

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

1

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Zoning Commission was held electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website January 20, 2021, beginning at 5:30 p.m. Members present were: Chair Hugh Holston, Sandra O'Connor, Raymond Trapp, Richard Bryson, Tony Collins, Michael Jones, and Vernal Alford. Present for City staff included Luke Carter, Mike Kirkman and Steve Galanti, (Planning Department), Noland Tipton (GDOT), Andrea Harrell, (City Attorney), and Alan Andrews, (Chief Deputy City Attorney).

Chair Holston welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted online. Chair Holston advised of the policies and procedures in place for the Zoning Commission and how the meeting would be conducted using the online format.

Attorney Harrell advised pursuant to General Assembly Session Law 2020-3, adopted by the North Carolina Assembly, anyone may submit written comments between now and 24 hours after the public hearing closes on each of the identified items requested each item be identified for comments to be made on and submit the comments to Planning staff.

Chair Holston performed a roll call of the Commissioners present. Chair Holston advised Commissioners Engle and Rosa had previously advised they would not be present at this meeting. Ms. O'Connor moved to approve the absences of both Commissioners, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Commission voted 6-0. (Chair Holston, O'Connor, Alford, Jones, Bryson, and Collins. Nays: 0).

APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 21, 2020 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: (Approved)

Mr. Alford requested verification of the end time which was incorrect in the minutes. A conditional motion was made by Ms. O'Connor to have the closing time adjusted in the December minutes; seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Commission voted 6-0. (Chair Holston, O'Connor, Alford, Jones, Bryson, and Collins. Nays: 0).

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE

No withdrawals or continuances.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

OLD BUSINESS:

PL(P) 20-26 & Z-20-11-006: The City of Greensboro is proposing a change to the Airport Overlay District to establish a Zone 1 (AOD-1) and a Zone 2 (AOD-2) in accordance with the proposed new Airport Overlay District map. (Recommended Approval)

Text Amendments:

- a. Zoning Planning and Development Text Amendment: Amending Sections 30-4-1.4 (Mailed Notice), 30-4-8.7 (District Boundaries), 30-7-8.2 (District Standards), and 30-13-9.2 (Owner's Associations) of the Land Development Ordinance related to the Airport Overlay District.

Mr. Kirkman advised that Mr. Steve Galanti of Greensboro Planning would present most of the information and stated there were two different actions that need to be taken. The first was changes to the boundary of the airport

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

2

overlay zoning district via a map amendment. The second was to change the text in the Land Development Ordinance regarding the regulations tied to the Airport Overlay District. Mr. Galanti stated city planners have two tools used to regulate development in the City of Greensboro. First is the based Zoning District. If zoned C-M in the eastern part of town, the setbacks and building height limits are the same as if zoned C-M in the western part of town. Overlay districts are additional standards that go above and beyond the base Zoning District. The discussion will be regarding the zoning map amendment and the text amendment for the overlay district related to the Airport Overlay. Slides were shown depicting the current Airport Overlay district purpose to limit residential land uses in order to be compatible with the airport, minimize the impacts of aircraft noise, and prohibit large structures that would interfere with the airport operations. Current regulations require written documentation from the airport for structures exceeding 50 feet and prohibits residential uses, except single family residential uses on lots of at least 40,000 square feet. The current boundary of the Airport Overlay is based on the 60 dnl line from the county adopted airport area plan of 2001 and is the day/night average for noise within the airport overlay, also referred to as the noise cone. Since the map was adopted in 2002, the airport, as part of its required Part 150 study, amended that map and changed the boundaries of their noise cone.

Mr. Galanti noted these items were continued at the Zoning Commission two months ago and there have been several meetings with stakeholders who have expressed concerns during that time. As a result of those discussions the text amendment in the Commissioners package was revised and the revised text amendment was sent to the members and dated January 20, 2021. He noted that two changes were made regarding the noise level reduction and a provision to allow other measures in addition to construction and materials to perform noise level reduction. An amendment was also made to the notification requirement for the airport that went back to the current wording in the ordinance requiring written documentation from the airport for structures over 50 feet in height.

Mr. Galanti stated then reminded the Commission that they would consider an amendment to the zoning map and the Land Development Ordinance. The proposal is to divide the current airport overlay district into two sub-districts, District 1 and District 2. District 1 will be the boundary of the 60 dnl noise cone from the airport's more recent Part 150 study done in 2007. Within the proposed Airport Overlay District 1 is a continuation to prohibit residential uses, except for single family detached dwellings on lots greater than 40,000 square feet. The new District 2 will be the area between the District 1 line and the current boundary of the Airport Overlay District. Within District 2 there will be three provisions, one currently in the ordinance and two that are being added. The first one is public notification, requiring a disclosure statement whenever property is sold, adding a required note on the final plat whenever a lot is created, and a statement in the owner's association document depicted on the screen. The second provision is noise level reduction. In District 2, the ordinance will require that building materials or construction methods are used to reduce the outside noise heard inside the dwelling by at least 30 decibels. The builder will be required to hire a certified acoustical professional to certify the noise reduction is achieved. The third provision continues the split parcel provision. If a parcel is split by the overlay district boundary, it could be shifted out of the boundary with two caveats. It cannot be shifted more than 600 feet and cannot encroach into District 1.

Mr. Galanti stated when this effort began there were several public information sessions and information was made available to the public. A media release was done and covered by several of the local news channels. There were meetings with the airport, land owners in the area, and the Greensboro Chamber of Commerce. A web site was created with all of the information. The web site had an interactive map that would allow land owners to type in their address and show them whether they are inside Districts 1 or 2, or outside the overlay district. Two public

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

3

information sessions were also held via Zoom. Notices were mailed to the affected property owners. When the item is heard by City Council, a notice in the local newspaper will also be published. Mr. Galanti reiterated this is a public hearing for both the map amendment and the text amendment, and asked the Zoning Commission to hear public comments and make a recommendation as both items for City Council, which is tentatively set to hear both items at their February 16, 2021. Mr. Galanti advised he would answer any questions.

Chair Holston stated if there were no additional comments from the City, if anyone who wished to speak on the application would raise their hand, state their name, address, and state their case. A total of 15 minutes combined will be applied to each side for speakers. Chair Holston requested those in favor to speak first.

Attorney Tom Terrell, Fox Rothschild, 230 North Elm Street, representing the Piedmont Triad Airport Authority. Mr. Terrell stated this request is critical to the airport. There have been a number of meetings with staff and there suggested several changes. Mr. Terrell introduced General Council to the airport, Bill Cooke who would introduce those changes.

Attorney Bill Cooke, 3 Stone Creek Court, Greensboro. Mr. Cooke reiterated the airport believes maintenance of the overlay districts is crucial. The airport does support the proposals outlined by the Planning Department and passed a resolution that stated so, with one exception which will be discussed later. Mr. Cooke referenced a slide depicting the two overlay districts and the Zone 1 boundary (AOD1), the proposed AOD 2 boundary is Zone 2. Overlaid on them are the arrival paths to the runways at the airport. Mr. Cooke stated as aircraft cross over Hwy 220 the planes are on their final approach and there is a concentration of flights going down the middle of the overlay districts. Of particular concern are the approach to Runway 23L located on the right of the slide. It is the most used arrival tract at the airport and is 53% of the arrivals during the day. Flights can arrive between 10:00 p.m. and 1:00 in the morning. The arrival tracts are the same as presented in December and will only increase in the future. Currently Fed Ex has 10 aircraft and plans to have up to 63. The airport is set up to accommodate all of those Fed Ex Flights. If Fed Ex does not develop to 63, the airport would be ideally situated for other cargo development. Internet business is booming and the airport is perfectly situated geographically and can accommodate cargo flights. Talks have been had to locate a focus city or a mini-hub to increase the flight tracts.

Mr. Cooke advised the airport anticipates other airport development and is actively working to develop the airport. Part of the mission is to help bring more aviation development to the airport which would bring in jobs. Currently the combined work force of people working at the airport for the authority and airport tenants is over 8,000 with an average salary of \$60,000 to \$65,000. These are good paying jobs to help make up for the jobs lost in this community and to contribute to the economic development of the community. As the airport develops there will be more air traffic and more arrivals on this arrival path. It is crucial that housing within the arrival path is prepared to accommodate not only the current flights but those anticipated in the future. If housing is not prepared to accommodate arrivals it will stand in the way of further development at the airport that benefits the community.

Mr. Cooke noted the two conditions in Zone 2 are farsighted and well thought out. Notification is very important to anybody who might buy a new house within the airport district to know they would be in a flight path and a lot of that flight traffic would be at night. Houses will be shown by relators during the day and potential buyers need to be aware of what happens at night. Second condition was use whatever methods the developers are able to use

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

4

to address noise insulation and reduce the noise levels that would penetrate into the home from outside. There would be a modest cost for the insulation which will increase the value of the homes. The airport authority feels these two conditions make good sense. The only exception to the proposal made by the Planning Department that made good sense in to have the same standards in Zone 1. Currently Zone 1 only has the 40,000-foot density restriction. The airport has proposed that the 30db requirements apply in both zones. A recent Part 150 study has been completed and has a very limited time on the horizon. It is only a 5-year plan which would be 2025. In the current Part 150 study, there are only 15 FedEx flights, less than a fourth of the total number that the FedEx hub is planned for. The contours coming out of the current study are referred to as the Low Tide. As the airport develops and expands, the tide will go back out, and planning needs to be done for the high tide. Once housing is built in an approach, it is there to stay and they need to look decades into the future and plan beyond the current 150 study. There will be many more 150 studies over those decades as the airport develops and many years to regret if this plan is not right. The airport authority strongly requested a favorable consideration and recommendation for the proposal made by the Planning Department, with the exception to have further discussion with the Planning Department regarding including the Zone 2 conditions into Zone 1.

