

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
January 21, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, January 21, 2015 at 4:03 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chuck Truby, Chairman; Marc Isaacson; Steve Allen, Seth Steele, Day Atkins, Richard Bryson and Celia Parker. City staff present included Hanna Cockburn, Jeff Sovich, Mike Kirkman, Steve Galanti, Nicole Ward, and Sheila Stains-Ramp from the Planning Department; Cynthia Blue and Caitlin Warren from Neighborhood Development Department; and Jennifer Schneier, Attorney for the Planning Board.

Chairman Truby welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Bryson moved approval of the December 2014 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Isaacson. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**EASEMENT RELEASE:**

- a. Proposed release of a portion of a 20' wide utility easement located at 3304 Morning Dew Road, as recorded in Plat Book 57, page 67**

Nicole Ward stated that the release had been evaluated by all involved utility companies, which had supported the request.

Mr. Bryson moved approval of the easement release as described by staff, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**

- a. Affordable Housing Development RFP**

Cynthia Blue presented an update on the 2015 Affordable Housing Development program, in particular the Request for Proposals being put out to utilize almost \$1 million in funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) under the HOME Program. She noted that the funding includes the \$424,493 available in the budget and the carry-forward of \$518,497 from last year.

Ms. Blue stated that HOME is not an easy program to comply with, as there are long-term investments and the minimum affordability period for new rental construction is 20 years, so staff is looking at the sustainability of these projects as part of the underwriting process. She noted that compliance is assured for the affordability periods, generally, through loans rather than grants. Staff is looking to provide the gap-subsidy assistance that is necessary to make a project both affordable and sustainable. If a developer borrows a million dollars to construct housing he would need to set the rents at a rate to enable him to pay back both the debt service and maintain the operations. Staff looks to replace some of that hard-debt service with funds that can have softer debt terms and

subordinate financing that allows those rent levels to be lowered for the tenants occupying those units.

In this year's RFP process, Ms. Blue noted that staff plans to advertise and have the application packages posted on the City website by January 27, with the proposals due back to the City by February 24. The public information sessions will be held in early February. Developers will be at the March Planning Board meeting to present their projects. In April, Housing staff will bring the project assessment and funding recommendations to the Planning Board; the Board's project selection recommendations will then go to the City Council for a public hearing and award, projected for the May 5<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

Ms. Blue stated that projects are assessed through a scoring criteria tool, such as included in the agenda packets, and through public input. She noted that Board members are invited to participate in that assessment process and that Mr. Allen has already indicated his desire to do so.

Ms. Blue stated that the goals of the Housing RFP are expressed through the scoring criteria and many of the adopted redevelopment neighborhood or corridor plans have housing components or goals that may be achieved through HOME funded development. She noted that staff will be looking for projects that use durable materials and incorporate energy efficiency for sustainability and lower tenant costs, and for locations with good access to services, jobs, schools and community facilities, which also improves the affordability for tenants.

Ms. Blue noted that funding dollars are limited and the City partners with other housing development funding sources wherever possible. The NC Housing Finance Agency is a major partner and the Federal Home Loan Bank has previously funded projects in Greensboro. The Community Foundation of Greater Greensboro and other non-profits are entities who can bring leverage to the table. The HOME Program includes a component of capacity building for local community housing development organizations through a set-aside of 15% of the annual HOME funding and other special types of financing. The City's five current CHODOs - Servant Center, Partnership Homes, Community Housing Solutions, East Market Street Development Corporation and Unity Builder - all have developed projects within the last three years. The HOME funds relate directly to the housing goals identified in the Consolidated Plan and other adopted City Plans which feature housing components.

Ms. Blue stated that revisions to the HOME Program rules encourage speculative single family projects and one of the challenges is to work with housing providers to create a better pipeline of qualified interested buyers and to restructure single family offerings to support more down payment assistance. She noted that those options will be looked at in the upcoming budget cycle; this RFP will be limited specifically to rental housing. She noted the threshold conditions included in the site analysis sections, such as energy and water sustainability, handicap accessibility, presence of adequate streets and utilities, any federal requirements (such as Acquisition and Relocation processes), and site and neighborhood standards. She noted that HUD does not encourage building new rental construction in areas with high minority concentrations, high poverty rates or other limiting conditions. They do encourage rehabilitation of housing stock in those areas.

Ms. Blue noted HOME funds require commitment within two years and expenditures within five years, so there needs to be enough committed funding to meet those requirements. Only projects that have all of their financing in place by June 30<sup>th</sup> can meet the definition of a valid commitment so those projects are looked at as a priority. The HOME Program also requires that 15% of each year's annual allocation be awarded to community housing development organizations and those requirements must be met or exceeded.

Mr. Atkins suggested that staff may want to advertise through the Home Builders Association to increase exposure and possibly interest in the program.

In response to a question by Mr. Allen concerning promotion of rehabilitation in low income areas, Ms. Blue stated that the site and neighborhood standards are a federal site location analysis tool; the definition of minority concentration area and low income concentration area are the 2 pieces left undefined by HUD. By the most recent census date the City is about 50% white, 50% non-white, and staff defines an 'area of minority concentration' to be an area where 75% of the residents are non-white. The HUD definition of 'low income' is where a majority of the people are under 80% of median income and a 'high poverty area' is one where 40% of the residents are below the poverty line. Census tracts that are low income and greater than 40% poverty rate will be considered low income concentrations.

#### **b. Presentation on 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan Process**

Planning Manager Hanna Cockburn introduced Jeff Sovich to make the presentation for the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan.

Mr. Sovich provided the background for the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan process, and spoke to the role the Planning Board would have in its consideration and adoption. He noted that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires those receiving federal housing funds to prepare a Consolidated Plan every 5 years, which is to document the type, scale and distribution of housing needs within the jurisdiction. He stated the Consolidated Plan also sets the direction for the City's Capital Improvements Program, provides a framework for the more detailed plans also required by HUD, establishes public policy direction for housing and community development activities over the course of the Plan, helps coordinates the work of several City departments, sets benchmarks to measure the progress against, and provides guidance and support for various partner agencies. He noted that data compilation and analysis of conditions and trends over the past 5-10 years has been done, as a base for understanding the severity of need for the various housing and community development activities in the City.

Mr. Sovich stated the public launch will be February 4, the Plan draft will be at the Planning Board in March with a final draft presented in April, and the Council will receive it for public hearing and adoption at their first meeting in May. The Plan is to be submitted to HUD no later than May 15.

Mr. Sovich noted that an on-line survey and the contact information for the involved City staff would be available on the City's website by the public launch.

#### **c. Lawndale Drive Corridor Plan Process**

Planning Manager Hanna Cockburn noted to Board members that the agenda package included Lawndale Drive Corridor Plan Phase 1 (Cornwallis to Cone Boulevard) materials. She noted that the public comment period would close the first week of February, and the final draft would be presented at the February Planning Board meeting. If recommended, it would go to City Council some time in March.

#### **d. Update on Guilford County Hazard Mitigation Plan Process**

Planning Manager Steve Galanti stated that Guilford County is now in the process of updating the county-wide Hazard Mitigation Plan, as required by state and federal governments and tied to

funding to respond to emergencies and hazard mitigation, such as flood insurance programs. He noted a copy of the current Hazard Mitigation Plan and the consultant's presentation had been forwarded to the Planning Board, and that a consultant has been hired to identify the hazards within the County and what techniques can be used to make those hazards less severe. The consultant will catalog all hazards that can affect Guilford County and assess what techniques can best be used by jurisdictions to lessen the risks.

Mr. Galanti noted that the materials referenced a website and survey to which Board members were invited to respond. Updates will be provided as the effort progresses.

Mr. Bryson suggested that information concerning this topic may be inserted in resident's water bill to be able to reach more people. Steve Galanti thanked him for this suggestion.

#### **e. 2015 Housing Summit Invitation**

Planning Manager Steve Galanti noted that the Housing Summit was scheduled for Wednesday, February 25, and a registration form was included in each member's packet. He asked that any Board members interested in attending the Summit contact him not later than February 9, so staff could get everyone's registration paid for at the same time.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING (Recommendation):**

##### **College Hill Neighborhood Plan**

Planner Jeff Sovich introduced the President of the College Hill Neighborhood Association, Dr. James Keith, to present the draft Plan.

Dr. Keith noted the many changes made to the version of the Plan brought to the Planning Board in July, 2014, which resulted from an enhanced public input effort as requested by the Planning Board.

He outlined the additional efforts to collect comments and concerns from residential and business neighbors, such as open houses at neighborhood venues, outreach efforts at the Tate Street Festival, and the Plan website and online survey available there. He noted the extended process that has been involved, with the initial public launch having taken place in January, 2009, and that notification of the present hearing before the Planning Board as having been sent to all residents and all owners of property located in or within 600 feet of the College Hill Neighborhood Plan boundaries.

Dr. Keith described the review of conditions, assets, trends, the infrastructure deficiencies and housing needs, and the concerns cited as impacting the quality of life in the area. He noted that eventually a shared vision emerged that tried to respect the various perspectives and situations. He summarized the comments received as: encouraging a greater proportion of owner-occupied housing; of conversion of informal apartment houses back to single family dwellings as feasible; and most importantly the desire to ensure that all dwellings be appropriately maintained, inside and out, as safe, healthy and attractive places to live, whether rental or owner occupied. These principles helped guide and refine development of the Goals, Strategies and Actions that form the heart of the Plan.

Chair Truby opened the hearing to public comment, asking that those in favor of the proposed Plan speak first.

Speakers in support of the proposed College Hill Neighborhood Plan were:

Dr. James Keith referenced several letters he had been asked to share with the Board that were in support of the revised Plan, received from people who were not able to attend the hearing, as well as a supporting petition signed by some of the business community.

Marjorie Bagley stated that she and her neighbors felt the neighborhood offered many benefits to be protected and promoted, especially the walkability of the area. She noted there have been several efforts to renovate and rehabilitate residences in the area, making all of the homes appear much more inviting.

David Hammond noted that a lot of work and improvements have taken place in this area, making it a much better place to live, and stated his support of the revised Plan.

Bill Moore, Lyddan Powlowski, Cindy Shepherd and Janet Frauman each stated their strong support for the new Plan.

Virginia Haskett commented that she had lived in the neighborhood all her life and witnessed the many changes that have taken place. She stated that College Hill is now a very beautiful neighborhood with a variety of residential types. She is very happy with the revised Plan.

Tom Carron stated that he had completely restored his home, as have some of his neighbors. He stated his pride in the neighborhood, that he felt it a great place to live, work, play and retire, and was very happy that the City was working with the residents in this way. He also stated that he supported the revised Plan and hoped that there could be more redevelopment for affordable housing in the area.

Clara Kelly stated as a long-time resident she found College Hill a great neighborhood and hoped the Board would support the Plan.

Joe Weebie stated that he has been involved in the crafting of the revised Plan since the beginning and he strongly supports it. He feels College Hill would become a model neighborhood for the City.

Dan Curry stated that he believed the revised plan addressed many of the issues and concerns of residents in this neighborhood. He pointed out that for an area to have the mix of single family, multifamily and a variety of neighborhood businesses brought many strengths and stated that having both public and private investment was key to transforming neighborhoods. He stated he hoped the Board would support the Plan, especially the Strategies and Actions related to the work relative to street and traffic concerns with GDOT.

Speakers opposed to the revised Plan were:

David Little stated that he has heard disdainful comments by area homeowners regarding rental residents in the area and this is unsettling for him. He stated he felt additional revisions were needed to address current issues in the area.

Doris Yates stated that Plan needed to address parking issues in the area. She noted that off-street parking is a problem because houses are so close together, so this causes a demand for on-street parking, while the streets are very narrow and it is hard to get through a street when people park on both sides. She noted she is not necessarily against the Plan after hearing some of her neighbors speak, but she felt more input on some of these points would be of benefit.

Hooker VanDusen stated that he had concerns about the way the map shows multifamily versus single family and thought the actual use of properties rather than their future use should be shown. He stated he agreed with earlier comments regarding quality of life and parking issues.

Michael Jackson stated that he owned homes in this area and wants good renters in them, that he felt the proposed Plan does not address the actions to be taken by the City and University to nurture growth and maintain the neighborhood and community. He stated he was concerned that his rights and protections could be violated by some portions of the Plan, that he thought there would continue to be excessive traffic and a lack of parking, and increased foot traffic and loitering. He stated that UNCG should build another parking deck to alleviate some of the parking issues in the neighborhood and on Tate Street.

Hauke Kelly stated the he thought another hearing and more interaction with residents was needed, that he believed a lot of people had not participated or provided their input.

There being no other speakers the public hearing was closed.

Chair Truby stated that he felt the revised Plan was a good compromise for the neighborhood and he would support it. Mr. Allen stated that the revised Plan was much more favorable to the neighborhood. Mr. Bryson asked that staff and stakeholders continue to communicate with each other in an on-going manner. Ms. Parker asked for clarification on the diversity that the Plan was intended to support; she also asked that efforts be made to improve the relationships between the landlords, renters and property owners. Mr. Atkins pointed out that there needs to be more work between GDOT and UNCG in regard to the traffic and parking concerns that continue to be a problem in the area.

After a short discussion among the Board members, Mr. Bryson moved to recommend approval of the revised College Hill Neighborhood Plan, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board members voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Truby acknowledged the absences of Mr. Martin and Mr. Mossman, which were approved.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS:jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
February 18, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, February 18, 2015 at 4:08 p.m. in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chuck Truby, Chairman; Marc Isaacson, Celia Parker, Seth Steele, Day Atkins, Richard Bryson and Richard Mossman. City Planning staff present included Steve Galanti, Hanna Cockburn, Nicole Ward, and Sheila Stains-Ramp. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

Chairman Truby welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Isaacson moved approval of the January 21, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Mr. Isaacson stated that he would recuse himself from the two items on the agenda related to the former Jefferson Pilot campus. Mr. Isaacson was recused by unanimous vote of the Board for these two items.

**ANNEXATION:**

**Proposed Contiguous Annexation: 5300 High Point Road** (Former Jefferson Pilot campus) and NCDOT right of way, totaling 146.4 acres. Site is north of High Point Road, west of Alamance Road and more generally I-73 and south of railway r/w and High Point Road Widening and Relocation Project. **(Approval Recommended)**

Planner Nicole Ward stated that the property is within the Tier 1 Growth Area, is considered contiguous, and is proposed for mixed use development. City water is available by connecting to an existing 16" water line along High Point Road, while sanitary sewer can be provided with the installation of a sewer lift station. The City Fire Department noted that the site is currently served by the Pinecroft/Sedgefield Station #23 on McKay Road and would continue to be so served upon annexation. The Police Department estimated that additional personnel and equipment would be necessary to provide service to this site. Provision of City services will involve a travel distance almost equal to that necessary to provide service to the adjacent properties. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) reviewed and recommended approval of the annexation request to the Planning Board and to the City Council.

There being no questions, Mr. Bryson moved to recommend approval of the proposed annexation as explained by staff, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion (6 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 recusal).

**GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE PLAN (GFLUM) AMENDMENT:**

**Amendment to Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLUM): CP 15-03 – 5300 High Point Road**, former Jefferson Pilot campus, from Mixed Use Corporate/Business Park to Mixed Use Planned Community. **(Comments offered)**

Planning Manager Hanna Cockburn noted the site is presently in 3 different use categories (Low Residential, for 3 to 5 dwelling units per acre; Moderate Residential, for 5 to 12 dwelling units per acres; and Mixed Use Corporate and Business Park), and the change is to a single category, Mixed Use Planned

Community. She noted that this designation is intended for large, undeveloped tracts of land at the City's fringe, appropriate for large scale, creatively planned residential uses, mixed with other uses, such as supporting retail and small- to medium-scale office development. She noted that the demographics in the area have been very stable, with growth trends very similar to the rest of the City, and that demand in the area for housing is anticipated to remain strong. There may even be additional pressure for multifamily units, as units are lost due to construction of the Urban Loop.

In response to a prior Planning board request, Ms. Cockburn provided a handout offering information on how Plan amendments are reviewed and criteria for the Board to use in evaluating proposed amendments.

Chair Truby stated that such a large parcel needs a degree of flexibility accommodating a wide range of uses to make a development proposal work. Board members also noted that the proposal appears to fit well in its context while allowing for reuse of the parcel and its improvements. Mr. Atkins about potential impacts on adjoining properties towards the highway, noting this was an attractive move for this parcel; Mr. Bryson asked about notification of area owners and residents. The consensus was that the proposal allowed a way forward for redevelopment of an important site and was in keeping with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Isaacson returned to participate in the remainder of items on the agenda.

### **PUBLIC HEARING: LAWDALE DRIVE CORRIDOR PLAN (Approval Recommended)**

Planning Manager Hanna Cockburn stated the Board was conducting the first of two public hearings on Phase 1 of the Lawndale Corridor Plan. She stated that Lawndale Drive is a thriving corridor in north-central Greensboro where there are change-shaping public investments about to take place that are expected to continue growth pressures along the corridor in the coming decade, including the opening of the next section of the Urban Loop by 2025, and continued growth at the Greensboro Science Center. As such, in 2013 the City Council directed staff to develop a plan for a 3.6 mile segment of Lawndale Drive, to provide opportunities to create a shared vision for the corridor and to recommend appropriate tools and strategies that can help guide future land decisions along the corridor.

