

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION**

July 15, 2019

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Zoning Commission was held on June 17, 2019, beginning at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Members present were: Vice Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Present for City staff included Luke Carter and Mike Kirkman, (Planning), Noland Tipton (GDOT), and Terry Jones, from the City Attorney's Office.

Vice Chair Mazzurco welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Zoning Commission.

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 17 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Mr. Engle moved to approve the June 17, 2019 minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated the minutes are approved as amended by the amendment that was sent via email before this meeting. The Commission voted 7-0. Vice Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: 0). Andrew Pinto sustained as he was absent from that meeting.

Vice Chair Mazzurco stated that it was decided at the meeting to discuss the agenda to hear case number 1 and case number 9 together (original zonings) then hear case number 8 second. The rest of the cases would follow in the order shown on the agenda. The Zoning Commission approved by consensus reordering the agenda.

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCES:

Mr. Kirkman advised that there were two requests for continuances. First was Z-19-07-001 and Z-19-07-001 because they are together and are requesting a continuance.

Suzanne Sherwood, 4505 Old Burlington Road. Requesting a continuance as she was out of town and had not receive the information until recently. She received one letter July 1 and another one was later. She was at her property July 2 and there were no zoning sign up. She was out of town for a week and it was up for when she returned. She stated that her neighbor, Jay Stanley, was not aware of the rezoning process until she contacted him this past weekend. She was hoping to have a continuance until people affected by the rezoning might have a chance to review it.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked for anyone who wished to speak on the continuance to come forward and requested to hear from the applicant.

Brian Pearce with Nexsen Pruet Law Firm spoke on behalf of the applicant. They are just now hearing of a continuance request. As far as they know everything was done in order. He pointed out this was an original zoning so it will be going to Council. Mr. Pearce stated that his client had a representative from Charleston and one from Florida in attendance. His client would have been happy to speak with Ms. Sherwood in the interim before this matter goes to Council. However, they wanted to keep moving due to the money already invested and that the project was on a tight time schedule.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the continuance or against. No one came forward. Public portion was closed for board discussion.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Pinto made a motion to deny the continuance of Z-19-001 and Z-19-07-009. Second by Mr. Engle. Mr. Engle stated with an original zoning, no matter what is decided now either for or against this would go before City Council and they would have the final vote. There was time to work together to say yes or no, and get the neighborhood around it or otherwise. In the interest of making sure the Commission was moving things along for everyone to get a resolution that night, he seconded the motion. The Commission voted 8-0. Vice Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: 0).

Mr. Kirkman stated the other continuance request was for Case Z-19-07-008. This case was for 1302 New Garden Road. Staff received several emails requesting a continuance of 60 days.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there was anyone to speak of the continuance request.

Kim Reittinger, 1293 New Garden Road, stated that she was the applicant and was not requesting a continuance.

Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired if there was anyone requesting a continuance in this matter. She stated the Board also receive emails but the person requesting the continuance is not here. The public hearing was closed.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Pinto stated everyone on the Board received numerous emails regarding this rezoning and referencing a future strategic plan for this area. The plan has not been adopted by City Council and could not be considered for this case. Mr. Pinto stated with respect to all the work put in for the plan, he would move for a 30-day continuance to see if the plan is put in place, so this Commission could consider that policy for this rezoning.

Mr. Engle stated it appears there are a large number of people ready to speak. The applicant was in support of moving forward. Mr. Engle prepared to move forward and would not vote for a continuance. Mr. Engle moved to deny the continuance request. Mr. Holston seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Mazzurco stated there is a motion on the floor to move forward case Z-19-07-008, second by Mr. Holston. The Commission voted 7-1. (Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: Andrew Pinto). Vice Chair Mazzurco stated the Board will hear case Z-19-07-008.

NEW BUSINESS:

Z-19-07-001: An original zoning request from County HB (Highway Business) and County CU-HB (Conditional Use – Highway Business) to City CD-LI (Conditional District(- Light Industrial) for the property located at 4501 Old Burlington Road, generally described as north of Old Burlington Road, east of Willow Lake Road, and south of Burlington Road, 4.02 acres. (Approved)

Mr. Carter stated these cases were combined as this is an original zoning and the property to the north is in the City and represents the closest primary corporate limits. When an annexation and an original zoning are separated from the primary corporate limits by property owned by a public entity such as NCDOT, the intervening properties are also annexed to make the annexation continuous with the primary corporate limits.

Mr. Carter provided the zoning map for Z-19-07-001 and other summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties and noted there are no conditions.

Z-19-07-009: An original zoning request from County CU-HB (Conditional User – Highway Business) to City LI (Light Industrial) for the property identified as a portion of Burlington Road

between Willow Lake Road and I-840, generally described as east of Willow Lake Road, west of I 840, 0.68 Acres. (Approved)

Mr. Carter presented the zoning map for Z-19-07-009 and other summary information on the subject property and surrounding properties and noted there are not conditions.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked for any questions of staff. No questions were asked. Vice Chair Mazzurco called on the applicant to present their request.

Brian Pearce, 701 Green Valley Road spoke for Willow Greensboro Gas, LLC. According to Mr. Pearce, this project presented a glimpse of the progress in this area given with completion of the new urban loop. There would be more traffic resulting in more gas stations. The plan for the property was to place a 7-Eleven gas station with fuel pumps for cars and trucks to serve the increased traffic. The applicant and engineers were present to speak regarding any technical questions.

Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired of any questions of the applicant from the Commission. Mr. Engle stated he would encourage the applicant to work with the neighbor to address their concerns. Mr. Pierce responded they were very willing to speak with the neighbor. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition. No one came forward. The public hearing was closed and asked for staff recommendation.

Mr. Kirkman stated the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates this area as Mixed Use Corporate Park. The Mixed-Use Corporate Park designation is intended for large tracts of undeveloped land near the City's fringe that are appropriate for well planned, larger scale business/employment parks with supporting uses such as retail, hotels, and residential. The requests are consistent with the Growth at the Fringe goal to promote sound and sustainable patterns of land use at the City's fringe and the Economic Development goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community, including under-served areas such as East Greensboro. The proposed CD-LI and LI zoning districts provide supporting uses to both existing and planned large scale distribution centers in the surrounding area. Staff is recommending approval of the request.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Engle moved to approve both cases.

Mr. Engle stated in regards to agenda item Z-19-07-001, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approve the zoning amendment, for the property located at 4501 Old Burlington Road from County HB (Highway Business) and County CU-HB (Conditional Use – Highway Business) to City CDLI (Conditional District- Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Growth at the Fringe goal to encourage development at the fringe that follows a sound, sustainable pattern of land use. The request is also consistent with the Economic Development goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community, including under-served areas, such as East Greensboro. The proposed CD-LI zoning district provides supporting uses to both existing and planned large scale distribution centers in the surrounding area.

Motion by Mr. Engle, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Commission voted 8-0. (Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: 0).

Mr. Engle stated in regards to agenda item Z-19-009, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approve of the zoning amendment, for the property located at Portion of Burlington Road between Willow Lake Road and I-840 from County CU-HB (Conditional Use – Highway Business) to City LI (Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted Connections 2025 Comprehensive

Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Growth at the Fringe goal to encourage development at the fringe that follows a sound, sustainable pattern of land use. The request is also consistent with the Economic Development goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community, including under-served areas, such as East Greensboro.

Motion by Mr. Engle, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Commission voted 8-0. (Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: 0). Vice Chair Mazzurco advised this is a favorable recommendation and will go to City Council on August 20 for final approval.

Z-19-07-008: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-Family - 3) to CD-O (Conditional District – Office) for the property located at 1302 New Garden Road, generally described as east of New Garden Road and south of Belvidere Place, .078 acres. (Denied)

Mr. Carter presented the zoning map and other summary information on the subject property and surrounding properties and noted the conditions.

Vice Chair Mazzurco called on the applicant to present their request.

Kim Reittinger, 1293 New Garden Road, stated that she was asking the zoning commission pursuant to Article 4 of the Land Development Ordinance that the Commission approve a conditional district rezoning to CD-O. She stated this property was in the middle of CD-O and referenced recent rezoning in this area. She requested for her property to grow with the area and be able to utilize it for the highest and best use. She knocked on the doors of her neighbors. Letters were mailed and has proof of everything she has done and to whom she had spoken. She provided her name, phone number, and email address on the letter. When speaking to people in her neighborhood, there were no questions or concerns.

Vice Chair Mazzurco stated she appreciated all her work regarding neighborhood outreach. Stated the Commissioners have received a great deal of emails, phone calls, and visits about this case. She stated she is asking for a change of use with two conditions but in reading the Use Table there are a large number of other uses that could be done even with the conditions. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked what were the plans and if there was site plan. Ms. Reittinger responded she did not have a site plan and that she did not want to change the use immediately. She was still considering all options. The only discussion she had was increasing the number of units for rental. The property had tenants at the time of the rezoning request. It was a lower rent base. With this change they could change the utilities over. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if she was using this property as rental. Ms. Jones advised that under North Carolina state law, whether a property was owner or renter occupied was not something the Zoning Commission could consider in making their decision.

Mr. Engle stated he was in support of infill but he sees the neighborhood is extremely close to this property. He stated that the rezoning cases previously referenced by the applicant included a lot of community outreach and included concrete plans. He asked if an office use would be able to comply with the Office buffer requirements. Ms. Reittinger responded she would follow whatever TRC recommended. She would not just put anything there. She would have to go through the Planning Department to receive approvals.

Mr. Holston asked if it was possible for a buffer to be placed in-between the existing house and the adjacent residential property. Ms. Reittinger responded she owns one home with a fence and shrubbery on the left side facing the adjacent property. Mr. Holston asked if she was thinking of tearing down the existing structure. Ms. Reittinger stated she does not know. She was only stating that they current have a good buffer.

Mr. Kirkman responded to Mr. Engle's question of what would be required. The landscape buffer would vary depending upon the use. An office use next to a single-family residential dwelling would require a 25 feet wide type B landscape buffer. A multi-family use, which is permitted in an office district, would require a 15 foot type C buffer. The ordinance requires a certain ratio of trees to shrubs within the buffer. Mr. Engle asked if they were to get the rezoning tonight, could they use the office designation starting tomorrow to rent out rooms in the house with parts of the house used as an office without constructing a new buffer. Mr. Kirkman responded they would have to go through a change of use process and landscaping would be a part of that review. Mr. Engle asked the applicant if she was planning on using the existing structure for an office use or planning to tear down the existing structure for something else. Ms. Reittinger stated they are still considering building costs.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked Ms. Jones if the North Carolina general statute did not allow a single-family residence to be used as rental property. Ms. Jones responded that was not correct. She said that it was an inappropriate consideration to consider whether something would be rental or owner occupied. Under North Carolina state law, you cannot make a distinction between rental and owner-occupied properties in making zoning types of decisions. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if the people living in the property have a business within the home. Ms. Reittinger responded no.

