

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
MAY 20, 2020**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, March 20, 2020, at 4:00 pm virtually via Zoom. Board members present were: Chair Steve Allen, Mike Cooke, Dave Blackman, Homer Wade, Richard Bryson, Donald Brandon, Carol Carter, John Martin, and Emanuel Clark. Planning staff present included Steve Galanti, Luke Carter, Jeff Sovich, Russ Clegg, and Sue Schwartz. Also present was Terri Jones from the City Attorney's Office and Cynthia Blue from the Department of Neighborhood Development.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 2020 SPECIAL PLANNING BOARD MEETING (APPROVED)

Mr. Bryson moved to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2020 Planning Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Blackman. The Board voted 9-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Cooke, Blackman, Bryson, Brandon, Wade, Carter, Martin, and Clark. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 19, 2020 REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING (APPROVED)

Mr. Bryson moved to approve the minutes of the February 19, 2020 Planning Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Blackman. The Board voted 9-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Cooke, Blackman, Wade, Bryson, Brandon, Carter, Martin, and Clark. Nays: None.)

AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT RFP (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Wade, Mr. Cooke and Mr. Martin asked to be recused from the item for a potential conflict of interest and were recused by a unanimous vote.

Cynthia Blue, Department of Neighborhood Development, presented the results of the 2020 Multi-family Affordable Housing Development requests for proposals. Since two projects were received after the deadline and one project was missing several of the threshold elements, the remaining four projects are recommended for funding. With the addition of \$267,002, there is enough to fully fund all four of the project requests. Guilford County is the most competitive in the state with 12 applications, eight of which were new construction, two rehabilitation, and two tax credit bond deals. The four projects recommended are: Redhill Pointe presented by Affordable Housing Management, comprised of 84 new construction units for families; Appert Farm, presented by Beacon Management Corporation, comprised of 72 new construction units for families; the Loft at Elmsley Crossing, comprised of 84 new construction family units; and Windhill Development, presented by Affordable Housing Management, comprised of 60 family units as an acquisition / rehabilitation project. Municipal commitment letters will be accepted until the final application deadline of July 15, 2020 and all supporting material must be submitted by the developers at that time. An award announcement is scheduled

in the August through September timeframe. The Planning Board's recommendation would go to City Council for their June meeting.

In response to a question from Mr. Bryson, Ms. Blue stated the \$267,002 additional HOME program funds are in the Rehabilitation Programs funding. Due to Covid-19, the homeowner rehabilitation program has been mostly shut down as we are not currently doing construction in homes during this pandemic. These additional funds most likely will not be spent this year.

In a response to a question from Ms. Carter, Ms. Blue stated the LIHTC awards are awarded on a pro-rata basis for the Metro counties. Based on our population, we can generally expect two projects to be funded. The tax credit bond projects are generally non-competitive and will probably move forward on their own.

Bobby Funk, Mills Construction, Raleigh, advocating on behalf for the proposed development of Yanceyville Place requested that it continue on with a favorable recommendation for local funding. After submission of the application to the City, Yanceyville Place was not recommended for HOME funding or local bond funds from the City's allocation. A full application has been submitted to the state for tax credits and is in position to access HOME funds from the state's RPP program. Mills Construction believes the site will provide much needed housing in northeast Greensboro, which has experienced less new housing developments relative to other areas. They do believe it is in the city's best interest to position as many feasible projects for state funding as possible or there could be a higher likelihood for funding to go to other municipalities. This is the first time for Mills Construction seeking to do development within Greensboro.

Chair Allen stated from past experience usually the majority of these projects require not just municipal funding but also state funding so in the event that one of the projects does not meet state funding, having as many projects presented is something that would have a better chance of having more projects done locally.

In response to a question from Ms. Carter, Ms. Blue responded that there were two threshold element issues with the Yanceyville Place request. There were two areas where the applicant was missing information. One was justifying the land cost and the other was full documentation of commitments. Since the information was submitted late, staff did not have time before this meeting to determine if the scoring would meet the threshold.

Ms. Carter stated without having all of the information she was hesitant to recommend funding for the Yanceyville Place request.