Ms. Cockburn noted that because of the size of the study area and the diversity of uses, the planning area was divided into four phases, with the first phase – the Greater Kirkwood Community area – being what is presently before the Board. She noted the planning process began with the collection and analysis of a wide range of data, and several key conditions were identified as having a significant influence on the growth and development of the corridor. To help develop the shared vision, a series of public events, surveys and meetings were held in the corridor to help understand what really matters to the stakeholders and property owners in the area, what they like and don't like, and what opportunities exist to work together to make improvements.

Ms. Cockburn noted that continued meetings with the Greater Kirkwood community, their neighborhood association and other stakeholders in the area have taken place throughout the process. Input was received, steps for identifying actions and help in clarifying and focus the recommendations. She noted that there have been some very clear themes: stakeholders really care about the character and fine-grained mixture of development as it occurs but are concerned about more traffic; keeping infill and property maintenance at high quality levels; and sustaining a tree canopy. She noted the community's excitement about the potential and opportunities that exist in the area, including the completion of the Greenway, the repurposing of the Sears building, and building upon while sustaining the historic character of the area.

Ms. Cockburn noted that this phase is home to a wide array of uses, with everything from post-war bungalows to strip-style commercial centers and an industrial warehouse. It is this great variety and intensity of uses and building types that has resulted in some very conflicted ideas about what growth should look like in this area.

The recommendations associated with this phase of the corridor are tailored to the specific needs and desires that were heard throughout the process; as a result, it is not a typical Future Land Use Plan. The recommendations for policies and actions to be undertaken are clustered around a) preserving and maintaining compatibility; b) enhancing non-motorized amenities; and preserving and enhancing the tree canopy.

Ms. Cockburn noted that the Plan would go to the Council for another hearing in April, and requested that the Planning Board give the Plan a positive recommendation.

Planning Board members had no questions for Ms. Cockburn.

Chair Truby opened the public hearing and invited speakers to approach the podium.

Ken Boyles, 2413 Hawthorne Street, stated that he is President of the Greater Kirkwood Community Association. He thanked staff for holding the sessions and allowing the residents to ask questions and offer their comments and concerns. He noted the Association was in favor of the three goals outlined, i.e., keeping and preserving the character of the neighborhood, the architecture and setbacks that are in place; the importance of the tree canopy to everyone in the neighborhood; and the non-motorized access to the Greenway will be very important. He commented that traffic issues will continue to be a challenge but that work seemed on track for developing a good response. He underscored the importance of the tree canopy, noting that it is aging and that planning for replanting and protections needs to be done.

Ann Hummell, 1907 Rosecrest Drive, stated that she was concerned with the health and age of the trees, and with their eventual removal and replacement.

Earl Bower, 5106 Lorenzo Drive, spoke about the significance of bike lanes for the area and distributed information packets on bike usage locally and nationally. He noted that bike usage has been increasing as a way of commuting, although Greensboro's ratio is well behind many other cities. He stated the City needs to pay attention to protecting cyclists if there is to be an increase in the number of people who ride, noting the bike commuter would likely not use the greenways because of the other greenway users. He urged protected bike lanes, which would provide a physical barrier between the bike lane and vehicular traffic. Protected bike lanes encourage bike-riding while dropping the risk of injury or death by substantial margins.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the proposed plan, and the Board closed the public hearing.

In response to a question by Mr. Isaacson concerning the intersection of Cornwallis and Lawndale Drive, Ms. Cockburn stated that the intersection was flagged repeatedly in the input sessions as a danger, something borne out by incident statistics. A broader conversation about traffic management is necessary, given the coming of the Greenway and how it interacts with the lanes of traffic to the south of the study area.

Mr. Atkins stated that there is a strong interest by some of the young professionals for the use of safe bike lanes in this area. Ms. Cockburn stated that GDOT would be advised of concerns raised at these public sessions. She pointed out that this is a unique opportunity for the City to explore options for this area.

Ms. Cockburn noted that the concerns about the age and health of the large trees providing the canopy over Lawndale Drive were an opportunity to explore what options may be available for grants to help with reforestation and maintenance of the trees in the neighborhood. She noted the Urban Forester would be involved in any such assessments and programs. Ms. Cockburn noted that a tree seems to be at risk of falling, it should be reported to the City immediately. Sometimes something preventative can be done, but certainly the City is concerned about avoiding such dangerous situations as falling trees obviously create.

Mr. Atkins moved to recommend approval of the proposed Phase 1 Lawndale Corridor Plan, with a footnote that this corridor is a prime candidate along which Greensboro should consider planning in protected bike lanes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mossman. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

#### **ANNEXATIONS:**

**Proposed Contiguous Annexation (PL (P) 15-03:** Several properties and portions of properties totally 9.90 acres, generally between Woodpine Drive south to City limits parallel to Bass Chapel Road. **(Approved Recommended)**

Planner Nicole Ward stated that this property is within the Tier 1 Growth Area, is considered contiguous, and is proposed for single family residential use. City water is available by connecting to an existing 8" line located along Netfield Road and a 24" line along Bass Chapel Road. City sanitary sewer is available by connecting to an existing 8" sewer outfall located along Bass Chapel Road. The City's Fire Department noted that this site is currently served by Fire District #13, Station #58 on Spencer Dixon Road and will be served by City Station #53 on Lake Jeanette Road upon annexation. The City's Police Department stated service can be provided with little difficulty. Provision of the other City services will involve a travel distance almost equal to that necessary to provide service to the adjacent properties. The Technical Review Committee reviewed and recommended approval of the annexation request by the Planning Board and City Council.

Mr. Isaacson moved to recommend approval of the annexation request as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

**Proposed Satellite Annexation (PL (P) 15-01:** 5207 Burlington Road, 0.71 acres, east of the intersection of Burlington Road and Mt. Hope Church Road. **(Approval Recommended)**

Planner Nicole Ward stated that this property is within Tier 1 Growth Area, is considered a satellite annexation, and is currently the site of a single family home that will remain. City water and sewer are available by connecting to lines located along Burlington Road. The City's Fire Department noted that this site is currently served by McLeansville Fire Station #47 on Freedom Church Road and would be served by City Station #57 on Mt. Hope Church Road upon annexation. The Police Department noted they can serve this site with little difficulty. Provision of other City services will involve a travel distance almost equal to that necessary to provide services to the nearby property within the City. The Technical Review Committee RC reviewed and recommended approval of the annexation request to the Planning Board and City Council.

Mr. Isaacson moved to recommend approval of the proposed annexation as presented by staff, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

#### **GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE PLAN (GFLUM) AMENDMENT:**

**Amendment to Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLUM): CP 15-04 – 3525 and 3527 Lewiston Road, 10.88 acres, from Mixed Use Corporate/Business Park and Low Residential to Mixed Use Corporate/Business Park. (Comments Offered)**

Planning Manager Hanna Cockburn stated that this is an opportunity to provide comments on a change to the GFLUM associated with a proposed rezoning. The property is in two use designations, Mixed Use Corporate/Business Park and Low Residential, which supports 3 to 5 dwelling units per acre. The request is for all of the property to be moved into Mixed Use Corporate/Business Park, a designation intended for large tracts of undeveloped land near the City's fringe that are appropriate for well-planned and larger scale business and employment parks, with a mixture of uses such as retail, hotel, and residential. Primary uses like office, flex office or technology and research development, light industrial uses, distribution and assembly could be placed in campus type corporate parks in settings with generous open space and locations that promote visual quality compatibility with the surrounding area.

In response to a question, Planning Manager Steve Galanti stated that this area is within the noise cone for the airport.

Chair Truby noted he questioned use of the site for multi-family residential purposes, but that that was a difficulty with the rezoning side of the matter, not the GFLUM amendment. He stated that the GFLUM amendment made sense to him and he did not have a problem with the amendment. Mr. Atkins asked what guidelines were involved in looking at small parcels for these changes; Mr. Bryson stated that he had a concern about this having a domino effect on other properties in the area. Mr. Isaacson recommended the Board members look through the guidance handout Ms. Cockburn had provided to help in their assessment of the proposal.

**EASEMENT RELEASE:**

**Proposed release of a 10-foot wide easement located at 4101 Beckford Drive, as recorded in Plat Book 32, Page 6. (Approved/Final Action)**

Planner Nicole Ward stated that this easement release has been viewed by the various departments and the release was supported.

Mr. Bryson moved approval of the easement release as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Mossman. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Chair Truby asked what rights were actually being released by this action. Steve Galanti stated that the City can relinquish their rights to the easement, but cannot give up other parties' rights to the easement. For instance, if Duke Power had easement rights in this strip, those would not be ceded by the City's action. This process is to relinquish only the City of Greensboro's rights.

**ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT**

Informational presentation re Growth Strategy Map Reinvestment Corridors, Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan

Hanna Cockburn presented background information regarding amendments to the Reinvestment Corridors map, Figure 4.3, which will come to the Board for a public hearing in March 2015.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Truby acknowledged that the absence of Mr. Martin and Mr. Allen was approved.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Department, Director  
SS:jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
March 18, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, March 18, 2015 at 4:02 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chuck Truby, Chairman; Celia Parker, Seth Steele, Day Atkins, Richard Bryson, Steve Allen and Richard Mossman.

City staff present included Steve Galanti, Hanna Cockburn, Russ Clegg, Jeff Sovich, Nicole Ward, and Sheila Stains-Ramp from the Planning Department; Cynthia Blue and Caitlin Warren from the Neighborhood Development Department; and Becky Jo Peterson-Buie from the City Attorney's Office.

Chairman Truby welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Bryson moved approval of the February 18, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted 6-0 to approve the minutes.

Mr. Allen joined the meeting at 4:06 p.m.

**PRESENTATION:**

**Presentations by Affordable Housing RFP Respondents**

Cynthia Blue, Housing Services Division Manager in the City's Neighborhood Development Department, introduced the series of presentations by respondents to the City's RFP for Affordable Housing funding. She noted that the staff recommendations would be made to the Planning Board at their April meeting, and the Board's recommendations would go to the City Council May 5.

Patrick Theismann, Beacon Management, summarized the proposed 72-unit Smith Farms project for seniors and small families, for 3516 Lewiston Road, noting the proximity to services, the provision of a club house and amenities, and the energy-efficient construction standard. The project would develop 5 8-unit single story buildings and 2 2-story buildings.

David Levy, Executive Director of Affordable Housing Management, summarized the proposed 72-unit Sumner Ridge project for families, for 4452 Old Randleman Road. He noted the proximity to services, the provision of amenities, the energy-efficient construction standard, and the degree of affordability the project would reach. Nine 2-story, 8-unit buildings would be developed.

Mark Morgan, representing MC Morgan and Associates, summarized the proposed 60-unit Ryan Ridge project for a site at Rehobeth Church Road at Glendale. He noted the proximity to services and amenities.

The Planning Board returned to this agenda item later in the meeting to hear from Mike Cook, representing Partnership Homes, which has submitted two applications. The Summit Center project

would refurbish the former Summit House at 2505 Fairview Street for housing for homeless Veterans. He noted the Greensboro Housing Authority had indicated they would be offering 14 vouchers for Veterans to use at this facility. The 2118 Everett Street project would renovate the structure.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

### **Update on Greensboro 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan, followed by public hearing on FY 2015-16 Application for Federal Funding and Identified Community Needs to be addressed by the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan (RECOMMENDED)**

Jeff Sovich, Senior Planner, stated that the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan process is underway, with staff developing that Plan and simultaneously the 2015-2016 Annual Action Plan. The Annual Action Plan is the first of five that will establish specific annual goals and activities to implement the 5-year framework described in the Consolidated Plan.

Mr. Sovich noted the success in meeting and exceeding nearly all of the current 5-year planning cycle program goals, including the production of affordable housing units and the number of households assisted.

Mr. Sovich noted that one goal with which the City has had less success was the distribution of affordable units throughout the city in ways that begin to disperse areas of concentrated poverty, so that low income individuals have more opportunities and choices for living in mixed-income neighborhoods. Only 18% of the affordable units developed over the past 5-year program cycle were located in Council Districts 3, 4 and 5, together.

Mr. Sovich stated that analysis of data about the various conditions and trends Greensboro has experienced over the past decade, showed that Greensboro's population growth is slowing down; basic costs of living are increasing; the local unemployment rate has dropped but the number of persons in households facing poverty has increased; and the economic recovery has not benefitted all parts of Greensboro to the same extent. He noted that the population is becoming more diverse while the gaps in economic and social opportunities have widened.

Relative to the affordable housing situation, despite the number of units produced during the current 5 year period, the level of need remains large and continues to grow.

Mr. Sovich summarized survey results, which indicated affordable housing and employment opportunities were of major concern to the respondents.

Mr. Sovich noted that the Annual Action Plan is the funding application for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and is required in order to receive annual federal grant funds. Approval of the Plan begins the process to fund new projects and honor longer-term commitments. There are consistent goals to increase the supply of affordable housing, continue to rehabilitate and repair existing housing, support community efforts to combat homelessness, and work to complete redevelopment projects in target neighborhoods.

He noted the purpose of the public hearing was to allow community input and provide a public forum to comment on the anticipated use of HUD funds in the 2015-16 fiscal year. The Neighborhood Development Department will publish a summary of the planned expenditures in April and a second public hearing will be held at the April 15<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting. Chair Truby opened the hearing to speakers from the public.

Beth McKee-Huger presented a summary of the initiatives and reviews to address the enormous need for fair, healthy and affordable housing. She stated it was encouraging to see the new partnerships forming to address these issues.

Luther Falls, Jr. stated that he has been happy to see development in the Bingham Street area, and to see the cooperation between agencies to address homelessness in the city. He reiterated how important it was for the City to see that affordable housing is available for everyone.

There being no other speakers, Mr. Bryson moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Steele. No action was required or taken.

### **Neighborhood Small Projects Program**

Russ Clegg, Planner, summarized the objectives and parameters of the Neighborhood Small Projects Program, the projects submitted for the program and their scoring. He noted that these projects were scored by representatives from 6 departments as well as 2 residents of Greensboro, on the categories of community benefit, community involvement, community need, leveraging with other projects, and any on-going impacts of City resources. He noted that the Board's recommendation on the slate of projects would go to the City Manager's Office for confirmation.

Mr. Clegg updated the Planning Board on the status of projects from prior years that are completed or underway, such as the sidewalk in the park at Hunter Hills along the roadway; sign toppers in Fisher Park; repairs to the stone columns and sign at Lindley Park; a column and fence in place of a guardrail along an under-road culvert/stream in Sunset Hills; an Aycock Neighborhood sign at Bessemer and Yanceyville; and the parking area for the urban farm project on Phillips, which is instead to be located on another site.

Mr. Clegg summarized the five proposals filed for this year, totaling a little over \$40,000 to fund. These are additions to Nealtown Park (garbage cans, picnic table and a flash camera for security reasons); sun shade shelters at the play equipment in Textile Park; neighborhood sign for the Heath Community at East Market Street; sign toppers for Sunset Hills, for the area between Walker Avenue, Friendly Avenue, Aycock Street and Elam Avenue; and a new playground at the Windsor Recreation Center. Most of the projects this year are in District 2, with one in District 4.

Representatives from some of the neighborhoods were on hand to answer questions; the Planning Board had no additional questions.

Mr. Allen moved to close the hearing; Ms. Parker seconded the motion. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

After a short discussion Mr. Bryson moved to recommend approval of the slate of proposed projects as submitted, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

### **Amendment to Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLUM)**

**CP-15-06 for 505-509 Pisgah Church Road; 3920 Baylor Street; 3517 N. Elm Street and Portions of 3508, 3515, 3521 and 3529 North Elm Street. Change from Moderate Residential to Mixed Use Commercial, 10.69 acres**

Hanna Cockburn, Planning Manager, stated that the proposed change has been triggered by a rezoning request in the vicinity of the intersection of Baylor Street and Pisgah Church Road. The proposed change is from Moderate Residential to Mixed Use Commercial and the total request for a 10.69 acre overall site, a small part of which is the rezoning site.

Chair Truby stated he thought the change was appropriate for the development in existence in the area, and that the change would be in harmony with what is going on in the area. Other Board members agreed with this.

### **CP-15-05 Amendments to Comprehensive Plan Growth Strategy Map Reinvestment Corridors and Areas**

Hanna Cockburn, Planning Manager, summarized the purposes of the Growth Strategy Map, the Growth Tier policies and the reinvestment corridor and area policies. She noted that these are what the City has identified as priority areas for public and private investment, places where appropriate infill is encouraged, and the areas to which the Economic Development staff directs investments for incentives according to the Urban Development Investment Funding Guide.

The proposed revisions include the Central Gateway Corridor, adopted in 2009; the Downtown Reinvestment Area boundaries, which were changed in 2012, and the triggering request, the extension of the Redevelopment Corridor along the new alignment of what has been known as High Point Road, now to be called Gate City Boulevard. This change increases the total area within these boundaries to 20.4 square miles.