Chair Holston inquired if there were additional questions for Attorneys Cooke or Terrell. Ms. O'Connor asked if the purple line represented what is a current noise zone and now would be designated as Zone 2. Mr. Cooke responded Ms. O'Connor was correct. Ms. O'Connor asked if northwest of the red runway line, was there housing between the purple boundary and the red line. Mr. Cooke responded Mr. Galanti mentioned the 600-foot offset exemption and there has been some housing built within the current overlay district but not beyond that 600-foot line. Chair Holston inquired if there were additional questions. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of this request. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone in opposition to this request.

Janet Mazzurco, 5443 Winters Way, former Vice Chair of Zoning Commission, Chair of PTI Citizens Advisory Committee. (Due to issues with the speaker's connection, portions of Ms. Mazzurco's comments were muted or had to be repeated.) Ms. Mazzurco stated in view of the definition of the airport overlay, the LDO, and her leadership with the Citizens Advisory Committee regarding the Part 150 study over the past year and a half, she opposed the current draft amendment as proposed. The current Part 150 study suggests a smaller overlay as appropriate from the previous proposal. The proposed creation of the two zones of the airport overlay acknowledges the appropriate smaller zone but creates problems for citizens of Greensboro and could be summarized as controlled by regulation. There is a lack of accountability between the airport and the citizens. It is vital the airport acts a good neighbor. FAA regulations suggest that the airport should be able to be a good neighbor within the 65 dnl corridors. Greensboro has been using the 60 dnl contour around the airport allowing for growth but there is a partial disregard for the community by airport officials regarding noise. Currently the airport cites High Point regulations as a standard. The local airport executives have had a strong hand in formulating those regulations. Ms. Mazzurco requested regulations not be created allowing airport authorities to dismiss citizens' complaints regarding noise. In the Part 150 study, it clearly indicates where the airport ignored chances to mitigate noise impacts to surrounding communities. The federal government has created the Part 150 studies to provide scientific information to communities to determine zoning and make wise land use decisions. Airport executives have considerable hope the mega site will revitalize the regional economy.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

5

Ms. Mazzurco requested the Zoning Commission to include a resolution to have a citizens advisory committee that would have the power to report to local government and influence the appointees to the PTI Airport Authority. Locally, if airport executives understand there is a responsibility to the community, in balance to the communities' responsibility to the airport, real progress will be made. The text amendment ignores the science of the most recent Part 150 study which does not allow a mutual respect, restraint, and regulation by the citizen body on the noise impacts discussed. A consideration of the stakeholders was if a house was destroyed or significantly damaged, it would have to be brought up to today's standards, not the standards of when it was built. Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions for Ms. Mazzurco from the Commissioners. Chair Holston asked if there were any accompanying visuals relative to what was being requested compared to what was presented by the applicant for the Commission to review. Ms. Mazzurco responded the only visuals were the maps Attorney Terrell put up and referred to when working on the Part 150 study. She noted it was expanded and the Citizen's Group was not sure why. Chair Holston asked if in general the opposition was due to the expansion from the purple line to the green line. Ms. Mazzurco responded that was correct. Chair Holston asked if there were additional questions for Ms. Mazzurco from other Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Holston requested Ms. Fentress to speak in opposition.

Melodi Fentress, 3630 Lewiston Road. (Due to issues with the speaker's connection, portions of Ms. Fentress's comments were muted or had to be repeated.) Ms. Fentress indicated on the current overlay where the airport wants to split into two districts. Currently in the entire area, subdivisions, apartment complexes, or townhouses are not permitted. With the change, it will allow for massive residential development in an area that is already overpopulated. Ms. Fentress asked if anyone has done any type of impact studies on what it will do to the area when the population is increased. Ms. Fentress stated her concerns are population density. There will be residential developments increasing the population density in an area already experiencing low access to food. There are larger planning issues that need to be addressed and are not supported by the GSO2040 Plan. Ms. Fentress asked how would this area be used regarding economic impacts, social capital, and public health issues. The noise issue is the only thing being addressed and is a very small part of a much larger change. No one within this area wants more residential, especially apartment complexes, townhomes, and subdivisions. There are no traffic impact studies. City services need to be in place. This is a complete change to an overlay map.

Ms. Fentress asked if decisions will be made like this one based upon lining the pockets of a few property owners over considering the good of the people who live in this area. Chair Holston stated relative to the comment regarding the area where currently there is no building allowed but if it was allowed, those services would be resolved by demand and supply. Ms. Fentress responded there are people living on those properties. Ms. Fentress felt maybe the supply and demand would even out, but is not evened out now. The current supply and demand are a problem now. Ms. Fentress stated she had to drive to multiple grocery stores for items. The supply chain has not recovered from Covid and this does not appear to be the time to increase population density. Mr. Kirkman advised the Commission the overlay does not dictate what the base zoning is among individual properties and those properties would have to be rezoned even if this change is made to allow new multi-family and that could be part of that conversation on the individual basis. Ms. Fentress stated she will oppose every single rezoning to build apartment complexes in these neighborhoods. This is not for the good of the people and is not being made to help the people that live there. If it were, the communication about what this really means would have been clearer. Ms. Fentress stated she had to ask via emails with city planning staff, to please answer yes or no to her question

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

6

because no one would answer the question. Chair Holston inquired if there were no questions for Ms. Fentress, if there was anyone else to speak in opposition to this request.

Christine Peeler, 3702 O'Bryant Place, advised she lived on the other side of Brush Creek and was in sympathy with Ms. Fentress. These are heavily established populated neighborhoods with single family dwellings and she could not imagine why the Zoning Commission is even involved in wanting to have office and apartment buildings or whatever as it would ruin the neighborhood. Ms. Peeler asked if the upscaling of the noise protection only applied to new buildings or if it was retro-active to all of the homes still there, and/or is the airport planning to buy more homes. Chair Holston stated city staff to respond to the question regarding the noise abatement applied strictly to new homes or existing homes. Mr. Galanti responded under the non-conforming section of the code, if the dwelling was destroyed by more than 50% of its assessed value, they would need to rebuild it and meet the new standards. Ms. Peeler asked if it was sound and still standing, would it be left alone. Mr. Galanti responded that was request. Chair Holston inquired if there were any additional questions for Ms. Peeler. Seeing none, Chair Holston allowed Ms. Mazzurco to speak again.

Janet Mazzurco stated her biggest issue were nonconforming structures and an evaluation needed to be done for more information. With the cost of building materials currently, construction may not be feasible. A developer or builder building inside of a noise cone must meet all building code standards and it would cost a lot more money to build within a noise cone. This issue needs more consideration. Mr. Kirkman advised the time for opposition speakers was up. Chair Holston advised there would be a 5-minute rebuttal period for each side. Those in opposition would have a total of 5 minutes after the applicant speaks.

Attorney Cook stated he understood Ms. Fentress' concerns but felt Mr. Kirkman had the correct answer. With an airport overlay, the sole concern is noise. The other questions raised by Ms. Fentress were a question of underlying zoning to be worked out as development takes place. In Zone 2, the density limitations that used to exist will be changed and a developer could develop as much housing in those areas as allowed. The Zone 2 boundary is not being used to determine how much housing there could be, if it compatible. This airport has been carefully protected over the years by the city and the development that would occur would have reasonable conditions. Mr. Galanti has provided the conditions that would be appropriate for this zone 2 area because it is still a major approach to the airport. The airport needs to be concerned about noise, be a good neighbor and that is exactly the reason why they are supporting the continuation of the Airport Overlay District within these boundaries. It enables the airport to be a good neighbor to whoever comes to live in that area as a result of the new housing and to make sure it is developed in such a way that would be good for those who will live there, and will accommodate the growth of the airport. Attorney Cook stated Ms. Mazzurco's service on the Part 150 Committee was very much appreciated.

Kevin Baker, 1008 Ted Johnson Parkway, stated recently the Triad's Business Journal's Book of Lists noted in combining all of the companies that are at the airport, the employment is equal to the 5th largest employer in the entire Triad. The jobs have salaries significantly above average household incomes within a 35-mile radius of the airport. The AOD issues absolutely will have an impact on their ability to continue growing in the future. The airport has two concerns. To protect the airport's future as driving around the airport there is development that has been done to prepare for what could be a Boeing plant, an Airbus plant, a Lockheed Martin plant. Somebody who could be employing thousands of people within the community. The future of the airport has to be protected

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

7

to have the ability to continue to bring those types of employers in. When companies are added, it is highly likely the airport noise will grow and the airport needs to protect their ability to grow. At the same time, the airport wants to ensure buyers of homes in the areas. Mr. Baker stated neither he nor any member of the Airport Authority or their staff had any financial stake in this matter. Their position is 100% focused on the interest of the community, growing jobs for the community, and the important aerospace business. The city has been protecting the airport in an outstanding way for a long time and the airport understands there are competing interests that must be considered from time to time. The Airport believes that the City Planning Department has found a good balance, subject to the additional two components they would like to see in phase 1. It is a good solution for both the airport and the community for the future.

