

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
JANUARY 19, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board met in regular session on Wednesday January 19, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Planning Board members present were: Chairman Gary Wolf, Donald Blackstock, Curtis Douglas, Calvin Williams, Velma Speight-Buford, Chuck Truby, and Betty Smith. Planning staff present were Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Sheila Carmon and Nicole Ward.

MEETING MINUTES:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 15, 2010 MEETING.

Ms. Smith moved to approve the minutes of the December 15, 2010 meeting, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Blackstock, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, and Smith. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. STREET CLOSING: RECOMMENDATION ON A RESOLUTION CLOSING CAMPUS DRIVE FROM BENJAMIN PARKWAY EASTWARD TO WESTOVER TERRACE FOR A DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 1,685 FEET. (RECOMMENDED)

Nicole Ward stated that Campus Drive was recorded on the 1927 City Property Plat Number 75. The owner of 100% of the abutting property has signed the petition. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) feels circumstances here allow the City to make the two required determinations for a street closing. 1) That closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to public interest and, 2) that no property owner in the vicinity is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress. Therefore, the TRC recommended the street closing.

In response to a question from Chair Wolf, Dennis Cullen, representing Guilford County Schools, stated that closing the street would allow them to better enforce speeding and traffic during drop-off and pick-up by installing speed bumps and gates.

Mr. Truby moved to recommend the street closing to City Council, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Blackstock, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, and Smith. Nays: None.)

Mr. Williams arrived at 2:11 and participate in the remainder of the meeting.

B. TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON AN AMENDMENT TO THE LDO RELATED TO ASSISTED LIVING FACILITIES. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Kirkman stated that staff had received a request from a citizen to amend the LDO regarding requirements for Assisted Living Facilities; specifically to remove a minimum square footage requirement for individual units. Staff's investigation of the request showed that State licensing requirements and other industry standards speak to not having this large a

requirement as currently defined in the Ordinance. No potential conflicts were identified with this change and staff felt this change still meets the intent of assisted living in terms of the arrangement of the facility relative to the Ordinance and the city as a whole. Additionally, staff supports changes proposed as part of this text amendment to clarify terminology and replace the current term “congregate care” in the definitions section, with the term “assisted living” as that is the correct and useable industry term.

Hunter Trefzger, from Smith Packett located at 4423 Pheasant Ridge Road, SW, Roanoke, Virginia and developers of this project, stated that the current Ordinance proposes a unit size of roughly 400 square feet per resident. That is an individual square footage, wherein, there would be two residents sharing a room with roughly 800 square feet in size. The State of North Carolina has several regulations in place to dictate the size of a resident room, whether it is in assisted living or skilled nursing. The State also dictates the provision of a minimum 80 square feet per resident, per room and a minimum of 130 square feet for a dual-occupancy room. All of our assisted living projects are well in excess of that square footage and other operators who are developing projects of similar scope and size are significantly larger than the minimum State requirement as well, but cannot as easily meet the City’s much greater requirement.

The Board members commented that they felt this was a good change for the assisted living facilities.

After a short discussion, Ms. Smith moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Blackstock, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Williams and Smith. Nays: None.)

EASEMENT RELEASE:

RELEASE OF A 15-FOOT ACCESS EASEMENT AND A PORTION OF THE D.M.U.E. RUNNING THROUGH 1215-1217 MOSLEY ROAD AS DEPICTED IN PLAT BOOK 178 ON PAGE 145. (APPROVED)

Steve Galanti stated that this portion of easement was dedicated as part of the plat recorded in Plat Book 178 on Page 145. All utility departments have reviewed the request and there are no objections to releasing this easement.

After a short discussion, Mr. Truby moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Williams. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Blackstock, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Williams and Smith. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

REQUEST TO CALL A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE FEBRUARY 16, 2011 MEETING ON CHANGING THE NAME OF A PORTION OF WALKING HORSE LANE TO WILLOW ROCK LANE ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF JESSUP GROVE ROAD. (APPROVED)

After a short discussion, Mr. Williams moved to set February 16, 2001 as the public hearing for the subject street name change, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 7-0 in

favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Blackstock, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Williams and Smith. Nays: None.)

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Mr. Alston and Ms. Bachmann were acknowledged as excused.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz
Interim Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
FEBRUARY 16, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, February, 16, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd Floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Planning Board members present were: Chairman Gary Wolf, Curtis Douglas, Calvin Williams, Jr., Anita Bachmann, Velma Speight-Buford, Chuck Truby, and Betty Smith. City staff present were Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Nicole Ward, Carol Carter and Sheila Carmon. Also present was Adam Fischer, Director of the Greensboro Department of Transportation.

MEETING MINUTES:

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 19, 2011 REGULAR MEETING.

Mr. Williams moved to approve the minutes of the January 19, 2011 meeting, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Bachmann and Williams. Nays: None.)

ANNEXATION AGREEMENT:

**REVISIONS TO THE GREENSBORO-JAMESTOWN ANNEXATION AGREEMENT LINE.
(RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. Galanti explained that Greensboro and Jamestown entered into an annexation agreement in March of 1991, later amended in September of 1993, which is due to expire December of 2018. This revised 30-year agreement makes several changes and he presented a map showing the changes along Mackey Road, at the intersection of Guilford College Road and High Point Road, along Grandover Parkway and along Guildford College Road. He also explained the changes being made to move the line to the future right-of-way line for any road that abuts the boundary of this agreement. The two properties, which will go over to the Greensboro side of the line totals approximately 38 acres and the area going to the Jamestown side is approximately 45 acres. Staff expects that in the long-term the total evaluation of these areas will be roughly comparable when the properties are developed. This agreement will require both the approval of the Greensboro City Council and the Town Council for the Town of Jamestown.

In response to questions, Mr. Galanti stated that the property along Mackey Road is the back half of a storage yard, the property along Grandover Parkway contains a single family house, and the others are currently undeveloped.

Mr. Williams moved to recommend the annexation agreement to City Council, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Bachmann and Williams. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

B. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT: CP-11-01 – 5001 GUILFORD COLLEGE ROAD - EXISTING FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION: UNDESIGNATED - PROPOSED FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION: MIXED USE COMMUNITY. (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Carter explained that normally when there are amendments to the Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM), there is no public hearing and it is brought to the Planning Board for comments. However, the two properties being moved to the Greensboro side of the Greensboro-Jamestown Annexation Agreement line are undesignated on the GFLUM. The adopted guidelines state that if it is a City-initiated zoning or change of land use, it would need to be brought for a public hearing.

5001 Guilford College Road has an undesignated land use and is in another jurisdiction. The proposal is to add it to the GFLUM under the Mixed Use Community category, which is the same as the property in the vicinity. A letter was sent to the surrounding property owners, as required by Statute. Ms. Carter reminded the Board that this is not a zoning change but simply an addition to the GFLUM.

In response to a question from Chair Wolf, Mr. Galanti stated that there are several items on the agenda that are influenced by the change to the Greensboro-Jamestown Annexation Agreement. The GFLUM needs to be amended to add those areas being added to the Greensboro side of the line. There is no development associated with this request.

Ms. Carter stated that this property is currently vacant. The Mixed-Use Community category to the east is part of Grandover and is undeveloped. Staff has received several phone calls from citizens regarding this issue.

Ms. Carter clarified that Mixed-Use Community is the category used to encourage large scale development with a mix of residential, commercial, and neighborhood oriented uses.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the request.

Mr. Truby moved to recommend this change in the GFLUM to the City Council, seconded by Ms. Bachmann. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Bachmann and Williams. Nays: None.)

C. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT : CP-11-02 – WEST OF GUILFORD COLLEGE ROAD AND EAST OF HIGH POINT ROAD - EXISTING FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION: UNDESIGNATED - PROPOSED FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION: MIXED USE COMMUNITY. (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Carter explained that this area also does not have a designated land use on the GFLUM. It is proposed to be identified as Mixed-Use Community.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the request.

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to recommend the change in the GFLUM to the City Council, seconded by Mr. Williams. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Bachmann and Williams. Nays: None.)

ANNEXATION RESOLUTION OF CONSIDERATION:

REVIEW OF AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE RESOLUTION IDENTIFYING THE AREAS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR ANNEXATION BY THE CITY OF GREENSBORO, WHICH INCLUDES THE 2011-2013 RESOLUTION OF CONSIDERATION MAP. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Galanti stated that state law gives municipalities doing city-initiated annexations the choice of: (1) adopting at least a year in advance of the annexation vote a resolution of consideration identifying areas eligible for city-initiated annexation, or (2) delaying any city-initiated annexation for a year after City Council votes to approve it. Greensboro is following the first choice. Since resolutions of consideration are good for two years, the current resolution will expire in September of 2011. The only revision being made to the 2011-2013 Resolution of Consideration Map reflects the changes to the Greensboro-Jamestown Annexation Agreement.

Mr. Williams moved to recommend the resolution and map to City Council, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Bachmann and Williams. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. STREET NAME CHANGE: RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO CHANGE THE NAME OF A PORTION OF WALKING HORSE LANE TO WILLOW ROCK LANE ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF JESSUP GROVE ROAD. (RECOMMENDED)

Ms. Carmon stated that the name change has been proposed due to the Horse Pen Creek Village Apartments construction project, which closed the middle portion of Walking Horse Lane which left two unconnected portions of the street with the same name. Of the three parties affected by this change two are property owners and one is a tenant. The Planning Department requested that these residential property owners suggest a new name for its section of Walking Horse Lane and they have proposed the new name of Willow Rock Lane. The change is necessary in the interest of public safety to minimize confusion and delivery of goods and services. The Technical Review Committee recommended the name change as proposed.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the request.

Ms. Bachmann moved to recommend the street name change to the City Council, seconded by Mr. Williams. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Bachmann and Williams. Nays: None.)

Ms. Smith arrived and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

E. TEXT AMENDMENT – RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 30-11-11 OF THE LDO RELATED TO PARKING FOR SINGLE-FAMILY AND DUPLEX DWELLINGS. (RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED)

Mr. Kirkman explained that the proposed changes were in response to several citizen inquiries and to address previous direction from City Council on the previously adopted front yard parking standards. The proposed changes reflect Council's intention to allow parking in the front yard on a temporary basis for residential-oriented events. It also addresses concerns by enforcement staff on the appropriate design of parking areas for existing residences as the current standards were applied retroactively to existing development. Staff looked at various ordinances from

across North Carolina, particularly language that would make sense for these two items, and felt the proposed changes are most appropriate for the City of Greensboro. These changes will allow use of the front yard area of the grass and bare earth for temporary parking for temporary events up to three days in duration. It clarifies the definition of parking areas, removing the required physical edge as long as it is clear from the street what is parking area.

In response to a question, Mr. Kirkman stated that one reason for this change was a request from a citizen off Westridge Road, with a very large lot. They actually meet the 40% requirement for the paved area but had folks that park in the grass area on a temporary basis for social gatherings, family reunions, birth of a child, deaths, etc. Several others have asked for the ability to park in that front area and would like to have flexibility. He then responded to a comment regarding another issue regarding allowing residents to have a second commercial vehicle that will be discussed next month.

Ryan Finch, 3506 Spicebrush Trail, stated that she is curious about the change in the amendment, whether the surrounding neighbors have been consulted and how the process works.

Mr. Kirkman stated that this text amendment did not have any specific address identification and would be relevant to city-wide parking restrictions.

Mr. Galanti stated that this is a text amendment and the Planning Board will be making a recommendation. City Council will be the final approval authority and there will be an advertisement that goes into the local paper to cover the notification requirements. He reiterated that this would be for all properties located within the City's jurisdiction.

Mr. Truby feels that if it is non-commercial with 3-days duration, it should be okay.