The Board voted 7-0 to close the hearing. Mr. Allen moved approval of the Amendments as submitted by staff, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion.

### **EASEMENT RELEASE**

#### **Proposed release of a 15-foot wide drainage easement located at 1307 Westminster Drive, as recorded in Plat Book 158, Page 63.**

Nicole Ward explained the easement release, noting it had been reviewed and the release supported by the relevant utility companies and City departments.

Mr. Allen moved approval of the easement release, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Mossman. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the easement release.

### **ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**

Hanna Cockburn stated that City Council approved the College Hill Neighborhood Plan at their meeting last night.

### **SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:**

None.

### **APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Truby acknowledged that the absences of Mr. Isaacson and Mr. Martin were approved.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Department, Director  
SS:jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
April 15, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, April 15, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chuck Truby, Chairman; Marc Isaacson, Celia Parker, Steve Allen, Day Atkins, Richard Bryson, John Martin, and Richard Mossman. Planning staff present were Jeff Sovich, Hanna Cockburn, Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Nicole Ward, and Sheila Stains-Ramp. Cynthia Blue of the Neighborhood Development Department was present, as was Jennifer Schneier, Attorney for the Planning Board.

Chairman Truby welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Allen moved approval of the March 18, 2015 meeting minutes with the correction of the location of the Sumner Ridge project as being on Old Randleman Road, not Old Battleground Road, seconded by Mr. Mossman. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion.

**PRESENTATION:**

**Affordable Housing Program (Recommendation)**

Cyndi Blue stated that the competition in Guilford County for State housing development dollars this year is substantial, noting that a single very competitive project in High Point may absorb essentially all the tax credit capacity for the County if selected. She noted that that particular developer has several projects submitted to the State and there is a cap on how many a developer can receive, so if that developer gets capped out, then there is a chance that Greensboro could receive some of the funding.

Ms. Blue summarized the recommendations and the reasons for them, as made by the Team scoring the projects. She noted the top projects had similar scoring with the key difference being a higher score in the category of siting and design for the recommended project, with the two other high scoring projects reaching that level through bonus points. With this information, staff is recommending the Ryan Ridge Apartments for funding and move forward to City Council for a final vote.

Ms. Parker arrived at 4:10 p.m. for the remainder of the meeting.

George Carr, Beacon Management, representing the Smith Farm application, stated that their proposal is for the elderly and so their being marked down for a location not near schools was disappointing. He also stated the other sites were in areas of minority concentration, which he understood was not supported by this year's guidelines. He stated it looked like all the affordable housing was being thrown in the same census tract, which is unfair to people that want housing choices around the City. He stated he believed Smith Farm should have been given special consideration as it is the only application that meets concentration standards.

Ms. Blue responded that the City's definition of minority concentration is 1 ½ times the non-white population ratio, so the definition of an area that would be considered an area of minority concentration for these funding purposes was one that exceeded 75% non-white population. The sites Mr. Carr refers to do not meet that threshold as they do not exceed 75% non-white population. She also noted that Smith Farm was filed as a family project, not an elderly project.

Patrick Thiesman, Beacon Management, reiterated the arguments made by Mr. Carr, commenting that he was concerned about what it says about Greensboro when affordable housing units are proposed to be so close to each other.

Luther Falls, Jr, 1603 Landsdown Avenue, stated he thought MWBE participation should be considered in scoring the projects. He stated he understood the Ryan Ridge project showed no MWBE participation.

Ms. Blue noted that any selected projects will be required to follow the MWBE policy when we reach the contracting process. The RFP awarded points for documentation of solicitations for development team members. As a developer who is new to the City process, Ryan Ridge did not know about the point structure.

David Levy, Affordable Housing Management, representing Sumner Ridge, pointed out the 0.5 point difference in scores between Sumner Ridge and Ryan Ridge, out of a possible total of 175 points. He also noted some differences between the two applications, in terms of MWBE outreach and how 'local' the team behind Ryan Ridge could be considered. He stated that the general contractor for Sumner Ridge is Greensboro-based, providing Greensboro jobs.

John Kavanaugh, representing Smith Farm, stated that they are 100% a Greensboro team, with Greensboro-based architect, engineer, contractor and owner.

Ms. Blue noted that the developer and general contractor for Ryan Ridge are both from Guilford County (High Point and Jamestown), so all are locally based.

Chair Truby stated that he agrees with Mr. Carr, even taking the scoring system into consideration. In response to a question, Ms. Blue stated that the Board does not have to recommend the project presented by staff and actually does not have to make any kind of recommendation to City Council. In either instance, the project would go to City Council and they would have to make the final decision.

After some clarifying questions of staff and the presenters, Mr. Mossman moved to favorably recommend Ryan Ridge, based on City staff's research and supporting documents, as explained by staff, seconded by Mr. Martin.

The Board voted 3-5 in favor of the motion and the motion failed. (Ayes: Truby, Mossman and Martin. Nays: Atkins, Isaacson, Bryson, Allen and Parker.)

Chair Truby asked for another motion.

Mr. Atkins moved to favorably recommend the Smith Farms project, based on the information presented, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 5-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Isaacson, Mossman, Atkins and Bryson. Nays: Parker, Allen and Martin.)

## **PUBLIC HEARING:**

### **2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and FY 2015-2016 HUD Funding Allocation (Recommendation)**

Jeff Sovich summarized the Draft 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and Draft 2015-2016 Annual Action Plan, noting the Consolidated Plan describes the strategies Greensboro will use to achieve the federal statutory goals of decent housing, a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunities, and the Annual Action Plan is the first of five establishing specific annual projects and activities to implement the

strategies. The federal funding sources used to achieve those goals the Community Development Block Grant program, the HOME Investment Partnerships program, Emergency Solutions grant, and the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS.

Mr. Sovich stated that the plans have been developed in tandem through a process led jointly by the Planning Department and the Neighborhood Development Department. The Planning process has included extensive public engagement efforts that will continue through the City Council meeting in May.

Mr. Sovich noted that while significant gains have been made over the past 5 years in addressing housing needs in the community, needs still remain. The primary issues center on housing affordability, housing condition, and a degree of mismatch between the types and location of affordable units available and the needs of the low and moderate income households. He noted that substantial progress has been made on homelessness issues over the past 5 years by focusing on a housing-first approach, on rapid rehousing to minimize additional impacts of homelessness and providing assistance to households in danger of becoming homeless. He noted there has been a continuing decline in the number of individuals facing homelessness in the community. He also noted that although the residential construction sector has largely recovered from the recession, there has been a substantial shift in focus from single family housing development to the multifamily market. Despite this reorientation, housing affordability remains illusive for many households because median household rents and transportation costs have increased while median incomes have stagnated or declined.

Mr. Sovich stated the geographic priorities identified in the draft plan are the active redevelopment areas of Arlington Park, Eastside Park, Ole Asheboro, South Elm, Phillips Avenue, Willow Oaks and the Heritage House site that was recently designated as blighted. With the exception of Heritage House, all of these locations are located in racially concentrated areas of poverty so they align closely with the areas designated by the City's proposed "Promise Zone" designation and grant application. The priority needs for this 5 year period are housing affordability and access, job growth and access, quality living environments and homelessness services, which relate very closely with the stated goals of the plan. These are based directly on HUD's guiding principles for consolidated planning, which helps to demonstrate a clear connection between the projects and activities, and the federal requirements that need to be met. Funding awarded under the Annual Action Plan application will enable Greensboro's continued support of neighborhood revitalization, affordable housing development, owner-occupied housing rehabilitation and services that address homelessness, including rapid rehousing, shelter operations and housing information and referral.

Chair Truby asked if there were any speakers on this matter.

David Levy, Affordable Housing Management, stated that one of the priorities identified was to continue to provide affordable housing. He would like to see that further defined due to the greater need of renter households for affordable housing. The cost burden of renters earning below 30% of median income is 27,597 households compared to owner households of 17,497 and the numbers are similar with the cost burden for households earning less than 50% of median income.

Luther Falls, Jr. stated that he wished to speak on what he felt was a lack of notification to potentially impacted and interested parties to give input through responding to such surveys, especially the disadvantaged citizens in the City. He stated he felt more responses would have been provided if more direct effort had been made to make these populations aware of the opportunity. He offered to assist in efforts to do so going forward.

Beth McKee-Huger stated that the Consolidated Plan does not have very many specifics about what strategies are going to reach the goals. Public comments should be incorporated into the plan.

There being no other speakers, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Bryson suggested that in an effort to reach more people, information on the survey be included in water bills mailed out to the public. He stated this may make more people aware of the surveys.

Mr. Bryson moved to recommend the 2015-2019 Consolidated Plan and FY 2015-2016 HUD Funding Allocation as explained by staff, seconded by Mr. Martin. The Board voted unanimously (8-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Parker, Martin, Atkins, Isaacson, Bryson, Allen, Mossman. Nays: None.)

**TYPE 3 MODIFICATION: 4017 Yanceyville Street (Final Decision/Approval)**

Mr. Isaacson asked that he be recused from this matter, as his firm has business involvement with the request. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) to recuse Mr. Isaacson from this item.

Steve Galanti stated that this Type 3 Modification for 4017 Yanceyville Street involves a site zoned Conditional District Commercial Low (CD C-L) in June 2014. One of the approved conditions states: "A six foot tall opaque fence shall be constructed along the southern and western property boundaries." With the detailed engineering for development of the property it was recognized that this location for the fencing would place it within a stream and drainageway. The applicant has requested a Type 3 Modification to instead place the fence more interior to the site, out of the environmentally sensitive area, which would also provide better visual buffering and separation from adjacent properties.

Chair Truby asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Attorney Amanda Hodieme, 101 W. Friendly Avenue, representing the applicant, stated that this is proposed to be a Dollar General store.

Mr. Martin moved to approve the Type 3 Modification as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Parker, Martin, Atkins, Bryson, Allen, Mossman. Nays: None. Abstained: Isaacson.)

**EASEMENT RELEASES: (Final Decision)**

- a. Proposed release of a drainage maintenance utility easement, sanitary sewer easement, and BMP access easement located at 1620 Fairfax Road, as recorded in Plat Book 163, Page 2.

Nicole Ward stated that this easement release has been reviewed by all utility companies and is supported.

Mr. Isaacson moved approval of the easement release as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted unanimously (8-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Parker, Martin, Atkins, Isaacson, Bryson, Allen, Mossman. Nays: None.)

- b. Proposed release of a temporary drainage maintenance utility easement and access easement located at 301 Gallimore Dairy Road, as recorded in Plat Book 164, Page 67.

Nicole Ward stated that this easement release has been reviewed by all utility companies and is supported.

Mr. Allen moved approval of the easement release as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted unanimously (8-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Parker, Martin, Atkins, Isaacson, Bryson, Allen, Mossman. Nays: None.).

- c. Pulled from Agenda
- d. Pulled from Agenda
  
- e. Proposed release of a 1234 square foot section of a 10' utility easement and a drainage maintenance and utility easement located in common area adjacent to Bedstone Drive, Griffin's Knoll, as recorded in Plat Book 185, page 27.

Nicole Ward stated that this easement release has been reviewed by all utility companies and is supported.

Mr. Bryson moved approval of the easement release as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted unanimously (8-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Parker, Martin, Atkins, Isaacson, Bryson, Allen, Mossman. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**

None.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Truby acknowledged that the absence of Mr. Steele was approved.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Department, Director  
SS:jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
May 20, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, May 20, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chuck Truby, Chairman; Celia Parker, Seth Steele, Day Atkins, Richard Bryson, Marc Isaacson, Steve Allen and Richard Mossman. City Planning staff present included Hanna Cockburn, Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Nicole Ward, and Sheila Stains-Ramp. Also present were Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office, and Steven Buter, Budget and Evaluation Department.

Chairman Truby welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Allen moved approval of the April 15, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion.

Mr. Allen joined the meeting at 4:06 p.m.

**PRESENTATION:**

**Update Regarding the Capital Improvements Program (CIP)**

Steven Buter, Budget and Evaluation Department, presented a brief overview on the 2016 - 2025 CIP. Mr. Buter noted that no Board action is necessary, although if the Board wishes to formally recommend anything to Council related to the CIP they can do so.

Mr. Buter noted that the CIP planning process is a way that the City can plan for the major capital needs of the City, allowing for both their identification and their ranking for funding. He noted that the projects so identified collectively would require just under \$1.5 billion dollars and include transportation and water resources projects, building roof replacements, landfill needs, parks and recreation and library requirements, public safety needs, and so forth. He also noted that funding for these projects includes a mix of enterprise bonds, revenue bonds, grants and other funding when available. Approximately 38% of the project funding is anticipated to be through enterprise or revenue bonds, and approximately 35% of the 'future needs' project costs does not yet have an identified funding source.

Mr. Buter noted that \$228 million dollars worth of projects have been funded through 2006, 2008 and 2009 Bond Referenda, with \$99 million of the bonds not yet having been approved by City Council. There is the ability to issue those bonds to support those projects, which are, by a large majority, transportation-related projects. Mr. Buter stated that with the borrowing represented by issuing the bonds and funding these projects, debt service costs will also increase

Mr. Buter also noted projects that have been completed that have been funded out of the issued bonds.

Mr. Bryson requested that a copy of Mr. Buter's presentation be emailed to the Board members.

## **GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (GFLUM) AMENDMENT:**

### **CP 15-07: 4006 Lawndale Place and 4111-4113 Lawndale Drive, from Low Residential to Moderate Residential, 2.36 acres (COMMENTS ONLY)**

Hanna Cockburn stated that the Board is asked to provide comments on a requested change to the GFLUM for a 2.36 acre site, from Low Residential to Moderate Residential. She noted these are properties accessed from Lawndale Drive in close proximity to the Science Center and Park and that the requested classification, Moderate Residential, allows for densities between 5 and 12 units per acre. The requested change would shift from the low density, predominantly single family designation to a category that accommodates a wider range of housing types, such as small lot single family detached and attached units (townhomes), at a moderate density. She noted the area has a variety of different future land use categories, from Mixed Use Commercial to Moderate Residential and to the north, land use and density changes where the future Urban Loop improvements will intersect with Lawndale Drive.

Chair Truby requested comments from Board members.

#### **Comments:**

Mr. Atkins asked about references in some of the staff comments to “pocket neighborhoods”, noting this was a new concept for him.

Mike Kirkman stated that while there is nothing directly applicable in the LDO, the concept involves typically smaller-scale homes around a common green or similar amenity that creates and identifies a small neighborhood. He also noted that this item was not about pocket neighborhoods per se but about the appropriate density for residential development and related support uses, and requested that comments be made with that density question in mind.

Ms. Cockburn noted that the existing density surrounding this site was calculated as being 2.25 to 2.5 units per acre.

Mr. Bryson noted both the current relatively low densities of properties in the area and the potential for infill development given the Loop and the proximity to desirable destinations such as the Science Center, the Parks, and the shopping opportunities relatively close by at Pisgah Church Road.

Mr. Mossman commented that he thought this was not consistent with existing neighborhoods and he did not believe the neighbors would support additional density even in small pockets.

Mr. Steele commented that he had some similar concerns given that the park’s proximity, and was concerned such a change would probably lead to further development not be in keeping with that area.

In general, comments were that completion of the Urban Loop will change development pressures in the area; that the request does not seem consistent with and is too dense for the existing density and surrounding development patterns, and that such a change could trigger additional development pressures in the vicinity.

Hanna Cockburn stated that the Board’s comments will go to City Council with the item at the June meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**LDO Text Amendment: Amend Section 30-15-19 Definitions/terms beginning with “T”, re Townhouse Dwelling; Section 30-13-3.8, Subdivision/Lots re Access Requirements; Subsection 1 of Section 30-3-7.5(A) Administration/Board of Adjustment/Voting re Required vote for Approval (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Steve Galanti stated that this technical amendment clarifies various issues that have been pointed out to staff. Mr. Galanti noted that four different items are being carried forward with this amendment:

First, the definition of ‘townhouse’ differs in two sections of the LDO (30-7-2.6 Housing Type: Townhouse; 30-15-19 Terms Beginning with T: Townhouse). The amendment clarifies this so that only one version is in effect. The definition retained reads “A building consisting of single-family residences attached to one another or detached from one another, in which each unit is located on an individually owned parcel, generally within a development containing drives, walks, and open space in common elements.”

Second, the allowable forms of street access for townhouse developments differ amongst 3 sections of the LDO (30-8-10.1.K Townhouses; 30-9-3.4 Townhouse Developments; 30-13-3.8 Access Requirements). The amendment will result in consistency amongst the sections, making it clear that townhouse developments, along with cluster developments, planned unit developments, group developments and integrated multiple use developments, are permitted to use private streets, private driveways and/or private drives within the project.

Third, voting requirements for the Board of Adjustment (Sub-Section 1 of Section 30-3-7.5(A) Required Vote for Approval) are being brought in line with recent changes to the State Statutes, whereby an affirmative vote of 4/5 of the appointed members, not just appoint members present and voting, shall be required to grant a variance.