Chair Holston inquired if there were questions for Mr. Baker or Mr. Cooke from the Commissioners. Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request in rebuttal. Hearing and seeing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition to this request in rebuttal. Ms. O'Connor advised Ms. Fentress a lot of what she had said previously was lost to poor connection and suggested a solution to address that issue. Chair Holston requested Ms. Fentress to speak.

Melodi Fentress stated this is not a continuation of the noise cone. The changing of the noise cone into the two different districts are big change in development. No research has been done on the impacts from traffic, health and safety, and population density on the schools. No plans are in place to account for the changes that will occur if this request is approved. Protection was talked about but she did not hear how are the citizens being protected that already live there. There is an interest in building apartments and other dwellings where they are currently not allowed which would be changing what is allowed in this area. The neighborhood does not want any more residential development. They want to take some time to look at all the residential development already planned and happening to see what that does to the population density. Currently schools are overcrowded, the supply chains are not secure and no one has looked into any of that. Ms. Fentress stated the amendment is a complete change to the overlay and more than an amendment. People are not at this meeting because they don't understand or know what is happening. Ms. Fentress stated the Part 150 study has not been approved and the change would be made based on a study that has not been approved by the FAA which is a problem and there are two zoning Commissioners missing on this vote. Chair Holston advised the Commission is not making a final determination at the meeting, it would be a recommendation to City Council. Ms. Fentress replied there are two less people to convince to recommend against it. If they were present, maybe they would side with her and be recommendations against it. Ms. Fentress stated it was an unfair calculation of recommendations. Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in opposition to the request.

Janet Mazzurco, stated it has to be remembered that the Part 150 study has not been approved by the FAA to date. The study was expedited by approximately 6 weeks from the time it was supposed to be finalized until the time the public hearing was noticed. That hearing was via Zoom and with very little participation from the public. Ms. Mazzurco stated she did not feel Part 150 was adequately or publicly advertised. Chair Holston thanked everyone who spoke both in favor and opposition and closed the public hearing. Chair Holston requested to hear from city staff for recommendation before the Zoning Commissioners discuss the issue.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

8

Mr. Kirkman stated the Commissioners are being asked to approve or not approve the changes to the airport overlay boundary. As far as the text amendment the Commissioners needed to approve the amendment as presented, approve with changes, or to deny the amendment. Staff is recommending the map changes as presented and the text amendment with the adjustments from the January 20 version.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Holston inquired if there were questions or discussion. Mr. Collins stated currently any house inside the City of Greensboro that is damaged beyond 50% has to be built back to current standards. It is not just in the airport overlay. Mr. Galanti stated it is city wide but the question was asked in relationship to the Airport Overlay District and the noise level reduction standards. Mr. Collins felt Ms. Fentress was thinking that the zoning is being changed and it is not. The Zoning Commission's recommendation goes on to City Council regardless of what the Zoning Commission may do. Mr. Collins stated he would support the amendment going forward and felt there would be enough time for further discussion with those that have concerns. Chair Holston stated he heard three things in particular; noise issues, nonconforming issues, and density issues. It would cost builders more to actually build in that area. Those persons who are looking to build and live there would be on notice upfront of the noise cone that could be an issue. Mr. Collins stated the nonconformity issue is something that applies to the entire City of Greensboro in all of the zoning precincts. It would cost slightly more due to the noise abatement but is applied city wide. Density concerning supply and demand and services whether it is a grocery store or whatever it may be, the Zoning Commission does not deal with. Traffic would be dealt with on a plot by plot and plat by plat basis. Commissioner Collins stated the airport notification asked to be placed in the amendment has to happen, because it makes realtors do their job when showing houses and the buyers have to understand the impacts. Mr. Bryson stated he heard passion from both sides for and against this request, but what was missing on the against side was factual information and data to support their side. Mr. Bryson stated as a real estate appraiser, numbers and trends are looked at. Mr. Bryson asked if the density was one unit per 20,000 square feet. Mr. Galanti responded in the Airport Overlay District 1, residential is prohibited except for single family residential on lots greater than 40,000 square feet, which is around one unit per acre. Mr. Bryson felt right now is a time with the pandemic all schools are overcrowded currently in Guilford County. Mr. Bryson advised he is in favor of the proposal and hoped and prayed both sides would come together and be transparent with each other with all of the facts on the table. Chair Holston inquired if there were any further comments from the Commissioners. Ms. O'Connor stated she was prepared to make a motion.

Ms. O'Connor made a motion to recommend approval of the Text Amendment presented at this meeting; seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Commission voted 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Holston, Collins, Jones, Bryson, Alford, and O'Connor. Nays: 0). Chair Holston advised the motion passed, constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the February 16, 2021 City Council meeting. Ms. O'Connor then made a motion to recommend approval of the Overlay Map as proposed. The Commission voted 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Holston, Collins, Jones, Bryson, Alford, and O'Connor. Nays: 0). Chair Holston advised the motion passed, constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the February 16, 2021 City Council meeting.

Z-20-12-007: A rezoning from CD-C-M (Conditional District – Commercial – Medium) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) and approval of an associated Unified Development Plan, with conditions, for the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

9

property identified as 4310 Big Tree Way, generally described as northeast of Big Tree Way and northwest of West Wendover Avenue, (2.47 Acres). (Recommended Approved)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the zoning map and other summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. Mr. Kirkman advised of the conditions related to the request. Chair Holston asked if there were any questions for Mr. Kirkman. Seeing none, Chair Holston requested the applicant to provide their name and address, and state their case.

Tony Miller, 715 North Church Street, Charlotte, NC, stated he is the architect for the owner who did not see a future for a buffet restaurant and was looking for uses compatible with what surrounds this property currently. There are four hotels nearby and townhomes in the rear. The applicant would like to take advantage of the infrastructure and place mixed use development at this location. The roads are used at different times and mixed-use development is probably the most logical usage for the site.

Chair Holston inquired if there were questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. Seeing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone in opposition to the request. Seeing none, Chair Holston closed the public hearing and requested to hear from city staff.

Mr. Kirkman stated the Greensboro 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the site currently as Urban General and also being within a regional scale activity center on the Future Built Form Map and as Commercial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff concluded this request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because the proposed development is compatible with the scale and design of the adjacent roadway and can accommodate a satisfactory transition to the existing scale and intensity of existing adjacent uses. The proposed PUD zoning classification is conditioned to allow a mix of commercial uses and residential uses appropriate for the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the rezoning request.

Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions for Mr. Kirkman. Seeing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was conversation, discussion, or a motion. Ms. O'Connor made a motion in regards to agenda item Z-20-12-007, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property described as 4310 Big Tree Way from CD-C-M (Conditional District – Commercial – Medium) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO 2040 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 Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use map. The property proposed for rezoning can accommodate a satisfactory transition to the existing scale and intensity of existing, adjacent uses. The PUD, as conditioned, would permit uses that are complimentary to those existing in the surrounding area. The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions and other attributes of the area, and will benefit the property owner and surrounding community. Approval is in the public interest. Seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Commission voted 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Holston, Collins, Jones, Alford, Bryson, and O'Connor. Nays: 0). Chair Holston stated this constitutes final action unless appealed in writing to the Planning Department within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals will be subject to a public hearing at the February 16, 2021 City Council meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

Mr. Kirkman advised the separate action the Commission needed to address was to approve the Unified Development Plan to which Mr. Carter will address. Mr. Carter shared the Unified Development Plan submitted and distributed to the Zoning Commissioners earlier. The Unified Development Plan went before the Technical Review Committee and was approved with a specific condition to change the watershed regulation to say that it is

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

10

not in a watershed and specify which creek it drained to, even though it is not in a specific watershed. That was TRC's only condition but they had a question regarding the traffic impact study and whether that was required. The traffic impact study was not required for this request. The applicant broke it down into Zone A, Zone B, Zone C, and provided those standards. Staff believed the standards in place now would allow them to work with the applicant to clear up or can enforce them. Ms. O'Connor inquired if a motion to approve the three zones. Mr. Carter responded a motion was needed to approve the Unified Development Plan with the proposed changes. Ms. O'Connor made a motion to approve the Unified Development Plan with the three changes. Seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Commission voted 6-0. (Chair Holston, Collins, Jones, Bryson, Alford, and O'Connor. Nays: 0). Chair Holston stated this constitutes final action unless appealed in writing to the Planning Department within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals will be subject to a public hearing at the February 16, 2021 City Council meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.