After a short discussion, Mr. Truby moved to recommend the text amendment with a recommended change to limit the frequency of these temporary events, seconded by Mr. Williams. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Bachmann, Smith and Williams. Nays: None.)

D. TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SEVERAL SECTIONS OF THE LDO RELATED TO TEMPORARY OFF-SITE REAL ESTATE DIRECTIONAL SIGNS (RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED)

Mr. Kirkman stated that the proposed text amendment is in response to concerns related to the application and enforcement of previously adopted standards for temporary off-site directional real estate signs, also referred to as "weekend real estate signs". City staff met with a variety of stakeholders from November 2010 through January 2011 to try and address concerns and still maintain the intent of the ordinance regarding these types of signs. Following these discussions and the information staff got from these conversations the text amendment makes several changes to the previously adopted ordinance related to these types of signs. Changes include the removal of setback requirements from the road for the signs tied to a reduction in the maximum height of signs allowed in these spaces. Also, it establishes a new area in the Civil Penalties section that has a flat fee for most violations unless there are a number of violations within a short period of time, and allows real estate companies to assign the penalties to individual real estate agents, if they are readily identifiable to staff. Mr. Kirkman also noted that

staff recommends adoption of these changes but to become effective 60 days after adoption, to allow time for additional education and to make adjustments to these new standards.

Judy Stalder, 115 S. Westgate Drive representing the members of the Triad Real Estate and Building Industry Coalition (TREBIC) and a realtor with Allen Tate, stated that 60% to 75% of the traffic to new homes on weekends comes from off-site directional signs. 95% of traffic to open houses for existing homes comes from these same signs. Builders and realtors need to make the sign ordinance work because it is critical to their business and the community at-large need the sign ordinance to work because selling homes is critical to the overall economy. The signs and cluttering needs to be controlled at intersections but these are temporary signs, which are six square feet and they are only there for a few days per week. They are not asking for special treatment, but an ordinance that fits this unique business where the location of the product they sell is temporary. The ordinance enforcement for the past two years has been a nightmare. There have been a lot of problems and fines involved in this time period. To make this ordinance work a simple, business-friendly ordinance is needed. The height restriction has sometimes also been a problem because when the earth is very dry, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to set the rods deep enough for the sign to be in compliance. They also asked that the fines be reduced to fit the restriction. It is felt that the maximum \$500 fine is exorbitant and excessive. They feel that a \$50 penalty would be more in keeping with the restrictions. They asked that the 30-inch limit on the height of a sign be eliminated as that would allow the builders to still participate on weekends. They would also like to remove references to other ordinances so that realtors and builders know what they are dealing with, specifically, at the end of Item #5 that refers to another ordinance.

Kathleen Sullivan, 23 Oak Branch Drive, stated that they are asking that the Planning Board put forth to City Council, a text amendment to amend the present sign ordinance, keeping it simple. Friday from 12 until Monday at 12; flat fee violations; no measurements, however, keeping everyone safe. It is hoped that an amendment can be brought forward that will keep our region in compliance. It has become more and more difficult for a person to sell their home. The real estate signs are a large part of weekend business and are only up for a couple of days.

Holly Lindsay, 4523 Brandtridge Drive, stated that she is representing a company's perspective. She feels that the fee structure needs to be realistic and proportional for any violations. These temporary signs are used to direct potential buyers to Open Houses because research has shown that the majority of Open House traffic is a result of directional signs. This is a simple method that works well. She does not feel that a more restrictive ordinance is needed in this city. It is also sometimes very difficult to get the signs in the ground deep enough to meet the required height, especially if the dirt is very hard and it hasn't rained in awhile. Also, real estate companies have purchased large inventories of signs and stands that are used for directional purposes and if the ordinance reduces the size and height of these types of signs, there will be a huge expense in order to comply.

Stan Meyers, 5404 Rugby Drive, stated that he is against the signs. The real estate agents were given special privileges a few years ago and they are now taking advantage of it and don't abide by the rules in the ordinance. Now they don't even want to take responsibility for their own agents and don't want to pay for signs that are in error, but if someone else was in business and had a penalty, they would have to pay the penalty. Signs are not pretty and are very ugly, dotting the landscapes and ruining surrounding areas. He also argued that the signs are, in reality, up a lot longer and more frequently than what the other speakers are saying. He feels

that these signs should be 20 feet from the corner of an intersection. He has seen as many as 25 signs at one intersection for many different realty companies. This is too many signs to be placed at one intersection. He is also opposed to these realtors attaching balloons to the signs. He presented a letter from David Wharton, who is also opposed to the amendments to the sign ordinance.

Scott Wallace, 3708 Alliance Drive, representing Keystone Group, stated that he wants an ordinance that is fair, simple to understand and business-friendly. They want all the business and builder agents to adhere to the policies and want to feel comfortable in performing their jobs. It is not a good situation when a builder agent feels uncomfortable or even unsafe while they are putting their signs out, as it seems to be the case now. There are over 2,500 new and existing homes that are currently for sale in the Greensboro market, the sellers are relying on these signs and the agents to promote their property and help sell their properties. They are all interested in following the rules; they just want them to be enforced in a fair and professional manner. Changing the height of the signs would be an added expense that would be difficult to cover. He asked that those in support of the amendment to stand and show their support. Approximately 20 people stood up in support of the text amendment.

Frederick Smally, 1224 Brookway Drive, Lewisville, NC, stated that he is a sign maker and a big portion of his business is real estate signs. They also offer the service of placing the signs in designated areas and removing them. The workers providing this service are very diligent in making sure that the signs are not placed earlier than they are supposed to be on Friday and are removed on Mondays. He pointed out that when there has not been any rain and the ground is very hard, it is difficult to set the posts deep enough to comply with the height limitations.

Judy Stalder returned to the podium and stated that there has been much education in the real estate field and the ordinance is still not working. They just cannot control where those signs are all the time.

Greg Pitts, 2315 Emorywood Road, stated that he also produces real estate signs and there is a friendly business relationship with Mr. Smally's company. In response to the height of the signs, the tallest sign they have is 38 inches and that includes the stand and putting it in the ground. He feels that 3.5-foot limitations work well. He also pointed out that if the grass hasn't been cut it makes the sign difficult to see. He stated that the signs are always picked up on Monday before 12 Noon or Sunday night.

Jane Hornsby, 600 Fairmont Street, stated that she is a real estate agent and wanted to point out the importance of eliminating the placement requirements. If you have to place the sign 20 feet from the corner, it can become misleading and no longer indicate where to turn to get to the house.

David Keith, 3130-C Island Lane, Harrisburg, NC, with Artisan Signs, stated that he wanted to clarify that the stands are actually 40 inches tall and if the ground is very hard would not be within the limitations currently in the ordinance.

Chair Wolf stated that the CAT Team did not resolve the conflict with this ordinance and other portions of the City Code related to height and sight distances.

Adam Fischer, Director of GDOT, stated that the Obstruction to Cross-Visibility Ordinance is in the Motor Vehicle and Traffic section of the City's Code, separate from the Development Ordinance, and it has specifics that limit the height of objects that can be placed within the sight triangle at an intersection. The sight triangle is defined as 20 feet from the intersection to various distances along the main street, based on the speed of traffic. Objects taller than 30 inches in height and less than 96 inches in height could be considered an obstruction within these site triangles.

Ms. Smith stated that these signs are not just for realtors. Realtors put these signs out because there is a homeowner that wants to sell their home or there is a buyer that needs to find a home, but primarily, it is for a seller who wants to sell their house. Homeowners have rights and should be allowed to direct potential buyers to their home. She also pointed out that, from personal experience, one of her homeowners moved the sign themselves, because they did not feel it was visible enough. She does not like the use of balloons for advertising as they are detrimental to the wildlife and are a distraction on the roadway. City Council will have to make the final decision on this matter. She feels that the industry has a responsibility to police themselves and do a better job of that. She is conflicted on the 30 inches versus the 42 inches and the intersection issue because at 20 feet the signs are too far from an intersection. She is in favor of the changes except for doing away with the height requirement.

Mr. Williams stated he is also conflicted as he realizes it is critical for the economy and the livelihood of so many industries and jobs. He supports the changes listed in standards 1, 2 and 3 but, needed clarity on how that came about. Mr. Kirkman stated that the request was to remove the requirement for the 20-foot-intersection setback. If removed, the height requirement becomes more of a factor to sight obstructions.

Ms. Smith stated that with the number of open houses on a weekend, \$50 for a violation would be an excessive cost of business, that large companies do not have the individual agent's name on signs, and supports a flat fee instead of an accelerated fee.

Ms. Speight-Buford stated that she feels that this should be a regional change, everyone should be doing the same thing, and hopes the regions will get together. Mr. Kirkman stated that contact with staff in Winston-Salem and High Point revealed that High Point does not allow these signs in the right-of-way.

Mr. Truby stated that he is in support of a flat \$50 fine that could be adjusted later. He also does not think the rules for Greensboro should be more stringent than other communities. He feels that if the sign is 30 inches tall it can be placed anywhere in the right-of-way, and if it is between 30 inches and 42 inches tall it has to be outside of the sight triangle.

Mr. Truby moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council with three changes as follows: (1) signs may be placed anywhere within the public right-of-way but not extend into the roadway and not exceed 2.5 feet in height within 20 feet of the intersection; (2) signs that exceed 2.5 feet up to a maximum height of 3.5 feet shall be placed at least 20 feet from street intersection measured from the corner along the curb and at least five feet from the back of curb; and (3) the penalty for a violation be a flat \$50 per violation, seconded by Mr. Williams. The Board voted 6-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Truby, Bachmann, Douglas, Williams. Nays: Speight-Buford.)

Chair Wolf further suggested that staff review the language related to sight obstructions relative to these signs.

ANNEXATION PETITIONS:

A. RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING THE CHRIST COMMUNITY CHURCH PROPERTY (WITH FRONTAGE ON NETFIELD ROAD) AT 369 AIR HARBOR ROAD – 3.22-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION – REGULAR ANNEXATION PETITION. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Truby stated that he would recuse himself from this item due to a conflict of interest. The Board voted unanimously to recuse Mr. Truby from the matter.

Mr. Galanti stated that this request is for a recommendation on an ordinance annexing the Christ Community Church property, located at 369 Air Harbor Road, with frontage on Netfield Road. It is a 3.22-acre annexation filed as a voluntary request. It is considered contiguous since it abuts the primary city limits on the north, east, and a portion of its southern sides. It is located within the Tier II growth area, which is years 2013 through 2019 on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The developer is proposing to combine this site with the property immediately to the north and construct an assisted living facility. The City's fire department notes that this site is currently served by Fire Station #58, located on Spencer Dixon Road and upon annexation, will be served by City station #43 on Lake Jeanette Road. The travel time will be less so providing fire service will actually improve. Water service is available by connecting to the water line located in Netfield Road and sewer service is available by connecting to the outfall which crosses this site. The Police department estimates that it can provide service with little difficulty and providing other city services will involve a travel distance almost equal to that to provide service to the previously-annexed property to the north, south and east. The TRC recommends approval of the annexation.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the annexation to City Council, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Bachmann, Smith and Williams. Nays: None. Abstain: Truby.)

Mr. Truby returned to the dais and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

B. RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING THE FSH PROPERTIES, LLC PROPERTY AT 4720 – 4736 U.S. HIGHWAY 29 – 6.399-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION – REGULAR ANNEXATION PETITION. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Galanti stated that this property is located at 4720 through 4736 U.S. Highway 29, contains 6.399 acres, and is a voluntary request. It is considered contiguous because it abuts the primary city limits along its western side. It is located within the Tier I growth area on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The City's fire department notes that the site is currently served by Fire Station #55 on Hicone Road and upon annexation will be served by both City Station #14 on Summit Avenue and Station #55. Service will improve due to the City's ability to provide a full complement at the scene. Water and sewer service is available by connecting to the water and sewer lines located within Anita Lane. The Police department estimates that it can provide service with little difficulty and providing other City services will

involve a travel time almost equal to that necessary to provide service to the previously-annexed property to the west. The TRC recommended approval of the annexation.