Mr. Holston asked Ms. Reittinger if she had any inclination for a meeting with the neighbors. Ms. Reittinger responded they seemed very familiar with the rezoning in the area, seemed very comfortable. She stated she has a witness that went to each door because of what she experienced with this community in the past. No one said anything about having a problem with it. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated staff recommends in most cases for the applicant to call a community meeting and asked Ms. Reittinger if she called a meeting. Ms. Reittinger responded she did not because she spoke with them many times regarding how this should be handled.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if anyone else wanted speak in favor of the request. No one came forward. Vice Chair Mazzurco opened the floor to the opposition.

Lavon Williams, 5607 Robin Ridge Road. Ms. Williams was speaking on behalf of the Robin Ridge Neighborhood and other residents along New Garden. She stated Dr. Adam Ross, head of Eagle Family Medicine provided a written statement of his opposition. Ms. Williams spoke with Kathy Ferguson who expressed opposition to her and sent an email to Ms. Mazzurco. She stated that she understood hesitation in referring to the New Garden Plan but felt it was important to consider. The plan had been two years in the making. It was this very type of contentious rezoning that served as the impetus for the formalization of the strategic plan. She referred to the staff's recommendation as being flawed and disheartening as the recommendations were based on information that had been "cherry picked", picking portions of the Comprehensive Plan that support one side and ignoring the portions that contradict the validity of this type of rezoning. She read Section 6 of the Comprehensive Plan and stated that the request represented commercial encroachment into their neighborhood. The property was currently zoned as a single-family residence within a clear delineated boundary of a well-established neighborhood. She referred to a city GIS map. She stated this neighborhood deserves protection per the Comprehensive Plan which states there should be provisions for smooth, well designed transitions between residential and commercial properties. Any time there are two different land use properties on the same corridor will meet and that meeting point is a transition from one type of land use to the other. It is not grounds for rezoning one to be the same as the other. Ms. Williams stated it is the job and duty of the Planning officials, Zoning Commission, and City Council to protect residents in an established neighborhood. This rezoning is disruptive and there is no plan. She asked the Commission to please oppose the rezoning.

Richard Jordan, 5503 Belvidere Place. Mr. Jordan was a representative for Robin Ridge Neighborhood and served on the Advisory Committee for the New Garden Road Strategic Plan. He was opposing the rezoning. There is no plan. He was concerned about the possibility of 60 plus uses being permitted and up to four stories in height where every other property is one or two stories. Everything that has come up

around the Robin Ridge Neighborhood has had a plan. The New Garden Road Strategic Plan has a plan and quoted from page 26 regarding the focus of commercial reinvestments and additional developments. Mr. Jordan provided a track record regarding 1302 New Garden Road and provided quotes Commissioners made in 2008. After the failed rezoning, there was a mother in law addition to the property which resulted in a number of permit violations. After the additions were completed, there were multiple ordinance violation complaints regarding increased occupancy with tenants parking on the front lawn, occupancy by more than allowable non related persons living in the property. Today there are 5 pickups parked on the gravel. There are multiple trailers and building equipment parked in the rear of the property. He stated that Ms. Reittinger did not reside on the property and there was no positive contribution to the neighborhood. There had been minimum contact with neighbors other than a letter regarding the intent to request rezoning. He stated that some neighbors attempted to call for clarification and left a message with no response. Applicants for other nearby rezoning cases reached out to the neighbors and held multiple neighborhood meetings. Mr. Jordan felt Ms. Reittinger was trying to rezone for any of the 63 uses to mitigate her financial risk. He stated it was no secret that Ms. Reittinger was no stranger to City officials in Greensboro and had proven she had little regard for zoning regulations and asked why she should be rewarded with an open-ended rezoning classification. Mr. Jordan asked the Commission to support the Comprehensive Plan and the future New Garden Road Strategic Plan and protect the City's neighborhoods.

Mary Beth Kerns, 1207 Condor Drive, stated she sent the Commissioners an email voicing her opposition to this proposal. She provided the Commissioners a map she made of the neighborhood which depicts the height of surrounding buildings. There are no three- or four-story houses or structures of any kind in Robin Ridge. Ms. Kerns provided an aerial image of the subject property depicting six vehicles in the front yard. This is a residential house that does not allow for front yard parking. There is parking also in the back. Along the addition there are two sets of steps going to different parts of the building because lots of people live in that house. She stated that their neighborhood was zoned R-3, low density, and single-family.

Mr. Engle asked staff what the maximum height was in the R-3 zoning district. Mr. Kirkman responded that it was 50 feet and three stories. Mr. Engle stated he would like for everyone to understand that if somebody tore down a house in their neighborhood today, they could build three or four stories without anything from the City. He stated he is not for or against, he only wants that to be understood.

Ms. Kerns alluded to a petition signed by the neighborhood asking for an overlay district for protection. The neighborhoods that have overlay districts, or plans, or conservation districts have protection and can talk about heights and setbacks, boundaries and whatever else. This neighborhood does not have that protection and is being eroded a little at a time. They don't want a hodgepodge. The oldest houses in the neighborhood were built in 1951.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if the subject property was being used as a residential multi-family. Ms. Kerns responded that she thought it was.