NEW BUSINESS:

Z-21-01-001: A rezoning request from CD-O (Conditional District - Office) to CD-O (Conditional District – Office, with conditions, for the property identified as 625 Franklin Boulevard and north of Afton Drive, (0.38 Acres). (Approved)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the zoning map for Z-20-01-001 and other summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. Mr. Kirkman advised of the conditions associated with this request. Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions for Mr. Kirkman. Ms. O'Connor asked if the detached building counted in the total building square feet for the proposed condition. Mr. Kirkman responded the current condition speaks to preserving the existing building footprint. The new condition covers two items. One is a small addition to the principal building which started the conversation about the rezoning. In that conversation it was discovered the applicants would also like to use an accessory building on the site for office uses and needed to add that in. The total square footage that is being asked for covers both the principal building with the small expansion and the accessory structure. Ms. O'Connor asked if the accessory structure would have to have all the same accommodation as the main structure such as heating, air conditioning, plumbing and asked if it was all the same or just an extra room. Mr. Kirkman responded he did not have all the details. Mr. Carter or the applicant may be able to speak to that. Mr. Carter advised the applicant would speak in more depth regarding any upgrades to the structure that have taken place. If the structure does not meet current building code, it would have to be upgraded to the applicable building code. As far as zoning is concerned, it has been taken into consideration the use itself and whether or not it is appropriate for the site and then building inspections would take it from there. The applicant is aware that it would have to be upgraded to any kind of commercial building code requirements that are relevant. Ms. O'Connor advised she was troubled in justifying her professional experience regarding detached spaces with what is being requested now. It was a hard hurdle for her to get over. Chair Holston requested the applicant to state their name, address, and present their case.

Adreanna Wideman, 5591 Bishop Glenn Drive, Brown Summit, stated she was the school counselor and coordinator for this particular program held in this facility that helps children experiencing challenges academically, emotional, social, or whatever the case may be. Currently they are working with members that are ages 5 to 16 and serve about 10 to 13 members. There are approximately 8 or 9 members on the waiting list due to limited space and they were asking to add on approximately a 16 x 16 space to accommodate more children. The team consists of a licensed substance abuse counselor, herself as the licensed school counselor, and a paralegal

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

11

that works with them. Most of the children are in the neighborhood and either walk to the facility or parents drop them off and pick them up. The addition outside has a unisex bathroom, central air and heating, window, appropriate lighting and flooring, and paved parking spaces on the side of the building. Ms. Wideman stated their goal is to use that space as an assembly space so when they are done working with their children in the primary building, they could walk outside to the assembly building for them to be picked up by their parents. Ms. Wideman requested the Commission to work with them to make this happen for the children.

Chair Holston inquired if there were questions from the Commissioners for Ms. Wideman. Chair Holston asked Ms. O'Connor if that addressed her questions. Ms. O'Connor responded it did address her questions. Chair Holston inquired if any other Commissioners had questions for Ms. Wideman. Mr. Bryson asked if they have made any contact with their neighbors and how it may impact the neighbors. Ms. Wideman responded they sent out mail and fliers. There have been no responses. Chair Holston inquired if there were additional questions for the applicant. Not seeing or hearing any, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request.

Valarie Farrington, 208 Heritage Creek Way, stated she is the paralegal for the Academy. Her son is served by the academy and enjoys the program and helps him in his academics, his social skills. The academy does a great job. Ms. Farrington stated she has been with the academy since the beginning and provides assistance to Ms. Wideman and the parents. Ms. Farrington conducts training in the facility with those children that are interested in the legal field and parents who have questions. This request was not unreasonable as they need more space for breakout rooms for the children to allow Ms. Wideman and the other substance counselor to work with the children and their parents. Parents are encouraged to speak out regarding what they would like the academy to do to serve the children and can work together in the community and become more involved in the immediate community. Ms. Farrington stated the academy does a great job in the community with the neighbors. There is a church on the corner the academy works with. Ms. Farrington stated this would be a great thing for the Commission to approve.

Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions from the Commissioners for Ms. Farrington. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, Chair Holston closed the public hearing and requested to hear from city staff.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban Central on the Future Built Form Map and Mixed Use Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because the uses requested are of compatible scale intensity or off-site impact as existing nearby uses and the request accommodates a satisfactory transition to the existing scale and intensity of those neighbor uses. The proposed CD-O request does include conditions to limit negative impacts on the surrounding area and would allow the expansion of an existing office use that fits within the surrounding neighborhood context. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair Holston inquired if the Commissioners had any comments, questions, thoughts, discussion or a motion. Mr. Bryson stated in regard to agenda item Z-21-01-001, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval for the rezoning request of the property described as 625 Franklin Boulevard from CD-O (Conditional District – Office) to CD-O (Conditional District – Office) to be consistent with the adopted GSO 2040 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 Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map. The proposed CD-O request, as conditioned, limits uses to only office uses without drive-through

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

12

facilities, which fits the context of the surrounding area. The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions and other attributes of the area. It will benefit the property owner and surrounding community. Approval is in the public interest. Seconded by Commissioner Alford. The Commission voted 6-0. (Ayes: Chair Holston, Collins, Alford, Jones, Bryson, and O'Connor. Nays: 0). Chair Holston stated the approval constitutes final action unless appealed in writing to the Planning Department within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals will be subject to a public hearing at the February 16, 2021 City Council meeting. All adjoining property owners shall be notified of any such appeal.

A 10-minute break was taken at 7:25 p.m. and the meeting resumed at 7:35 p.m.

Z-21-01-002: A rezoning from R-3 (Residential Single-family-3) to R-5 (Residential Single-Family-5) for the property identified as 1300 Covered Wagon Road, generally described as west of Covered Wagon Road, and north of Chandler Oaks Lane, (9.79 acres). (Recommended Approved)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the zoning map and other summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties, and advised there were no conditions related to this request. Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions from the Commissioners for Mr. Kirkman. Hearing none, Chair Holston requested the applicant to come forward, state their name, address and their case for the record.

Ian Phillips, Crown Companies, 121 North Crutchfield Street, Dobson, NC, stated Crown Companies submitted the application for 1300 Covered Wagon Road to take the property from its current R-3 residential to R-5 zoning. Mr. Phillips referred to the Future Lane Use Map and the Future Built Form Map. The Future Land Use map for this area indicates the area is already residential, to include both single-family and multi-family dwellings. The request for the R-5 is a single-family residential zoning with no multifamily and is in line with what the Future Land Use Map calls for there. The Future Built Form Map designates this area as Urban General with more detail and outlines some characteristics of that area. In general, the area is described and envisioned as areas conducive to single-family home ownership and a more traditional neighborhood setting. There are three characteristics of the Urban General Guidelines that stood out to Crown Companies in making this case for the rezoning. That urban general area envisions residential styled buildings consistent with the neighborhoods surrounding it. The neighborhoods surrounding this property are R-5. Crown Companies believes they can match the scale and density of the adjoining subdivision. The second consideration was the desire for urban general areas to have new housing to help increase the range of choice and supply of housing in the immediate area. The greater Greensboro area scores behind in housing inventory, especially on the eastern side of the county. This project would provide much needed housing inventory at prices consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The third consideration was the urban general designation area and the desire to have transitions between neighborhoods and provide connectivity to existing city roads and sidewalks. By developing the property, the interconnectivity can be accomplished and is the safe thing to do for EMS and fire trucks. Once the property is developed there would not be a need for fire trucks or EMS vehicles to make an abrupt turn around at the end of Roshni Terrace and would be a better option. The density would match with the density of the adjacent neighborhood and meet the desire of the urban general area to have new housing in a form consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods and connectivity of safe streets and sidewalks. City staff sent out letters to everyone within 600 feet of the site. In addition, Mr. Phillips walked the neighborhood and talked with some land owners. He noted that he did not speak to everyone within the 600-foot radius but he did make efforts to talk to each land owner willing to speak. In looking at the Roshni Terrace side of the development, the feedback was those residents have to drive through just

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

13

about the entire subdivision to reach their home on the western portion of Roshni Terrace. Several of those residents stated they would be glad at the end of the construction to have a connection to Covered Wagon Road.

Mr. Phillips noted there were concerns expressed regarding traffic concerns and possible trespassing at the end of Covered Wagon Road. Robert Bynum, resident at 1315 Covered Wagon Road, took it upon himself to run people off when they were parked and trespassing. Toni Brown, with the Chandler Oaks Homeowners Association called to express her concern that the Chandler Oak subdivision would not have amenities like a club house or playgrounds or a pool. Crown Companies is an adjacent development and are required to have their own ownership association for several reasons. Crown Companies development will have their own storm water pond and mail box units. For that reason, it will be a separate ownership association which will not be shared with the Chandler Oaks subdivision. Mr. Phillips stated in discussions with Councilwoman Sharon Hightower, it was brought to his attention there are people in the Chandler Oaks subdivision that have voiced concern regarding storm water runoff. Mr. Phillips stated Crown Companies are required to build their own storm water management device which will control all storm water runoff from their site so that it will not contribute to any of the problems in the Chandler Oak subdivision. Mr. Phillips stated they are looking to replicate the R-5 subdivision next door which was set up to envision that connectivity. The need for new housing is envisioned in the Urban General Designation on the Future Built Form Map. Those things stick out to Crown Companies as reasons to match that zoning designation.