Mr. Truby moved to recommend the annexation to City Council, seconded by Ms. Smith. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Bachmann, Smith and Williams. Nays: None.)

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ITEM:

CP-11-3 - LOCATED AT 4720 – 4736 U.S. HIGHWAY 29 - FOR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT - EXISTING FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION: INDUSTRIAL/CORPORATE PARK AND LOW RESIDENTIAL - PROPOSED FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION: MIXED USE COMMERCIAL.

Ms. Carter stated that this amendment is related to an annexation request. This request from Sheetz Incorporated contains multiple lots located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Anita Lane and U.S. Highway 29 North. The existing land use classification is primarily Industrial Corporate Park with a small portion as single family residential. The request is to change the land use designation to Mixed Use Commercial and staff feels it meets several of the criteria; particularly since it is the redevelopment of an existing property.

In response to a question from Chair Wolf, Ms. Carter stated that NCDOT will make the final decision on access points to this site.

The Board commented that this is a good change if it is properly buffered and if access concerns are addressed by NCDOT.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Galanti stated that a copy of the new Landscape Manual was placed at each member's seat, and contains both the Landscape Ordinance and the Tree Preservation Ordinance.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Mr. Blackstock and Mr. Alston were acknowledged as excused.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Interim Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 16, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday March 16, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Planning Board members present were: Chairman Gary Wolf, Curtis Douglas, Calvin Williams, Jr., Velma Speight-Buford, Chuck Truby, Donald Blackstock and Betty Smith. City staff present were Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Nicole Ward, Lamont Taylor, Sheila Carmon, and Russ Clegg. Also present was Chris Spencer from GDOT, Tom Carruthers from the City Attorney's Office, and Chris Wilson from Parks and Recreation.

MEETING MINUTES:

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2011 REGULAR MEETING.

Mr. Williams moved to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2011 meeting, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Williams, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SEVERAL SECTIONS OF THE LDO RELATED TO MOBILE FOOD VENDORS. (RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED)

Mike Kirkman stated that staff had been requested to look at changes to the City Code, based upon some concerns related to recurring food sales from vehicles, grills and push carts on both active and vacant lots. Staff has evaluated changes to the development ordinance to more fully define and regulate these uses. The proposed changes to the development ordinance include establishing specific districts for these "Mobile Food Vendors"; where those uses may occur on the lots; limitations on the allowable number of vendors per lot; and requirements to limit potential impacts on travel to, from and within any site where these uses may be located. The definitions for mobile food vendors are drawn primarily from State and County health and safety regulations for similar uses.

Mr. Kirkman added that the Land Development Ordinance is also designated as Chapter 30 of the City of Greensboro Code of Ordinances and is the section of the City Code that Planning Board has authority for review and recommended changes. However, as part of the City's efforts to provide an appropriate framework for mobile food vendors in Greensboro, City staff is also recommending changes to Chapters 13 and 26 of the City Code clarifying the relationship of these uses to non-profit organizations and establishing more specific requirements that must be met in order to obtain a privilege license for operations. While Planning Board does not have the authority to recommend changes to Chapters 13 and 26 of the City Code, the proposed changes to these Chapters are included as supporting materials to provide additional context to Board members.

Mr. Kirkman stated that the proposed changes to Chapter 30 (LDO) for mobile food vendors attempt to strike a balance related to the size and scale of vendors and areas where they are most

appropriate in the city and the City's interest in supporting local entrepreneurship. Staff recommends that Planning Board receive public comments on the requested changes to the LDO and then move to recommend to City Council the adoption of these changes.

Mr. Kirkman also stated that there would be a limitation on the larger, motorized food vendors to only the Industrial zoned districts and to active construction sites, which have historically been where these types of vehicles have operated in the City of Greensboro. The push-cart vendors would be allowed in the Industrial zoned districts as well as the Commercial-Medium, Commercial-High, and Central Business zoning districts. A map was shown which indicated the different districts. He stated that staff had proposed exemptions for non-profit organizations as well as for temporary events. Also included in the proposed amendment is a requirement that vendors cannot occupy required parking spaces for a use on property, they cannot interfere with the principal use for the property, and that they be located out of sidewalks and pedestrian and vehicular access points to the lots.

Tom Carruthers, City Attorney's Office, stated that staff felt it was important to receive public comment on all the proposed changes to the City Code at this time before the City Council public hearings on this matter. There have been complaints from the restaurateurs on Randleman Road and High Point Road and also from the Guilford County Health Department. If you are a not for profit under the regulations of the City of Greensboro and under the Health Department, then you do not have to comply with food safety requirements. There is a difference between an organization selling food on a temporary basis for a fundraiser and someone selling food as an ongoing commercial venue. The public has an expectation that meats that are prepared and cooked at various places around town on site on rolling grills are regulated by the Health Department. Since 1990, the City of Greensboro has regulated push-cart sales and it is well defined and is working very smoothly. He stated that the proposed changes from staff would allow a similar framework for food vendors outside of downtown.

In response to a question from Chair Wolf, Mr. Carruthers stated that some of the other restaurateurs in the area have complained that it is not fair for them to have to pay their overhead and fixed asset costs and the rolling vendors do not have that same kind of commitment or obligations in meeting public health requirements.

Ken Conrad, 4517 W. Market Street, stated that he is a local restaurateur but he comes on a different vein today. These people are small business people and they have the same rights and privileges he does and the state code outlines how they can have a pushcart and sell from mobile operations. Last year he was asked to visit Washington, DC, as a past Chairman of the NC Restaurant Association and a Board member. He testified in Congress on the Food Safety Bill that was finally passed last fall. Americans demand that they have safe food from the farm to the table. He feels that anyone selling food to the general public should operate from a facility that is first rate and ensures that the consumer is eating safe food. Some of these vendors operate from facilities without running water, no toilets, and no sanitation procedures and yet they are serving the population of Guilford County. He is not trying to put them out of business, but rather, only wants them to operate in a safe manner and follow the rules of other eating establishments.

Wayne Willard, 2832-D Randleman Road, stated that he is with the Randleman Road Business Association. In their organizational meetings they are trying to get similar requirements for the vendors that are creating a problem with the restaurants in that area, who have to follow the strict

health codes to offer their food to the general public. He also pointed out that anyone can claim to be a non-profit, but he feels that should be looked into and verification of their claim should be made. It is not fair to other food preparers for these types of businesses to continue without some kind of policing of the regulations. Legitimate non-profits should not have a problem providing the proper documentation. He also pointed out that in most cases, if the wind is blowing, there is a good chance that dirt is blowing right up into where the food is on the grill or wherever the food is being prepared. He feels that is a safety issue that needs to be controlled.

Bob Linton, 501 Teague Street, stated that he agrees with Mr. Conrad concerning having good health and safety laws in effect. He is a landlord on Randleman Road and the gentleman that leases from him probably has about \$75,000 invested in his equipment that includes hot and cold running water, stainless steel, and bathrooms on site and he does not see where there is a problem. He has made sure he has met all the regulations and guidelines for this site. He feels it is smart business to be able to create a business environment without all the overhead and fixed assets that restaurants have.

Walter Campella, 1213-B Shanna Lane, Asheboro, NC, stated that he runs a business in Asheboro called NC Pushcart Vendors Commissary and he sponsors vendors and helps get them through the Health Department, makes sure everything is up to par, as far as their operations. Most of these vendors are people who have lost their jobs and are looking for some way of making a living. It is really upsetting that some of the vendors are doing things they are not supposed to be doing, but the majority he has sponsored are following the guidelines and the rules. In response to dirt and the wind blowing on the prepared food, he pointed out that they are now required to have sneeze-guards to alleviate this type of problem.

Ken Stacks, 3000 Randleman Road, stated that he has a push-cart and it is permitted. It has hot and cold water on it and access to a bathroom. He came up with the idea to sell the all-beef hotdog for \$1.00 because of people losing their jobs and still being able to buy something affordable to eat. He has worked with Portia Shipman, who runs a non-profit helping people in the neighborhood and he donates money to help the non-profit organizations and help the kids stay focused. They are aware of the problems with blowing dirt and take that into consideration and turn the cart away from the wind so it won't be a problem. He just wants to give back to the community and he is now talking to some people about doing a fund raiser for the veterans, the police department and other organizations. There are some young men who have applied for jobs and due to their background are unable to be employed because the system kicks their application out. These young men have focus, they're making money and paying their bills and do not have to rely on illegal activities to make their living. He is trying to help these young men make that living by using the push-carts.

Joe Roundtree, 2500 Randleman Road, stated that he agrees with a lot that was previously stated by other vendors. He has built his business, legally, on the existing statutes of the City and the County and his life savings is tied up in it. One day he is legal and the next day he finds out that he is not legal and his life savings is gone and he is out of business and limited to where he can go to make his living. He feels that it is not fair for him to be limited to an industrial area or a place where somebody is building a building. That limits his right to make a living. He asked that the Board continue this matter to the next meeting, because there has not been enough time to organize and analyze the proposed amendments.

In response to a question from Chair Wolf, Mr. Kirkman stated that if the Planning Board decides to make a recommendation today, it would go to City Council on April 5th as a public hearing item that City Council would have the purview to continue, and that the Planning Board also has the option of continuing the matter.

In response to a question from Mr. Douglas, Mr. Kirkman stated that there is a “grandfather” clause for uses within the City but it was not clear if these uses could be considered “grandfathered” since the use was not clearly defined previously.

Chair Wolf stated that he viewed this solely as a safety issue and has concerns about the collection of sales tax. He pointed out that as a volunteer for the Jaycees at the GGO, they did this same type of vending and the Health Department was there every day checking on them to make sure everyone was abiding by the regulations. He feels that none of that type of checking is going on with the rolling grills and feels it is very unsafe.

Mr. Williams stated that he was in favor of the amendment for health and safety restraints, but he was not in favor of limiting some vendors to only be allowed in industrial districts. He does not feel that the government should be in the roll of governing that.

Mr. Blackstock stated that he knows a lot of these vendors have invested their life savings, and he hates to see people lose that investment because of regulations that they have no control over.

Mr. Douglas stated that he is also in favor of the health and safety issues related to the amendment.

Ms. Smith stated her support for the changes, with no cooking on site for for-profit businesses and she is also concerned about the safety issues but is not sure how that can be addressed. She also stated that she feels that some kind of recommendation should go forward that there should be some kind of policing of these types of vendors for safety and health reasons.

Mr. Kirkman clarified that City Council will be reviewing the Board’s recommendation only as it applies to Chapter 30, which relates to location and those requirements within that Chapter. He stated that the proposed amendment will clearly define the use, clearly define what zoning districts the use can occur in and some additional standards about where on those lots those uses can be placed.

Mr. Williams moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council as amended, to allow motorized mobile vendors to conduct their business in the Commercial-Medium and Commercial-High zoning districts, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Williams, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

Ms. Smith reiterated to the interested parties that they understand that just because this Board included Commercial zoning with their recommendation, it does not mean that the City Council will also include it. She suggested that anyone who is interested in this item should go to the City Council meeting and make their case.

Chair Wolf excuse himself from the meeting for a few minutes and Vice Chair Speight-Buford introduced the next item.

B. TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE LDO RELATED TO THE NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES KEPT ON-SITE IN CONJUNCTION WITH A HOME OCCUPATION. (RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED)

Mike Kirkman stated that in response to City Council direction, staff has worked to further revise requirements for home occupations, specifically the ability to allow a second commercial vehicle to be kept on-site in residential zoning. The latest proposed revisions to the ordinance attempt to balance specific citizen and Council interest in supporting small home-based businesses with neighborhood concerns to limit potential negative visual and public safety impacts.

The City of Greensboro allows home-based occupations in residentially zoned areas subject to meeting a series of ten standards. One of these standards currently limits the number of commercial vehicles for home-based occupations that may be kept on site to one (1) vehicle. In response to a citizen request Planning Board reviewed and recommended approval of changes at the October 20, 2010 meeting to allow a second commercial vehicle for a home occupation to be kept on site subject to limitations on size and where the vehicle may be kept. Based in part of neighborhood oriented opposition, City Council voted to deny the ordinance changes at their November 7, 2010 meeting. However, the citizen who originally requested the change was not present at the November 7, 2010 Council meeting and subsequently spoke to the issue at the December 7, 2010 Council meeting during “speakers from the Floor”. Following that discussion City Council directed staff to review the proposed ordinance and determine if additional adjustments could be made to address the needs of small home-based occupations and concerns from neighborhoods on potential negative impacts from an additional commercial vehicle on site.

Staff feels the latest proposed change allowing a second commercial vehicle, if kept under a covered structure, provides additional protection to adjacent residential properties by further limiting potential visual impacts and making such vehicles more of an extension of the primary residential use of the property. These changes also address the original citizen concern and subsequent City Council direction for means to support home-based businesses where a second commercial vehicle may be needed on-site. These changes do not in any way alter other requirements for home-based businesses like the prohibition of employees of the business from reporting to work at the home or the prohibition of outdoor storage of materials related to the business. Staff recommends that Planning Board receive public comments on the requested changes to the LDO and then move to recommend to City Council the adoption of these changes.

Chris Koontz, 1407 Spry Street, stated that he owns and operates a limousine service and parks the vehicles in his rear yard. Approximately 10 years ago and at a substantial amount of money he built a structure to protect the vehicles and shields them from the road. There is also a lot of vegetation around his property that also helps to hide these vehicles. He stated that several months ago, one of his neighbors had a party where there were approximately 55-60 people and these people parked on both sides of the road. He could not get his vehicle in his driveway and went down to the house where the party was being held and asked that some of the vehicles be moved so he could park his car. That neighbor subsequently reported his vehicles as being illegal. He came before the Board and he understood that the Board approved the amendment with a one year trial before going to City Council for any changes. As a result he was not at the City Council meeting because he thought the issue was at rest for 1 year. He was then notified that he was still

in violation (since Council had denied the text amendment) and a fine was assessed to him. He would like the Board to make a determination that he would be able to maintain his business and keep his vehicles in their current parking places at the side and rear of his property. He does not feel they are intrusive to the surrounding neighbors and that this was a retaliation tactic on behalf of one of his neighbors down the street. He has talked to many of his close neighbors and they have no objection to the current location of his vehicles. He cannot put his vehicles in an off-site storage facility because they close at 8:00 p.m. and he would not have access after that time, and especially on the weekends, when his vehicles would be needed.

Ms. Smith stated that she remembered this case very well and she remembered that the Board had recommended that the amendment be adopted, live with it for a year and that it would sunset at the end of the year and it would be revisited. She pointed out that the Planning Board is not the last word; this Board only makes recommendations to City Council.

In response to a question, Mike Kirkman stated that the intent is to take this to City Council on April 5, 2011.

After a short discussion, Mr. Truby moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council as amended, to require the second vehicle to be fully screened from adjacent residential uses, seconded by Mr. Wolf. The Board voted 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Williams, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

Chair Wolf returned to the dais and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

C. STREET CLOSING: RECOMMENDATION ON A RESOLUTION CLOSING BATTLEGROUND AVENUE FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH NORTH EUGENE STREET SOUTHEASTWARD APPROXIMATELY 150 FEET TO ITS INTERSECTION WITH WEST SMITH STREET. (RECOMMENDED)

Nicole Ward stated that the street was recorded on the J.L. Barnfield and C. N. Herndon plat. The petition was signed by the property owners of 80% of the street frontage. The Technical Review Committee feels circumstances allow the City to make the two required determinations for a street closing. 1) That closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to the public interest, and 2) that no property owner is deprived of reasonable means of ingress and egress. Therefore, the TRC recommended the closing with one condition: 1) The City shall retain a 20-foot easement over existing utility lines until such time as the lines are no longer needed for public use.

Chris Spencer, from GDOT, stated that the proposed street closing is for the downtown greenway. Plans have been underway since 2002 for the greenway including the Greensboro Urban Area Bicycle, Pedestrian and Greenways Master Plan adopted in 2006. It is designated as a signature project to commemorate bicentennial and will loop four miles around downtown. The greenway is a paved, multi-use path for bicycles and pedestrians. It would be used for transportation, recreation, exercise and make connections between downtown and neighborhoods. Construction for Phase 1-A, between Lee Street and South Eugene Street has been completed. The greenway will serve as a hub with the rail trail being extended northward along Battleground Avenue to the recently completed section of greenway in Summerfield. Design for the remainder portions of the greenway is underway. This particular area focuses on the intersection of North Eugene Street, West Smith

Street and Battleground Avenue to provide a safer crossing for pedestrians and a small park. The Guilford County Commissioners are in favor of the closing and the greenway plans.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the street closing to City Council, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Williams, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

D. NEIGHBORHOOD SMALL PROJECTS PROGRAM: REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD SMALL PROJECTS PROGRAM APPLICATIONS.. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Blackstock stated that he would recuse himself from this item due to a conflict of interest. The Board voted unanimously to recuse Mr. Blackstock from the matter.

Russ Clegg stated that the Neighborhood Small Projects Program allows groups to have capital projects completed on public property in their neighborhood. City Council has approved \$100,000 dollars in funding to be split evenly between each district, limiting each to \$20,000 dollars. The City received eight applications this year, four of which are being recommended for funding. The total dollar amount for all requested projects is \$77,358 out of \$100,000 of program funding. All of the projects received above the minimum score required for approval; however, the per-district funding limit does not allow three of the projects to be funded. This year's recommendations from the NSPP team are: landscaping improvements in the northeastern portion of Heath Park in District #1 as part of the Parks & Recreation Department plan implementation and with help from A&T students; four requests from District #2 at Northside Park for new playground, a new playground and community garden in Southside, and a neighborhood sign for the Aycock Neighborhood; median enhancement for Westerwood in District #3; and flash camera installation for the Farmington Community and the Meadowoods Community in District #5. There were no requests from District #4.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

After some discussion, Mr. Williams moved to recommend the Neighborhood Small Projects to City Council, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Williams, Speight-Buford, Truby, and Smith. Nays: None. Abstain: Blackstock)

Mr. Blackstock returned to the dais and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

BRIEFING ON THE BATTLEGROUND PARKS DISTRICT.

Chris Wilson, from the Department of Parks and Recreation, explained how the district would utilize and connect the resources available at the Natural Science Center, the National Military Park, Country Park, and Jaycee Park. He explained that the Natural Science Center is one of the top 20 tourist attractions in North Carolina; the National Military Park is a significant piece of property and one of the first Revolutionary War sites in the United States, that Country Park was one of the first parks in Greensboro, and that Jaycee Park hosts many recreational opportunities. Having these facilities close to each other creates the opportunity to have science, education, and history as one destination point when bundled together. He presented the Battleground Parks District Master Plan

and explained that it is a visioning plan in concept only and that details are still in the works. This collaboration between: local government; County government; National Military Park, which is federal government; and the non-profit which manages the Natural Science Center involves approximately 400 acres in the Lawndale/Battleground.

Charles Cranfield, Superintendent of the National Military Park, stated that as part of the plan they are looking to: combine the two visitor centers into one 15,000 square foot facility at the site called the Colonial Heritage Center as part of their Battlefield Restoration Project; remove the Old Battleground Visitors Center and study the feasibility of incorporating a tramway, trolley or shuttle system in the park.

Glenn Dobrogosz, from the Natural Science Center, stated that the Natural Science Center is about to embark on a three-phase expansion process, which includes the SciQuarium and HealthQuest. The “Bodies” exhibit brought in 63,000 people in four months. The SciQuarium will add 23,000 square feet to that facility as an aquarium experience; Phase 2 will make the existing 16,000 square foot museum new, fresh and modern; and Phase 3 will replace discovery, double its size, and add an endangered species corridor to tell the story of extinction. The Battleground Districts project also includes several other ideas for expansion, including more convenient parking.

Mr. Truby stated that he had visited the Natural Science Center within the last several weeks during the “Bodies” exhibit and there were people parking in the neighborhoods, along the streets and in the street right-of-way and he feels that parking is critical for this type of facility.

Chris Wilson added that the public process involved interaction with the public through focus group sessions where people were invited to provide input about what they wanted to see in these facilities. About 400 people participated and provide good suggestions. He also stated that Country Park receives 800,000 to 900,000 visits per year and hopes that they will soon have a Board of Directors to review the major changes that will be happening.

EASEMENT RELEASE:

RELEASE OF A 10-FOOT SERVICE EASEMENT RUNNING THROUGH THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4504 GRENDDEL ROAD AS DEPICTED IN PLAT BOOK 34 ON PAGE 15. (APPROVED)

LaMont Taylor stated that the proposed easement release was requested by the homeowner located at 4504 Grendel Road and is to release the service easement recorded on the plat. All utility companies and parties have been contacted and agree to its release.

Mr. Truby moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Williams, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

CITY-INITIATED ANNEXATIONS:

A. RECOMMENDATION ON CITY INITIATED ANNEXATION 2011-1 LOCATED AT 3216 CHESWICK DRIVE – 0.23-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION – CITY-INITIATED ANNEXATION.

B. RECOMMENDATION ON CITY INITIATED ANNEXATION 2011-2 LOCATED AT 3208 CHESWICK DRIVE – 0.21-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION - CITY-INITIATED ANNEXATION.

C. RECOMMENDATION ON CITY INITIATED ANNEXATION 2011-3 LOCATED AT 2872 AND 2873 FLEMING ROAD – 2.5-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION - CITY-INITIATED ANNEXATION.

D. RECOMMENDATION ON CITY INITIATED ANNEXATION 2011-4 LOCATED AT 2025 AND 2029 PLEASANT RIDGE ROAD – 13.07-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION - CITY-INITIATED ANNEXATION.

E. RECOMMENDATION ON CITY INITIATED ANNEXATION 2011-5 LOCATED ALONG BOULDER ROAD – 6.24-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION - CITY-INITIATED ANNEXATION.

F. RECOMMENDATION ON CITY INITIATED ANNEXATION 2011-6 LOCATED AT ALONG EAST LEE STREET, CEDAR PARK ROAD, AND I-40 – 330.5-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION - CITY- INITIATED ANNEXATION.

Steve Galanti explained the City-Initiated annexation process and how each of the six areas is eligible for annexation under the North Carolina General Statutes. Areas 1, 2 and 5 are completely surrounded by the current city limits with a population, use or lot size of that to qualify them for annexation. Area 3 abuts the current city limits with a residential population sufficient to qualify. Area 4 abuts the current city limits with lots either occupied by a residential use or institutional use to qualify. Area 6 is divided into sub-areas based on use or as a necessary land connection. The TRC recommends the annexations.

