, livable neighborhoods that offer security, quality of life, and the necessary array of services and facilities. It is also consistent with the Growth at the Fringe goal to provide a development framework for the fringe that guides sound, sustainable patterns of land use, limits sprawl, protects rural character, evidences sound stewardship of the environment, and provides for efficient provision of public services and facilities as the City expands. The request is also consistent with the surrounding pattern of single-family residential development. Staff recommends approval of the requested City R-5 (Residential Single-Family – 5) zoning.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND MOTION:

Mr. Holston stated that he was not comfortable with the requested R-5 designation as the R-5 looks like it is too much for the neighborhood. He thought R-3 zoning might be more appropriate. Ms. Mazzurco also noted that she was uncomfortable with the R-5 zoning and maybe even R-3 zoning. She noted that they wanted to take one lot and put in two houses and she will not be supporting the request. Chair Lester stated that there are probably some conditions they could consider for R-3 but Mr. Kirkman reminded the Commission that this is not a conditional zoning request.

Mr. Engle moved that in regard to case Z-19-02-001, 4500 Pine Vista Lane , the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend denial of the R-5 zoning request for this property to be inconsistent with adopted Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to not be reasonable and in the public interest because the request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Housing and Neighborhoods goal to meet the needs of present and future Greensboro citizens for a choice of decent, affordable housing in stable, livable neighborhoods that offer security, quality of life, and the necessary array of services and facilities. The request is also inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Growth at Fringe goal to provide a development framework for the fringe that guides sound, sustainable patterns of land use, limits sprawl, protects rural character, evidences sound stewardship of the environment, and provides for efficient provision of public services and facilities as the City expands, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Commission voted 7-0 to recommend denial of the request. (Ayes: Lester, Mazzurco, Holston, Blackstock, Alford, Dansby-Byrd and Engle. Nays: None.)

Counsel Jones stated that if the Zoning Commission has a recommendation on the appropriate zoning designation should the property be annexed, she suggests that they go ahead and make a vote on that so City Council would be fully informed of the Commission's views. Chair Lester asked if there was an alternative zoning designation that the Commission would recommend City Council consider. Ms. Mazzurco asked why they would consider taking up a new item since that is not what was in front of them. She thinks that if they are moving the case forward to City Council, then they should make the decision. Counsel Jones stated that if the property is annexed, it needs an appropriate City zoning designation. The Commission could approve this plan, or they can provide a recommendation to City Council on what the proper zoning designation would be should if it is annexed. Chair Lester stated that what Ms. Mazzurco was asking were if they were under any obligation to make a recommendation. Counsel Jones stated that for original zoning the Commission is asked to make a recommendation. Chair Lester asked if City Council would be able to decide without a recommendation. Counsel Jones stated that was correct. She asked the Commission to consider a motion because they had discussion on what the Commission members felt the appropriate zoning should be. Mr. Engle suggested that they make a motion to recommend the zoning designation to be R-3, instead of R-5.

Chair Lester then moved that in regard to case Z-19-02-001, 4500 Pine Vista Lane, the Greensboro Zoning Commission recommend to City Council R-3 zoning district, seconded by Mr. Engle. The Commission voted 7-0 to approve the recommendation. (Ayes: Lester, Mazzurco, Holston, Blackstock, Alford, Dansby-Byrd and Engle. Nays: None.)