Ms. Blue stated all the funds have been allocated. The bond funds were the remaining allocation of the multi-family housing bonds funding.

Chair Allen stated that the Board is making a recommendation, City Council would make the overall decision, and that it is possible for changes to be made to get the project back on the list.

Chair Allen stated he has seen projects added or recommended but did not want to overlook the time and effort staff has put into making these recommendations for the Board. Chair Allen felt the Yanceyville project was submitted before the timeframe allowed and even though it wasn't complete, he would like to see as many projects as possible. A lot of times projects might not come to fruition and the Board could possibly be seeing a lot more on the next slate.

Patrick Theisman, Beacon Management Corporation, stated that each company has worked hard to submit the information, make sure that all of the exhibits were complete and wants the process to be conducted fairly.

In response to a question from Ms. Carter, Ms. Blue stated they would need to look at the elements submitted and ensure the Yanceyville project met the threshold. They would need to identify an additional funding source because currently what has been allocated are the HOME funds and the multi-family bond funds that are available. Ms. Blue stated she did not think Yanceyville could be funded with HOME funds and would have to look at a reallocation of bond funds.

David Levy, Affordable Housing Management, stated that this is a very serious business that needs to be followed to the letter. Affordable Housing put a lot of time, money, and effort into making sure that when their application was submitted it was complete. If they were to leave out something that was specified and were disqualified for not submitting everything required to meet the threshold, he would not have any argument with that. Mr. Levy stated in the past Affordable Housing Management has not ranked and was not recommended for funding. If there are not enough funds in the RFP specifically for all the projects that were being funded, the city has never done that. The only time was if the City had enough bond funds to cover all of the projects that were being awarded. Mr. Levy did not feel it was fair to bring in another application for funding as there is not enough money to cover all four projects as has been done in the past by the City, and they failed to submit a thorough application meeting all the City's thresholds.

Ms. Carter moved to recommend approval, of the staff-recommended projects, to City Council, seconded by Mr. Blackman. The Board voted 5-1-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Brandon, Bryson, Blackman, Clark, and Carter. Nays: Chair Allen. Abstain: Martin, Wade and Cooke.)

RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF GREENSBORO'S NEW COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; GSO2040 (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Ms. Schwartz stated they are asking the Planning Board to make the recommendation to City Council on the adoption of the new Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Schwartz explained the process for development of the plan called PlanitGSO, with the plan transitioning to the new name. Ms. Schwartz stated that the Comprehensive Plan is the road map for the future. *GSO2040* provides the common touch points for the City's programs and policies with the community's vision. *GSO2040* focuses on how land use issues affect the

economy, quality of life, and sense of community. There was a heavy emphasis on having a wide range of public input. There were specific workshops, pop ups, team meetings, festivals and more. The Speaker Series included 10 different experts from around the country regarding issues that will affect the future and how to make Greensboro better. An advisory committee was formed composed of members from each City Board or Commission that provided invaluable feedback on how the plan is being developed and guidance for public outreach. There have been survey opportunities and a strong Facebook presence. The presentation will be in three parts, brief presentation on the plan, public comments and a vote on a recommendation by the Planning Board to City Council. The hope is to have the recommendation go to City Council on June 16th. There are several amendments to the Land Development Ordinance that will need to be updated to achieve the target date of September 1, 2020. Ms. Schwartz stated changes have been adopted in line with the North Carolina general statutes for land use policies.

Mr. Clegg explained the plan structure beginning with community values. Mr. Clegg spoke to Greensboro's value of culture, diversity and history. Plan vision statements were presented. Mr. Clegg referred to the six big ideas; filling in our framework, creating great places to work and live, becoming car optional, prioritizing sustainability, building community connections and growing in economic competitiveness. *GSO2040*, if approved by City Council, will streamline the way property is rezoned and will not require as a separate amendment.