Mr. Truby moved to recommend the City-Initiated annexations to City Council, seconded by Mr. Williams. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Williams, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

Mike Kirkman stated that the Planning Department is assembling another group of technical amendments to the LDO which are scheduled to be presented to the Planning Board in April and City Council in May. He also gave an update on the previous text amendments presented to the Board and the City Council results. Chair Wolf stated his disappointed in the final decision made by Council in regards to real estate signs. After some discussion, there was consensus that future updates would be provided to the Board members in a written format.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Mr. Alston and Ms. Bachman were acknowledged as excused.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Interim Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
APRIL 20, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday April 20, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Planning Board members present were: Chairman Gary Wolf, Curtis Douglas, DeSean Alston, Velma Speight-Buford, Chuck Truby, Donald Blackstock and Betty Smith. City staff present were Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman and Nicole Ward.

MEETING MINUTES:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2011 REGULAR MEETING.

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2011 meeting, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Alston, Speight-Buford, Truby, and Blackstock. Nays: None)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SEVERAL SECTIONS OF THE LDO RELATED TO THE DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS FOR CLUSTER DEVELOPMENTS. (RECOMMENDED)

Mike Kirkman stated that over the last several months, staff has discussed a concern from developers regarding minimum requirements for lots in cluster developments. Cluster developments allow a reduction in the minimum size and dimensions of residential lots in order to protect significant natural features and open space. The stated concern relates to whether or not the current LDO standards allow the same level of clustering (particularly related to reduced minimum setbacks) as the previous UDO standards. He explained that the LDO grouped all the residential zoning districts from the UDO into a more limited number of residential zoning districts to reflect their similar characteristics and to establish districts based upon developable density (in line with multi-family zoning districts) rather than minimum lot size. In doing so the minimum dimensional standards (including minimum size and setbacks) were also combined into one set of standards for each new district. This typically either reduced minimum requirements or left them the same as the equivalent residential districts under the previous UDO.

It was brought to staff's attention that lots in a proposed cluster development directly adjacent to existing residential zoning (in use or vacant) might have to meet a standard greater than those for existing development on those adjacent lots. Additionally, there was some question on what standards would apply when adjacent lots were zoned residential but were vacant or undevelopable for some reason. In response, staff is recommending additional language be added to allow any preliminary plat for cluster development approved under the UDO (as of June 30, 2011) to use the previous dimensional standards for lots adjacent to residentially zoned lots. Staff also recommended adding language to the section on perimeter compatibility for cluster developments to exclude compatibility requirements if adjacent residentially zoned property is not currently developed for residential use. Staff also recommended changing the minimum front setback for garage doors in the R-7 zoning district (the smallest single family zoning district in the

LDO) to 20 feet (garage doors must currently be set back 25 feet in R-7) to reflect the standards that would previously have been applied using the smallest single family zoning district (RS-5) in the UDO. Staff feels these proposed changes will adequately address the previously expressed concerns and further encourage the use of the cluster development option to preserve significant natural features and open space. Staff recommends that the Planning Board receive public comments on the requested changes to the LDO and move to recommend to City Council their adoption.

Ms. Smith arrived and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

After a short discussion, Ms. Speight-Buford moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Alston, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

B. TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 30-11-5 AND TABLE 11-1 RELATED TO THE MINIMUM REQUIRED PARKING RATIOS. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Kirkman stated that Planning and Community Development staff received a citizen request to evaluate the current parking ratio for Personal and Professional Services uses in the LDO, with a concern raised that the current parking ratio is too high for the types of uses allowed by this category. Staff has also been evaluating the appropriate LDO parking ratio for auditoriums, coliseums and stadiums in response to staff and citizen concerns on the provision of adequate parking for these facilities. He explained in detail the impact the amendment would have on the specifications of the current ordinance. Staff feels these proposed changes to parking ratios are appropriate to more accurately reflect the anticipated parking demands for these types of uses and since the recommended parking ratios are the same as those applied to similar uses under the previous UDO, there is no immediate impact upon existing development. Staff recommends that the Planning Board receive public comments on the requested changes to the LDO and then move to recommend to City Council the adoption of these changes.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Alston, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

Mr. Kirkman stated that these two items will be heard by City Council on May 17, 2011.

ANNEXATION:

RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING THE DAWN RENTALS, LLC PROPERTY AT 1447 ALAMANCE CHURCH ROAD – 1.09-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION – UTILITY AGREEMENT AND ANNEXATION PETITION. (RECOMMENDED)

Steve Galanti stated that this annexation is contiguous since it abuts the primary city limits along its western and southern boundary. This property is within the Tier 3 Growth Area on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The site currently contains a single family dwelling. The City’s Fire Department notes that this site is currently served by Alamance Fire Station #54 on Presbyterian Road. Upon annexation it will be served by City Station #53 on Willow Road. Response times would improve and service would be more reliable. Water service is available by connecting to the existing 8-inch water line located within Alamance Church Road. Sewer service is available by connecting to the existing 8-inch sewer line within Alamance Church Road. The Police Department estimates it can provide service with little difficulty. Provision of other City services will involve a travel distance almost equal to that necessary to provide service to the previously-annexed property to the west and south.

Mr. Truby moved to recommend the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Alston, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

A. PROVINCE – SPRING GARDEN STREET, FULTON STREET, HOUSTON STREET AND LILY STREET – FOR GREENSBORO PROPERTIES I, LLC - 8.864 ACRES – REVISED UDP TO AMEND REQUIRED LANDSCAPING ALONG FULTON STREET FOR THE CD-PUD ZONING DISTRICT. (APPROVED)

Mr. Truby stated that he would recuse himself from this item due to a conflict of interest. The Board voted unanimously to recuse Mr. Truby.

Mr. Galanti stated that this property is zoned Conditional District Planned Unit Development, contains approximately 8.864 acres and is located on the east and west sides of Fulton Street, south of Spring Garden Street. There are two main purposes for a unified development plan. One is to specify the permitted uses, the amounts of development in various sections, and the dimensional standards that will govern the development of the property. The other is to place these development standards into a form recordable at the Register of Deeds Office so as to provide notice of the requirements to future owners and occupants. The established development standard for the landscaping planting yard along Fulton Street is being revised to shift it to the area behind the sidewalk to reflect the relocation of the public sidewalk toward the street. The Technical Review Committee reviewed the revised UDP and recommends its approval.

Ms. Speight-Buford moved approval of the UDP, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Blackstock, Speight-Buford, Alston and Douglas. Nays: None. Abstained: Truby)

Mr. Truby returned to the dias and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

B. DEERBROOK FOREST SUBDIVISION – ALAMANCE CHURCH ROAD – FOR ALAMANCE CHURCH ROAD TOWNHOMES, LLC - 5.15 ACRES - UDP TO ESTABLISH DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR THE CU-PUD ZONING DISTRICT. (APPROVED)

Mr. Galanti stated that this property is zoned Conditional District Planned Unit Development, contains approximately 5.15 acres and is located on the north side of Alamance Church Road. The applicant is proposing to develop this site with 24 single family dwellings. The unified development plan specifies the permitted uses, density, building setbacks, landscaping, signage, open space, parking, and the dimensional standards that will govern the development of the property and is in a form recordable at the Register of Deeds Office. The UDP also depicts the conditions placed on the property as part of the rezoning process. The Technical Review Committee reviewed the UDP and recommends its approval.

Mr. Truby moved to approve the UDP, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Alston, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock and Smith. Nays: None)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

Mr. Kirkman stated that the text amendment related to mobile food vendors discussed at the last Planning Board meeting was continued until the May 3, 2011 City Council meeting as some people wanted additional time to make sure there was a clear understanding of the proposed ordinance.

He then noted that the previously recommended text amendment related to additional vehicles for home occupations was approved by City Council with no changes. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment related to U.S. 29 case was also approved by City Council.

Also at last month’s meeting it was brought up that staff has been reviewing the full Land Development Ordinance over the past several months to identify needed cross-references, address unclear wording and make sure the ordinance was ready to use as the only ordinance in effect as of July 1. Staff is almost through with their review and will present a full technical amendment list to Planning Board in May. The changes with this technical amendment are not intended to change the meaning of anything in the ordinance.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Ms. Bachman and Mr. Williams were acknowledged as excused.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Interim Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
MAY 18, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday May 18, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chairman Gary Wolf, Calvin Williams, Jr., Anita Bachmann, Velma Speight-Buford, Chuck Truby, Donald Blackstock and Betty Smith. City staff present were Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Nicole Ward, Sheila Carmon and Sue Schwartz, Interim Director of Planning and Community Development.

MEETING MINUTES:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 2011 MEETING.

Mr. Williams moved to approve the minutes of April 20, 2011 meeting, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Williams, Bachmann, Speight-Buford, Truby, and Blackstock. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON A TEXT AMENDMENT TO MAKE SEVERAL TECHNICAL CHANGES TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mike Kirkman stated that the document presented to the Board members includes a cover memo as well as a list of LDO technical amendments. He noted that the text shown in red identifies some items inadvertently left off the list and some changes made following discussions with folks originally involved in drafting the LDO, after determining some items were more substantive in nature, which was not the intent of this list. These changes have been made since the initial draft of the amendment was sent to Planning Board members. Mr. Kirkman also informed the Board that on page 58, Section 208, the language concerning trucks less than 30' in length is to remain and not be struck through.

Ms. Smith arrived and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Kirkman continued with his presentation noting that when City Council adopted the LDO in June of 2010, they established a one-year period of time between the effective date of the new ordinance (July 1st) and the following year (June 30, 2011). During this time both the LDO and the previous UDO ordinances would be in effect and available for use by developers, citizens, and staff. The idea was to give everyone some time to become familiar with the new document, to have a chance to apply the new document to a variety of processes and development plans and to give everyone a chance to see what the differences were and to make any adjustments necessary. Since that point, staff has been processing a number of text amendments which were primarily initiated by the public to address specific concerns. The technical amendments list before the Board today is a culmination of several months of work by staff reviewing the full LDO document, trying to identify areas where clarification is needed, making sure the language is

consistent throughout the document, appropriate references are included as needed, and some other minor adjustments.

The intent of these technical amendments are not to substantially alter any aspects of the LDO, but just to address consistency issues and making sure information is accurate and properly referenced.

Chair Wolf asked about the decision process on the major things that have been struck in response to the meetings held with the Citizen Advisory Team members. Mr. Kirkman stated that the decision process was to look at the draft of the LDO prior to its adoption and talk through the intent of each item. Items struck through are things that may make sense to revisit at some point, but are more substantive in nature and different from the intent of these technical amendments.

Ms. Speight-Buford asked if there is an editor that reviewed the changes to make sure they are consistent. Mr. Kirkman responded staff is overseeing the editing, working with the consultant to make identified changes. The consultant will be doing the final cleanup and making sure the document is ready to go. A limited run of print copies will be done initially and the document will be available in some type of electronic media that can be provided at a reduced cost.

Chair Wolf asked if copies of the older version are kept for reference. Mike Kirkman stated that there is a reference to what was changed and the date of the change. There is also a list on-line of the amendments that have been adopted since July 1, 2010, so there is a historical record.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the text amendment as presented and including the noted change to page 58, Sec. 208, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock, Bachmann, Williams. Nays: None.)

B. TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 30-9-8 OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE RELATED TO THE ASSIGNMENT AND POSTING OF ADDRESSES. (RECOMMENDED)

Mike Kirkman stated that this is a request to amend the language in Chapter 26 concerning the posting of addresses once assigned and the responsibility of assigning City addresses. That function has fallen to an Address Coordinator who is currently in the Planning & Community Development department. Staff is requesting that the Planning Board take the language in its entirety from Chapter 26 to Chapter 30 to ensure there is timely posting of addresses once they are assigned. It is felt that this change will make it easier to ensure addresses are properly posted in a timely manner.