Chair Holston inquired if there were additional questions for Mr. Phillips. Chair Holston asked Mr. Phillips if Roshni Terrace was going to run through to Covered Wagon. Mr. Phillips responded that was correct. Chair Holston asked if Covered Wagon would still have a dead end or would it be looped around. Mr. Phillips responded Crown Companies will be required to create a DOT standard turn around at the end of Covered Wagon Road. The connection will go to the end of Covered Wagon Road and connect over to Roshni Terrace. The thought was with houses in that area and neighbors with watchful eyes, some of the concerns regarding loitering would be minimized. It is the plan to connect Roshni Terrace to Covered Wagon. Chair Holston asked as far as the illustrative plans if the neighborhoods looked similar. Mr. Phillips responded they would. Chair Holston stated it was mentioned that one of the neighbors asked about a club house. Mr. Phillips responded Ms. Brown did ask about a club house. Chair Holston asked if Mr. Phillips was saying that there was a plan for a club house or there was no plan for a club house. Mr. Phillips responded this development would not have a clubhouse. Chair Holston asked if they will have an HOA. Mr. Phillips responded that was correct, to manage the storm water pond, maintenance, and varied common areas and that sort of thing. Chair Holston asked as far as access or egress and ingress to McConnell, would it be through Covered Wagon. Mr. Phillips responded that was correct. Mr. Phillips asked if Chair Holston meant Mt. Hope Church Road. Chair Holston apologized and stated it was Mount Hope Church Road. Mr. Phillips stated they do not control land that connects to Mount Hope Church Road, there is no frontage there. Chair Holston asked if Mr. Phillips communicated with the community via the mail and then walked to meet neighbors. Mr. Phillips responded that was correct. Chair Holston asked approximately how many of the neighbors were Mr. Phillips able to address. Mr. Phillips responded it was approximately 15 to 20 range. Chair Holston asked how the conversations went with those neighbors. Mr. Phillips responded on Roshni Terrace concerns were expressed regarding construction traffic and the dust of construction, typical things of construction. At the end of the day it was more palatable because they would have easier access to their home. On Covered Wagon, concerns were additional traffic coming out of their development and were coupled with the understanding that this is a dead-end.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

14

Chair Holston welcomed Mr. Trapp to the meeting in progress. Mr. Carter noted for the record Mr. Trapp joined the meeting at 7:53 p.m. Chair Holston inquired if other Commissioners had questions for Mr. Phillips. Seeing and hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. Seeing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone in opposition to this request.

Toni Brown, 5208 Woodhollow Terrace, McLeansville, Vice President of Chandler Oaks Association. Ms. Brown was opposed to the development because several of the homes in Chandler Oaks have experienced low water pressure. The water quality is not good. The hydrants on Roshni Terrace have been flushed out more than normal. The roads in the area coming into the neighborhood are narrow and did not accommodate the current residents. There would be increased traffic with 40 to 50 additional homes. Ms. Brown was concerned about property values going down because who was to say that management companies would not purchase those homes and make them rental homes and driving property values down. Ms. Brown advised she became aware of the meeting a few days before the Zoning meeting, but did obtain 64 signatures on her petition out of 157 home owners. The biggest concern is the impact of traffic. There are enough children in the neighborhood and more than enough going on in their small community. With an additional 40 to 50 houses, it would not be a benefit to Chandler Oaks. Ms. Brown asked if the Builder was Eastwood Homes because Eastwood built Chandler Oaks. Roads were not paved as was told to Chandler Oaks they would be and they also failed to complete the sidewalks. Sidewalks were completed by an outside company who also failed to clean up the four retention ponds in the neighborhood. Ms. Brown did not see how Chandler Oaks would be able to accommodate an additional 40 to 50 homes as there is already low water pressure in the neighborhood. Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions for Ms. Brown from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Holston requested Mr. Panter to provide his name, address, and state his case.

James Panter, 5251 Chandler Oaks Lane, stated his first concern are the amount of homes being built and asked going from R-3 to R-5, was it 5 homes per acre that was allowed. Chair Holston responded in general that was correct. Mr. Panter was concerned that 5 homes on one acre would crush the value of homes in his neighborhood. Chair Holston advised the information he received indicated the homes on Roshni, Chandler Oak, Sedona, and Covered Wagon are already in the R-5 category. Mr. Kirkman stated that was correct. Mr. Panter stated it may be classified that way but the lots are basically 3 homes to an acre lot. It was mentioned that a storm pond would be maintained by this new development. Chandler Oaks already manages the storm pond and there was no need for anyone else to take care of that. The width of Covered Wagon is very narrow with more traffic. There has been no discussion regarding widening that road. Mr. Phillips stated he talked to 15 to 20 people on Roshni Road. There are 157 homes in this neighborhood and the site was not a large portion. Those on Roshni do not have to drive all the way through his neighborhood to get to their road. Mr. Panter stated he is the President of the HOA and no one has ever brought that topic up at any of the meetings and never heard of it being a complaint until this meeting. Mr. Panter stated this is a good neighborhood with nice homes and decent lots. Putting in another neighborhood with 40 to 50 homes and half or less of the size homes currently would affect home values and what people have worked and built for. Mr. Panter stated he never received anything regarding the building of homes. Mr. Panter requested to have Mr. Phillips address the question of the size of the average homes and prices the homes would start at. Mr. Kirkman reminded the Commission that the minimum size and price of a house is not a consideration for the Commission. Chair Holston advised Mr. Panter the Zoning Commission deals with land use and does not go into those other details.

Chair Holston inquired if there were questions for Mr. Panter or Ms. Brown regarding their comments or statements. Chair Holston stated going back to Ms. Brown regarding the water pressure, water quality, and the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

15

adequacy of the roadways, asked city staff if that was something to be addressed in TRC or outside of this decision by the Zoning Commission. Mr. Kirkman responded the discussion regarding the capacity for serving the new development both in terms of roads and water and sewer would be addressed a part of the technical review from the city departments. New roadways have to meet city standards. Mr. Tipton could speak further on that. Mr. Tipton stated Roshni Terrace is currently at city standard. It would have to be widened along the frontage of Chandler Oaks to city standard. Chair Holston asked if it would only be the portion. Mr. Tipton stated only the portion along their frontage. Chair Holston asked if that was the same for Covered Wagon. Mr. Tipton apologized as it was not Chandler Oaks, it was Covered Wagon. Chair Holston, it was alluded to short notices and asked if the notices went out in a timely manner. Mr. Kirkman stated all the notices go out for all cases in their normal timeframe for meetings and met the requirements in place for zoning. Chair Holston asked if the lack of sidewalks, the need of or storm water retention drainage, and traffic would be addressed by TRC. Mr. Kirkman responded they were site design issues that would be addressed as part of the subdivision process.

Toni Brown stated when the sign was placed, it was placed so far back on Covered Wagon where no one would have seen the sign. Ms. Brown saw the sign because one of the neighbors that received a letter, contacted Ms. Brown and she drove to where the sign was placed. No one would have seen that sign except those that live in the last two homes on Covered Wagon. Chair Holston stated the signage was one method of communication, the other was by mail and confined to the 600-foot buffer area. Chair Holston asked if Ms. Brown knew if those she had spoken with lived within the 600 feet buffer. Ms. Brown responded they did. Ms. Brown spoke with home owners on Chandler Oaks and some of their signatures are on the petition provided to staff. Ms. Brown spoke with a couple of home owners that were on Roshni Terrace and their signatures are on the petition also. Chair Holston asked if it was mentioned that they had received the letter notifying them. Ms. Brown responded a couple of people stated they had not received a letter and some said that Mr. Phillips came by but they were not receptive to what was being said and were not in favor of it. Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in opposition to this request.

Denise Ruff, 5341 Chandler Oaks Lane, stated she was a member of the Chandler Oaks Board. Ms. Ruff's concern was to ensure that the Planning and Zoning Department considered the safety of the residents, specifically children. There was a speed limit installed in 2019 due to concerns with speeding down Chandler Oaks Lane. In late 2019, a family member's car was parked in front of her home and was totaled by an individual driving down the road and hit the car. No one was hurt. Ms. Ruff challenged the group to consider the safety of the residents but mainly the children. The road cannot accommodate the additional traffic. Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions for Ms. Ruff from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to this request.

Tanya Beatty, 5305 Chandler Oaks Lane, stated one of the biggest concerns she had as a homeowner in the area was the safety. Ms. Beatty felt there was no consideration regarding how slow mail has been since Covid. She received the letter a week ago but it was dated and stamped 12/31. Ms. Beatty was one of the ones who signed the petition regarding consideration of the water pressure and the safety aspects. Ms. Beatty stated she did not know the value of the homes that will be built. The safety component is specifically for the children. Chair Holston asked when saying safety, did she mean traffic safety or safety mentioned earlier regarding the loitering on Covered Wagon or something else. Ms. Beatty responded her concerns were more of the safety of the children, specifically as already stated about traffic coming into the area. Covered Wagon is a narrow road and it may not be something for the Board to be concerned about. Safety in general, but specifically the safety of the children and people who are walking. Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions for Ms. Beatty from the other

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

16

Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in opposition to the request.

Pamela Galbreth, 5343 Chandler Oaks Lane, stated her biggest concern is safety. During rush hour times, the corner of Covered Wagon and Chandler Oaks becomes bottlenecked. A third parking pad was added to her driveway due to safety concerns on the corner. Covered Wagon currently cannot support 40 to 50 additional homes for traffic purposes. Ms. Galbreth asked if there would there be a traffic study or procedure to ensure that Covered Wagon can support the ongoing traffic from the additional homes. Chair Holston stated if the Zoning Commission approves this request, it will go through City Council. It would be a consideration; the question is how much of a consideration. Mr. Kirkman stated this did not trigger a traffic impact study but requested Mr. Tipton to speak further to that. Mr. Tipton stated this did not require a traffic impact study with only 40 to 50 units. Currently Covered Wagon can take two-way traffic which is the only thing being looked at right now. Chair Holston asked if this project is approved, would the intersection of Covered Wagon and Chandler Oaks have any further consideration. Mr. Tipton responded it would not, but adding a connection at Roshni would alleviate some of the traffic coming out of Chandler Oaks by providing an additional outlet out of the neighborhood on to Covered Wagon. Chair Holston advised Ms. Galbreth it may not be the answer she was looking for but hopefully answered her question. Ms. Galbreth responded it confirmed her original concern. Covered Wagon is narrow and dark due to restrictions what was wanted when first coming into the area. Since then, another 100 plus homes are there and adding another 40-50 homes will have the situation deteriorate on Covered Wagon.