There being no more opposition speakers, the applicant was given 5 minutes of rebuttal time.

Kim Reittinger stated that the New Garden Road plan had not yet been adopted. There was not an overlay adopted. That should not have any impact on this rezoning. She verified the meeting was being recorded. She stated that she withdrew a previous rezoning due to the amount of disrespect. She stated that she had never had a violation on any property she has ever owned. She had a lot of fake complaint calls from that area. She could obtain a city printout and tell the names and numbers who call the City. The parking has been addressed with the City and was compliant with the ordinance. They have never been out of compliance. Ms. Reittinger stated the people living there were her mother, an aunt, and an uncle. She is allowed to have up to four unrelated people. Two are related and the other two are not. She went out of her way to provide a tour of the house to City Code Compliance. She was not required to. Ms. Reittinger feels these statements that are being falsely made.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked how long she had owned this property. Ms. Reittinger responded almost 18 years and she lived there for four years. The house and the yard are maintained. There has never been a call to the police department. They are good neighbors. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated that she has said she was unaware of any violations. Ms. Reittinger responded there are no violations on that property. Staff has a record of all of it. There are no violations against her. The only calls she has ever received is on this property here.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked Mr. Kirkman if staff was aware of violations. She searched and she found 15. Mr. Kirkman stated there is a question about if there are any active violations on the property and there are not. He looked through from the zoning perspective and there have been multiple investigations related to a number of people and others but they were unfounded. There was nothing that could be proven that there were more than four unrelated individuals which has been investigated several times. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated the investigations she saw were real but didn't result in a violation. Mr. Kirkman responded that was correct and felt the confusion was in the terminology. Complaints were filed, investigated, and determined not to be violations. Mr. Holston asked if there was anything involving parking. Mr. Kirkman responded there were some references to front yard parking but that was handled by a different department. He was unable to do any more investigating on that. There had been gravel placed in the front as part of that. Front yard parking standards allow gravel or pavement in up to 40% of the front yard. Ms. Reittinger stated they are not using the 40% capacity.

Mr. Pinto asked Ms. Jones if this were within the Commissions' purview. Are they allowed to consider any alleged violations or investigations in consideration of this zoning application? The fact that even if this property had a zoning violation, if the rezoning would abate the violation, that is an avenue that an applicant can remedy the violation. It is often done when it is discovered there is a setback violation and go before the Board of Adjustment to seek a variance. The fact that it is in violation is really not to be considered. Ms. Jones likened it to the Historic Preservation Commission and changes made without proper approvals, the legal standard is to consider the application as if the violation had not occurred. In this case, she recommended against considering zoning violations in determining whether the requested zoning district was appropriate for the property. You are not to consider who the applicant/owner is, only consider the uses that would be allowed.

Ms. Reittinger stated the Commissioners are all familiar and well versed with that area. There are no houses behind this house. There is one house on the east side. The college is directly behind and to the right is Urgent Eagle and bank and other office facilities. This property would be suited for CD-O.

Vice Chair Mazzurco opened the floor to the opposition for their rebuttal.

Richard Jordan stated that said Ms. Reittinger had multiple ordinance violation complaints, not violations. The point was that what she does with the property was not conducive to the neighborhood and whatever the Commission gives her will not be conducive to the neighborhood.

Yvonne Williams reiterated that there was no plan and people on all sides of her that adjoin the property were opposed to the rezoning. She received a letter but does not know how many other people received letters. Vice Chair Mazzurco requested that the people who received the letter from the applicant within the 600 feet requirement to stand.

Rosemary Wolkaski, 1312 New Garden Road, stated that she was on the same side of the street as the subject property. She stated that everyone in that row all live on the same side of the street and did receive a letter. Ms. Reittinger did come to their doors and speak to them. She is not for or against. She is undecided at this point. She reference a car accident that just occurred in front the property that resulted in a fatality. The building across the street, even though there were meetings, things were said that potentially was going to happen there are not necessarily are what happened. Ms. Wolkaski is not saying the applicant doesn't have a right to do things on her property because everyone should have that right. We all should be heard and that is what this forum is for. She has lived in this neighborhood for a long

time and is aware when some get their feet dug in, they're dug in. Some people would like to progress, some may not. Ms. Wolkaski just wants to know exactly what could happen there. No more high-rise apartment buildings telling us that 55 and older will live there because that's not the case. Those kinds of things are why some are saying that they don't want this to happen. They don't want that loop hole to take place. They don't want to see the neighborhood go to the wayside. Ms. Wolkaski suggested more lights where people have to slow down. The school is a constant issue. There are a lot of things to consider. She is not trying to hinder Ms. Reittinger but perhaps more time is needed to make a better educated decision.

Vice Chair Mazzurco thanked everyone for their comments. The public hearing was closed and requested staff's recommendation.

Mr. Kirkman stated this site is designated as Low Residential on the Generalized Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan. The Low Residential designation includes the City's predominantly single-family neighborhoods as well as other compatible housing types that can be accommodated within this density range. Per City Council adopted policy, a GFLUM amendment is not required for zoning requests that are less than one acre in size. The proposed request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Reinvention/Infill goal to promote sound investment in Greensboro's urban areas and the Economic Development Goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community. The proposed CD-O request, as conditioned, limits potential negative impacts on the surrounding area. Staff is recommending approval of this request.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Engle stated when he looks at a zoning case, it's what would the property best exist as. At this point he does not know enough to be able to say this is compatible with that area as CD-O. He would need to have some sort of idea how this would interact with the community. Right now, R-3 is what it is. He is not in support of the rezoning.