Fourth, inconsistency in the classification of art, music and photography instruction as a use is being eliminated. The amendment clarifies that the use is classed as a Typical Use under Personal Services.

Mr. Galanti noted that the recommendation of the Planning Board will go to the City Council for a public hearing tentatively scheduled for June 16.

In response to a question, Mike Kirkman clarified that if a member has been appointed to the Board of Adjustment but they are not in attendance, their vote is considered in the affirmative.

There being no other speakers the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Bryson moved to approve the proposed amendments as submitted, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted unanimously, 8-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Mossman, Steele, Bryson, Isaacson, Allen, Atkins and Parker. Nays: None.)

**ANNEXATION PETITIONS:**

**PL(P) 15-04 – Proposed Contiguous Annexation, 5605 Sapp Road, 1.01 acres, east of the intersection of Sapp Road, Guilford College Road, and McClellan Place. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Mr. Isaacson was recused by unanimous vote on this matter due to a conflict of interest.

Nicole Ward stated that the contiguous site is currently vacant and proposed to be developed for commercial use. She noted that City water is available by connecting to an existing 12" line located within Sapp Road, and City sanitary Sewer is available by connecting to an existing line within East Wendover. She further noted that for the site to be served by water and sanitary sewer the owner would be responsible for all costs associated with off-site extensions through the site to abutting properties and for connecting to public lines. The Fire Department indicated that the site is currently served by the Pinecroft/Sedgefield Station 23 on MacKay Road, and would be served by Station 52 upon annexation. The Police Department indicated that they can provide service with little difficulty. The provision of other City services will involve a travel distance almost equal to that necessary to provide service to the adjacent properties. The Technical Review (TRC) recommended the approval of the annexation to the Planning Board and to City Council.

Mr. Allen moved to recommend approval of the proposed annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Mossman, Steele, Bryson, Allen, Atkins and Parker. Nays: None. Recused: Isaacson.)

Mr. Isaacson returned to the meeting.

**PL(P) 15-05 – Proposed Contiguous Annexation, 400-404 and 407 East Vandalia Road, 11.85 acres. North and south sides of East Vandalia Road, between Bethany Trace and Riverdale Road. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Nicole Ward stated that the properties are contiguous to primary City limits and are within the Tier 1 growth area, with the current uses to remain, as single family homes and the Vandalia Elementary School. She noted that City water and sewer are available by extending and connecting to the existing lines located within Vandalia Road. She further noted that for the site to be served by water and sewer, the owners would be responsible for all costs associated with off-site extensions through the site to abutting properties and across the frontages of the site, and for connecting to the public lines. The Fire Department indicated the site is currently served by the Pleasant Garden Station 3 on Pleasant Garden Road and would be served by Station 61 on West Vandalia upon annexation. The Police Department indicated that additional personnel and equipment will be necessary to provide service. The provision of the other City services will involve a travel distance almost equal to that necessary to provide service to the adjacent properties. The Technical Review (TRC) recommended the approval of the annexation to the Planning Board and to City Council.

Mr. Allen moved to recommend approval of the proposed annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Mossman, Steele, Bryson, Isaacson, Allen, Atkins and Parker. Nays: None.)

**UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

**Lofts at New Garden – 1301-1317 New Garden Road, 7.63 acres (APPROVED)**

Chair Truby was recused from this matter due to a conflict of interest. Vice Chair Isaacson was seated for this matter.

Nicole Ward stated that the 7.63 acre site is conditioned to be multifamily development through the Zoning Conditions adopted as part of the site's rezoning to Planned Unit Development (PUD). She

noted the Unified Development Plan (UDP) sets the dimensional standards and other development standards that will govern the development of this property. The UDP will be recorded and so will be available through the Register of Deeds for future owners and applicants. TRC has reviewed this UDP and recommended its approval.

In response to a question by Mr. Atkins, Steve Galanti noted that rezoning to a PUD is a 3-step process, requiring a concept plan approved by TRC; rezoning action by the Zoning Commission (and the City Council depending on the vote); and then the UDP. The UDP is the technical document that establishes the development standards. The two findings the Board should be able to make are that the UDP meets the technical standards of the LDO and that it accurately reflects the actions taken in previous decisions. He noted that this plan does that.

Mr. Bryson moved to approve the UDP as submitted, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Mossman, Steele, Bryson, Isaacson, Allen, Atkins and Parker. Nays: None. (Recused: Truby)

**North Elm Associates, LLC – 4108-4114, 4200 Bell Orchard Road, 3607 – Near North Elm, 3619 North Elm, 10.62 acres (APPROVED)**

Chair Truby was recused from this matter due to a conflict of interest. Vice Chair Isaacson was seated for this matter.

Nicole Ward stated that the 10.62 acre site is also conditioned to be a multifamily development through the Zoning Conditions adopted as part of the site's rezoning to Planned Unit Development. She noted the UDP specifies the permitted uses, the amount of development in various sections and dimensional standards that govern the development of this property. The TRC reviewed this UDP, found that it met the technical standards of the LDO, and recommended its approval.

Mr. Allen moved to approve the proposed UDP project as submitted, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Mossman, Steele, Bryson, Isaacson, Allen, Atkins and Parker. Nays: None. Recused: Truby)

Chair Truby returned to the podium for the remainder of the meeting.

**EASEMENT RELEASE**

Mr. Isaacson was recused from the first easement release due to a conflict of interest.

**Proposed release of a 3'-wide portion of a 15'-wide Drainage Maintenance Utility Easement located on the western edge of 2109 Berkshire Lane, as recorded in PB 188 Page 4. (APPROVED)**

Nicole Ward stated that this is a request to release a 3' wide portion of the eastern portion of the 15' drainage maintenance and utility easement located on the western edge of 2109 Berkshire Lane, as recorded in Plat Book 188, Page 4. All of the utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to release of this easement.

Mr. Allen moved to approve the easement release as submitted, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Mossman, Steele, Bryson, Allen, Atkins and Parker. Nays: None. Recused: Isaacson.)

Mr. Isaacson returned to the Board.

**Proposed release of a 10'-wide portion of a utility easement located at 1710 Three Meadows Road, as recorded in Plat Book 58, page 15. (REMOVED FROM AGENDA)**

**Proposed release of a 15'-wide sanitary sewer easement, a 25'-wide access easement, a 20'-wide water easement and two 20'-wide drainage easements, located at 3304 and 3306 Isler Street, as recorded in Plat Book 117, Page 14 (APPROVED)**

Nicole Ward stated that this is a request to release a 15' wide sanitary sewer easement, 25' access easement, 20' water easement, and two 20' drainage easements, located at 3304 and 3306 Isler Street, as recorded in Plat Book 117, Page 14. All utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to release of this easement.

Mr. Bryson moved to approve the easement release as submitted, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted unanimously (8-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Mossman, Steele, Bryson, Isaacson, Allen, Atkins and Parker. Nays: None.)

**Proposed release of 10' of a 20' wide utility and drainage easement located at 731 Kemp Road, as recorded in Plat Book 62, Page 131 (APPROVED)**

Nicole Ward stated that this is a request to release 10' of a 20'-wide utility and drainage easement located at 731 Kemp Road, as recorded in Plat Book 62, Page 131. All utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to release of this easement.

Mr. Bryson moved to approve the easement release as submitted, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted unanimously (8-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Mossman, Steele, Bryson, Isaacson, Allen, Atkins and Parker. Nays: None.)

#### **ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**

Sheila Stains-Ramp invited Board members to an upcoming summit titled "Small is Big: Planning for Prosperity", sponsored by the NC Chapter of American Planning Association in partnership with the City and the Greensboro Partnership. The speakers will discuss "best practices for planning for the ever-changing ways things are made in our communities and how innovative strategies can support economic entrepreneurship." The City will cover the registration fee for Planning Board members if they will let staff know of their interest in attending before June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015.

Hanna Cockburn noted that staff has been working very closely with the NC Chapter of the APA to bring this event to Greensboro and there will be two outstanding, nationally recognized speakers. Ilana Preuss, who for many years was staff to Smart Growth America and before that the EPA, and has started her own company called ReCast City. She is focused on the changing nature of manufacturing and micro-sized manufacturing and how that type of operation fits into the context of how industrial use and industrial space is thought about and its location in the community. The other speaker is Beth Macy, author of the New York Times Bestseller Factory Man, which will be coming out in paperback in June and which has many parallels to Greensboro's development and current status.

Mr. Isaacson asked that TREBIC be notified of this session also as there are people that would be interested.

Hanna Cockburn also relayed that as an update to the Heritage House redevelopment plan, on April 30<sup>th</sup> a public meeting was held in 2 sessions; one for property owners of the condo complex and one for the general public to provide feedback on some of the proposed redevelopment strategies for this site. Those will be included in the redevelopment plan as it moves forward. That plan is in process now and it is anticipated that it will be before the Planning Board for comment at the August or September meeting.

**ITEMS FROM THE CHAIR:**

Chair Truby stated that he asked that Board members respond to e-mails from staff concerning attendance at the meetings. It is important that staff have a good count of how many members will be attending meetings.

**ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:**

Richard Bryson asked if the APA summit will be advertised to the public. Hanna Cockburn stated that staff is working with Action Greensboro and the Greensboro Partnership to produce some public materials because this has a lot of cross-over interest.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Truby acknowledged that the absence of Mr. Martin was approved.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Department, Director

SS:jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
June 17, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, June 17, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chuck Truby, Chairman; Celia Parker; Day Atkins; Richard Bryson; Mark Isaacson; Steve Allen; John Martin; and Richard Mossman. City staff present included Russ Clegg, Mike Cowhig, Steve Galanti, Nicole Ward, and Sheila Stains-Ramp. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

Chairman Truby welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**1. MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Isaacson moved approval of the May 20, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**2. PRESENTATION (For information):**

**Overview of background analysis and recommended strategies to increase access to fresh, local foods in Greensboro's "food desert" areas.**

Russ Clegg, Planning Department, presented an overview of a proposed plan, funded by the USDA's Local Food Promotion Program, to improve access to fresh, healthy food in Greensboro's 'food deserts'. He noted a public hearing on the draft plan will be scheduled for the Board's July meeting, after which the Board will be asked to make a recommendation on the Plan. The item will go to City Council in August. He noted his presentation would include an overview of the grant, findings about the food system as it operates in Greensboro, and the plan's recommended strategies.

Mr. Clegg explained that the gaps in the City's food system represent opportunities for new businesses and better health outcomes. He noted the USDA defines food deserts as census tracts with a poverty rate of 20 percent or greater or a median family income at or below 80 percent of the area median family income, and where at least 33 percent of residents live more than one mile from a supermarket. The plan focuses on how to increase access to fresh, local foods; expand local food business enterprises; and create strategies for new local business enterprises to address gaps in the food system.

Mr. Clegg noted that the plan is funded by a planning grant by the USDA's Local Food Promotion Program and hopefully will move to an implementation grant in the spring of 2016.

Mr. Clegg presented a map of 'food deserts' in Greensboro.

Mr. Clegg explained that the focus of the local USDA grant is "local food business enterprises", defined as anything that gets food from the farm or urban garden to consumers. The Plan does consider the food system as a whole so that it is of use to the broader community and help ensure that any implementation steps can leverage other ideas.

The 2016 Implementation Plan looks for support to food businesses and includes training, technical assistance, and marketing. There will be an opportunity to partner with businesses in the area toward this goal.

The planning process has revolved around a steering committee that meets every two weeks. The committee consists of City staff, County staff from the Department of Public Health, people involved in urban farming, individuals who live food deserts, and representatives from the Guilford County Food Council. Mr. Clegg reviewed the committee's analysis of survey information and public input that has determined the gaps and barriers in the food system along with recommended strategies.

The strategies were vetted at a public meeting held last week, attended by over 40 participants who gave their feedback. Strategies include the following: (1) Create a campaign to introduce people to those currently growing produce as a way of marketing the producers, (2) Offer market research to new or existing farmers, (3) Implement a local food entrepreneurship program, (4) Establish a food hub, (5) Establish a commercial kitchen to create more demand, (6) Build and sustain a relationship between growers and institutions, (7) Create a fresh food incentive program to support store owners to sell more fresh produce, (8) Retail gap research, and (9) Implement an education campaign. Mr. Clegg pointed out that these recommendations look at the food system as a whole as a way to strengthen the system.

### **3. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM:**

#### **Review of continued applicability of the Local Historic District Standards to 1107-1111 West Market Street, College Hill Historic District**

Mike Cowhig, Planning Department, distributed a brochure explaining the historic district program and presented slides of the subject properties.

Mr. Cowhig stated that this is a rezoning application to remove the Historic District overlay zoning category from these properties on West Market Street. It would have the effect of changing the boundary of the College Hill historic district. Under North Carolina enabling legislation the process for changing the boundary of a historic district is the same as for initially establishing the district. A report must be prepared and submitted to the North Carolina Historic Preservation Office for comments and then it must be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission, the Planning Board, and the Zoning Commission. Final approval rests with City Council.

Mr. Cowhig stated that in 1980 College Hill was designated as Greensboro's first historic district and the neighborhood was deemed to have special historical and architectural significance, with integrity of design, setting, workmanship, and materials. He noted that review of the request should be limited to the following questions: (1) Do the properties retain their historic associations? (2) Has anything changed so drastically that the standards for the Historic District are no longer appropriate for these properties? (3) Would their removal diminish the overall historic character of the district? The report prepared and submitted to the State argues that these properties still possess the integrity of design, setting, materials, feeling, and association with the rest of the College Hill Historic District.

Responding to questions, Mr. Cowhig stated that the property is currently zoned for Office use and the Historic District overlay zoning does not change the permitted uses. Mr. Cowhig was asked to cite an example illustrating a change in the boundary. He explained that when the boundary was first established, the boundary included two historic houses from the original neighborhood that still stood in 1980. Ten years later, those houses were demolished for commercial development and several years later a request was made to change the boundary. Since the properties had been demolished, a change in the boundary was warranted.

Mr. Cowhig described the properties, noting 1107 West Market was built around the turn of the century, had been substantially renovated and is being used as an office. 1109 West Market Street was built between 1915 and 1920, and 1111 West Market Street was built around 1895 making it one of the older houses in the neighborhood. 1109 and 1111 West Market are being used as apartment houses. He said they are similar in character to other houses found in the historic district.

Mr. Cowhig noted that at their May 2015 meeting, the Historic Preservation Commission recommended that the properties should remain in the historic district.

Chair Truby opened the public hearing. Speaking in favor of removing this property from the historic district were the applicants, Mary and Tony Luper. Mr. Luper's mother owns the subject properties. Ms. Luper pointed out that the uses that had come onto properties in the vicinity, citing UNC-Greensboro's music building at McIver Street, and the Tate Street corner where Greensboro College now owns the old YMCA building. Across the street the former IBM building was recently taken over by UNC-Greensboro and behind the properties is an easement for student access and a brick apartment complex used for student housing. These properties are surrounded by primarily commercial buildings.

She also commented that, contrary to the report, the properties were not in good structural condition, stating the foundations were crumbling, having been built directly on the ground, the chimneys are falling in, there is termite damage, and major plumbing and electrical work is needed. The siding is asbestos and removing it requires special measures. It will cost a lot of money to refurbish these properties and to follow all the regulations in the historic district.

She stated that Mr. Luper's mother is approaching 90 years of age and lives on the rental income generated by these properties. They have had many offers for commercial types of development and they would like to have the properties removed from the historic district. She has met with Marsh Prause of Preservation Greensboro who is putting together a proposal to locate private owner who may be interested in the properties. She questioned if private owners would want to live on Market Street surrounded by commercial properties. Mr. Luper commented that a lot has changed on the corner where the properties are located and he noted the surrounding commercial properties. Responding to questions, Mr. Luper said that it is likely the properties will be demolished if they are not removed from the historic district. The office and student apartments are fully occupied. His main reason for wanting to remove the properties from the historic district is to sell the land for development.

Responding to questions, Mr. Cowhig said that the College Hill Neighborhood Association does not support the removal of these properties from the historic district.

Members noted that changes in the area around the properties. Mr. Cowhig clarified that when speaking about change, he is referring to the physical characteristics of the property and the buildings. A lot of change has occurred nearby; however, the historic structures have the same architectural features and physical characteristics they possessed when the district was created. Additionally, he commented that the neighborhood feels it is important to protect the boundary of the historic district because it is important to the overall sustainability and success of the district.

There being no other speakers, Chair Truby closed the Public Hearing.

One member expressed bewilderment that the Historic Commission would not allow the property to be removed from the district. It was also noted that a representative from the College Hill Neighborhood Association was not present to comment. The properties are on the edge of the district and the area is leaning toward commercial development.

Chair Truby stated he felt that the situation should be played out. The houses are still present and they are still historic. Therefore, he could not support the request because the properties meet the requirements in the historic district. He expressed his opinion that perhaps the owners should have tried to remove the properties in 1980 when the district was created. Mr. Atkins stated his agreement with Chair Truby. The houses are still there and this is an important boundary for the College Hill district. Ms. Parker asked if the College Hill Neighborhood Association sent any kind of letter regarding this request. Mr. Cowhig indicated that a representative was present at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting and they were opposed to removing these properties from the district.