Marc Isaacson stated that he was speaking in favor for recommendation of this plan to City Council. A lot of hard work went into the plan. Mr. Isaacson advised he was on the Advisory Committee which included a broad representation from other commissions around the city. This point was reached because this City was based on the vision and leadership displayed by Greensboro predecessors. This is an opportunity to carry forward the principles, standards, and values that those predecessors set forth that made Greensboro unique. Mr. Isaacson stated the Six Big Ideas that have been outlined are supported by details that give it substance. The City has been operating under the old plan for approximately 20 years and this new plan will greatly serve Greensboro for the next 20 years. The plan is a balanced approach to achieve those six ideas with enough detail to refer back to it when needed. Mr. Isaacson asked the Board to consider this request carefully and recommend in favor to City Council for consideration and approval.

Judy Stalder thanked staff for the outreach to the general public and the development community. Staff met with builders, developers, the Greensboro Chamber, and other economic development players. This is usable guidance for many years because of the flexibility within the plan. Ms. Stalder stated she looks forward to seeing it moved through the process for approval.

Wayne Durham stated that he was on the Advisory Committee. Mr. Durham grew up in the Greensboro area, was gone for a long period of time and moved back to Greensboro. The biggest area is that Greensboro has a lot of opportunities. There are 50,000 college students per year and Greensboro has done a great job of planning for meeting the needs

of younger people. Greensboro needs a couple of big businesses. A lot of hard work has gone into this plan. Mr. Durham supports the plan and hoped the Board will support it.

Heather Dodson, President of the Greensboro Regional Realtors Association, stated that GRRRA reviewed the *GSO2040* Comprehensive Plan currently available to the public. GRRRA commended the Planning Department and the City of Greensboro for creating this vision for Greensboro. It is a well-rounded document providing a great framework for achieving Smart Growth goals which realtors are really striving to lead in. The Realtor Association also thanked the partners and the Greensboro Planning Department for bringing the first national Smart-Growth which provides an important statistical backdrop to the plan. The GRRRA supports the *GSO2040* Comprehensive Plan adoption and looks forward to having the City achieve its goals.

Mr. Blackman stated that the key here is to focus on the Sx Big Ideas, that the planning staff continually pried for specifics and kept the plan in tune within the community, and he supported this plan.

In response to a question from Ms. Carter regarding the level of generality in the Anticipated Land Use maps, Mr. Isaacson stated that he understood the map to be a guideline for the future and the city. The map is generalized and parts of the plan are generalized but pointed out it is not so general that it is vague and ambiguous. It has enough detail in it with the supportive maps and other exhibits to have some very real substance. Mr. Durham added that in the next 20 years it will change often. The key point is how often to take a look at what that change is. Ms. Stalder added that the GFLUM is often viewed as a zoning map rather than guidance. Ms. Stalder felt the new map with the added flexibility allows developers to use their imagination and come up with new products. Everything is changing at an accelerated pace right now. The areas where there are already specific plans, such as the corridor plans and area plans are still in effect.

Mr. Clark stated he read the plan, was much impressed, and commended staff and everyone for their hard work.

In response to a question from Mr. Clark, Ms. Schwartz stated that staff has been acutely aware of the changes. Before this meeting, Mr. Clegg and Ms. Schwartz were on a call with the Urban Land Institute discussing how this pandemic is going to change the projections that were just accomplished months ago. There are three things that keep coming back and we keep seeing in the literature, listening from national experts who are studying this. CNBC had a couple of articles regarding how cities are changing or not changing. If the attention to cleanliness and hygiene in cities gets revisited, that is not necessarily a bad thing.

Mr. Bryson stated that he commended everyone, to include staff, for the work done on this plan. In thinking of this plan, his family walked in the neighborhood for the first time in 18 years, on the street without worrying about getting hit by a car because there are sidewalks now. This is major because everyone can walk in the neighborhood and not

walk in the street. Due to this pandemic, nothing is the same and nothing will be going back to normal. Young people have options to go different places when they graduate from an institution of higher learning in Greensboro and there is a need to keep them here. In two years, everyone can look back and see some strides. Mr. Bryson implored the staff, the Planning Board, and everyone involved to make sure that this plan doesn't stay as a dream and becomes a reality.

Mr. Blackman moved to recommend the plan to City Council, seconded by Mr. Wade. The Board voted 9-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Brandon, Carter, Cooke, Clark, Martin, Wade, Bryson, and Blackman, Nays: None.)