Mr. Blackstock stated he would vote against the request.

Mr. Marshall stated he is not saying office is not an appropriate use, e does not have enough information at this time to vote to change the existing zoning. At best there is a speculative plan with no plan of what this will be. He is not in support of the rezoning.

Mr. Pinto stated this is tough. New Garden is changing rapidly. The applicant has no responsibility to show a plan and feels it may be the correct way to do it by going through zoning first and then TRC. He has listened to everything. Has driven and looked at it. At this time, he cannot be in support of the rezoning.

Mr. Holston stated he was concerned about the limited amount of outreach, the minimal conditions, the building height capability with the Robin Ridge neighborhood, and incompatible commercial encroachment. He was also concerned that there were no plans and the applicant's reticence to produce or show plans. He stated he would not be supporting the rezoning.

Ms. Dansby-Byrd stated she does not have enough information to make an informed decision at this time and will be voting against the rezoning request.

Ms. Mazzurco thanked both the applicant and the neighborhood for their interest in this case. She felt it was outstanding for neighborhoods to look out for each other and come out in support or opposition. The commission had been inundated with emails, snail mail, and phone calls. She thanked everyone for all of the interest. She stated that she has several problems, some lie here at the Municipal Building. She was told by neighbors of the violations but when researching she found 15 complaints called in and out of 15 there were 5 violations which dates back some years. It has been said there were complaints called in but

no violations. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated staff work needs to be done to make the system more streamlined and easier to find things. Vice Chair Mazzurco would like staff to respond to her about violations on the property on not. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated that there is a committee called the New Garden Strategic Plan Committee. Mr. Clegg has worked very hard on that strategic plan. She requested to have the members of the committee placed on the screen and wanted to emphasize how much involvement and thoughtfulness has gone into this plan for New Garden Road. There are important people and decision makers involved such as Mr. Isaacson and Dr. Ross. Mr. Clegg stated there has been a lot of public outreach in the process and a lot of involvement of stakeholders and community members in the process. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated how impressed she was with people who are engaged on a weekly basis in the process. Legally and technically that plan cannot be considered. Vice Chair Mazzurco advised the audience the plan will be heard on July 17 at 4:00 in this chamber before the Planning Board. It is a public hearing and asked the audience to show up and voice their concerns. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated who the members are working on this plan. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated that the neighbors who are not supporting this rezoning. She cannot support this rezoning request because there is not a plan. No drawings and the Commission is unsure of what is being requested. There are too many unknowns in it. Two conditions with no plans. It is too much of a fluid situation and she will not be in support of this rezoning request.

Mr. Holston stated in agenda item Z-19-070-008, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to deny the zoning amendment, for the property located at 1302 New Garden Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family- 3) 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 for the following reasons. The request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Reinvestment/Infill goal to promote sound investment in Greensboro's urban areas. The request is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan's Economic Development Goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community. The request, as conditioned, does not limit negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhood.

Motion by Mr. Holston, seconded by Vice Chair Mazzurco. The Commission voted 7-1. (Yays (7) - Vice Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Nays (1) - Vernal Alford.). Vice Chair Mazzurco advised the motion failed and is denied. That zoning denial constitutes final action unless appealed in writing to the Planning Department within 10 days. All zoning appeals will be subject to a public hearing on Aug 20, 2019 at the City Council meeting.

Z-19-07-002: An original zoning request from County CU-PD-M (Conditional Use – Planned Development – Medium) to City CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) and City CD-C-M (Conditional District – Commercial – Medium), general described as southwest of NC Highway 68 and south of Leabourne Road, 73.561 Acres. (Favorable Recommendation)

Mr. Carter presented the zoning map and other summary information on the subject property and surrounding properties and noted the conditions.

There being no questions for staff, Vice Chair Mazzurco requested to hear from the applicant.

Nathan Duggins of Tuggle Duggins, 100 North Greene Street represented Greenlee 68 Land, LLC. Mr. Duggins introduced Brian Hall with Samet Corporation. Mr. Hall stated that this project was a joint venture between Samet Corporation and the Collett Companies. Introduced Andrew Hayes, who was a traffic engineer and would offer any guidance if needed. Mr. Duggins provided a site map to the Commission. This had originally been planned to be a retail development. The owners of the property decided to annex the property in to the City of Greensboro which was scheduled to be heard at the next City Council meeting. This was a recommendation before the Zoning Commission. This was in front of the Planning Board in June and was recommended for approval.

There were two tracts. One tract would be built as spec industrial and developed by the Samet Corporation along with Mr. Collett and his organization. They anticipate the first building to be built would be the building in the northeast corner. As the development progressed, the four more buildings would be constructed. Tract two was on the eastern portion of the property. They were anticipating fast food, office, or some sort of other use that would service the industrial use. The GTCC's airport campus was just to the north of where the map ends. The off ramp of 73 was where you would come into this development. They communicated with the neighbors by letter and heard from a Mr. Lyons who owned property to the west and was concerned with connectivity and traffic. A good conversation was held and his concerns were alleviated. They had worked very closely with NCDOT. Mike Mills and his organization were excited about the development and were working with him and GDOT regarding the development of the unnamed road and the traffic access.