Nadia Suddreth, 5338 Chandler Oaks Lane, stated her concern is safety of the residents regarding traffic. The road is narrow and dark with a lot of traffic. Ms. Suddreth stated she has never seen “riff raff” on Covered Wagon. Ms. Suddreth expressed her concern regarding the value of homes going down with so many homes being added at the end of Covered Wagon. Ms. Suddreth was interested in knowing what the neighbors have to say that live further down on Covered Wagon and have less traffic. Chair Holston asked if there were questions for Ms. Suddreth. Hearing none, Chair Holston requested the next speaker to come forward.

Candi Price, 1426 Sedona Lane, secretary of the Board for Chandler Oaks. Ms. Price stated she has never seen any type of “riff raff” at the end of Covered Wagon. Her and her spouse walk their dog almost every night and have never seen cars, trash, or loitering in that area. Not once and she has lived in this area for 3 years. Ms. Price expressed her concern regarding no lights on Covered Wagon and the safety of all of the residents and children regarding cars speeding down that road. There are no sidewalks on Covered Wagon. Covered Wagon cannot contain more homes, traffic, and congestion in the area. Chair Holston inquired if there were questions for Mr. Price. Chair Holston advised time had run out for those speaking in opposition but there would be a 5-minute rebuttal period beginning with the applicant, Mr. Phillips.

Ian Phillips, advised Crown Companies will have their own pond handled by a different HOA. The pond would be responsible for handling all of the runoff contained on their site. The Chandler Oaks pond will not be used. Crown Companies will do what is required by traffic engineers for the City of Greensboro. Road dimensions, turn arounds, lighting, widening will be determined by the traffic engineers. The same with connectivity and safety. It was mentioned Roshni Lane was envisioned to connect with Covered Wagon and is what is planned. That should alleviate some of the traffic and allow access for first responders. Chair Holston asked Mr. Tipton related to the end of Covered Wagon, the tail end that will probably join Roshni Terrace, was it a situation where lighting would be considered. Mr. Tipton advised it would be looked at the site plan stage, but did think if there was widening along Covered Wagon, it would be an opportunity to install street lights. Chair Holston asked Mr.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

17

Phillips if when speaking with the neighbors or met with them, where any illustrative drawings depicting how this may look shown to them. Mr. Phillips responded they did not.

Mr. Phillips stated Diane Durham and Robert Bynum, 1315 and directly across from 1315, were the two individuals who voiced concerns and had several issues with people parking there and trespassing. Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions for Mr. Phillips from the Commissioners. Seeing none, Chair Holston advised those in opposition had a combined 5-minute rebuttal period.

Toni Brown, stated Mr. Phillips keeps saying that it will alleviate the traffic. It will not alleviate the traffic coming into Chandler Oaks. It will increase the traffic on Covered Wagon. Regarding Crown Companies developing their own pond, she asked how on 9.79 acres that would be addressed for 40 to 50 homes. Chair Holston advised if there is approval or not and goes through the process, it would be worked out. There would be additional opportunities through the TRC process to determine how that was being done and the effects. TRC has an interest with all the parties, not only with those that are building anew. Chair Holston inquired if there were any additional opposition rebuttal.

James Panter, stated there are 157 homes in Chandler Oaks, adding 40 to 50 homes that could have approximately 100 to 150 cars coming down that road. It did not make sense to him and another reason why he was opposed.

Denise Ruff, challenged Mr. Phillips to do his due diligence and work with the traffic engineer. The traffic engineers identified a speed issue within their neighborhoods, specifically on Chandler Oaks and turning from Covered Wagon onto Chandler Oaks.

Nadia Suddreth, asked if the home owners at the entrance of Covered Wagon were spoken to regarding the potential disturbance of their property to put in sidewalks. Chair Holston did not have an answer but presumed it would be handled through TRC and whatever the standard processes are for sidewalks. Mr. Tipton stated sidewalks on Covered Wagon would only be required along the frontage of the project and would not be in front of existing homes. Seeing no one else to speak, Chair Holston closed the public hearing and requested to hear from city staff.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General within a district scaled activity center on the Future Built Form Map and Commercial and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to expand Greensboro's city-wide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and also meeting the Building Community Connections goal to maintain stable, attractive, and healthy places to live and raise families. The proposed R-5 zoning district is intended to accommodate lower density single-family detached residential development up to the 5 dwelling units per acre. The uses in the proposed zoning are consistent with surrounding uses, noting the zoning both of the CD-R-5 and R-3 nearby. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair Holston asked Mr. Trapp if he intended to vote on this item and if had reviewed the record before hand and felt that he had enough information to participate in the vote. Mr. Trapp responded he felt he had more than enough information to vote on the issue.

Chair Holston inquired if the Commissions had questions for staff. Seeing none, Chair Holston asked if the Commissioners had any comments, questions, thoughts, discussion or a motion. Mr. Bryson stated he would be voting against the request and felt Mr. Phillips needed to reach out to the community, become more involved with the community and let the community know what was happening in that neighborhood. Mr. Bryson quoted "it would benefit the property owner and surrounding community and approval is in the public interest." Ms. Brown

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

18

made it well known with 64 people out of 157 stating they did not want this in their neighborhood indicating Mr. Phillips did not explain or show ideas properly regarding the vision his company has for that area. Chair Holston inquired if other Commissioners had comments. Mr. Collins stated the notification process was addressed at their last meeting. Commission and staff are operating under state statute to handle that. Mail and sequencing are what has to be done. A mention was made of signage and thought that occurred because the signage has to go on the property that is being rezoned. There are no directional signs and also by statute. Signs are put out by the Zoning staff. Letters are sent within a 600-foot radius to contact neighbors. Mr. Collins understood what Mr. Bryson and the Chandler Oaks people were saying, but had a hard time denying this application as it is exactly the same zoning beside Chandler Oaks, which was anticipated both would connect. Mr. Collins understood the safety issues and traffic but this is land use and the rest will be sorted at the TRC level. Mr. Collins asked how do you turn down an adjacent zoning asking for the exact same thing and advised he would vote in favor of the request.

Mr. Trapp stated he was in the same mindset as Mr. Collins. Mr. Trapp understood the community and everyone who attended the meeting. Mr. Trapp stated he had voted against previous rezonings because of the applicant not doing their due diligence, but this is one where some of the things brought up will be addressed through this development. Traffic will be taken care of by this addition and made better. Water issues addressed will also be made better by the development. Mr. Trapp stated once this is all worked out, it will work in their favor. The process and notification could be better, but staff and the Commission are dealing with state statutes. Mr. Trapp stated he will be voting in favor. Ms. O'Connor agreed with Mr. Trapp and Mr. Collins. She was sympathetic to the neighbors and took seriously the concerns expressed. Ms. O'Connor believed this project will be a success of the land and was appropriate for what is there. Chair Holston agreed with what Mr. Collins, Mr. Trapp, and Ms. O'Connor have stated. Chair Holston was not discounting comments regarding safety, water, traffic, the notice, lighting and all the like. Those are usually and normally worked out during the TRC process after approval from Zoning and City Council. It would go through more vetting and helps to protect the concerns and objections expressed. Not everyone will be satisfied or agreeable but most times it works out well. Chair Holston stated it was exciting to see neighbors engaged and involved and know there is a process that the community can contribute to and helping to make things better. Chair Holston was voting in favor of the application.

Ms. O'Connor stated in regard to agenda item Z-21-01-002, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property identified as 1300 Covered Wagon Road from R-3 (Residential Single-Family-3) to R-5 (Residential Single-Family-5) to be consistent with the adopted Greensboro 2040 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 Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map. The proposed R-5 zoning district fits the context of the surrounding residential areas. The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area. It will benefit the property owner and surrounding community. Approval is in the public interest. Seconded by Mr. Alford. The Commission voted 5-2. (Ayes: Chair Holston, Collins, Trapp, Alford and O'Connor. Nays: Bryson and Jones). Chair Holston stated this approval constitutes a favorable recommendation and is subject to a public hearing at the February 16, 2021 City Council meeting. Chair Holston again thanked everyone for their participation and encouraged those in opposition to attend the City Council meeting.

PL(P) 21-01 & Z-21-01-003: An annexation and original zoning from County RS-20 (Residential Single-Family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-Family-3) for the property identified as a portion of 3214

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

19

Groometown Road, generally described as west of Groometown Road and north of Broadacres Drive, (0.39 Acres).

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the zoning map and other summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties, and advised there were no conditions related to the request. Mr. Kirkman clarified the zoning request was for 0.39 acres. Chair Holston inquired the Commissioners if there were any questions for Mr. Kirkman. Chair Holston requested the applicant to state their name, address, and case.

