

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission was held in person and electronically through a Zoom meeting and broadcast simultaneously on the City of Greensboro's website on Monday, October 17, 2022, beginning at 5:33 p.m. Members present were: Vice Chair Richard T. Bryson, Vernal Alford, Catherine Magid, Mary Skenes, and Andrew Egbert. Present for City staff were Mike Kirkman, Luke Carter, and Rachel McCook (Planning), Deniece Conway (GDOT) and Alan Buansi (City Attorney).

Vice Chair Bryson welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the meeting was being conducted both in-person and online. He advised of the policies, procedures and instructions in place for the Planning and Zoning Commission. He briefly explained how the Commission members normally prepare for the meeting by reviewing materials and visiting the subject properties and advised those participants attending virtually would be able to view the meeting and speak when called upon. Vice Chair Bryson noted the online meeting was being recorded and televised and was close-captioned for the hearing impaired. He further explained the expedited agenda for items without any speakers in opposition and how staff would give a shortened presentation and the applicant would have up to 2 minutes to speak if they had additional information they wanted Commissioners to know. Vice Chair Bryson then stated that because only five Commissioners can be present tonight, all decisions by the Commission would only be recommendation and would be subject to a public hearing by the City Council.

Alan Buansi, City Attorney, then advised that the Planning and Zoning Commission was here only to determine land use and conditions of a rezoning application, with respect to highest and best use of the property. All other concerns not related to land use and conditions of the rezoning application are not germane to the determinations made by the Commission, but can be referred to the Planning Department or Technical Review Committee as appropriate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES

Vice Chair Bryson advised that Chair Sandra O'Connor, Zac Engle, Erica Glass, and Keith Peterson were unable to attend the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 19, 2022 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES: (APPROVED)

Vice Chair Bryson requested approval of the September 19, 2022 meeting minutes. Ms. Magid made a motion to approve the September meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Egbert seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0).

WITHDRAWALS OR CONTINUANCE:

Mr. Kirkman advised that there was a request for a continuance for items PL(P)22-37 & Z-22-10-005.

Melissa Rich, 1900 Youngs Mill Road, stated that her community is requesting this continuance to conduct more discussions with the applicant, and that they did not have enough time to prepare for this hearing this evening.

Ms. Skenes made a motion to approve the continuance for 30 days to the next Commission meeting in November. Ms. Magid seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

EXPEDITED AGENDA:

Mr. Kirkman noted there were several items that did not have opposition and were eligible for the expedited agenda. The items were Z-22-10-001, Z-22-10-002 and Z-22-10-003. Vice Chair Bryson asked if anyone in attendance or online wished to speak in opposition to any of those items. Hearing none, he noted these items would be at the top of the agenda and addressed through expedited review.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

NEW BUSINESS:

Z-22-10-001: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to RM-5 (Residential Multi-family – 5) for the property identified as 6101 Brushwood Court, generally described as south of Brushwood Court and south of Grassy Meadow Court (0.55 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the property as Planned Industrial on the Future Built Form Map and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. If this rezoning request is approved, the Future Land Use designation for the subject site is considered to be amended to Residential in order to ensure an appropriate fit between future land use designation and zoning. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in Our Framework goal to arrange land uses for a more vibrant and livable Greensboro and the 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. The proposed RM-5 zoning district accommodates duplexes, twin homes, townhouses and cluster housing in addition to currently allowed single-family detached dwellings. The uses allowed with the proposed zoning are compatible with adjacent existing residential uses and provide additional housing options in close proximity to a number of employment uses. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice Chair Bryson asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson then asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Mauro Ruggieri, 1207 Hounslow Drive, stated that his request would allow him to build a Twinhome on the subject property, which is larger than most other lots in the City and has ample frontage. He stated that he visited neighbors and felt they were supportive.

Ms. Skenes asked if Mr. Ruggieri was planning on repeating the style of development he had done previously elsewhere in the City. He stated that was correct, and that the neighborhood was supportive when they learned more about his project.

Vice Chair Bryson then asked for any objections to the request. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson closed the public hearing.

Ms. Skenes then stated regarding agenda item Z-22-10-001, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

identified as 6101 Brushwood Court from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to RM-5 (Residential Multi-family – 5) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 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 RM-5 zoning district 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. Ms. Magid seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0). Vice Chair Bryson advised the vote constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 15, 2022 City Council meeting.

PL(P) 22-35 & Z-22-10-002: An annexation and original zoning request from County LI (Light Industrial) to City LI (Light Industrial) for the property identified as 5566 Burlington Road, generally described as south of Burlington Road and south of Birch Creek Road (338.688 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the property 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 the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a resilient economy with the goal of increasing and preserving the inventory of developable sites compatible with corporate and industrial uses. The proposed City LI zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate limited manufacturing, wholesaling, warehousing, research and development, and related commercial/service activities which in their normal operations, have little or no adverse effect upon adjoining properties. The proposed original zoning request allows uses that are complimentary to uses already in existence in the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice Chair Bryson asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson then asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak in favor of the request.

Michael Thelen, 555 Fayetteville Street, Raleigh, on behalf of Publix Supermarkets, thanked staff and stated that the staff report effectively explained their request and he was available to answer any questions.

Vice Chair Bryson then asked for any objections to the request. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson closed the public hearing.