Ms. Bachmann asked who has the responsibility of ensuring compliance with the requirements. Mike Kirkman stated that the Transportation Department is responsible because it is currently under Chapter 26, but once moved to Chapter 30, it will become the responsibility of the Planning & Community Development department through the Address Coordinator.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Ms. Bachmann moved to recommend the text amendment, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock, Bachmann, Williams. Nays: None.)

EASEMENT RELEASE:

A. RELEASE OF A 15-FOOT-WIDE SEWER EASEMENT LOCATED AT 7900 NATIONAL SERVICE ROAD AS RECORDED IN DEED BOOK 3735, PAGE 1855. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward presented the item and stated that all utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Mr. Truby moved approval of the easement release, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock, Bachmann, Williams. Nays: None.)

B. RELEASE OF A 20-FOOT-WIDE SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT LOCATED AT 1593 NEW GARDEN ROAD AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 129, PAGE 37. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward presented the item and stated that all utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

In response to several questions, Mr. Galanti stated that this release is needed to convert the sewer line to private maintenance in conjunction with the proposed integrated multiple use development.

Ms. Smith moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Ms. Bachmann. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock, Bachmann, Williams. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

Mike Kirkman stated that three LDO text amendments have been approved by City Council since the last meeting. Council approved a text amendment regarding mobile food vendors as recommended by the Planning Board. Council also approved changes to the cluster development standard as written and changes to the parking ratios table for adjustments for the personal and professional services group and breaking out separately, the auditoriums, coliseums and stadiums and as written.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Mr. Douglas and Mr. Alston were acknowledged as excused.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:41 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Interim Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
JUNE 15, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday June 15, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chairman Gary Wolf, Velma Speight-Buford, Chuck Truby, DeSean Alston and Curtis Douglas. City staff present were Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Nicole Ward, Russ Clegg, Barbra Harris and Chancer McLaughlin.

MEETING MINUTES:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2011 MEETING:

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to approve the minutes of the May 18, 2011 meeting, seconded by Mr. Alston. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby and Alston. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE LDO TO INCORPORATE PROVISIONS FOR THE CREATION OF GREENWAY OVERLAY DISTRICTS. (RECOMMENDED)

Russ Clegg stated that staff is asking the Board to make a recommendation on this text amendment which will enable applicants to create Greenway Overlay Districts. This request was initiated by a property owner that has commercial properties along a rail line that has been slated to become greenway in the future. The property owner wants to make sure that as property is developed, the greenway will be used as an amenity. The current overlay districts in the LDO are not adequate so, staff has worked with the GDOT to formulate these changes. The main purpose is to create an environment that uses the greenway as an amenity for uses such as cafés and weekend markets, allow the greenway to provide access to surrounding properties, and allowing the commercial uses to be oriented toward the greenway users. The secondary purpose is to provide cross-access between the greenway and the abutting commercial properties. The process contained in the text amendment is similar to that necessary to create other overlays and includes a planning process through the Zoning Commission, Planning Board and City Council. Design standards and guidelines, signage, connections and shielding are to be considered and included as part of the overlay.

Mr. Truby stated that he could not support this request since it would place additional restrictions on development.

Chair Wolf stated that the language should be amended to allow overlays to contain guidelines as well as design standards.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council, with the addition of the words "and/or guidelines" in two portions of paragraph C, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The

Board voted 4-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford and Alston. Nays: Truby.)

AMENDMENT TO THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DRIVE NORTH TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT (TND) PLAN. (APPROVED)

Chancer McLaughlin stated that this amendment to the Martin Luther King, Jr. TND plan is needed because of changes to the proposed infrastructure improvements in the original plan are not being implemented, which will cause a change in the overall design of the area. He gave a brief history of the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood Redevelopment plan, adopted 30 years ago, which defined strategic initiatives for redevelopment. In 2004, the plan was amended to define strategic initiatives which included: the MLK North initiative, which is the change before the Board; the single family lot initiative; and the Dorothy Brown Park initiative. That amendment was done with extensive collaborative efforts by the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood residents and the City of Greensboro. The plan designated the northern-most section of Ole Asheboro as Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive North. Since it was considered a gateway from downtown into the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood there were several key infrastructure improvements proposed. One such improvement was the extension of Vance Street from Bragg Street to Lee Street and the second improvement was the closure of the Lee Street ramp. In 2005 the Martin Luther King, Jr. TND plan was adopted to implement the recommendations of the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan and to establish a set of development standards that were designed to transition development from the high density areas to the north to a lower intensity neighborhood further south. It also established and set the framework for the future development, which would be consistent with the design standards set forth in the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan; the proposed infrastructure improvements for Vance Street and Lee Street; and established classifications by street frontage to promote a mixture of development ranging from retail, multifamily and single family residential. The amendment also includes changes to the setback regulations as a result of the elimination of the extension of Vance Street and leaving the Lee Street ramp open.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Mr. Truby moved to approve the amendment to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive TND plan, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby and Alston. Nays: None.)

ANNEXATION PETITION:

RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING THE PROPERTY AT 1934 TROSPER ROAD AND THE INTERVENING CITY/COUNTY PROPERTY – 26.33-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION - REGULAR ANNEXATION PETITION. (RECOMMENDED)

Steve Galanti stated that this annexation is considered contiguous and is located within the Tier II Growth Area on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The site is currently undeveloped and the applicant plans to develop the 17 acres along Trospers Road with approximately 44 townhouse dwellings. The intervening City/County property will remain undeveloped. Water and sewer service is available by connecting into the city water and sewer lines located within Trospers Road. The site is currently served by Summerfield Fire Station #39 located on Lake Brandt Road, north of this project. Upon annexation, it will be served by City

Station #41 located on Lake Brandt Road, south of the project. As a result, the response times and service will improve. The Police Department can provide service with little difficulty. The Technical Review Committee recommended the annexation.

Mr. Alston moved to recommend the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby and Alston. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

BRIEFING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (GFLUM) IN THE GUILFORD COLLEGE AREA.

Russ Clegg stated that city staff is currently meeting with residents and property owners in the Guilford College and West Friendly Avenue area concerning changes they would like to make to the Generalized Future Land Use Map. These changes are part of a larger process that the community is undertaking to improve pedestrian and bicycle access, create more green space and better integrate the residential areas with Guilford College and the other commercial and institutional uses. The formal request will come to the Board in July a recommendation.

LDO TEXT AMENDMENT UPDATE:

Mike Kirkman stated that the technical amendments list for the LDO went to City Council on June 7th and was approved. The text amendment regarding street addressing raised questions that needed more research and was continued to the July 21st meeting.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:

In response to a question from Mr. Douglas, Mr. Kirkman stated that you can call 373-CITY which is 373-2489 to report someone who is parking in their front yard.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Ms. Smith, Mr. Williams, Ms. Bachmann and Mr. Blackstock were acknowledged as excused.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Interim Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
JULY 20, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday July 20, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chairman Gary Wolf, Chuck Truby, Curtis Douglas, Donald Blackstock and Betty Smith. City staff present were Steve Galanti, Nicole Ward, Russ Clegg, Carol Carter and Sheila Carmon.

MEETING MINUTES:

Mr. Blackstock moved to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2011 meeting, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. CP-11-05 – WEST FRIENDLY AVENUE – FOR THE GUILFORD COLLEGE ALLIANCE – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP. (RECOMMENDED)

Russ Clegg stated that the West Friendly/Guilford College Area Alliance submitted a request to change the Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM). The changes cover a large area, but have been vetted through multiple, well-attended public meetings. The changes to the future land use categories reflect the existing, built and stable uses in the area; bring the area more in line with other parts of Greensboro with single family homes; and includes opportunities for growth in the commercial, high traffic areas. He explained three additional changes being made to the map to the north and west of Friends Home and to the multifamily along Brownstone Lane.

In response to a question, Carol Carter stated that Friends Homes will have to request a rezoning to expand their use to the parcels along Ridgecrest Drive.

Willie Taylor, 808-C Carriage Crossing, gave a brief history of the process that began in March of 2010 when the City Manager came to the Neighborhood Congress and announced a new initiative called the Community Walk Through; then in May the Director of Public Affairs met with representatives from all the districts to identify one neighborhood for the walk-through and the Alliance asked for a walk-through on Friendly Avenue instead of the neighborhood; at a meeting held in June of 2010, with 25 to 30 people from the neighborhood, the Planning Department presented the existing zoning map and the existing GFLUM and everyone was surprised to see how much of the area was zoned commercial; after the meeting, three participants got together and formed a core committee to explore what needed to be done. It was determined that there was a need for sidewalks, green space and a neighborhood parks, and concerns with traffic and safety in the area.

BJ Weatherby, 564 Lindley Road, continued with the history by stating that the Alliance grew as it reached out to others by working closely with the Planning Department in holding seven meetings

with representatives from Guilford College, Friends Homes, churches, businesses and residents from the neighborhoods and she urged the Board to approve the proposed changes. When asked, approximately 16 people in attendance stood in support of the amendment.

John Varnell, 3400 Shaker Drive and representing Guilford College, stated that they worked with the Alliance and felt their goals represent the character of the area, the history of the area and a sense of place for the area and that the change represents a better sustainable development plan for the area.

Mark Putnam, 323 Lindley Road and Senior Pastor of Trinity Church, stated that were concerns with the development patterns suggested on the GFULM which would stress the existing infrastructure. He also raised a concern with accessing Western Guilford High School as the road deteriorates and becomes unsafe and supported the change since he felt it would be beneficial for this area.

Jim Newlin, 5512 Boxwood Drive, presented the historical events that have occurred in the area and stated that the change would help preserve those historical features.

Jean Basden, 8502 Cedar Hollow Road and owner of 5308 West Friendly Avenue, stated that she and some of her neighbors being affected by the proposed changes have not seen the maps, were not aware of the changes, and needed additional information to determine whether the changes would have a negative impact on her property or other properties in the area.

Ms. Smith raised concerns with prohibiting nonresidential expansion along the north side of West Friendly Avenue in the vicinity of its intersection with Jefferson Road and that further study is needed.

The Board members commented that the proposed changes would be a real plus for this area, made sense, and that the changes to this already very busy area will not necessarily increase traffic.

Mr. Wolf stated that he supported the change but raised concerns with the precedent being set for the rest of the City, that by having designations this specific on the Comprehensive Plan map could lead to the GFLUM being a community-based zoning map instead of generalized land use map.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the requested amendment, to City Council, with the changes presented to the north and west of Friends Home, the multifamily along Brownstone Lane and with further study along the north side of West Friendly Avenue in the vicinity of its intersection with Jefferson Road, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

B. STREET CLOSING: RECOMMENDATION ON A RESOLUTION CLOSING BROOKS COURT FROM ITS INTERSECTION WITH MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DRIVE WESTWARD A DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 440 FEET. (RECOMMENDED)

Nicole Ward stated that this street was created with the Westminster Circle plat recorded in 1924 in Plat Book 7 on Page 112 and that all of the abutting property owners have signed the petition.

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) feels that circumstances allow the City to make the two required determinations for it to be closed: 1) that closing the street to vehicular traffic is not contrary to public interest, and 2) that no property owner in the vicinity is deprived from reasonable means of ingress or egress. Therefore, the TRC recommends the closing of the street with two conditions: 1) the closing is to become effective upon the recording of a new plat to combine the previously subdivided lots into one, and 2) the City shall retain 20-foot utility easements over existing utility lines until such time as the lines are no longer needed for public use.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Mr. Truby moved to recommend the street closing to City Council, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

STERLING PROPERTIES, LLC – 400 NORTH BENBOW ROAD – .726 ACRES – UDP TO ESTABLISH DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR THE CD-PUD ZONING DISTRICT. (APPROVED)

Steve Galanti stated that the site is zoned Conditional District Planned Unit Development, contains .7 acres and is located at 400 North Benbow Road. The applicant plans to renovate the existing multifamily building to create 24 units. There are two main purposes for a UDP: 1) to specify permitted uses, the amounts of development in various sections and dimensional standards that will govern the development, and 2) to place these development standards in a recordable form at the Register of Deeds office to provide notice of the requirements to future owners and applicants. To establish development standards the developer may either borrow existing standards from the ordinance, propose different standards, or use a combination of the two. This UDP also depicts the conditions that were placed on the property as part of the rezoning process. The TRC has reviewed this UDP and recommends its approval.