Mr. Allen moved to remove the properties from the historic district, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted 3-5 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Parker, Bryson. Nays: Truby, Atkins, Martin, Isaacson, Mossman.) Chair Truby stated that the motion failed.

Mr. Martin moved to recommend that the properties not be removed from the district, seconded by Mr. Mossman. The Board voted 5-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Atkins, Martin, Isaacson, Mossman. Nays: Allen, Bryson, Parker.)

#### **AMENDMENT TO GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE PLAN (GFLUM) CP 15-07:**

**CP 15-08: 3333, 3341-3343, 3326, 3334-3336 Spring Street; 3325, 3401, 3425 North O'Henry Boulevard; Portion of 3329 and 3301 North O'Henry Boulevard, 34.34 acres. From Low Residential to Moderate Residential.**

Russ Clegg stated that the amendment from Low Residential to Moderate Residential was related to a rezoning application in process. The Low Residential designation is intended to cover densities from three to five dwelling units per acre and includes the City's predominantly single-family neighborhoods as well as other compatible housing types that can be accommodated within this density range. Compact developments that include clustered small lots with substantial retained open space are encouraged. The requested change, Moderate Residential, supports densities of five to twelve dwelling units per acre. Moderate Residential accommodates a variety of housing types, ranging from small lot single-family detached and attached single-family dwellings such as townhomes to moderate low-rise apartment dwellings. Referring to photographs and a map of the area, Mr. Clegg described the subject site along with surrounding properties.

**Board Comments:**

Responding to questions, Mr. Clegg indicated that the proposed zoning density is twelve units an acre, the requested zoning is RM-12, and the proposed use is apartment units. North O’Henry Boulevard parallels Highway 29 as an access road and there is also access from McKnight Mill Road. There is not much single-family located on the North O’Henry Boulevard access road.

Chair Truby commented that Highway 29 is a major highway and it does create a divide between other moderate residential uses. He was supportive as long as the existing single-family homes were appropriately buffered and access was not through the residential area. Mr. Isaacson felt that the request was okay as a whole and appropriate for the Moderate Residential designation.

**EASEMENT RELEASES:**

**Proposed release of a 10’ wide portion of a utility easement, located at 1710 Three Meadows Road, as recorded in Plat Book 58, Page 15.**

Mr. Isaacson was recused from this matter due to a conflict of interest.

Nicole Ward stated that this is the proposed release of a 10’ wide portion of a utility easement located at 1710 Three Meadows Road, as recorded in Plate Book 58, Page 15. All of the utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to release of this easement.

Mr. Allen moved to approve the proposed amendment as submitted, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted unanimously 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Mossman, Bryson, Martin, Allen, Atkins, Parker. Nays: None. Recused: Isaacson)

**Proposed release of a 15’ drainage easement located at 301 Norwalk Street as recorded in Plat Book 78, Page 114.**

Chair Truby was recused from this matter due to a conflict of interest.

Nicole Ward stated that this is the proposed release of a 15’ drainage easement located at 301 Norwalk Street as recorded in Plat Book 78, Page 114. All of the utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to the release of this easement.

Mr. Allen moved to approve the easement release as submitted, seconded by Mr. Atkins. The Board voted 7-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Mossman, Bryson, Allen, Atkins, Martin, Parker. Nays: None. Recused: Truby)

**ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:**

Sheila Stains-Ramp stated that there are four terms on the Board that expire in August, 2015. Mr. Steele, Mr. Atkins, and Mr. Martin are eligible for reappointment if they are interested; the application indicating interest in being reappointed was provided by email and is to be sent to the City Clerk’s office. Mr. Truby is not eligible for reappointment.

**ITEMS FROM THE CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Truby congratulated Nicole Ward on her new job and thanked her for her work with the Board.

Chair Truby stated that election of new officers will be elected at the end of the July meeting.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Truby acknowledged that the absence of Mr. Steele is approved.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz

Planning Department, Director  
SS:sm/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
July 15, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, July 15, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Chuck Truby, Chairman; Day Atkins, Richard Bryson, Mark Isaacson, Steve Allen, John Martin, Seth Steele and Richard Mossman. City staff present included Russ Clegg, Hanna Cockburn, Steve Galanti, and Sheila Stains-Ramp. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

Chairman Truby welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**1. MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Martin moved approval of the June 17, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted unanimously, 8-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Isaacson, Mossman, Bryson, Steele, Martin, Akins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**2. PUBLIC HEARING:**

**USDA Fresh Food Retail Access Plan (RECOMMENDED)**

Russ Clegg, Planning Department, presented an overview of the plan to improve food access in the City's food deserts. The Board is asked for a recommendation to City Council to consider adoption of the plan in August. The plan received funding from the USDA's Local Food Promotion Program. The goals of the plan are to increase retail access to fresh local food and support local food business enterprises.

The strategies were vetted at a well attended public meeting held last month. Strategies include the following: (1) Create a campaign to introduce people to those currently growing produce as a way of marketing the producers, (2) Offer market research to new or existing farmers, (3) Implementation of a local food entrepreneurship program, (4) Establishing a food hub, (5) Establishing a commercial kitchen to create more demand, (6) Build and sustain a relationship between growers and institutions, (7) Create a fresh food incentive program to support store owners to sell more fresh produce, (8) Retail gap research, and (9) Implement an education campaign. The plan will be presented to the Parks & Recreation Commission and to City Council in August. The plan must be submitted to USDA in September. Comments on the Plan will be received until August 7<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Truby asked if there was anyone from the public that wished to speak on this matter.

Dr. Adrienne Sabir, 1206 Eton Drive, stated that she is part of the steering committee in discussions on this plan. A very diverse group was involved in the steering committee

and have had very good communications during the public meetings. She hopes that the Board will recommend this plan to City Council.

There being no other speakers, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Martin moved to recommend the Fresh Foods Plan as described by staff to City Council for their consideration and approval, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted unanimously, 8-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Isaacson, Mossman, Bryson, Steele, Martin, Akins and Allen. Nays: None.)

### **3. ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR AUG 2015 – JULY 2016**

Chair Truby thanked the Board members and staff for supporting him over the last six years on the Board. He also thanked staff for all the hard work they do in preparation of matters coming to the Planning Board.

Mr. Martin nominated Mr. Isaacson to serve as Chair of the Planning Board, Mr. Isaacson accepted the nomination and the Board members voted unanimously for Mr. Isaacson's election. The Board voted unanimously, 8-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Isaacson, Mossman, Bryson, Steele, Martin, Akins and Allen. Nays: None.)

Mr. Allen volunteered to serve as Vice Chair and there were no other nominations. The Board members voted unanimously, 8-0, for Mr. Allen to serve as Vice Chair of the Board. (Ayes: Truby, Isaacson, Mossman, Bryson, Steele, Martin, Akins and Allen. Nays: None.)

### **4. ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**

#### **Heritage Community Program:**

Hanna Cockburn stated that the City Council established a new program to recognize a neighborhood or area that played an important note in Greensboro's history as a Heritage Community. Historic significance may not be apparent today because of physical changes that have occurred over time. The purpose of Heritage Community recognition is commemorative and educational. It is acknowledged that the community is historically and/or culturally significant but is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places or local Historic District designation. This program has no effect on property rights, zoning or taxation. There are no regulations and it does not take the place of other forms of recognition such as listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Heritage Communities will have general rather than exact boundaries, e.g., "the are generally south of Lee Street, west of south Elm-Eugene Street, north of Florida Street and east of Freeman Mill Road". A printout of the criteria for consideration and application information was provided to Board members.

**ITEMS FROM THE CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Isaacson stated that he had no items at this time. He thanked his fellow Board members for the opportunity to serve as Chair and would try and uphold the confidence placed in him.

**SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Isaacson acknowledged that the absence of Ms. Parker is approved.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz, FAICP  
Planning Director  
SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
August 19, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, August 19, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Marc Isaacson, Chairman; Day Atkins, Steve Allen, Chuck Truby, Celia Parker and Seth Steele. City staff present included Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Hanna Cockburn and Sheila Stains-Ramp. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

Chairman Isaacson welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**1. MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Allen moved approval of the July 15, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted 5-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**a) Recommendation on a Land Development Ordinance and Text Amendment Regarding Section 30-15-19 to define what constitutes a "Truck Stop" for the use specifically identified in the Permitted Use Table. (CONTINUED)**

Steve Galanti, Planning Department, stated the proposed amendment created a definition for the term "Truck Stop", which appears in the Table 8-1 Permitted Uses as a Specific Use under Retail Sales and Service in Light Industrial (LI) and Heavy Industrial (HI) zoning districts, but which has been an undefined term. Staff has relied on a standard Webster's Dictionary definition, i.e. Restaurant or service station located along an interstate highway that caters specifically to truck drivers. That is lacking for practical application and needs to be better defined.

Mr. Galanti also stated that convenience stores with fuel pumps are designed to carry a large number of convenience items, perhaps including a food preparation area, are geared towards the broader public and located in areas convenient to the public. In Greensboro, convenience stores are allowed in all Commercial districts except Commercial – Neighborhood, as well as in most of the Mixed Use districts, the Business Park district and the LI and HI zoning districts. In some of those zoning districts there are some additional design-related development standards.

Mr. Galanti noted that staff had been questioned recently about allowing convenience stores with fuel pumps in highway-oriented locations to also provide services for trucks in a limited manner and while retaining the main focus as a typical convenience store. In particular, a Sheetz Gas Station on US 29 was experiencing a demand for fueling stations set up specifically for trucks, given the location on a route used by truckers

accessing industrial uses in the vicinity. Preparation of plans to add fueling facilities for trucks led to the determination that the use was transitioning to a 'Truck Stop' that could not be dealt with as the LDO and zoning district stood.

Mr. Galanti stated that the proposal would permit convenience stores with fuel pumps to provide for fueling no more than 3 trucks simultaneously and/or overnight parking spaces for no more than 5 trucks, and defined 'truck stops' as those facilities providing for more intensive use.

Ms. Parker arrived at 4:08 p.m. for the remainder of the meeting.

Tom Terrell, an attorney representing Sheetz Corporation, stated that the proposed amendment was a limited and practical solution to an existing problem. He stated that Sheetz is not a truck stop and its business model is not geared towards serving trucks, but some of the stores are in major-highway locations where truckers are interested in fueling. The catalyst for this was the mentioned site on Highway 29, and the question was whether the site could be redesigned to safely accommodate the maneuvering needs of trucks while preserving their standard passenger-car-oriented facilities. He noted the location did not have showers, overnighting facilities or the many products used by truckers. He stated that this was an example of a business that does not fit the current ordinance, with the proposed amendment creating a narrow and practical exception for a scenario that had not been contemplating during the LDO's creation. He asked that the Board recommend the amendment with a stipulation that they work closely with the Neighborhood Congress to come up with wording that would limit something like this to a highway use.

Steve Galanti stated that although the amendment had been discussed with the Neighborhood Congress, a representative of the Congress had brought some questions to the Planning Board meeting, and he recommended that the Planning Board continue the item to a future meeting so that all the concerns could be better explored and addressed.

Michael Pendergraff stated that he was on the Issues and Bylaws Committee of the Greensboro Neighborhood Congress and wanted to identify concerns with the proposal.

He noted that the proposed truck stop definition does not say anything about major thoroughfares, highways or interstate roads; it just identifies that otherwise similar facilities are truck stops if there are more than 3 fueling stations or 5 overnight parking spaces, and convenience stores if there are fewer fueling stations or overnight parking spaces, regardless of the site's location. Convenience stores are allowed in many more zoning districts than truck stops are, and so are in many more places in the City, which raises the chance for conflicts between a truck stop use and the residential or less-intensive nonresidential use of surrounding properties. He noted that while some of these in-town sites might be too small to actually be able to have truck-stop facilities, the potential remains and should be considered.

Chair Isaacson suggested that it might be more feasible to continue the matter as there was no time urgency involved.

After a short discussion Mr. Truby moved to continue the matter, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**b) Recommendation on a Land Development Ordinance Text Amendment regarding Section 30-7-1.4(C) to allow the landing portion of handicap ramps to encroach into the required setbacks with the ramps. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Steve Galanti, Planning Department, stated that the LDO establishes minimum setbacks for structures from property lines, and allows some minor encroachments into those setbacks. A handicap access ramp is one of those minor encroachments. However, as currently written, only the ramp is allowed to encroach, not the level sections that serve as landings. The landing exclusion can make it difficult to provide a usable, reasonable means of access.

The proposed amendment eliminates the exception and allows the entirety of the handicap ramp to encroach into setback. The ramp would still have to be built to building code and properly permitted. Mr. Galanti noted this allowance is also made in Guilford County and High Point.

Mr. Truby moved to recommend the Text Amendment as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins, Allen. Nays: None)

**c) Recommendation on a Land Development Ordinance Text Amendment regarding Sections 30-4-5.8 and 30-15-16 to remove Protest Petitions from the Ordinance. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Steve Galanti, Planning Department, stated that the intent of the amendment was to remove the provisions that allow Protest Petitions to be submitted as part of the rezoning request. A valid Protest Petitions affected the size of the majority vote needed for City Council action on a rezoning request. NC General Statutes allowed cities to use this provision, and it has been included in the LDO, Articles 4 and 15, which outline the mechanisms for submitting and using the Protest Petition provisions.

Recent action by the State Legislature removed the ability for Protest Petitions to be used by municipalities. The proposed amendment eliminates the references to Protest Petitions from the LDO, in line with the inability to any longer allow their use. Staff recommends the Text Amendment as submitted.

Mr. Allen moved to recommend the text Amendment as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

### **3. Redevelopment Plan Review**

#### **a) Heritage House Redevelopment Plan: Request for Certification to Redevelopment Commission and Recommendation to City Council (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Hanna Cockburn, Planning Department, presented the draft Redevelopment Plan, and explained the requested action of the Board. She stated that this is a technical review of the proposed Redevelopment Plan for the Heritage House Redevelopment Area. A copy of the draft Plan and a copy of the North Carolina Urban Redevelopment provisions, out of the General Statutes, were provided to each Board member. The Redevelopment Area for the Heritage House is a total of ±6.9 acres which includes both the Event Center which was not declared blighted and the condominium complex that this Board declared blighted last September. Ms. Cockburn explained the Plan is broken into several sections that correspond to the elements required under the NC Urban Redevelopment Law. An existing conditions report was compiled last spring which includes a range of data that influences the development potential for this site, including employment and income in this study area lag behind the City as a whole; the median income in this area is roughly half of the City as a whole; and the unemployment rate is almost 19%. The high level of residential vacancy in the area indicates the residential market is very soft, and replacing units in this location could further depress the market. The location itself has excellent access to two interstate interchanges and relatively high traffic counts, particularly along Randleman Road. Commercial space along Randleman Road is well occupied and there is a growing demand for light industrial and warehouse uses in this area. This location is not in a residential neighborhood, but is surrounded by commercial, Light Industrial and institutional uses. The Connections 2025 Comprehensive Plan calls for industrial and corporate park uses in this area, and no changes to the proposed future land use plan are suggested with the Redevelopment Plan.

There were two primary documents that were commissioned that influenced the recommendations in the Redevelopment Plan. The first is a structural analysis that was produced by SKA Engineering who performed both a visual and code review of the structure and produced estimates to compare the relative costs of renovating the building versus demolition. Renovation requires the replacement of almost all the major elements of the building: stairs, elevators, reconfiguration of the units, repair of structural connections between each concrete slab, significant repair to the exterior of the building, replacement of the windows, roofing and mechanical and fire suppression systems. The probable construction costs exceeded \$16 million compared to the selected demolition which would preserve the Meridian Center, as is, and repair locations where the buildings were connected at just over \$1 million. The second report was a market analysis produced by Teska Associates which demonstrated the weaknesses in the housing market in the vicinity of this site and highlighted the growing demand for Light Industrial space. The condition of the building and a weak housing market led to a set of recommendations that are found in the Plan for the reuse of the site.

Three conceptual site reuse scenarios are included in the Plan. These are conceptual in nature and are meant to be illustrative of what is possible for the site in the future. In each of the scenarios, the Meridian Center is preserved. The first concept is a business park that would allow for the expansion of senior services complementary to facilities adjacent to the site. The second concept expands the light industrial footprint by adding an additional building for a total of 32,000 square feet. The third scenario includes light industrial and indoor recreational uses on the site. All three scenarios aim at adding jobs to the area.

The Redevelopment Area as currently zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD), a district that allows a diverse mixture of residential and non-residential uses in accordance with an adopted Unified Development Plan. The current zoning scheme is tied to a Plan that does not support any of the proposed reuse scenarios. In order for redevelopment to occur, the site is proposed to be rezoned at a future date to a Conditional Use PUD, to allow for the development of both a new Unified Development Plan for this site that would support the reuse concepts and allow for some of the continuing controls. The site has significant public road frontage on Village Green Drive and an existing driveway connection to West Meadowview Road with limited frontage. Both roads are in good condition and offer curb and gutter cross-sections and adequate right-of-way. A sidewalk is proposed along the south side of Village Green Drive to improve pedestrian access to the site.