They thought this would be a great addition to the area. The airport needed industrial development as it grew and they were confident this tract would serve that purpose. They were asking the Commission to make a recommendation to the City Council that the original zoning request be approved.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there were questions from the Zoning Commissioners. Vice Chair Mazzurco stated she had asked if there was a traffic study on this case and staff said it was underway. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if they could speak about what the findings were. Mr. Hayes stated they had an approved traffic study with NCDOT for a denser land use for this property. A new study was being done for the lighter land use taking into consideration the road improvements to the I-73 southbound ramp. All the intersections operated at acceptable levels of service which was based on delay and was agreed upon in the first traffic study. The new study did not show any different findings. Vice Chair Mazzurco verified the traffic study has to be completely prepared before the TRC process. Mr. Hayes responded they would be signed and sealed by a professional.

Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition.

Gary Silverstein, 7917 Wind Spray Drive, stated he was the developer and builder of Sanford's Creek located in the lower left corner of the map. The residential neighborhood as approved by Zoning in 2006 or so, was zoned County RPD (Rural Preservation District). His development was zoned based upon the recommendation by the County Planning Department. He was not specifically opposed to the development of the subject property, but wanted to make sure the proposed use did not impact negatively on his development. When Mr. Silverstein look at the pamphlet, it described Light Industrial and Commercial Medium. On the map there was one point in which the property came in contact with Sanford's Creek and there were several properties that surround Sanfords Creek which at the time were potentially going to be developed for uses like this. Mr. Silverstein felt this zoning was going to be setting a precedent that would impact them as other properties eventually start to develop. He had the opportunity to develop this with greater density but chose not to because he specialized in green buildings. He felt a responsibility and took the recommendation of the County Planning Board to zone it Rural Preservation District. He was concerned about what the buffer would be and what use would be located closest to Sanford's Ridge. He felt this was a precedent and would like the Commission to consider the details when looking at multiple uses in a property such as this.

Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired of any questions from the Commissioners for Mr. Silverstein. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked Mr. Silverstein to identify his development again. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if it was Sand Creek Road or something like that. Mr. Silverstein responded Sanfords Creek is the subdivision, Sanfords Creek Drive and Sanfords Creek Court. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if Sanfords Creek Drive and the lots are county or city. Mr. Silverstein responded they are county. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if he was referring to the City Planning Board or the County's Planning Board. Mr. Silverstein was unsure. Mr. Kirkman believed that would be correct but noted the property referred to is designated as rural residential and the City has adopted the Western Area Plan acknowledge that those would not develop with any great density. He was not sure if it's a rural district from a zoning standpoint or if it was the

designation of the plan. Regardless, the plan itself from the city's perspective and for this particular property talks about services and when you move further west it does not include expansions of those types of uses.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there were any other questions. There were none. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there was anyone else to speak against the request. No one came forward. Vice Chair Mazzurco called on the applicants for their rebuttal.

Mr. Duggins indicated a map depicting a creek sitting on the border of the area that would require at least a 50-foot buffer. This is effectively a down zoning. It was zoned for a Target and other retail. The uses will be much less impactful from a traffic perspective. They were confident they would be good neighbors to Mr. Silverstein's development.

Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired if there was anyone else to speak. Vice Chair Mazzurco closed the public portion of the hearing and requested staff recommendation.

Mr. Kirkman stated the adopted Western Area Plan designates this area as Commercial/Mixed Use in support of the Campus Village Planning Area, which promotes development associated with and supportive of this large institutional use. The proposal supports the Growth at the Fringe goal to promote sound and sustainable patterns of land use at the City's fringe and the Economic Development goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community, including under-served areas. The requested CD-LI and CD-C-M- zonings provide job training opportunities and services to the GTCC Campus population. Staff is recommending approval of the request.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there was any discussion on this case or is there a motion.

Mr. Marshall stated in agenda item Z-19-7-002, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning for the property located at 1039 – 1949 NC Highway 68, 1049 NC Highway 60N, and a portion of 1051-1099 NC Highway 68 (AKA 1037 NC Highway 68N) from County CU-PD-M (Conditional Use – Planned Development – Medium) The Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approve the zoning amendment, for the property located at City CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) and City CD-C-M (Conditional District – Commercial – Medium) to be consistent with the adopted Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Growth at the Fringe Level goal to promote sound and sustainable patterns of land use at the City's fringe. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Economic Development Goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community, including under-served areas. The requested CD-LI and CD-C-M zonings provide job training opportunities and services to the GTCC Campus population.

Mr. Engle advised this is not a final action tonight and is supporting it but there is time for the applicant and Mr. Silverstein to get together and discuss a proper way to coexist.

Motion by Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Commission voted 8-0. (Vice Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: 0). Vice Chair Mazzurco advised this was a favorable recommendation and will go to City Council on August 20, 2019 for final approval.

Z-19-07-004: A rezoning request from RM-26 (Residential Multi-Family – 26) to CB (Central Business) for the properties located at 212-214 North Cedar Street, generally described as east of Cedar Street and north of West Friendly Avenue, 0.41 Acres. (Favorable Recommendation)

Mr. Carter presented the zoning map and other summary information on the subject property and surrounding properties and noted there are no conditions.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there were any questions from the Commission. Vice Chair requested that the applicant come to the podium.