Ms. Smith moved to approve the UDP, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

EASEMENT RELEASES:

A. RELEASE OF A PORTION OF A WATER QUALITY CONSERVATION EASEMENT (.632 ACRES) LOCATED AT 3319 OWLS ROOST ROAD, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 156 ON PAGE 91. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward stated that this is a request to release a .632-acre portion of a Water Quality Conservation Easement located at 3319 Owls Roost Road and that all utility companies have indicated agreement to its release.

Mr. Truby moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

B. RELEASE OF A 10-FOOT WIDE UTILITY EASEMENT LOCATED AT 539 WOODLAND DRIVE, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 18 ON PAGE 28. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward stated that this is a request to release a 10-foot wide utility easement located at 539 Woodland Drive and that all utility companies have indicated agreement to its release.

Ms. Smith moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

C. RELEASE OF A 10-FOOT WIDE UTILITY EASEMENT LOCATED AT 1195 HOUNSLOW DRIVE, AS RECORDED IN DEED BOOK 3751 ON PAGE 907. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward stated that this is a request to release a 10-foot wide utility easement at 1195 Hounslow Drive and that all utility companies have indicated agreement to its release.

Mr. Douglas moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

D. RELEASE OF A 20-FOOT WIDE SANITARY EASEMENT LOCATED AT 4747 MCCONNELL CENTER DRIVE, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 175 ON PAGE 35. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward stated that this is a request to release a 20-foot wide sanitary easement located at 4747 McConnell Center Drive and that all the utility companies have indicated agreement to its release.

Mr. Blackstock moved to approve of the easement release, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Douglas, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**BRIEFING ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE GLENWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN FUTURE LAND USE MAP.**

Russ Clegg stated that UNCG's planned campus expansion to the south of West Lee Street will impact the Glenwood neighborhood; that the proposed amendment will cover the entire area under consideration, and that it reflects the combined efforts of UNCG, the City and the Glenwood neighborhood to benefit the neighborhood and the school. The plan amendment will be presented for the Board's recommendation at the August meeting.

The board was also informed that the Greenway Overlay District and Chartered Home text amendments were adopted by City Council on July 19th and that Mr. Williams has resigned his position on the Board.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Mr. Alston, Ms. Bachmann, and Ms. Speight-Buford were acknowledged as excused.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 3:21 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

Agenda

Greensboro Planning Board

August 17, 2011

1. Meeting Minutes (Final Decision):
Approval of Minutes of July 20, 2011 meeting.
2. Public Hearing (Recommendation):
CP-11-04 – Southside of West Lee Street, east of Lexington Avenue and north of Haywood Street. – Amendments to the Glenwood Neighborhood Plan Future Land Use Map. (Presented by Russ Clegg)
3. Comprehensive Plan Item (List Comments):
CP-11-06 – 1501 Bridford Parkway and 600 Eagle Road – For Campus I, LLC - Proposed Amendment to the Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM) – Current Designation: Mixed Use Residential – Proposed Designation: Moderate Residential. (Presented by Russ Clegg)
4. Unified Development Plan (Final Decision):
Property of for BRC Knox Road, LLC and Stone Creek Medial Properties, LLC - Knox Road, Mt. Hope Church Road, and Birch Creek Road – 69.56 acres – Revised Unified Development Plan. (Presented by Steve Galanti)
5. Easement Releases (Final Decision):
6. Item from the Department:
7. Items from the Chairman:
8. Items from Board Members:
9. Speakers from the Floor on Items under Planning Board Authority:
10. Approval of Absences:
11. Adjournment:

Any individual with a disability who needs an interpreter or other auxiliary aids or services for this meeting may contact Steve Galanti at 336-373-2144 or 333-6930 (TDD)

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
SEPTEMBER 21, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday September 21, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chair Gary Wolf, Chuck Truby, Curtis Douglas, Velma Speight-Buford, and Donald Blackstock. City staff present were Steve Galanti, Carol Carter and Nicole Ward.

MEETING MINUTES:

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to approve the minutes of August 17, 2011 meeting, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford and Blackstock. Nays: None.)

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ITEM:

CP-11-07 - 3223 HORSE PEN CREEK ROAD – FOR WLJ INVESTMENT, LLC – PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (GFLUM) – CURRENT DESIGNATION: LOW RESIDENTIAL - PROPOSED DESIGNATION: MIXED USE RESIDENTIAL.

Carol Carter stated that this request is from Low Residential to Mixed Use Residential and will accompany a rezoning request at the October 10th Zoning Commission meeting. The proposal is within an area along Horse Pen Creek Road that has seen changes over the last year. Although there is much Low Density Residential in the area, this proposal is for an office type of use and, as such, the appropriate Comprehensive Plan Land Use Category for this change would be Mixed Use Residential.

The Board members felt that the proposed change would be a real plus and makes sense for the area.

EASEMENT RELEASES:

A. RELEASE OF A 20-FOOT-WIDE SEWER EASEMENT LOCATED AT 369 AIR HARBOR ROAD FOR A DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 520 FEET, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 180, PAGE 73. (APPROVED)

Mr. Truby stated that he would recuse himself from this matter because of a conflict of interest. The Board voted unanimously to recuse Mr. Truby from this matter.

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Mr. Speight-Buford moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 4-0-1 in favor of the motion. . (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford and Blackstock. Nays: None. Abstained: Truby.)

B. RELEASE OF A 15-FOOT-WIDE DMUE AND A 30-FOOT-WIDE DRAINAGE EASEMENT LOCATED WITHIN THE 2600 BLOCK OF SOUTH HOLDEN ROAD, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 179, PAGE 88. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Mr. Douglas moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Douglas, Speight-Buford, Truby, Blackstock. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

None

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:

None

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Ms. Bachmann, Mr. Alston and Ms. Smith were acknowledged as excused.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:12 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
OCTOBER 19, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday October 19, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chair Gary Wolf, Chuck Truby, Curtis Douglas, Velma Speight-Buford, Betty Smith and Donald Blackstock. City staff present were Sue Schwartz, Director of Planning and Community Development, Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Russ Clegg, Sheila Carmon and Nicole Ward. Also present was Virginia Spillman from the Department of Water Resources.

MEETING MINUTES:

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to approve the minutes of September 21, 2011 meeting, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Speight-Buford, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

WATERSHED MODIFICATION:

**BROOKHAVEN TODDLER DAY SCHOOL - 3231 HORSE PEN CREEK ROAD -
RECOMMENDATION ON A TYPE IV MODIFICATION TO SECTION 30-12-3.11(C),
MEASUREMENT IN HIGH DENSITY OPTION, AND TABLE 12-7 OF THE LAND
DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TO ALLOW 49.2% BUILT-UPON AREA. (RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. Truby stated that he would recuse himself from this matter because of a conflict of interest. The Board voted unanimously to recuse Mr. Truby from this matter.

Virginia Spillman, Department of Water Resources, stated that this is a request for a Type 4 modification to allow 49.2% built-upon area for the Brookhaven Toddler Day School located at 3231 Horse Pen Creek Road. The applicant is requesting the modification based on the grounds of equal or better performance for this site by treating existing built-upon area that is currently untreated. The applicant will provide treatment for the total built-upon area on the property. The applicant requested to exceed the maximum built-upon area of .372 acres by .086 acres. Equal or better performance is provided since .086 is less than .115 acres that currently exists and is not being treated.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the modification to City Council, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 4-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith and Blackstock. Nays: None. Abstained: Truby)

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ITEM:

**CP-11-08 – 3101 – 3207 PLEASANT GARDEN ROAD – FOR SIGNATURE PROPERTY, INC.-
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (GFLUM) –
CURRENT DESIGNATION: COMMERCIAL – PROPOSED DESIGNATION: HIGH
RESIDENTIAL.**

Russ Clegg stated that this site has been on the market for several years as commercial property but, the applicant plans to rezone it to multifamily. To the west of the property is Pleasant Garden

Road and to the east is Highway 220 South. There is High Residential across Highway 220 South and Mixed Use Residential at the intersection of Highway 220 South and Pleasant Garden Road. This property abuts those two designations and that based on the applicant's submittal, High Residential best fits this area.

Board members stated that they did not see a problem with this proposal and it is consistent with surrounding areas.

EASEMENT RELEASES:

A. RELEASE OF A PORTION OF A 20-FOOT-WIDE SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT LOCATED AT 911 MEADOWOOD STREET, AS RECORDED IN DEED BOOK 6542, PAGE 311. (APPROVED)

Mr. Truby stated that he would recuse himself from this matter because of a conflict of interest. The Board voted unanimously to recuse Mr. Truby from this matter.

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement with one condition; the easement release will become effective upon the dedication of an easement over the relocated sewer line.

Ms. Smith moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 4-0-1 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith and Blackstock. Nays: None. Abstained: Truby)

B. RELEASE OF A 10-FOOT-WIDE DRAINAGE EASEMENT LOCATED AT WEST SMITH STREET, AS RECORDED IN DEED BOOK 702, PAGE 435 AND 437. (APPROVED)

Mr. Truby stated that he would recuse himself from this matter because of a conflict of interest. The Board voted unanimously to recuse Mr. Truby from this matter.

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Mr. Blackstock moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Ms. Smith. The Board voted 4-0-1 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith and Blackstock. Nays: None. Abstained: Truby)

Mr. Douglas arrived and participated in the remainder of the meeting.

C. RELEASE OF A PORTION OF A 60-FOOT-WIDE DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE AND UTILITY EASEMENT, A 20-FOOT WIDE ACCESS/MAINTENANCE EASEMENT, A 20-FOOT-WIDE DRAINAGE EASEMENT AND A 15-FOOT-WIDE POWER EASEMENT LOCATED AT REGIONAL ROAD NORTH, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 117, PAGE 78.. (APPROVED)

Mr. Truby stated that he would recuse himself from this matter because of a conflict of interest. The Board voted unanimously to recuse Mr. Truby from this matter.

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement with one condition; the easement release will become effective upon the dedication of an easement over the utilities located along the North Regional Road frontage of the lot.

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0-1 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas and Blackstock. Nays: None. Abstained: Truby)

D. RELEASE OF A 10-FOOT-WIDE UTILITY EASEMENT LOCATED AT 603 HOBBS ROAD FOR A DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 50 FEET, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 67, PAGES 50. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Ms. Smith moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

E. RELEASE OF A 15-FOOT-WIDE DRAINAGE EASEMENT LOCATED AT 1229 BUCKINGHAM ROAD, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 176, PAGE 75. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Mr. Truby moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

F. RELEASE OF A PORTION OF A 15-FOOT-WIDE ACCESS EASEMENT LOCATED AT BASS CHAPEL ROAD A DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 93 FEET, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 120, PAGE 71. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

G. RELEASE OF A 2.284-ACRE DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE UTILITY EASEMENT LOCATED AT 2898 MANUFACTURERS DRIVE AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 163, PAGE 147. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Ms. Smith moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

H. RELEASE OF A 15-FOOT-WIDE SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT LOCATED AT BROOKS COURT, A DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 640 FEET. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward explained the request and stated that all utility companies have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Mr. Douglas moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Ms. Smith. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

A. REQUEST TO CALL A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE NOVEMBER 16, 2011 MEETING ON CHANGING THE NAME OF THE NORTHERN PORTION OF MCCALLUM STREET TO ELKHOUND TRAIL ON THE WEST SIDE OF BIG TREE WAY.