Bo Rodenbough, Attorney with Brooks Pierce, Suite 2000 Renaissance, 230 N. Elm Street, spoke on behalf of the applicant Secure, Inc., subsidiary of the State Employees Credit Union. As part of its mission Secure, Inc. attempts to rehab properties that have been foreclosed or deed in lieu of foreclosure and make them available for attractive and affordable housing for underserved communities that may not otherwise have opportunities for home ownership. The 3214 Groometown Road property was acquired by Secure, Inc. in 2014 and is a vacant lot currently. It was determined that the property was located about 55% in the City of Greensboro with a zoning of R-3. The back 45% of the property is still in the county and zoned RS-20. In order to obtain the building permit, Secure, Inc. made application for the annexation of the rear portion of the lot into the City of Greensboro and be zoned consistently with the existing R-3 zoning on the front portion of the lot. The annexation and original zoning will be consistent with the existing housing in the neighborhood, an addition to the housing stock in the neighborhood and consistent with the existing GSO 2040 plan.

Chair Holston inquired if there were questions for Mr. Rodenbough from the Commissioners. Seeing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair Holston asked if there was anyone in opposition to the request. Hearing none, Chair Holston closed the public hearing and requested to hear from staff.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because the uses requested exist on adjacent tracts and are of a similar scale, intensity, or off-site impact as existing nearby uses. The proposed R-3 zoning district is intended to accommodate low density residential development. The proposed original zoning request allows uses similar to existing uses in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair Holston inquired if any of the Commissioners had questions, discussion, comments, or a motion. Ms. O'Connor made a motion to approve the annexation. Seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Commission voted 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Holston, Collins, Jones, Bryson, Trapp, Alford and O'Connor. Nays: 0). Chair Holston stated the vote passed 7-0 on annexation. This was a favorable recommendation and goes to City Council on February 16, 2021.

Ms. O'Connor stated in regard to agenda item Z-21-01-003, a portion of 3214 Groometown Road, the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property described as 3214 Groometown Road from County RS-20 (Residential Single-Family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family-3) to be consistent with the adopted Greensboro 2040 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 Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map. The proposed R-3 zoning district permits uses which fits the context of the surrounding area. The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area. It will benefit the property owner and surrounding community.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

20

Approval is in the public interest. Seconded by Mr. Trapp. The Commission voted 7-0. (Ayes: Chair Holston, Collins, Jones, Bryson, Trapp, Alford and O'Connor. Nays: 0). Chair Holston stated this approval constitutes a favorable recommendation and subject to a public hearing at the February 16, 2021, City Council meeting.

Z-21-01-004: A rezoning from R-3 (Residential Single-family-3) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District-Residential Multi-family-8) for the property identified as 606-618 Whitfield Drive, generally described as north of Whitfield Drive and west of Bell Orchard Drive, (6.78 Acres).

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the zoning map and other summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties, and advised of the condition related to the request. Chair Holston inquired the Commissioners if there were any questions for Mr. Kirkman. Chair Holston requested the applicant to come forward and state their name, address, and case.

Judy Stalder, 115 Southwest Gate Drive. Ms. Stalder introduced the developers, Jeff Jackson with Investor Land Services and Jeff Garnier from True Homes. Both regularly build homes in Greensboro. Ms. Stalder referred to a slide depicting the proposed site, which is the last vacant property. The property is situated between RM-12 and R-3 with significant topographic challenges and environmentally sensitive areas. New construction in the area has been a mixture of apartments and townhomes not mentioned in the staff report. There is a precedent for multi-family development in this area. Given the challenges on this property, it is practical to develop it as attached housing. The homes need to be built close to retail centers and restaurants and still be sensitive to the existing single-family homes. This would be a moderate zoning district of RM-8, restricted to residential uses only and the proposed homes would be 15-20 feet lower in elevation. There would be a requirement to maintain Type C planting along the boundaries of the property adjacent to the single-family homes. For every 100 linear feet, two canopy trees, 3 understory trees, and 7 shrubs are required. The buffer would have an average width of 15 feet. The developers want to preserve existing vegetation and supplement the Type C buffer requirements. A slide depicting the townhomes proposed was shown. The townhomes will be for individual sales at 2,000 to 2,400 square feet. The price range was projected to be \$180,000 to \$240,000. With 45 homes, this site would be well below the threshold required for a traffic impact study. Whitfield Drive would be widened and an appropriate gutter and sidewalk placed along the Whitfield Drive frontage. Other needs may be identified by TRC. The creek will be protected in the associated environmentally sensitive areas. An HOA will be established to maintain and protect open space, common area parking, roof quality devices, and the exterior maintenance of the buildings and grounds. The requirements of utilities will be met and comply with local, state, and federal standards for storm water devices. The developers reached out to the neighbors on all sides, both single-family and multi-family and submitted a detailed report. There were 207 letters sent out explaining the proposed development and included the site plan. Neighbors were invited to a Zoom meeting and provided contact information for those who could not attend that meeting. Five calls were received, emails were received and they also met with neighbors on Zoom. The most frequent questions and concerns centered on the size, price, and the timing of the development. If approved, the development should start in the fall and construction in early 2022. Concerns were expressed regarding improvements on Whitfield Road and traffic on Bell Orchard Drive. Of the 207 letters mailed, 18 neighbors responded. Of those 18 neighbors, only 5 had positive comments. One neighbor wanted to know if he could purchase one of the townhomes. Individual calls or emails were sent to those neighbors adjacent to the Whitfield Right of Way letting them know that they would coordinate with them in staking the existing right of way and how could they can best work together to protect their property during construction. Ms. Stalder stated any infill development is unique. Consideration was done to decide the best type of housing suited for the area

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

21

and the site which narrowed it down to townhomes. The developer wanted to find an appropriate transition between adjacent uses between RM-12 and R-3 which became RM-8.

Chair Holston asked Ms. Stalder if the road improvements to Whitfield would be done because it is a part of the property and also extend all the way to Bell Orchard. Ms. Stalder responded that was correct. Chair Holston asked if that would be the only access to the development and no access off of Kenneth or Bell Orchard, or any other place. Ms. Stalder responded that was correct. Chair Holston inquired if the Commissioners had any questions for Ms. Stalder. Seeing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. Seeing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the request. Chair Holston advised they would have a combined 15 minutes for speaking.

Jeremy Lee, Darla Lee, and Teresa Lee, 611 Kenneth Road. Darla Lee stated the development would butt against the back yard of their home that they have lived in since 1958. Ms. Lee expressed concerns of disturbing wildlife roaming in the area, and the safety of children playing up and down the streets and in the woods. The developer would be taking away a lot of natural play areas. Ms. Lee expressed concerned regarding a bottle neck situation that could occur. When their property was annexed into the city in the '80s, Kenneth Road and Bell Orchard were to have been widened and never happened. Ms. Lee stated this development is too small to have that many people. Traffic is already heavy with the recently opened Urban Loop. Ms. Lee advised it is becoming very difficult to get out of the neighborhood and if the mail truck goes by, you have to wait your turn to go by. Chair Holston referred to other cases and similar issues and advised if the Zoning Commission approves and if City Council approves the request, there will be additional steps to go through. The Technical Review Committee, (TRC) would address issues such as was the access road sufficient for traffic on Kenneth Road and would address the widening issues and those types of things relative to this new project would be reviewed at that point. Currently Zoning is only looking at the land use. Infill is a target that the City of Greensboro has been trying to utilize as much space as possible. Not everyone would be satisfied as to how it ends up but there is a great deal of sources within the city. Not only the Zoning Commission and City Council, but also working within the city to protect as many of the rights and needs of both those coming in and those already there. Ms. Lee stated the apartments that were built do not come off Bell Orchard, it is directly off Elm Street. There is a gated area and a sidewalk behind the apartments and that is it. Mr. Lee stated the apartments have no access to the sidewalk built to the apartment complex. Chair Holston thanked Ms. Lee. Chair Holston inquired if there were questions for the Lees. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in opposition to this request.

David Rominger, 4207 Bell Orchard Drive, stated the neighborhood was built in the late 50s or early 60s in what was the county back then. When incorporated into the city, it was the believed the city would come in to widen the streets and improve the curves, lights. None of that occurred. When this neighborhood was built, Elm Street did not extend to where it is now, there was no intersection and only one way in via Bell Orchard. Kenneth Road connects into Elm Street currently. Mr. Rominger stated his concerns with cut through traffic that loops around to avoid the light. With 840 right there by Kenneth Road, traffic has increased every more. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic on Bell Orchard. The street in front of his home measures 19 feet wide and it is very challenging for two cars to pass. The posted 25 MPH speed limit is often ignored by those who do not live in the neighborhood. The biggest concern with the request is going from 3 homes per acre to 8 homes per acre, and 45 units doubles the amount of homes in the neighborhood. The image presented is much like the current townhome properties at the end of Kenneth and on Bell Orchard that all have garages and a single driveway with usually two cars per home forcing parking into the public streets. Mr. Rominger is concerned with parking and traffic issues on Whitfield, a private drive 10 feet wide and would need to be widened to reach Bell Orchard. The biggest

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

22

concern is traffic. The neighborhood would prefer the zoning stay at R-3 to stay within the footprint of this community. The site plan does not appear to be user friendly for first responders. Chair Holston stated that would be a consideration that would come out through the TRC process. The applicant has suggested in regard to widening Whitfield which would probably help with that, assuming the request is approved and goes through that process. Chair Holston asked Mr. Tipton if a traffic study was triggered with the new loop that is also in that area. Mr. Tipton responded it did not. Mr. Rominger asked if a traffic study should be done when building a new community that would double the traffic into a neighborhood. Mr. Tipton stated when it comes to multi-family, there would need to be approximately 140 to 150 units before studies are required. Mr. Rominger asked would GDOT take into consideration the amount of traffic cutting through the neighborhood. Mr. Tipton responded that would be addressed differently for concerns. Mr. Rominger is concerned that Bell Orchard Drive cannot support the volume of traffic there is. Chair Holston requested Brandon Roberts to speak.