The estimated costs include all of the things that would need to be done in order to purchase the site and get it ready for future development. Acquisition includes appraisals, legal fees, staff support and some contingency. The demolition costs are primarily for the contract to demolish the site and make necessary repairs to the Meridian Center. Disposition includes all of the costs that the City would incur over the course of holding the property and preparing it to be developed by a third party private developer. The City proposes to use two primary funding sources to undertake these redevelopment activities; through the Capital Reserve to acquire the site and then using Nussbaum Housing Partnership Funds to do the demolition of those housing units and the disposition. These costs are expected to occur over a long period of time, anywhere between three and six years. All the blighted parcels associated with the Redevelopment Area are intended to be acquired, according to this Plan and must be for redevelopment to occur. Acquisition occurs based on a fair market value that is established by an official appraisal of the properties and each unit is taken into consideration for its own unique circumstances. The Event Center is not intended to be acquired and was included in the Redevelopment Area due to its proximity and shared interest in the surrounding parking.

The completion of the redevelopment activities within this Plan are expected to occur over numerous years and the disposition schedule could be compressed if a site developer is identified quickly and can move through the necessary steps to secure redevelopment of the site. Continuing Controls are required as part of the Redevelopment Plan and this ensures, for both the City and the Redevelopment

Commission, that the property will have some long-term stability and prevents the return of uses that blighted the property. These Continuing Controls are enforced in a number of ways, by the Redevelopment Commission applying them through Restrictive Covenants that are attached to the deed but also reinforced through things like the Unified Development Plan and the Conditional PUD zoning of the site.

The Planning Board's role is to review the elements of the Plan and make a Certification to the Redevelopment Commission that the Plan meets the standard of the Urban Redevelopment Law and to make a recommendation to the City Council to either approve, revise or deny the Plan as presented. To complete the public review process, this will go to City Council, tentatively scheduled for September 15<sup>th</sup>, and the individual property owners will be notified. More information is available on the City's website.

After a short discussion Mr. Truby moved to recommend the Heritage House Redevelopment Plan as presented by staff for consideration by City Council and to Certify to the Redevelopment Commission that the Plan includes all the required elements, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

#### **4. Annexation Petition**

**a) Proposed Contiguous Annexation PL(P) 15-06: 4016 South Elm-Eugene Street including one-half of the public right of way of both South Elm-Eugene Street and Wolftrail Road. 2.5 acres, property of South Elm-Eugene Street Partners, LLC. Northwest corner of Wolftrail Road and South Elm-Eugene Street (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Lucas Carter, Planning Department, identified the site as just south of I-85 at S. Elm-Eugene Street. The applicant is South Elm Street Partners, LLC, and commercial use is proposed for the approximately 1.77 acre property. Mr. Carter noted the site was in the Tier I growth area and is recommended for annexation. The property is considered contiguous with existing City corporate limits and is part of a concurrent rezoning. The Zoning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the rezoning at their August 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. The proposed annexation has been reviewed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC), which also recommended approval. This is scheduled to go before City Council on September 15<sup>th</sup> along with the rezoning application. City services can be provided to this property.

Mr. Allen moved to recommend the proposed annexation as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

#### **5. Easement Releases**

**a) Proposed release of a portion of a 15' wide utility easement located at 2902 Crossfield Drive, as recorded in Plat Book 90, page 50 (APPROVED)**

Sheila Stains-Ramp, Planning Department, stated that the request was for the proposed release of a 15' wide utility easement located at 2902 Crossfield Drive. All of the utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to release of this easement.

Mr. Allen moved to approve the easement release as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**b) Proposed release of a portion of a 20' wide sanitary sewer easement located at 8 Sunfish Point, as recorded in Plat Book 128, page 129. (APPROVED)**

Sheila Stains-Ramp, Planning Department, stated that the request was for the proposed release of a 20' wide sanitary sewer easement located at 8 Sunfish Point. All of the utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to release of this easement.

Mr. Truby moved to approve the easement release as presented by staff, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**c) Proposed release of a portion of a DMUE located at 9013 W. Market Street as recorded in Plat Book 138, page 80. (APPROVED)**

Sheila Stains-Ramp, Planning Department, stated that the request was for the proposed release of a portion of a DMUE located at 9013 W. Market Street. All of the utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to release of this easement.

Mr. Allen moved to approve the easement release as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**d) Proposed release of a portion of a 10'-wide utility easement located at 16 Elm Ridge Lane, as recorded in Plat Book 86, Page 54. (Attachment 5D; Staff Resource – Sheila Stains-Ramp)**

Sheila Stains-Ramp, Planning Department, stated that the request was for the proposed release of a portion of a 10' wide utility easement located at 16 Elm Ridge Lane. All of the utility companies involved have indicated their agreement to release of this easement.

Mr. Allen moved to approve the easement release as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None)

**6. Set Public Hearing for September**

**a) Street Name Change to be heard September 16 – from Spring Oak Drive to Carter Woods Drive (APPROVED)**

Steve Galanti, Planning Department, stated that the street name change process is a two-step process. The first step is for the Planning Board to set a public hearing and then at that meeting to hold the public hearing.

Mr. Truby moved to set the public hearing for September 16 for a street name change from Spring Oak Drive to Carter Woods Drive as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Steele. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Parker, Steele, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**7. Amendment to Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLUM):**

**a) CP-15-09: Portion of 4001 Springbrook Drive from Low Residential to Commercial; 1 acre.**

Hanna Cockburn, Planning Department, identified the site location and characteristics, noting that the area and site were split between the Commercial and the Low Residential GFLUM categories. She noted the area around the intersection of Springbrook Drive and Holden Road was transitional, with a variety of uses. Ms. Cockburn reminded the Board that any comments they offer on the change in Generalized Future Land Use would be incorporated into the staff report that would be considered by the Zoning Commission at the rezoning.

Chair Isaacson commented on the split-designation of the site, and noted his concern about the provision of proper buffers between any future commercial uses and the existing residential in the area.

Mr. Atkins stated that the transitional nature of the area in his view made the GFLUM amendment appropriate. Chair Isaacson noted the proposal seemed a sensible resolution to the split-designation situation.

Mr. Truby left the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

**b) CP-15-10: 102, 104 and 105 E. Vandalia Road, and 108 W. Vandalia Road, from Low Residential and Moderate Residential to Mixed Use Commercial.**

Hanna Cockburn, Planning Department, identified the site location and characteristics, and noted the pattern of development to date, with the present GFLUM amendment proposing a move from Low Residential and Moderate Residential to Mixed Use Commercial. She noted the mixture of uses in the vicinity, including High Density Residential, Mixed Use Commercial, and Industrial and Corporate Park uses.

Board members noted that the intersection has been drawing more interest for non-residential, locally serving uses, and the change would support that. Mr. Isaacson as well as other Board members stated that the change made sense for the area.

**8. ITEMS FROM THE CHAIR**

Chair Isaacson stated that he had nothing to add.

**9. ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Isaacson acknowledged that the absence of Mr. Martin, Mr. Mossman and Mr. Bryson as approved.

Hanna Cockburn stated that the City Council did approve the Fresh Food Retail Access Plan that was presented to the Board at a previous meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz

Planning Director  
SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
September 16, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, September 16, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Marc Isaacson, Chairman; Steve Allen, Vice-Chair; Day Atkins, Richard Bryson, Richard Mossman, Chuck Truby. City staff present included Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Hanna Cockburn, Nicole Smith, Sheila Carmon and Sheila Stains-Ramp, from the Planning Department, and Cyndi Blue and Caitlin Bower from Neighborhood Development. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

Chairman Isaacson welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**1. MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Allen moved approval of the August 19, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**a) Street Name Change: From Spring Oak Drive to Carter Woods Drive.  
(CONTINUED TO OCTOBER)**

GIS Analyst Sheila Carmon, Planning Department, presented a map of the Street Name Change proposal and stated the Planning Board was asked to make a recommendation regarding the proposed street name change from Spring Oak Drive to Carter Woods Drive. She noted that 'Spring Oak Court' and 'Spring Oak Drive' are adjacent to each other along Country Woods Lane, and this has caused some confusion with Emergency Management for dispatch and delivery of services.

Ms. Carmon stated that Spring Oak Drive was recommended for the change as it is the newer of the two streets, and there are fewer residents on the street. She confirmed that letters were sent to property owners and residents asking for suggestions of a new name and no submittals were received. She stated that the change is proposed in the interest of public safety to eliminate confusion for emergency services, and that the renaming is in accordance with the Street Naming Manual. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) has recommended the street name change. If approved, the City will notify the utility companies and services agencies as well as the post office. Residents would still have to make their own changes to banking and other records and accounts.

Mr. Bryson asked when this would take effect if approved. Ms. Carmon stated it would take effect immediately upon Council adoption, and the residents and property owners would have 30 days to comply. Chair Isaacson asked if it is up to each owner or resident to notify the post office. Ms. Carmon stated that they would have to fill out a change of address form, but the City would also notify the post office.

Chair Isaacson opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak on this matter.

Brandon Lock, 1 Spring Oak Drive, stated that he had a petition signed by residents along Spring Oak Drive who are opposed to the name change. He noted that in his particular case, as a truck driver with a CDL, changing his license would be costly, and there would also be the costs of getting new checks and making changes to banking and other accounts, as well as all other notifications that would have to be made. He stated the petition indicates the residents have been here for many years and do not want to have to change their address, and so far as they were aware there had been no problems in getting emergency services along this street.

In response to questions by Board members, Ms. Carmon stated that she was not aware of specific instances of emergency vehicles going to the wrong address, but that Emergency Services had identified these streets as being a concern, especially with the similar numbering involved for homes on the two streets. She confirmed that the same process would be involved even if the street names remained the same and just the address numbers were changed. She noted that the Greensboro Department of Transportation initiated this street name change.

Howard Evans, #4 Spring Oak Drive, stated that he is an original owner on this street, having been there since 1988. He stated that there have been calls for emergency services along the street through the years and he does not know of any problems in the correct address being found.

With no other speakers, Chair Isaacson closed the hearing.

After a short discussion Mr. Truby moved that this matter be continued to the October meeting and someone from Emergency Services be requested to come to the meeting regarding these questions, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**b) LDO Text Amendment: Recommendation on a Land Development Ordinance Text Amendment regarding Section 30-15-4 to define what constitutes a "Convenience Store (with Fuel Pumps) for the use specifically identified in the Permitted Use Table. (APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)**

Planning Manager Steve Galanti stated that the proposed text amendment adds a definition to 30-15-4 of the Land Development Ordinance that defines a Convenience Store (with Fuel Pumps) for the use called out in the Permitted Use Table. The amendment adds the ability for a convenience store to have a limited number of truck fueling dispensers, but does not allow for overnight parking or other facilities similar to those found in the typical truck stop.

He noted that at the August Planning Board meeting staff had presented a text amendment to define "Truck Stops"; after comments from representatives of the Neighborhood Congress and the applicant, he had recommended and the Planning Board had agreed to continue the matter for further work. Conversations with the concerned parties led to the present amendment.

Mr. Galanti noted that convenience stores with fuel pumps are in the Retail Sales and Service use group found in the Permitted Use Table. Convenience stores with fuel pumps are allowed in all Commercial districts (other than C-N), in all Mixed Use districts (other than MU-L), and in the Business Park district, the Light Industrial and the Heavy Industrial districts. He further stated that in several of those districts development standards required incorporation of architectural and site design features to aid in compatibility with nearby residential uses. The Planning Board's recommendation would next go to the City Council for their public hearing on the proposal.

In response to a question from Mr. Allen, Mr. Galanti stated that under current regulations the addition of fueling stations for trucks would in and of itself re-define the convenience store as a truck stop. The present amendment arose from the recognition that the problem was better addressed by defining a convenience store in the ordinance and clarifying the limited truck fueling as within the definition.

Chair Isaacson opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter.

Frankie Jones, attorney representing Sheetz, stated that they are in support of the text amendment drafted by staff. Mr. Pendergraph, the representative of the Neighborhood Congress, was in attendance and offered no comments.

There being no other speakers, Chair Isaacson closed the public hearing.

Mr. Allen moved to recommend approval of the text amendment to Council, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**c) LDO Text Amendment: Recommendation regarding Section 30-8-10/1(H) Multi-Family Dwellings and 30-11.4.10 Parking Reductions to Expand the Permitted Multi-Family Options in the C-M, C-H and BP districts (Continued to October Meeting)**

Planning Manager Mike Kirkman presented a text amendment intended to expand the opportunities for multi-family development in certain commercial districts. He noted several policies in the City's Comprehensive Plan 2025 encourage a mix of housing choices and supportive non-residential uses and services in proximity to each other. In particular he cited policies relating to activity centers, where higher density residential is expected, and re-investment corridors, where older commercial areas may be enhanced with the introduction of other uses. He also noted the Plan's encouragement of mixed use districts, where mutually supportive uses are allowed, and re-investment infill policies, where older developed sites are the context for new uses that make the sites more viable and often more compatible with surrounding development.

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the current LDO requirements, saying the LDO allows multi-family in C-M, C-H and BP zoning districts but limits them to a percentage of the overall square footage of development.

He outlined the components of the proposed amendment, which would remove the cap for multi-family development under a specific set of circumstances. The base requirements would be that

the residential component be integrated into an existing commercial development and include connectivity between the two; that there be an integrated approach to architectural design; and that the project be organized as an IMUD. There would also be the requirement that the development be directly accessible from a thoroughfare, and either within an activity center or reinvestment corridor, or be directly accessible to a greenway, or be located within 1,320' of a usable portion of a public park as measured along a system of public sidewalks and crosswalks. Mr. Kirkman further noted that residential buildings would use the dimensional standards of the associated commercial district rather than the multifamily standards of 30-8-10.1(H) to encourage consistency in scale and size with the nonresidential uses, and that the project would be eligible for a flat 25% reduction in required parking to acknowledge the better integration of residential and nonresidential uses and to encourage incorporation of facilities for other means of transportation.

He noted that, as there may be projects potentially suitable but not meeting these standards, a route for them to be considered would be established, through the site-specific evaluation allowed by a Special Use Permit, with protection offered to surrounding properties through the necessary findings to be made in granting the SUP.

Chair Isaacson opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak on the matter.

Jeff Nimmer, Kotis Properties, 1420 Mill Street, stated that, in general, this is a good change for the Ordinance allowing for more infill development opportunities throughout the City, and staff has done a good job of bringing a lot of different stakeholders together to formulate the ground rules and build support for the broader options. He noted that Kotis has been evaluating potential projects under these changes and they have one in particular that they think makes a lot of sense as a location for adding in multifamily, but it is not doable without going for a Special Use Permit. Mr. Nimmer requested that changes be made to the draft ordinance that would allow their prospective development without a Special Use Permit.

Judy Stalder, Regulatory Affairs Director with TREBIC, stated that the TREBIC members worked closely with staff as stakeholders on this project to expand the ability to develop multifamily and support the text amendment.

There being no other speakers, Chair Isaacson closed the hearing.

After a short discussion, Mr. Bryson moved to continue this matter to the October meeting to allow more conversation with the stakeholders, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

Chair Isaacson recused himself from the following matter.

**d) LDO Text Amendment: Recommendation on a Land Development Ordinance Text Amendment regarding Section 30-9-5.1(B) Subsection 2, to adjust the threshold for Type B Outdoor Display. (RECOMMENDED)**

Senior Planner Nicole Smith presented the proposed amendment, explaining that there are two categories of permissible outdoor display. Type A allows up to 15% of the gross floor area of the retail business or center to be in outdoor display. Type B is applicable when the majority of the retail space is outdoors, such as is the case with garden nurseries, vehicle sales, manufactured home sales and similar uses. There is a gap between the 15% maximum of Type A and the 50% minimum of Type B Outdoor Display. She noted that with the amendment the minimum for Type B Outdoor Display would change from 'a majority' of the retail space being outdoors, to 'at least 40%' of the retail space being outdoors.

Ms. Smith stated the proposed amendment would accommodate the diversity of newer retail business models, and that the text amendment was requested as a result of discussions with such a retailer. The requirement that the sales be to the general public would not change

Staff recommended approval of this text amendment.

Vice-Chair Allen stated that the item was subject to a public hearing, and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on the matter.

Amanda Hodierne, attorney for the applicant, stated that the text amendment was submitted on behalf of a developer with a client interesting in having a significant amount of outdoor display area, but less than 50% of the retail area. Because they do not have the footprint of a larger business, they cannot meet the class A standards for outdoor display.

There being no other speakers, Vice-Chair Allen closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bryson recommended the text amendment as proposed by staff, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None. Abstained: Isaacson.)

Chair Isaacson returned to the dais.

