

**PARTIAL MINUTES OF THE  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
August 15, 2022**

**PL(P) 22-28 & Z-22-08-003: An annexation and original zoning from County AG (Agricultural) to City CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-family – 8) for the properties identified as 222 and 226 Clapp Farms Road, generally described as northwest of Clapp Farms Road and west of Mount Hope Church Road (31.52 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties, and advised of the conditions associated with the request. He then advised there were changes to the conditions after the item was advertised. The change was to the type of dwellings permitted in the district and a new condition on buffering requirements, and the updated conditions would read as follows:

1. Permitted uses shall be limited to a maximum of 120 single-family dwelling units.
2. Applicant will incorporate a Type “C” landscaped buffer yard the eastern property line of the subject property extending from Clapp Farms Road north for the length of the western property line of Guilford County Parcel Number 119220 (218 Clapp Farms Road). The buffer yard will be delineated as common area within the proposed development and will be HOA-maintained. The buffer yard shall remain free of any vehicular and/or pedestrian improvements.

Mr. Alford moved to accept the amended and new condition, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Magid, Engle, Alford, Skenes, Egbert, Peterson, Aye, Bryson, O’Connor; Nays: 0).

Mr. Kirkman then stated the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Planned Industrial on the Future Built Form Map and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan’s Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro’s citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Building Community Connections goal to maintain stable, attractive, and healthy places to live and raise proposed City CD-RM-8 zoning district, as conditioned, is limited to single-family residential development that is compatible with existing residential uses located on adjacent tracts. Additionally, the subject properties have some site challenges that limit opportunities for larger scale industrial development proposed for the larger area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O’Connor inquired if there were questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair O’Connor inquired if the applicant was present to speak.

Ryan Moffitt, 522 South Lexington Avenue, Burlington, on behalf of Eastwood Homes, thanked neighbors and staff for their collaboration and work with this request. He stated that they worked with TRC and staff to tailor this application to the property’s unique conditions. He then stated that they sent letters to neighbors and were subsequently contacted by several persons. They worked with those persons to address their concerns, which led to the modified conditions presented tonight. Mr. Moffitt then displayed the current preliminary working sketch plan, and stated that they pursued a conditional district request because of the complicated features of the subject property. Their use of the RM-8 zoning district allows for design flexibility but not the increased density of the district, as their projected maximum density is 3.6 units per acre. He

stated that there is significant growth in the county and the city is moving east, and this housing capacity is needed and compatible with the area given the goals and expectations outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there were questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor requested those speaking in opposition to identify themselves and provide their address.

Hendal Price, 241 Clapp Farms Road, stated that he appreciated the work of staff and that he does not oppose the concept but is uncomfortable with the density, and that neighbors had not been shown the sketch plan before tonight. He stated that daily farm traffic is present in the area which can regularly use the entire width of the road, and that he believes this development will change the character of this rural area too significantly. Mr. Price stated that this level of density seems more like an apartment complex than single family homes. He then stated that this area is already considered a food desert, and stated that this would only make the situation worse. He stated that a light industrial land use would likely be more compatible with the community, given traffic and disruption concerns. The road conditions are already unsafe and he anticipates it getting worse with an increased residential density. Mr. Price questioned if police and sanitation service in the area would be acceptable, and that the area is already dealing with issues in that regard. He also stated that he is concerned about poor quality construction happening in the area.

Edgar Clark, 300 Debanne Road, McLeansville, asked if the City would improve the roads in the area to support the proposed density.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor advised the applicant had 5 minutes for rebuttal.

Mr. Moffitt stated that this site is in the Growth Tier 1 area, and that residential expansion in this area is on pace to increase and that they intend for this development to help set high standards.

Ms. Skenes asked to confirm that the applicant's request as conditioned limits density to half of the maximum possible units normally allowed in the RM-8 district. Mr. Moffitt stated that was correct and they were using the RM-8 district for site design needs and not for density. Mr. Bryson asked if they had any illustrative material for how the project will look when completed, Mr. Moffitt stated they did not at this time.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else in support wishing to speak in rebuttal. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor advised anyone speaking in opposition had 5 minutes for rebuttal.

Hendal Price, 241 Clapp Farm Road, stated that the sketch plan displayed would have helped neighbors to understand this project earlier in the process. He stated that the stated number of units per acre is not accurate given the roads, landscaping, and other supporting elements required. The development may be good, but the density is too high for this area, and he believes this could set a bad precedent for other parts of the city. Mr. Price then stated that the attractiveness of this area has been due to controlled growth, and he does not think this is productive to that end.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else in opposition wishing to speak in rebuttal. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor closed the public meeting. Mr. Engle stated that he does not see

an issue with the density proposed in this request, and that city services are high quality and service delivery is suitable for this area.

Mr. Engle then made a motion to annex the property. Seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Commission voted 8-1, (Ayes: Magid, Engle, Alford, Skenes, Egbert, Peterson, Glass, O'Connor; Nays: Bryson). Mr. Engle then stated regarding agenda item Z-22-08-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the properties described as 222 and 226 Clapp Farms Road from County AG (Agricultural) to City CD-RM-8 (Conditional District - Residential Multi-Family – 8) with conditions to be consistent with the adopted GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan and considers the action taken to be reasonable and in the public interest for the following reasons: (1.) The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed City CD-RM-8 zoning district, as conditioned, permits uses which fit the context of surrounding area and limits negative impacts on the adjacent properties; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will benefit the property owner and surrounding community, and approval is in the public interest. Seconded by Ms. Magid. The Commission voted 7-2, (Ayes: Magid, Engle, Alford, Skenes, Egbert, Glass, O'Connor; Nays: Peterson, Bryson). Chair O'Connor advised the approvals constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, September 20, 2022 City Council meeting.