Brandon Roberts, 4201 Bell Orchard Drive, stated he lives at the corner of Kenneth and Whitfield and in front of the property in question. Mr. Roberts echoed the concerns regarding traffic and was dismayed there has not been and will not be a traffic study due to the cut through of traffic experienced by him. Most of the streets are narrow except the road behind the apartment complex that was widened. Mr. Roberts stated the proposed plans will in no way match the community and was concerned with the pricing of the townhomes if they do not sell. Mr. Roberts was concerned regarding a sidewalk coming out to Bell Orchard off of Whitfield and was confused on what would be done. Chair Holston advised there would be more from the developer in the rebuttal period. Mr. Roberts stated he would be concerned with foot traffic close to his property and so many vehicles coming past his home as his small children play in the yard. Mr. Roberts expressed concerns with the widening the road and utility lines and his property being compromised. The developer has met with him and his neighbor regarding the 40-foot easement. Traffic is the biggest concern. Mr. Roberts would like to be assured that there will be a proper barrier from the proposed neighborhood to the neighborhoods that back up to that property. Mr. Roberts stated it is a safety concern regarding how Bell Orchard and Kenneth Drive would be able to support additional traffic on those roads. Chair Holston inquired if there were questions for Mr. Roberts. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if there was anyone else to speak in opposition. Hearing none, Chair Holston requested to hear rebuttal from the applicant and advised rebuttal was 5 minute maximum for both sides.

Judy Stalder stated the proposed new residents may choose to travel down to Bell Orchard, turn right on Kenneth Drive to go to Elm Street to avoid a left turn onto Pisgah Church, but would not go left on Kenneth unless visiting in that area. Ms. Stalder stated this is infill development and an area that is walkable to commercial which is the type of thing the Greensboro Comprehensive Plan encourages and is within areas where there could be more density. Ms. Stalder stated it is the expectation of the developer that if the residents need additional parking, they would park within the neighborhood and not on Bell Orchard. Baylor is not an option for a connection as there are sensitive areas located there. The developer has no concerns being able to sell the townhomes. The apartments in the area filled up quickly, the townhomes in this area sold quickly for higher prices than will be asked by this developer. Chair Holston asked if there would sidewalks on Whitfield and what was the plan. Ms. Stalder responded sidewalks will be built along their frontage of Whitfield. The developer is not required to build them up to Bell Orchard. The developer will be consulting one on one with the two owners adjacent to Whitfield regarding what could be there in the right of way. Buffers will be adjacent to the single family and an average of 15 feet wide and every 100 feet two canopy trees, 3 understory trees, and 17 shrubs will be planted. The buffer would be undisturbed as much as possible, significant trees would be saved if possible, and would supplement wherever necessary to meet the minimums for a Type C buffer requirement. Chair Holston inquired if there were additional

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

23

questions for Ms. Stalder. Hearing none, Chair Holston inquired if anyone was responding in opposition for up to 5 minutes of rebuttal.

Brandon Roberts, stated Kenneth is not a dead-end street and has run-off traffic going in and out of the neighborhood off Nandina, part of the townhome development off of Baylor and have a rear access onto Kenneth and an addition to traffic issues the neighborhood faces on Kenneth and Bell Orchard. Mr. Roberts believes in walkability but was concerned with sidewalks and a wide enough street to support that.

David Rominger, stated the drive on Whitfield is misleading, it is only approximately 100 yards long and he stated the zoning sign was off the roadway and not visible. The narrow street and traffic are the major concern. On page 5 of the information sent out referencing becoming car optional, it was encouraged for new development compatible with the intended use of the adjacent roadway. The adjacent roadway is Bell Orchard and does not support any additional traffic. If this is approved by the Zoning Commission, a traffic study should be done and requested the developers to consider a privacy fence in addition to the natural vegetation already in place along Whitfield, Bell Orchard, and Kenneth.

Darla Lee, stated the only notice received from the city was a 2-page letter. It is difficult to cross the street at Pisgah Church and Elm because there are no pedestrian signs or signals, no walkway. Car accidents have occurred there also. The walkability has been mentioned and is it difficult to walk around in the neighborhood. Teresa Lee stated Whitfield Drive was originally only a private driveway for a single-family home. The developer is attempting to build in her back yard, literally. Chair Holston inquired if there were any questions for the Lees. Hearing none, Chair Holston closed the public hearing and requested to hear from staff.

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because the uses requested exist on adjacent tracts and are of a similar scale, intensity, or off-site impact as existing nearby uses. The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district permits residential uses only and is compatible with uses present in the surrounding area and would increase the range of choice and supply of housing. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair Holston inquired if there were questions for staff. Hearing none, Chair Holston requested thoughts, questions, comments, or a motion. Mr. Alford stated he went to the site and his problem is being adjacent to the R-3 housing. RM-12 zoning is nearby but not really in same community. Mr. Alford stated he would be voting against this request because of the density compatibility. Mr. Bryson stated in regard to agenda item Z-21-01-004 the Greensboro Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the zoning request for the properties identified as 606-618 Whitfield Drive from R-3 (Residential Single-family-3) to CD-RM-8 (Conditional District Residential Multi-family-8) to be consistent with the adopted GSO 2040 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 Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map. The proposed CD-RM-8 zoning district fits the context of the surrounding residential areas and limits negative impacts on adjacent properties. The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area. It will benefit the property owner and surrounding community. Approval is in the public interest. Seconded by Mr. Trapp. The Commission voted 6-1. (Ayes: Chair Holston, Collins, Jones, Bryson, Trapp, and O'Connor. Nays: Alford). Chair Holston stated this approval constituted final approval that is subject to a public hearing by

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

24

City Council if appealed within 10 days. Chair Holston advised all of the participants that perhaps a conversation regarding some of the issues that were stated. Chair Holston stated if those in opposition believed separate from the application that a traffic review was needed based upon conditions that have changed could reach out to the city for an opportunity for a separate review of the traffic issue.

ITEMS FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman advised this meeting was Mr. Trapp's last as a Commissioner for the Zoning Commission. Mr. Trapp has an opportunity to advance his career in Raleigh, North Carolina. Mr. Kirkman appreciated Mr. Trapp's passion for Greensboro and zoning. On behalf of staff, appreciation was expressed for Mr. Trapp's time and effort both with this current time with the Commission and the previous times also. Staff wished Mr. Trapp well with his future endeavors. Mr. Trapp thanked everyone and advised it had been an honor serving during the second stint. Chair Holston advised Mr. Trapp will be missed and congratulated him. Ms. O'Connor congratulated Mr. Trapp and stated all of her experiences with him was always he left the wood pile higher than he found it. Ms. Connor stated Mr. Trapp has made many great contributions in Greensboro and wished him well in the new venture.

ITEMS FROM THE ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mr. Carter advised currently there were 8 cases expected to be heard at the next meeting, plus a text amendment. Mr. Bryson stated there has to be a way to expedite the meetings. It is not fair to the Commissioners or the citizens and needs to be a better way. Mr. Bryson understood what the citizens are talking about regarding the mailings and notifications. There is an issue and the pink elephant in the room is the postal service currently is in shams and there are no guarantee citizens are receiving the information in a timely fashion. There needs to be a better way and these two things need to be worked on. Chair Holston responded he understood both issues. Chair Holston stated he was not defending the system but was very sensitive to when there is a case and 8 people want to speak and questions that come up. There are times when, in the past, it was said, okay, let's just cut everything down to 5 minutes or 2 minutes and keep things moving. His personal perspective is that when that is done, discussion is cut off, debate is cut off, along with information and opportunities to fact finding primarily on the opposition side. The opposition a lot of times may have gotten the mail late and not have a lot to time to review and then Zoning cuts the time from them. Chair Holston was sensitive to ensure Zoning hears from everyone who wants a say. This is done on a regular basis. There are notes and assistance from city staff. A lot of times it is the speakers first time ever coming and speaking in this type of environment. Chair Holston stated he does tend to err on the side of taking extra time to ensure speakers have their opportunity for their say. Chair Holston stated it is frustrating when it ends at 10:00 o'clock, 8 cases or 12 cases and midnight. State statute says by mailings, it is by the postmark date. Before it was discussed regarding pushing everything out a month. For example, if filed in January it would not be heard until March. Others would then be waiting and their project needs to move forward and now delayed them a full month and then if appealed or request is denied and have to come to City Council. Chair Holston stated he was not arguing with Mr. Bryson but saying it is frustrating and was not sure how to fix it and still give those persons needing the most opportunity to speak. If there are 8 cases and they are all hot and heavy, it will be a long night. Mr. Bryson stated this could be talked about off-line but there is a way to do it. Chair Holston inquired if there was other feedback from Commissioners. There was no further feedback.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO ZONING COMMISSION
January 20, 2021**

25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES:

Chair Holston advised the absences of Mr. Rosa and Mr. Engle were excused.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hugh Holston, Chairperson

HH/cgs

DRAFT