Eric Peterson, 508 Woodlawn Avenue, introduced his business partner, Timothy Cox of 908 Fairmont Street. Mr. Peterson stated he was also the proxy for First Bank, Carolina Bank at 212 parking lot next door to their property. They were requesting a rezoning application to take advantage of the many benefits offered by the Central Business zoning district. Benefits included on-demand trash pickup, appointments for yard waste pickup, on street parking and increased policing which gives the property a truly downtown urban living setting. First Bank was also seeking rezoning of their property for these same benefits.

Mr. Peterson and Mr. Cox had already invested in two commercial properties downtown. One on Friendly, which was a coffee shop and other was on John Wesley Way that housed their offices and a small dance studio. They passed by the house and felt a part of the community. Cedar Street was in need of investment and they planned to repeat their pattern of high-quality renovation investment to create a healthy and more diverse community. Their investment in the property to that point in time had been weekly yard maintenance, landscaping, and renovation plans created by a licensed architect who is on the Board of the Greensboro Historic Preservation Society. The renovation would be a creative form of housing that would be four single bedroom apartments, two of which will be ADA compliant. The apartments would add to the pool of available downtown housing available to Greensboro's diverse range of residents. A rendering of the property was shown. They created a postcard mailer featuring a current photo of the property and one of an artist's rendering of the structure after renovation. They planned to maintain the historical character of the exterior of the house which was built in 1915. The card was mailed to the current neighbors inviting them to share their concerns or questions about the application and notifying them of this hearing. They received one positive response from Mr. Vernon Powell who stated he was very supportive of the rezoning application. They also received encouragement from neighbors passing by as they worked onsite. With the zoning approval they hoped to begin renovations and have them completed before the end of the year.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor or opposition to the request. No one came forward. The public hearing was closed and Vice Chair Mazzurco requested to hear staff recommendation.

Mr. Kirkman stated this site is designated as Mixed Use Residential on the Generalized Future Land Use Map. The Mixed-Use Residential designation applies to neighborhoods or districts where the predominant use is residential and where substantial, compatible local-serving non-residential uses may be introduced. Per City Council adopted policy, a GFLUM amendment is not required for rezoning requests that are less than one acre in size. Proposal supports the Comprehensive Reinvestment/Infill goal to promote sound investment in Greensboro's urban areas and the 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. Staff is recommending approval of the request.

Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired of any discussion or a motion from the Commission.

Mr. Engle stated with regards to agenda item Z-19-07-004, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the zoning amendment, for the property located at 212-214 North Cedar Street from RM-26 (Residential Multi-family – 26) to CB (Central Business) to be consistent with the adopted Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Reinvestment/Infill goal to promote sound investment in Greensboro's urban

areas, including Center City, commercial and industrial areas, and neighborhoods. The request is consistent with the Housing and Neighborhood 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.

Motion by Mr. Engle, seconded by Mr. Marshall. The Commission voted 8-0. (Vice Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: 0). Vice Chair Mazzurco advised this is a final action unless appealed in writing to the Planning Department within 10 days. Anyone may file such appeal. All such appeals may be subject to a public hearing at the August 20, 2019 City Council meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-19-07-005: A rezoning request from O (Office) and CD-CB (Conditional District – Central Business) to CD-CB (Conditional District – Central Business for the property located at 512 and 514 Bellemeade Street, 305 North Edgeworth Street, and a portion of 307 North Edgeworth Street, east of Spring Street, and west of North Edgeworth Street, 0.827 Acres. (Favorable Recommendation)

Mr. Carter presented the zoning map and other summary information on the subject property and surrounding properties and noted the conditions.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there were any questions of Mr. Carter. There being none, Vice Chair Mazzurco asked to hear from Mr. Isaacson, the applicant.

Mr. Marc Isaacson, 804 Green Valley Road, presented the zoning map which showed most of the property was zoned Central Business. There was a sliver of land which was included in the request that was owned by Guilford County that was zoned office. The purpose of the rezoning was to align the zoning of the County's parking lot zoned office with the remaining property zoned Central Business. Their client had a contract with Guilford County to acquire this narrow strip of land and if it was rezoned would be combined with the existing central business property and redeveloped. The property was being shown to several potential office users, to include a bank and all have expressed an interest in additional parking. Off street or on-site parking was very valuable to have and the purpose of this zoning request was to add some land to the property to allow sufficient parking to redevelop the property. This gave them an opportunity to clean up the zoning conditions related to the building on the property which had been removed and had worked with staff to update the zoning conditions and bring this up to date.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there were any questions for Mr. Isaacson from the Commission. Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor or in opposition to this request. No one came forward. Vice Chair Mazzurco closed the public hearing and requested to hear staff's recommendation.

Mr. Kirkman stated this site is designated as Mixed User Central Business District on the Generalized Future Land Use Map. This designation applies only in and around downtown Greensboro. It emphasizes the urban character and the mix and intensity of activities uniquely suited to the central city. This request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Reinvestment/Infill goal to promote sound investment in Greensboro's urban areas and the Downtown goal to promote reinvestment, preservation, diversification, and selective intensification of activity in Downtown Greensboro, to reinforce its importance as the economic, cultural and civic center of the City while protecting its heritage and the historic resources and enhancing its urban character. Staff is recommending approval of the request.

Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired of any discussion or a motion.