### **3. Public Hearing**

#### **a) Presentation of the Greensboro Comprehensive Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) for federal programs within fiscal year 2014-2015 (HEAR COMMENTS AND CONCERNS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC PRIOR TO SUBMITTAL TO HUD.)**

Grants Compliance Administrator Caitlin Bowers stated that the CAPER is prepared annually for submission to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and measures performance toward the goals of the five year Consolidated Plan. The public hearing fulfills the citizen participation requirements set forth by HUD. The HUD funding supports the Community Development Block Grant, the HOME program, the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, and the Emergency Solutions Grant. These funds are used for large and small community development projects like Willow Oaks, the South Elm Street Redevelopment Plan, brownfields remediation, rental and homeowner-occupied housing unit rehabilitation, rental and new homeowner reconstruction, homebuyer assistance and counseling, Fair Housing activities,

economic development and small business assistance, and homelessness prevention activities. The report also includes information about Burlington, Alamance County, and Guilford County as participating agencies in the HOME program and housing consortium, of which Greensboro serves as the lead agency. Ms. Bowers noted the full report was available upon request.

Chair Isaacson opened the public hearing. No speakers came forward to comment, and the Chair closed the hearing.

Mr. Truby moved to accept recommend the CAPER report, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

Mr. Isaacson recused himself from the following item.

#### **4. Unified Development Plan - Pilot at Sedgefield (APPROVED)**

Planning Manager Steve Galanti reminded the Board that a Unified Development Plan is required for properties zoned PUD (Planned Unit Development) to show the uses, amount of development (square footage, units, as relevant), and the dimensional standards that will govern each Section or Phase of a PUD project. The approved Unified Development Plan is recorded in the Guilford County Register of Deeds to put all present and future property owners on notice to those regulations.

The Unified Development Plan before the Board today is for a 131 acre property located on West Gate City Blvd; it has been reviewed by the TRC and found to contain all the information required by the Land Development Ordinance for the development of the property. TRC recommended approval.

Mr. Mossman realized that his firm had current dealings with the property and that he needed to recuse himself. With both Mr. Mossman and Mr. Isaacson recused the Board was left without a quorum to take action on the item. Mitchell Brandon, the applicant, stated that Henry Isaacson did represent them on an item that was before the Board several months ago, but Marc Isaacson has not been involved in this matter.

After some discussion it was determined that Mr. Isaacson would not need to be recused from this item and it could move forward today.

Mr. Truby moved to approve the UDP – Pilot at Sedgefield, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Bryson, Atkins, Allen, and Isaacson. Nays: None. Abstained: Mossman.)

#### **5. Annexation Petition**

- a) Proposed Annexation PL(P) 15-10: 4706 Sharon Donna Drive, 0.527 acres, Property of Clemente McWilliams. South Side of Sharon Donna Drive and East of Youngs Mill Road. (RECOMMENDED)**

Planning Manager Steve Galanti stated that the annexation is located at 4706 Sharon Donna Drive and contains approximately 0.527 acre. The property is within Tier 1 Growth Area (2013-2019) on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. City water is available by connecting to the existing 8-inch line located within Sharon Donna Drive. City sanitary sewer is available by connecting to the existing 8-inch line located within Sharon Donna Drive. The City's Fire Department notes that the site is currently serviced, and upon annexation would continue to be served, by City Station #56 on Franklin Boulevard. The Police Department estimated service can be provided with little difficulty. This item has been reviewed by TRC and they recommend the annexation.

Mr. Truby recommended approval of the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

Mr. Isaacson recused himself from the following item.

- b) Proposed Annexation PL(P) 15-08: 4104 and 4106 South Elm-Eugene Street, including one-half of the public right of way of both South Elm-Eugene and Wolfetrail Road, 4.14 acres, Property of the Righard and Julie Greene Revocable Living Trust, Judy and Obed Smith, and Charles Benbow Family Trust, Southwest Corner of Wolfetrail Road and South Elm-Eugene Street. (RECOMMENDED)**

Planning Manager Steve Galanti stated that the approximately 4 acre annexation is located on the southwest corner of Wolfetrail Road and S. Elm-Eugene Street. It is located in Tier 1 Growth Area (2013-2019) on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. City water is available by extending and connecting to the existing 12-inch line located to the north of the site. City sanitary sewer is available by extending and connecting to the existing 8-inch line located to the northeast of the site. The City's Fire Department noted that the site is currently served by Pinecroft-Sedgefield Station #24 on Bishop Road and will be served by City Station #61 on West Vandalia Road upon annexation. The Police Department estimates service can be provided with little difficulty. The item has been reviewed by TRC and they recommend the annexation.

Mr. Bryson recommended approval of the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Truby. The Board voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None. Abstained: Isaacson.)

Mr. Isaacson returned to the dais.

- c) Proposed Annexaton PL(P) 15-11: 4903 Trailwood Drive, 1.001 acres, Property of Nancy Schmidt, East Side of Trailwood Drive between Grandover Parkway and Woodcroft Circle. (RECOMMENDED)**

Planning Manager Steve Galanti stated that the approximately 1 acre annexation is located in Tier 1 Growth Area (2013-2019) on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. City water is available by connection to the existing 12-inch line located within Trailwood Drive. City sanitary

sewer is available by connecting to the existing 12-inch line located to the east of the site. The City's Fire Department noted the site is currently serve by Pinecroft-Sedgefield Station #24 on Bishop Road and will be served by both Pinecroft-Sedgefield Station #24 and City Station #48 on West Vandalia Road upon annexation. The Police Department estimated service can be provided with little difficulty. The item has been reviewed by TRC and they recommended approval of the annexation.

Mr. Allen recommended approval of the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Atkins. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**d) Proposed Annexation PL(P) 15-09: 104 East Vandalia Road, .29 acres, Property of Tim McGehee, Southeast Corner of East Vandalia Road and South Elm-Eugene Street. (RECOMMENDED)**

Planning Manager Steve Galanti stated that the approximately 0.29 acre annexation is located in the Tier 1 Growth Area (2013-2019) of the Growth Strategy Map contained in the Comprehensive Plan. City water is available by extending and connecting to the existing 8-inch line located within South Elm-Eugene St. City sanitary sewer is available by connecting to the existing 8-inch line located within either South Elm-Eugene Street or north of the site. The City's Fire Department noted the site is currently served, and upon annexation would continue to be served, by City Station #61 on West Vandalia Road. The Police Department estimates services can be provided with little difficulty. The item has been reviewed by TRC and they recommended approval of the annexation.

Mr. Truby recommended approval of the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**6. Easement Releases:**

**a. Proposed release of all of a 30' DMUE and a 60' DMUE located at 110 E. Meadowview Road as recorded in Plat Book 24, Page 17. (APPROVED)**

Planner Shayna Thiel stated that all utility companies have recommended their support of this easement release.

Mr. Allen moved approval of the easement release, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**b. Proposed release of a portion of a 1.04' by 7.96' portion of a 20' wide utility easement located at 815 Rollingwood Drive, as recorded in Plat Book 41, Page 37. (APPROVED)**

Planner Shayna Thiel stated that all utility companies have recommended their support of this easement release.

Mr. Allen moved approval of the easement release, seconded by Mr. Atkins. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Truby, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**7. Amendment to Generalized Future Land Use Plan (GFLUM) (APPROVED)  
CP-15-11: Portion of 4001 Springbrook Drive, from Commercial to Industrial/Corporate Park, 1.1 acre.**

Hanna Cockburn stated that the Board has made comments on the portion of the same property on the east side of Holden Road at a previous meeting. According to tax records the two pieces are parts of one parcel and were assigned only one address despite being on opposite sides of Holden Road. The proposed amendment to Industrial/Corporate Park is in support of a proposed rezoning.

**Board Comments:**

Mr. Truby stated that he feels this is a wise use of the property, and he does not think it will ever have retail on it as retail would be more in place further north on Holden Road. Other Board members also felt that this would be a good use of the property.

Mr. Truby left at 5:45 for the remainder of the meeting.

**Items from Staff:**

- a. Update on Housing RFP awards and projects

Cyndi Blue provided an update on the status of the various tax credit and financing awards made for the housing projects the Board had heard from in earlier meetings.

**Items from the Chair:**

Chair Isaacson stated that he wanted to provide a big thank you to staff for all their hard work during these past several weeks given the staffing and workload challenges.

Chair Isaacson encouraged Board members to review the draft agenda upon receipt and notify staff if there may be a conflict with any of the items.

**Items from Board Members:**

None

**Approval of Absences:**

Chair Isaacson acknowledged the absence of Mr. Martin and Ms. Parker; Mr. Steele has resigned as he is no longer working locally.

**Adjournment:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 6:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
October 21, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, October 21, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Steve Allen, Vice Chair, Day Atkins, Richard Bryson, Richard Mossman, Celia Parker, John Martin and Homer Wade. City staff present included Mike Kirkman, Sheila Carmon, Shayna Thiel, Jeff Sovich, Dana Clukey and Sheila Stains-Ramp. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

Vice Chair Allen welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board. He also welcomed the Board's newest member, Homer Wade.

**1. MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Bryson moved approval of the September 16, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Bryson, Mossman, Martin, Atkins, Parker and Wade. Nays: None.)

**2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- a) Street Name Change: Recommendation on a Street Name Change from Spring Oak Drive to Carter Woods Drive. **(APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)**

Sheila Carmon, GIS Analyst, summarized the proposed street name change as initially presented to the Planning Board in September, noting the Board was being asked to make a recommendation on the change from Spring Oak Drive to Carter Woods Drive. Ms. Carmon stated that Spring Oak Court and Spring Oak Drive are adjacent to each other and have the same number range, which has caused confusion for Emergency Management to dispatch and deliver services. She noted that of the two Spring Oak Drive is the more recently recorded street and has fewer homes on it, which factored into the recommendation that Spring Oak Drive be the name changed. She noted that letters had been sent to property owners and residents asking for re-naming suggestions and no responses were received.

Ms. Carmon also noted that there were two people at last month's meeting providing a petition indicating opposition to the change from residents on the street. In response, the Board had requested that a representative of Emergency Services attend the October meeting to address the concerns raised. Ms. Carmon stated Glen Lanham, Metro 911 Support Services Manager, was in attendance to comment and answer questions the Board might have.

She summarized that the City considered the change in the interest of public safety by eliminating a source of confusion for Emergency Services, and stated that the change is in accordance with the City's Addressing and Street Naming Manual. She stated the Technical Review Committee (TRC) had also recommended the street name change. If approved, the City will notify the utility companies and services agencies as well as the post office. Residents would still have to make their own changes.

Glen Lanham, Metro 9-1-1 Support Services Manager, stated that a review of their call tracking system indicated 5 or 6 instances where addresses had been confused in responding to calls. He noted that these may or may not be life-threatening situations. Their staff supports the street name change for safety reasons.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter. No one from the public was in attendance for the item.

After a short discussion and questions by the Board members, Mr. Martin moved that this street name change be recommended to City Council, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Atkins, Bryson, Parker, Martin, Mossman and Wade. Nays: None.)

- b) LDO Text Amendment: Recommendation on a Land Development Ordinance Text Amendment regarding Section 30-8-10.1 (H) Multi-Family Dwellings and 30-11-4.10 Parking Reduction to expand the permitted multifamily options in the CC-M, C-H and BP districts. **(APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)**

Mike Kirkman presented a brief overview of the reason for the requested amendment and the basics of the proposed changes to the LDO. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan actively supports mixed development (residential and non-residential uses) from perspectives of housing choice, quality infill development, best use of public infrastructure and support to economic development. He further noted that while the Comprehensive Plan encourages mixed development throughout the City, it particularly identifies key areas such as reinvestment corridors/areas and activity centers and areas with Mixed Use future land use classifications as spaces best suited for such development. Mr. Kirkman then reviewed the current provisions in the Land Development Ordinance that allow multifamily dwellings, from residential multifamily zoning districts to limited options for residential development in commercial zoning districts. These options may either be done by right or following a rezoning conversation.

RM- zoning districts allow multifamily development with density ranges of 5 to 40 units per acre. The PUD zoning district basically allows for and encourages a mixture of uses in a planned setting and provides a lot of flexibility in terms of development standards in exchange for having unified development. There is no maximum residential density listed in a PUD district and there are various PUD districts throughout the City. There are also mixed use (MU-) zoning districts, included those recently applied to the Gate City Boulevard reinvestment corridor. In the mixed use districts there is no maximum residential density, but at least 30% of the gross square footage must be residential and at least 30% must be non-residential. A rezoning may be needed to get to one of these districts. Additionally the Commercial Medium (C-M), Commercial High (C-H) and Business Park (BP) zoning districts allow multifamily development, but caps the amount of residential to a maximum of 33% of the overall square footage of the development. Mr. Kirkman further added that there are two variations to this standard. One is no cap for residential development if it is part of a vertical mixed use building where there is ground-floor commercial or office and residential uses are limited to upper levels. The other is tied solely to the C-M district where a 100% residential project could be developed if the site is less than 1 acre in size and there are commercial services in immediate proximity (no more than 1/8 mile) and directly accessible to the residential development.

Mr. Kirkman then reviewed the framework for the proposed text amendment, noting the specific areas of the City that were deemed most appropriate for the desired mixed development. He also noted that if a site does not meet the proposed site requirements for staff only review there was still an option to request a Special Use Permit. This allowed for a public discussion through a quasijudicial hearing focused around information presented solely during the public hearing, with any appeals to superior court. Mr. Kirkman concluded with a summary of information that was updated after the September Planning Board discussion on this item. This included clarification on when to apply the Integrated Multiple Use Development (IMUD) provisions, clarification on the requirements for open space for new multifamily (use the more urban PUD standards versus more suburban general standards) and noted the potential location map references both minor and major thoroughfares.

Vice Chair Allen asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Jeff Nimmer, representing Kotis Properties, 1420 Mill Street, stated that they are in support of the text amendment as drafted by staff and were directly involved in meetings held with various developers in coming up with the framework for the amendment. Mr. Nimmer also agreed that the LDO speaks directly to an attempt to foster mixes of uses and encourage infill development. However Mr. Nimmer stated that the text amendment, as currently written, does not address some of the needs of the community, as a whole. He presented a handout for the Board members' review and highlighted a site he thinks would work for new residential development tied to existing commercial development. This would be an ideal site to add multifamily to the area and satisfies the intent of the text amendment, but as written would not qualify. Mr. Nimmer then suggested adjusting the proposed text amendment to also allow new residential development if site is within 500 feet of a major or minor thoroughfare and is either within 2,640 feet (1/2 mile) and accessible to an existing or planned greenway shown on the adopted Bi-Ped Plan or located within 2,640 feet (1/2 mile) and accessible to a usable portion of the public park, as measured along a system of public sidewalks and streets. This change would maintain the spirit of the text amendment and ensure that this site could be developed in an appropriate manner by right since the site is already zoned Commercial High (C-H). Mr. Nimmer also noted that allowing multifamily on this site would generate half as much traffic as if it were developed with retail facilities. In addition, traffic is handled at the TRC level and if there are needs for additional turn lanes that would happen during their review.

Michael Pendergraft, representing the Greensboro Neighborhood Congress, stated that they represent 50-84 different neighborhoods in Greensboro and they are a coalition that tries to direct its interest only to city-wide issues. The Executive Committee of the Greensboro Neighborhood Congress has authorized him to state that they support these changes as long as they are reviewed again in a reasonable timeframe (maybe two years) to find out how successfully the provisions had been used. He stated that the public should have input as to what a developer wants to do if a proposed development is outside the box that Planning staff feels is appropriate for by right review. He added that this proposed amendment should not be evaluated based on an individual project but looked at for city-wide implications.

There being no other speakers, the public hearing was closed. Planning Board members noted that while they thought the potential site presented by Mr. Nimmer makes some sense for new multifamily development with adjacent commercial uses, they expressed concerns on the city-wide impact of the proposed changes by Mr. Nimmer. Mr. Martin also mentioned he had received an email from TREBIC expressing support for the text amendment. After additional

discussion Mr. Bryson moved to recommend the text amendment as presented by staff with the additional stipulation that it will be revisited with an evaluation within a two year period, seconded by Ms. Parker. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Parker, Martin, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins and Wade. Nays: None.)

Mr. Wade asked to be recused from the following item.

### 3. EASEMENT RELEASES:

- a. Proposed release of all of a 20' drainage easement located at 2200 Sixteenth Street, as recorded in Plat Book 60, page 121. **(APPROVED, FINAL ACTION)**

Shayna Thiel stated that all utility companies have recommended their support of this easement release.

There being no questions, Mr. Martin moved approval of the easement release, seconded by Mr. Mossman. The Board voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Parker, Martin, Bryson, Mossman, Atkins. Nays: None. Abstained: Wade)

### 4. GENERALIZED FUTURE LAND USE MAP (GFLUM) AMENDMENTS:

- a. CP-15-13: 4803 and 4807 Hardindale Drive, and 635 Muirs Chapel Road; From Low Residential to Moderate Residential; 11.83 acres. **(COMMENTS ONLY)**

Jeff Sovich stated the site, currently designated as Low Residential, is proposed to be changed to Moderate Residential. Low Residential supports densities of 3 to 5 units per acre; Moderate Residential supports densities of 5 to 12 units per acre. Mr. Sovich noted the rezoning request generating the GFLUM amendment request is for a townhome-style project under RM-12 zoning. He indicated the range of residential densities in the area, including a greater-density multifamily development north of the site, as well as the lower-density single-family development generally in the area.