Sheila Carmon requested that the Board set November 16, 2011 as the date for the public hearing for the request street name change.

Mr. Truby moved to set November 16, 2011 as the public hearing for the subject street name change, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

B. REQUEST TO CALL A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE NOVEMBER 16, 2011 MEETING ON: (A) CHANGING THE NAME OF THE SOUTHEASTERN PORTION OF MCCALLUM STREET TO SEARS WOOD LANE AND (B) CHANGING THE NAME OF THE EASTERN PORTION OF KELLOM STREET TO BIG ROCK TRAIL.

Sheila Carmon requested that the Board set November 16, 2011 as the date for the public hearing for the request street name change.

Mr. Truby moved to set November 16, 2011 as the public hearing for the subject street name change, seconded by Ms. Smith. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

C. REQUEST TO CALL A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE NOVEMBER 16, 2011 MEETING ON CHANGING THE NAME OF THE PORTION OF FEDERAL PLACE BETWEEN WEST MCGEE STREET AND WEST WASHINGTON STREET TO POLICE PLACE.

Sheila Carmon requested that the Board set November 16, 2011 as the date for the public hearing for the request street name change.

Ms. Smith moved set November 16, 2011 as the public hearing for the subject street name change, seconded by Mr. Douglas. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Smith, Douglas, Blackstock and Truby. Nays: None.)

PRESENTATION OF THE ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER'S MEMO RELATED TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS AND THE CITY MANAGER'S REQUEST FOR INPUT.

Sue Schwartz, Director of Planning and Community Development, stated that there are several Boards and Commissions that meet each month. The City Manager has asked if each of those Boards and Commissions are still meeting the function for which they were intended. There were discussions to combine the Planning Board and Zoning Commission, but since it could lead to having two meetings a month it was not forwarded as a recommendation. Also included in the study is a recommendation to combine the Advisory Commission on Trees with the Board of Adjustment.

Chair Wolf questioned the fairness of having alternate members on the Boards and Commissions who would prepare for and attend a meeting and then be unable to participate fully. He also questioned whether the Capital Improvement Program couldn't be handled on a staff level, instead of the Planning Board.

Mike Kirkman stated that the purpose of having alternates would be to give them an opportunity to observe meetings and see how they are carried out as training toward their future service on the Boards and Commissions.

Sue Schwartz also advised the Board that any additional suggestions the Board members may have can be given to her, or any other City staff member, via e-mail and they would be forwarded to the Manager's Office.

Ms. Speight-Buford stated that she has observed other cities and their Boards and Commissions and is pleased to see that Greensboro is now observing a more professional operation.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Ms. Bachman and Mr. Alston were acknowledged as excused.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:57 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 16, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday November 16, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chair Gary Wolf, Chuck Truby, Velma Speight-Buford, Betty Smith and Donald Blackstock. City staff present were: Steve Galanti, Russ Clegg, Sheila Carmon, Alison Woods and Nicole Ward.

MEETING MINUTES:

Mr. Blackstock moved to approve the minutes of the October 19, 2011 meeting, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Speight-Buford, Truby and Blackstock. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO CHANGE THE NORTHERN PORTION OF MCCALLUM STREET TO ELKHOUND TRAIL ON THE WEST SIDE OF BIG TREE WAY. (RECOMMENDED)

Sheila Carmon explained that the construction of the Bridford Parkway Extension divided the street into two unconnected segments with the same name and that there are only two houses on this portion of McCallum Street that would be affected by the proposed name change. The suggested new name is Elkhound Trail. The name change is necessary in the interest of public safety, to minimize confusion with the delivery of goods and services, and is in accordance with the Street Naming and Addressing Manual. The Technical Review Committee recommended approval.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to recommend the street name change to City Council, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Speight-Buford, Truby and Blackstock. Nays: None.)

B. RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO: A) CHANGE THE NAME OF THE SOUTHEASTERN PORTION OF MCCALLUM STREET TO SEARS WOOD LANE AND (B) CHANGE THE NAME OF THE EASTERN PORTION OF KELLOM STREET TO BIG ROCK TRAIL. (RECOMMENDED)

Sheila Carmon stated that the streets were dedicated on the Hyde Park Subdivision Plat, recorded September 4, 1946 in Plat book 14, page 93, were never constructed, and are referred to as unopened streets. The unopened portion of McCallum Street connects into the existing McCallum at a right angle, and therefore, considered not to be in continuous alignment, thus, requiring a name change. The unopened portion of Kellom Street has been disconnected from the open portion of Kellom Street by the construction of the Bridford Parkway Extension and also requires the name change. The property surrounding these streets is undeveloped and the property owners suggested Searswood Lane to replace McCallum Street and Big Rock Trail to replace Kellom Street. Here are 10 vacant lots that require official address changes. The name changes are necessary in the interest of public safety and to minimize confusion with the delivery of goods

and services and are in accordance with the Street Naming and Addressing Manual. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) recommended approval.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the street name change to City Council, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Speight-Buford, Truby and Blackstock. Nays: None.)

C. RECOMMENDATION ON AN ORDINANCE TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE PORTION OF FEDERAL PLACE BETWEEN WEST MCGEE STREET AND WEST WASHINGTON STREET TO POLICE PLACE. (RECOMMENDED)

Sheila Carmon stated that this is a request to change a portion of Federal Place between West McGee Street and West Washington Street to Police Place. The City of Greensboro Police Department along with Engineering and Inspections Department have requested the name change in honor of the new Police Headquarters. The Police Headquarters is the only building addressed along this portion of Federal Place. The name change is in accordance with the Street Naming and Addressing Manual as it does not duplicate an existing street name and is not phonetically similar to an existing street name necessary in the interest of public safety and to minimize confusion and delivery of goods and services and is in accordance with the street name and addressing manual. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) recommends approval, as proposed.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition to the item.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the street name change to City Council, seconded by Ms. Speight-Buford. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Speight-Buford, Truby and Blackstock. Nays: None.)

ANNEXATION AGREEMENT:

REVISIONS TO THE GREENSBORO-JAMESTOWN ANNEXATION AGREEMENT LINE. (RECOMMENDED)

Steve Galanti stated that a revision to this annexation agreement was brought to the Planning Board in February, adopted by City Council in March but, was not adopted by Jamestown. Staff worked together to make several changes to the annexation agreement line by decrease the boundary of Area #1 on Chadwick Drive, including Area #3 and reducing Area #5 on High Point Road, while Areas #2, #4, #6, #7 and #8 remained the same as the previous revision. The majority of the change is located in the vicinity of the intersection of High Point Road and Guilford College Road. The development pattern and alignment of High Point Road/Guilford College Road has changed since the boundary of the agreement was created in 1991. The revised boundaries are an attempt to address those changes and create a boundary so that, when developed, the entire boundary of a particular development would be located in one jurisdiction or the other. Although the “to Greensboro” properties total 27 acres, compared to the “to Jamestown” property at 25.31 acres the future development potential for Area #4 as office is roughly comparable to that of Area #5 as compact commercial.

Ms. Smith moved to recommend the revised Greensboro/Jamestown Annexation Agreement to City Council, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Speight-Buford, Truby and Blackstock. Nays: None.)

EASEMENT RELEASE:

RELEASE OF A PORTION OF A 30-FOOT-WIDE AND 60-FOOR-WIDE DMUE, A 15-FOOT-WIDE SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT AND A 40-FOOT-WIDE TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT LOCATED AT 1313 FLAGSTONE DRIVE, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 96, PAGE 81. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward presented the item and stated that all utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement with one condition; that the required sanitary sewer easement be dedicated to the City before the easements are released.

Mr. Truby moved approval of the conditional easement release, seconded by Mr. Blackstock. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Wolf, Smith, Speight-Buford, Truby and Blackstock. Nays: None.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

2012 PLANNING BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE

Steve Galanti presented the 2012 Planning Board meeting schedule depicting the third Wednesday of each month. The Board acknowledged the schedule and shifted their November meeting to November 14th.

ITEMS FROM THE CHAIRMAN:

In response to a question from Chair Wolf, Mr. Galanti stated that appointments to boards and commissions have been placed on hold by City Council until the study by the City Manager’s Office is complete and City Council comes to resolution on the matter.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Mr. Alston, Ms. Bachman and Mr. Douglas were acknowledged as excused; ~~and the absence of Ms. Bachman was acknowledged as unexcused.*~~

*(*Amended upon approval by the Planning Board on 12/21/11)*

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 21, 2011**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday December 21, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2nd floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chair Gary Wolf, Chuck Truby, Velma Speight-Buford, DeSean Alston and Anita Bachmann. City staff present were: Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Russ Clegg, Loray Averett, Alison Woods and Nicole Ward.

MEETING MINUTES:

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2011 meeting, as amended by changing the absence of Ms. Bachmann to excused, seconded by Mr. Alston. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Truby, Alston and Bachmann. Nays: None.)

MODIFICATION OF ZONING CONDITION:

GUILFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS – 3920 NACO ROAD - TYPE 3 MODIFICATION OF ZONING CONDITION #3 WITHIN THE CD-LI DISTRICT (#3761) PURSUANT TO SECTION 30-4-11 OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE RELATED TO THE LOCATION OF THE OPAQUE FENCE WITHIN THE BUFFER ALONG O'FERRELL STREET. (APPROVED)

Steve Galanti stated that the site currently contains the Guilford County Schools maintenance facility which is being expanded into the area that abuts O'Ferrell Street. With the grading necessary for the expansion, the applicant is requesting a Type 3 Modification so that the required opaque fence can be relocated to the top of the slope, which is closer to the same elevation as O'Ferrell Street, and so that it will provide a better buffer. The Technical Review Committee reviewed the modification request and recommends approval based on the finding of equal or better performance, as relocating the fence would result in a better buffer.

Mr. Truby moved to approve the modification, seconded by Ms. Bachmann. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Truby, Alston and Bachmann. Nays: None.)

EASEMENT RELEASE:

RELEASE OF A 15-FOOT-WIDE SANITARY SEWER EASEMENT LOCATED WITHIN THE FULTON STREET APARTMENTS (742 AND 752 FULTON STREET) AS RECORDED IN DEED BOOK 2793 ON PAGE 212. (APPROVED)

Nicole Ward presented the item and stated that all utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Ms. Speight-Buford moved to approve the easement release, seconded by Ms. Bachmann. The Board voted 5-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wolf, Speight-Buford, Truby, Alston and Bachmann. Nays: None.)

ITEM FROM THE DEPARTMENT:

BRIEFING ON THE KIRKWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION OVERLAY DISTRICT.

Russ Clegg explained that, in general, a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District (NCO) is an attempt to maintain the unique characteristics of a neighborhood as new development occurs. Since some aspects of the current zoning code do not match the way some older neighborhoods were built, the NCO modifies the zoning code to better match the exiting neighborhood. The purpose is not to inhibit development, but to improve the fit of any new development. He also explained how an NCO is developed and the approval process, including notifications. He then explained the pending Kirkwood NCO, provided basic information on the different ordinance standards, and stated that in January the Planning Board will make a recommendation on the planning elements to City Council, after holding a public hearing. In February, the Zoning Commission will make a recommendation on the proposed boundary to City Council, after holding a public hearing. City Council will then hold a public hearing in March for final adoption of the overlay district.

APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:

The absence of Mr. Douglas, Ms. Smith and Mr. Blackstock were acknowledged as excused.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz,
Director of Planning & Community Development

SS/jd