Mr. Pinto stated with regards to agenda item Z-19-07-005, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the zoning amendment, for the property located at 512 and 514 Bellemeade Street, 305 North Edgeworth Street, and a portion of 307 North Edgeworth Street from O (Office) to CD-CB (Conditional District - Central Business) to be consistent with the adopted Connections

2025 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Downtown goal to promote reinvestment, preservation, diversification, and selective intensification of activity in Downtown Greensboro, to reinforce its importance as the economic, cultural and civic center of the City while protecting its heritage and historic resources and enhancing its urban character. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Reinvestment/Infill goal to promote sound investment in Greensboro's urban areas. The request includes conditions that limits potential negative impacts to the surrounding area.

Motion by Mr. Pinto, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Commission voted 8-0. (Vice Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: 0). Vice Chair Mazzurco advised this is a final action unless appealed in writing to the Planning Department within 10 days. Anyone may file such appeal. All such appeals may be subject to a public hearing at the August 20, 2019 City Council meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Z-19-07-006: A rezoning request from CD-BP (Conditional District – Business Park) and BP (Business Park) to CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) for the property located at 651, 653, 657, 659, 665, 665 Near, and 661 Brigham Road and 7940 Eric Road, generally described as west of Brigham Road and South of Eric Road, 80.62 Acres. (Favorable Recommendation)

Mr. Carter presented the zoning map and other summary information on the subject property and surrounding properties and noted the condition.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked if there were any questions of Mr. Carter. There being none, Vice Chair Mazzurco asked to hear from the applicant.

Chad Essick, Poyner Spruill, 301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1900, Raleigh, NC, represented the applicant, Highwoods Properties. The applicant was a regional developer, headquartered in Raleigh with a strong presence in the Triad. He introduced Ed Gamucca, construction manager for Highwoods. The company began developing industrial parks in the late 1990s and had since built out five buildings comprised of over 900,000 square feet. The buildings ranged from 118,000 square feet to 130,000 square feet with the largest building in the center being over 400,000 square feet. Prior to the City's adoption of its land development ordinance in 2010, the properties were zoned Corporate Park and at that time it allowed buildings over 60,000 square feet to be constructed. In 2010 when the LDO was adopted, the Business Park designation was put on this property which was an unintended consequence to render these buildings non-conforming because of the requirement that buildings in that district only be 60,000 square feet. The purpose of this rezoning was to make those buildings conforming. Highwoods plans to construct a sixth building in the northwest portion of the site that is currently vacant which will be approximately 180,000 square feet and would add 8 million in tax base to the already 35 million in tax base for the current property.

Mr. Essick provided a site plan for the proposed development to the Commission. Mr. Essick stated letters were sent to all property owners within 600 feet and enclosed a copy of the zoning application and provided an explanation on why the rezoning was being requested, and provided contact information. To date, nothing had been received any calls or inquiries from any of the surrounding property owners.

Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired if there were questions of Mr. Essick. Vice Chair Mazzurco thanked Mr. Essick for the site plan and stated that it was interesting to have. Vice Chair Mazzurco thanked Highwoods Property as they were a great additional and a wonderful tax payer in Greensboro and their properties were immaculate. Vice Chair Mazzurco inquired if there was anyone to speak in favor or in opposition to this request. No one came forward. Chair Mazzurco closed the public hearing and requested to hear staff's recommendation.

Mr. Kirkman stated this site is designated as Employment Area in the Western Area Plan. The majority of the demand for industrial and office land projected in the Market Analysis will be absorbed in the footprint of the Employment Area. The Western Area is a prime location for employers to look for assemblages of land to accommodate a large footprint facility. The proposed rezoning request supports both the Comprehensive Growth at the Fringe goal to provide a development framework for the fringe that guides sound, sustainable patterns of land use and provides for efficient provision of public services and facilities as the City expands and the Economic Development Goal to a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community. The proposed CD-LI request, as conditioned, allows uses that are generally compatible with the surrounding area. Staff is recommending approval of the request.

Vice Chair Mazzurco asked any discussion, comments, or a motion from the Commission.

Mr. Marshall stated in agenda item Z-19-07006, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the zoning amendment, for the property located at 651, 653, 657, 659, 659 rear, 665, 665 Near, and 661 Brigham Road and 7940 Eric Road from CD-BP (Conditional District – Business Park and BP (Business Park) to CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons. The request is consistent with 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 and provides for efficient provision of public services and facilities as the City expands. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Economic Development Goal to promote a healthy, diversified economy with a strong tax base and opportunities for employment, entrepreneurship and for-profit and non-profit economic development for all segments of the community. The request includes conditions that limits potential negative impacts to the surrounding area.

Motion by Mr. Marshall, seconded by Mr. Engle. The Commission voted 8-0. (Vice Chair Janet Mazzurco, Adam Marshall, Hugh Holston, Vernal Alford, Zac Engle, Marian Dansby-Byrd, Andrew Pinto, and Donald Blackstock. Nays: 0). Vice Chair Mazzurco advised this is a final action unless appealed in writing to the Planning Department within 10 days. Anyone may file such appeal. All such appeals may be subject to a public hearing at the August 20, 2019 City Council meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Mr. ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

No items from the Planning Department.

ITEMS FROM THE ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Holston asked how many cases for the next meeting. Mr. Kirkman responded four at this point.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair Lester's' absence was noted as excused.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Mazzurco, Vice Chairperson

JM/cgs

DRAFT