The applicant, Brad Deaton, 1400 Battleground Avenue, stated that he was available to answer any questions the Board members might have.

#### Board Comments:

Mr. Atkins stated the request provided for a good transition from single-family to the higher-density apartments in the area. Mr. Martin agreed, noting the existing multifamily and proposed project were not immediately adjacent but were sufficiently near each other to be a nice step-down for density in the area. Other members also commented on their general agreement that this would be a good use of the property in this area.

- b. CP-15-14: 3619 and 3629 Lewiston Road, 3410 Crimson Wood Dr, from Low Residential to Moderate Residential **(COMMENTS ONLY)**

Jeff Sovich noted the change in the request from what had initially been indicated for the agenda. Initially the request was for Mixed Use Corporate Park; this has been modified to a request for Moderate Residential.

Mr. Sovich stated the site, currently designed as Low Residential with a small amount of Mixed Use Corporate Park, is proposed to be changed to Moderate Residential. Moderate Residential supports densities of 5 to 12 units per acre.

**Board Comments:**

Mr. Atkins felt that this is a good transition from the single family uses in the area, particularly given the airport noise cone overlay in the area, noting how the whole area is seeing changes. Other Board members agreed.

**5. ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

Dana Clukey, Planner, guided Board members through two demographics reports recently released by the Planning Department, the City Fact Sheet, and a Growth and Development brief highlighting the changing use of land in the City. She drew particular attention to the decrease in Heavy Industrial uses in terms of acreage, and to the change in the mix of types of residential uses, with the single family portion of total land use decreasing while the multifamily portion has increased.

In response to a question by Mr. Mossman, Ms. Clukey stated that this information is available on the City's website on the Data Analysis page.

Mike Kirkman stated that October is Community Planning Month and staff wished to express their appreciation to the Planning Board members for their service.

Sheila Stains-Ramp stated that starting on the first Monday of November, final and exempt plats will be taking in through the Electronic Plan Review system. The change will allow those interested parties to track their reviews and more immediately have access to review comments.

**Items from the Chair:**

None.

**Items from Board Members:**

None.

**Approval of Absences:**

Vice-Chair Allen acknowledged the absence of Mr. Isaacson as approved.

**Adjournment:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Director, Planning Department  
SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
November 18, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, November 18, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Marc Isaacson, Chair; Steve Allen, Day Atkins, Richard Bryson, Celia Parker, John Martin, and Homer Wade. City staff present included Mike Kirkman, Steve Galanti, Luke Carter, Nicole Smith, Sheila Stains-Ramp and Shayna Thiel. Also present was Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

Chair Isaacson welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the procedures of the Planning Board.

**1. MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Allen moved approval of the October 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Allen, Bryson, Martin, Atkins, Parker and Wade. Nays: None.)

**2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- a) LDO Text Amendment Recommendation on a Land Development Ordinance Text Amendment regarding Sections 30-1-3 Terms Beginning with 'C' to add Craft Distillery; 30-15-19 Terms Beginning with 'T' to amend/add Taproom/Tasting Room; Table 8-1 Permitted Uses to add Craft Distillery to specific uses under Industrial and Manufacturing Uses; and 30-8-9.1 Light Industrial Uses to add Craft Distillery and Distillery. **(RECOMMENDED)**

Nicole Smith, Planning Department, stated that the proposed ordinance amendment accomplishes three things: introduces a new principal use, the Craft Distillery, which by definition has an annual production cap of 15,000 gallons of spirits; amends the current definition of Taproom/Tasting room to accommodate a room ancillary to the production of spirits produced at a distillery, similar to the current operations of a micro-brewery; and allows the use to be permitted by right in Mixed Use and Commercial districts, including the Central Business district. Ms. Smith noted two minor corrections to the original amendment language provided to Planning Board and stated the copy provided at today's meeting includes these corrections. The first correction clarifies the consumption of spirits produced on-site and to accommodate the tasting that is permitted to occur after completion of a tour. The second correction clarifies that either a distillery or a craft distillery are permitted to have a taproom or tasting room. Ms. Smith then noted that craft distilleries must meet a variety of other regulations, enforced through the NC ABC Commission, as well as the federal ATF and Tax and Trade Bureau. The text of the proposed LDO amendment is the result of recent changes in NC Statutes effective October 1, 2015, and was requested following conversations with local entrepreneurs. Ms. Smith also noted that the proposed text was presented to representatives of both the Neighborhood Congress and TREBIC, and neither indicated any objections to the proposed language. Staff is requesting that the Planning Board make a recommendation to City Council for adoption of this text amendment.

Chair Isaacson asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Bill Norman, 1012 N. Eugene Street, stated that they are the family that requested the change. He stated that they would like to open a small scale distillery downtown and had a letter of support from Downtown Greensboro, Inc. which he submitted to the Board their review. Mr. Norman stated that they have talked to several other cities that now have distilleries in their Central Business Districts because of the tourism opportunities associated with this use. He added further that this use increases tourism downtown areas due to the requirements of the tour and tasting of not more than 1 ¼ ounces of alcohol. As such a person could not really hang out at the craft distillery and drink alcohol so patrons would naturally go to nearby businesses after visiting the distillery, particularly in downtown areas.

There being no other speakers in favor or opposition, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Martin commented that this change would allow a new use that is a great addition to the downtown area and other commercial districts.

After a short discussion and questions by the Board members, Mr. Allen moved that the above text amendment be recommended to City Council as presented, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Allen, Bryson, Parker, Martin, Atkins and Wade. Nays: None.)

### 3. EASEMENT RELEASE

Mr. Wade recused himself from the following easement release.

- a) Proposed release of portions of a 15' section of common area access and drainage easement and water quality conservation easement located at 17 Rosebay Lane, as recorded in Plat Book 125, page 28. **(APPROVED)**

Shayna Thiel stated that the utility companies were provided the request for review and have supported the requested release.

Mr. Allen moved approval of the easement release as submitted by staff, seconded by Mr. Martin. The Board voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Allen, Bryson, Parker, Martin, Atkins. Nays: None. Abstained: Wade.)

### 4. ANNEXATION PETITIONS

Chair Isaacson recused himself from the first annexation request.

- a) PL(P) 15-12: Remaining Portions of 4900 and 4908 Summit Avenue: 0.9516 acre, between existing city limits, paralleling Pine Needle Drive, and lot line near Bullard Loop. **(APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)**

Lucas Carter, Planner, stated that the annexation at 4900 and 4908 Summit Avenue contained approximately 0.95 acres and was within the Tier 1 Growth Area (2013-2019) on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. The site is contiguous to the City's primary corporate limits along its western boundary. The site is currently undeveloped and is proposed to be developed for commercial use.

Mr. Carter stated that City water is available by connecting to the existing 36-inch line located within Summit Avenue, and that there is an existing 8-inch City sanitary sewer line located to the west of the site along Summit Avenue. Since the site slopes away from Summit Avenue, the design of the development will determine whether it can be served by the existing sewer line or if an extension of an outfall from the site eastward approximately 4000 feet to an existing manhole on the east side of US 29 North will be necessary for service. The City's Fire Department noted that the site is currently served and would continue to be served upon annexation by City Station #14 on Summit Avenue. The Police Department indicated that 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. The Technical Review Committee recommended approval of the annexation.

After a short discussion, Ms. Parker moved to recommend approval of the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 6-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Allen, Bryson, Parker, Martin, Atkins and Wade. Nays: None. Abstained: Isaacson.)

- b) PL(P) 15-13: Creekside Phase 3, Portion of 3505 McConnell Road; 5.71 ac. North of McConnell Road, west of Waterlyn Drive. **(APPROVAL RECOMMENDED)**

Lucas Carter, Planner, stated the proposed annexation was of a 5.71 acre portion of 3505 McConnell Road, located within Tier 1 Growth Area (2013-2019) on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. He noted the site is currently vacant and is proposed to be developed for residential use. City water is available by connecting to the existing 16-inch line located along the south side of McConnell Road. City sanitary sewer is available by connection to the existing 24-inch outfall that runs along the west side of the site. The City's Fire Department noted that the site is currently served, and will continue to be served upon annexation, by City Station #56 on Franklin Boulevard. The Police Department estimated 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 located to the west and north. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) recommended approval of the annexation..

Mr. Bryson moved to recommend approval of the annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Allen, Bryson, Parker, Martin, Atkins and Wade. Nays: None.)

## 5. ITEMS FROM STAFF:

### a. **2016 Planning Board Meeting Calendar**

The inclusion of the 2015 meeting calendar in the agenda was noted.

## 6. ITEMS FROM THE CHAIR:

Chair Isaacson stated that he had no items to discuss except to thank Mr. Allen for chairing the past month's meeting.

## 7. ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Bryson wished everyone a happy holiday and urged them to have fun and be thankful. He thanked staff for their cooperation in answering his many questions and he looks forward to working with everyone in the coming years.

Mr. Martin asked when the process for the Affordable Housing RFP would start. Steve Galanti responded that he would contact the Neighborhood Development staff for the schedule.

Mr. Atkins asked for the status on the 'pocket neighborhood' discussions. Mike Kirkman stated that there was nothing new to report as there is not a development proposal at this time, but there have been some related conversations about different housing types, such as tiny houses. He also noted the presentation on infill development and pocket neighborhoods that the Planning Director for Knoxville, Tennessee, participated in.

**8. APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Chair Isaacson acknowledged the absence of Mr. Mossman as approved.

**Adjournment:**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz  
Planning Director  
SS/jd

**MEETING OF THE  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD  
December 16, 2015**

The Greensboro Planning Board meeting was held on Wednesday, December 16, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were: Marc Isaacson, Chairman; Day Atkins, Steve Allen, Richard Bryson, John Martin, Celia Parker, Danielle Brame and Homer Wade. City staff present included Steve Galanti, Mike Kirkman, Hanna Cockburn, Beth Benton, Barbra Harris, Ron Fields, Shayna Thiel, and Cyndi Blue. Also present was Terri Jones and Jennifer Schneier, City Attorney's Office.

**MEETING MINUTES:**

Mr. Martin moved approval of the November 18, 2015 meeting minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Bryson, Brame, Atkins, Parker, Wade, Martin and Allen. Nays: None.)

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**LDO TEXT AMENDMENT: RECOMMENDATION ON A LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT REGARDING ARTICLE 5 (ADDING SUBSECTION 30-5-6, FRONT YARD PARKING VIOLATION); SECTION 30-11-11.2(A); AND SECTION 30-22-22, PARKING FOR SINGLE-FAMILY AND DUPLEX DWELLINGS (ADDING SUBSECTION 30-11-11.5) (RECOMMENDED)**

Terri Jones stated that front yard parking is currently a zoning violation in the LDO and it is punishable by a \$50 fine for the first offense. There has been difficulty in enforcing this through the normal zoning violation process because a Notice of Violation is issued to the property owner, where the violation occurs, but the vehicle belongs to the tenant. The proposal is to change from a zoning violation, with a Notice of Violation and opportunity to cure within 30 days, to an offense against the vehicle, which would be provided by the issuance of a ticket. This requires an amendment to both the LDO and to the motor vehicles ordinance of the City code. This would provide more effective enforcement of these types of violations because the person who is actually creating the violation and owns the vehicles will be the responsible for paying the ticket. After three unpaid parking tickets within 90 days, the vehicle could be immobilized by wheel locks.

In response to a question from Mr. Atkins, Ms Jones stated that the front yard includes everything between the roadway and the front of the actual dwelling unit. Someone would have to park on an actual parking pad, driveway or other impermeable surface. Similarly, you could not park on a sidewalk. Mr. Atkins pointed out that this would present a problem for residential neighborhoods with narrow streets if a number of cars were park along the street in the grass. Ms. Jones stated that where they are parking on the street, they would continue to be able to park on the street and that this would be a complaint-driven situation so an inspector would have to investigate each situation.

Ronald McIrvine, 605 W. Market Street, Unit 210, stated that he owns rental property near UNCG and has tried for the past several years to gain additional restrictions on front yard parking. There are many rental properties in the area, as well as other areas of the City and there have

been many problems with front yard parking for rental properties. Unfortunately, many landlords do not provide designated parking areas. Most front yard parking is a blight on the neighborhood and makes an undesirable appearance of these properties. Enforcement of the current parking violation is almost impossible and he feels that the new ordinance would be easier to enforce.

Mr. Atkins stated that he was concerned about the temporary situations that may arise due to a party or another gathering and someone being ticketed for illegal parking. He feels that there should be some accommodation for temporary parking in these situations.

Mr. Allen stated that he also has concerns about the proposed ordinance being placed on everyone because there are different circumstances that may arise from time to time.

Barbara Harris, Director of Neighborhood Development, stated that front yard parking is currently enforced by the City's Code of Compliance Division in Neighborhood Development and the violations are complaint-driven. Typically, the front yard parking complaint is due to a vehicle that is parked in front of the front door. The City is not out patrolling for these violations and if it is a special event, the Inspector has the discretion to warn the violator. However, if there is a complaint and a continuing violation, the owner of the vehicle will be ticketed.

Mr. Bryson moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Bryson, Parker, Brame, Wade, Martin, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**HEATH PARK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AMENDMENT, CP-15-12: 625 FRANKLIN BOULEVARD, FROM LOW RESIDENTIAL TO MIXED USE RESIDENTIAL, 0.38 ACRES (RECOMMENDED)**

Hanna Cockburn stated that this is a revision to the Future Land Use Map within the Heath Community Strategic Plan located on the corner of Afton and Franklin Boulevard. The request is to change the designation from Low Residential to Mixed Use Residential. The area in question is just under ½ acre. The Low Residential category includes predominantly single-family residences on lots greater than one third of an acre and future residential developments of conventional subdivisions. The Mixed Use Residential category applies to neighborhoods and districts where the predominant use is residential but where compatible local-serving nonresidential uses can be introduced. She also stated that the neighborhood endorses the amendment as submitted.

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

Mr. Martin moved to recommend the plan amendment to City Council, seconded by Mr. Allen. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Bryson, Parker, Brame, Wade, Martin, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

**LDO TEXT AMENDMENT: AMEND SUBSECTION E OF SECTION 30-14-7.3, FREESTANDING SIGNS AND SUBSECTION (A) OF SECTION 30-7-8.11, - VCO VISUAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY REPLACE "LEE STREET" AND "HIGH POINT ROAD" WITH "GATE CITY BOULEVARD" AND TO EXPAND AREAS WHERE POLE MOUNTED BANNERS ARE ALLOWED. (RECOMMENDED)**

Mike Kirkman stated that the proposed amendment includes two components. One is to update the references in the LDO to change High Point Road to Gate City Boulevard. City Council took action to change the road name effective July 1, 2015. The second part of the amendment is to expand and clarify where pole mounted banners can be placed. Currently, the pole mounted banners are limited to specific areas around the Coliseum, Downtown, East Market Street, in front of governmental facilities, as part of national registered districts, adjacent to college and university campuses, and with public improvement projects. This amendment will more accurately reflect the purpose of the pole mounted banners.

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

Mr. Allen moved to recommend the text amendment to City Council, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 8-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Isaacson, Bryson, Parker, Brame, Wade, Martin, Atkins and Allen. Nays: None.)

### **ITEMS FROM STAFF:**

#### **AFFORDABLE HOUSING UPDATE**

Cyndi Blue gave an update to the Board members and explained that each year the city goes through a process of selecting funding opportunities for the development of affordable housing. Staff's concern is providing new, quality affordable housing units in a geographic distribution across the city. For this year's process there will be \$1.3 million available but that may change as the process moves along. The city receives federal HOME program dollars from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and those funds are specifically for the production, preservation and maintenance of affordable housing. The city participates in a consortium with Guilford County, the City of Burlington, and Alamance County. Greensboro, as the largest entity, receives the funds and is the lead entity to distribute those funds to the funding partners.

Ms. Blue also asked if there were any Board members that would be interested in serving on the subcommittee to distribute HOME funds. Mr. Bryson, Mr. Allen and Ms. Parker volunteered to serve on the subcommittee. Emails will be sent to these members with information for available dates and times.

Mike Kirkman stated that City Council approved the amendment to add craft distilleries into the ordinance. There is one project in the downtown area that will be moving forward as a result of that approval.

### **ITEMS FROM THE CHAIR:**

Chair Isaacson welcomed the Board's newest member, Danielle Brame.

#### **SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR**

Russell Barrett, 610 Glover Street, stated that he is trying to reorganize the Arlington Park neighborhood and find out what they need to do to maintain their 501-3C status. He would like someone from the Planning Department to speak to the neighborhood residents and provide information about grant funds to be used in the neighborhood.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

The absence of Mr. Mossman was acknowledged as excused.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Schwartz, FAICP

Planning Director  
SS/jd