Chair Allen advised that in accordance with Session Law 2020-3, written comments can be submitted Steve Galanti for up to 24 hours for consideration on this item.

ANNEXATIONS

PL(P) 20-09 PROPOSED CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION OF 2240 EAST CONE BOULEVARD, (24.738 ACRES) (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Galanti stated that the annexation is for Guilford Charter School Corporation, is a portion of 2240 East Cone Boulevard, and that the site contains approximately 24.738 acres. City Water is available to the west of the property where a 30iinch line crosses East Cone Boulevard. City Sewer is available to the west of the property where a 16-inch sewer line cross East Cone Boulevard. The City's Fire Department noted that it is served by Fire Station #55 on Hicone Road, upon annexation would be served by City Station #7, and that response times to this property will improve. The Police Department can provide service to this site with little impact. Solid Waste can also provide service to the site. Mr. Galanti stated that the area to the north and east of this site is located in the County's jurisdiction and has single family dwellings. Property to the south is located within the City contains the city's landfill. West of the site, the property is the county's jurisdiction and is currently vacant. This property is located within Growth Tier 1on the Growth Strategy map in the current Comprehensive Plan and is contiguous to the primary corporate limits for the City of Greensboro. This request received a favorable recommendation by the Technical Review Committee at their May 14, 2020, meeting.

Ms. Carter moved to recommend the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 9-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Cooke, Blackman, Wade, Bryson, Brandon, Martin, Clarke and Carter. Nays: None).

PL(P) 20-11: PROPOSED CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION OF 5281 MACKAY ROAD AND A PORTION OF 2005 GUILFORD COLLEGE ROAD (16.43 ACRES.) (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Galanti stated that that annexation for a portion of the property located on Mackay Road and Guilford College Road. This annexation request will include the right-of-way for Mackay Road along its frontage. City Water is available by connecting to the existing water line located on the southeast corner of the property. Sanitary Sewer is available by

connecting to the line that runs through the site and the applicant has been advised to check with Jamestown/High Point to make sure they can handle the flow. The City's Fire Department noted that it is currently served by Pinecroft-Sedgefield Station #53 located on Mackay Road and upon annexation will continue to be served by them. For a single unit, the response time will remain the same, but the response time for multi-unit incidents would improve. The Police Department can provide service to this site with little impact. Solid Waste can also provide service. Mr. Galanti advised the area to the north is in the County's jurisdiction and contains single family dwellings, to the east of the site is in the City's jurisdiction and is a multi-family development, and the property to the south is located within the County's jurisdiction and contains single family dwellings. West of the property is located in Jamestown and contains a multi-family townhouse development. The property is located within Growth Tier 1 on the Growth Strategy map in the Comprehensive Plan and is contiguous to the City's primary corporate limits. This request received a favorable recommendation by the Technical Review Committee at their May 14, 2020 meeting.

In response to a question from Ms. Carter, Mr. Galanti stated that this site is within the Greensboro portion of the annexation agreements with High Point and Jamestown.

Ms. Carter moved to recommend the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Martin. The Board voted 9-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Cooke, Blackman, Wade, Bryson, Brandon, Martin, Clarke and Carter. Nays: None.)

STREET CLOSINGS

PL(P) 20-10: PROPOSED CLOSING OF A PORTION OF WALKER AVENUE, FROM A POINT 105.81 FEET FROM SOUTH TATE STREET WESTWARD A DISTANCE OF 260 FEET TO ITS TERMINUS. (CONTINUED)

This request was continued to the next Planning Board meeting.

EASEMENT RELEASES

2733 RING ROAD – RELEASE OF A 25-FOOT WIDE STORM SEWER AND UTILITY EASEMENT, AS ESTABLISHED IN PLAT BOOK 160 ON PAGE 69. (CONTINUED)

This request was continued to the next Planning Board meeting.

3232 & 3236 HORSE PEN CREEK ROAD - RELEASE OF A 20' UTILITY EASEMENT; PARTIAL RELEASE OF 10' UTILITY EASEMENT; PARTIAL RELEASE OF A 20' UTILITY EASEMENT, AS ESTABLISHED IN PLAT BOOK 137 PAGE 56; PLAT BOOK 49 PAGE 23; AND PLAT BOOK 102 PAGE 31. (CONTINUED)

This request was continued to the next Planning Board meeting.

AMENDMENTS TO GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (GFLUM)

CP 20-09: APPROXIMATELY 61.86 ACRES AT A PORTION OF 4327 FOUR FARMS ROAD, A PORTION OF 4319 R1 FOUR FARMS ROAD, AND 4315 WILLOW ROCK LANE, FROM LOW-RESIDENTIAL TO MIXED-USE – RESIDENTIAL

Mr. Sovich stated that the current designation for the site is Low Residential, the reason and circumstances for the proposed amendment to Mixed –Use Residential, provided the definition for each designation, and the relevant Connections 2025 goals and policies.

In response to a question from Mr. Wade, Mr. Galanti stated that a portion of the site is located in the noise cone.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chair Allen stated that mixed-use seems to be the trend in the area with a number of mixed-use facilities to the north, west, and east.

Ms. Carter stated that the proposal is in line with the current uses in the area.

Mr. Fox, attorney representing the applicant, stated that staff has done an excellent job in summarizing the request, and that the owner of this property sees this as a unique opportunity to have something special in this particular area consistent with what is already there. Hopefully whatever is developed there will be nice and something for the city and neighbors will be proud of and is consistent with the development patterns already in place.

CP 20-10: APPROXIMATELY 6 ACRES AT 3606-B, 3608, 3612, AND 3612YY NORTH CHURCH STREET FROM MODERATE-RESIDENTIAL TO MIXED-USE – COMMERCIAL.

Mr. Sovich stated the current designation on the site is Moderate Residential, the reason and circumstances for the proposed amendment to Mixed-Use – Commercial, provided the definition for each designation, and the relevant Connections 2025 goals and policies.

COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Carter stated she thought it was a good proposal and agreed the Mixed-Use Commercial was needed in this part of the City.

Mr. Bryson stated that Mixed-Use Commercial is needed in this portion of the City. It is a good idea to have this in that particular area and felt it was well done.

CP 20-11: APPROXIMATELY 12.16 ACRES AT 4007 AND 4015 STRAW HAT ROAD, FROM LOW RESIDENTIAL AND MIXED USE CORPORATE PARK TO MODERATE – RESIDENTIAL.

Mr. Wade asked to be recused from the item for a potential conflict of interest and were recused by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Sovich stated the current designation on the site is Low Residential, Mixed Use – Corporate Park, the reason and circumstances for the proposed amendment to Moderate-Residential, provided the definition for each designation, and the relevant Connections 2025 goals and policies.

In response to a question from Chair Allen, Mr. Sovich stated that access would be from Straw Hat Road.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Ms. Carter stated that this makes sense with the surrounding land uses, would fit well as a transition to the adjoining developments, and the dirt road would have to be brought up to city standards as part of the development process.

Chair Allen also expressed access concerns with Straw Hat Road being a dirt road.

CP 20-12: APPROXIMATELY 13.3 ACRES AT 321 MURRAYLANE ROAD, FROM MIXED USE CORPORATE PARK TO LOW RESIDENTIAL. (ATTACHMENT 7D; PRESENTED BY JEFF SOVICH)

Mr. Wade asked to be recused from the item for a potential conflict of interest and were recused by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Sovich stated the current designation on the site is Low Residential, Mixed Use – Corporate Park, the reason and circumstances for the proposed amendment to Moderate-Residential, the definition for each designation, and the relevant Connections 2025 goals and policies.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Mr. Bryson stated that the change was not good due to its close proximity to a salvage yard and the negative impacts the associated environmental issues would have on residential uses.

Chair Allen stated that this was not the proper portion of the City for single-family development and is more suitable for light industrial uses. He raised concerns related to the buffer and the environmental risks with being so close to a salvage facility.

Mr. Clark stated that the nature and character of this property is inappropriate for single-family residences, the request did not appear to meet the comprehensive plan's policies or goals, and did not fit area.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

There were no absences.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz, FAICP
Planning Department, Director