Ms. Magid then made a motion to annex the property. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0). Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-22-10-002, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 5566 Burlington Road from County LI (Light Industrial) to City LI (Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

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 LI zoning 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. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0). Vice Chair Bryson advised the approvals constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 15, 2022 City Council meeting.

Z-22-10-003: A rezoning request from BP (Business Park) to CD-LI (Conditional District – Light Industrial) for the property identified as a portion of 5440 Millstream Road, generally described as south of Millstream Road and north of the Mount Hope Church Road (29.364 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties, and advised of the condition associated with the request. Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the property as Planned Industrial on the Future Built Form Map and Industrial on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed CD-LI zoning district allows a variety of warehouse, industrial, distribution and office uses that are generally consistent with surrounding uses on adjacent or nearby properties. Rezoning to CD-LI will provide additional development flexibility for this property while not negatively impacting the existing large corporate research and manufacturing campus to the north and west of the subject property. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice Chair Bryson asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson inquired if the applicant was present to speak.

Amanda Hodierna, 804 Green Valley Road Suite 200, stated that the applicant is requesting the rezoning to better suit their business needs and the potential of the subject property.

Vice Chair Bryson asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the request. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson closed the public meeting.

Mr. Alford then stated regarding agenda item Z-22-10-003, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property identified as a portion of 5440 Millstream Road from BP (Business Park) to CD-LI (Conditional District-Light Industrial) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 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 CD-LI zoning district permits uses which fit the context of surrounding area and limits

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

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. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0). Vice Chair Bryson advised the vote constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 15, 2022 City Council meeting.

PL(P) 22-36 & Z-22-10-004: An annexation, original zoning and rezoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family), County AG (Agricultural), and City R-5 (Residential Single-family – 5) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) and consideration of the required Unified Development Plan for the properties identified as 3410-3432 McConnell Road, 1309, 1401, 1403, 1405 and 1407 Bridgepoint Road, and 3207 and 3211 Cedar Park road, generally described as south of McConnell Road, east of Bridgepoint Road, and north of Cedar Park road (48.89 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 the application wished to add an additional condition to the request as follows:

4. There shall be no access to Bridgepoint Road

Ms. Skenes made a motion to accept the amended condition. Mr. Alford seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0)

Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map currently designates this property as Urban General (approximately the eastern nine-tenths) and Planned Industrial District (remainder). The Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates this property as Residential (approximately the eastern nine-tenths) and Industrial (remainder). If this rezoning request is approved, the Future Land Use designation for the portion of the subject site currently designated as Industrial is considered to be amended to Residential in order to ensure an appropriate fit between future land use designation and zoning. Staff determined the proposed original zoning and rezoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places Big Idea 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 Big Idea to maintain stable, attractive, and healthy places to live and raise families. The proposed PUD zoning designation, as conditioned, would allow uses similar to those found in the surrounding area and expand housing choices in close proximity to a major thoroughfare. With the planned improvements discussed in the Traffic Impact Study, the proposed development is compatible with the scale and design of the adjacent road and nearby uses. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice Chair Bryson asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson inquired if the applicant was present to speak.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

Amanda Hodiernne, 804 Green Valley Road Suite 200 on behalf of Old East Properties, stated that this is a purely residential project for townhome development. The development team worked with staff to tailor the density of this project to meet the housing needs of the City and the goals of the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan while following the surrounding community's prevailing standards. She stated that the requested density of 4.45 dwelling units per acre is similar to the density allowed in the current R-5 zoning district. The new condition to prevent access to Bridgepoint Road was the result of feedback from neighbors. She then displayed a map of the land use in the area, and noted that the position of the subject property makes adding Townhomes in this area very advantageous. This provides a reasonable step-down in density to the more rural character near the City's edge while properly addressing the City's growth. She then displayed a proposed site plan of the development, and noted that the development does not start immediately off the McConnell road frontage. Ms. Hodiernne stated the applicant wants to preserve the charming rural character of the area for neighbors and future residents, and the topography of the subject property makes this easier to achieve. The access to Cedar Park Road will make traffic flow in and out of the community more efficient and avoid congestion in the McConnell Road area. She then displayed the Unified Development Plan and a plan of traffic improvements required by the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) and stated that the applicant will be required to improve Bridgepoint Road even though there will be no access.

With the applicant's speaking time expired, Vice Chair Bryson inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the request.

Gina Wallace, 601 Kimloch Drive, Garner, stated that she appreciated the applicant's engagement, but she needed to ask questions about the development. She asked to confirm there would be no access off Bridgepoint Road, and stated that her godfather originally developed this neighborhood to be private and safe and accordingly thought the applicant could consider changing the development near Janet Lane to be single-family homes.

Janet Stewart, 3406 Janet Lane, stated that she appreciated the applicant's new condition regarding access to Bridgepoint Road given the pre-existing issues with traffic entering and exiting the highway. She stated that if there is a cut-through at Cedar Park Road, traffic on Bridgepoint will become unreasonable. She stated that the neighborhood mainly consists of older adults, requested consideration for traffic control systems to help pedestrian safety, and asked if any widening of Bridgepoint Road would affect neighbors' properties.

Gerald Durham, 1804 Crawford Street, stated that he has environmental concerns about the area that he has not heard addressed. He also stated he had concerns about adding rental properties nearby to single-family homes, and asked if the applicant had considered modifying the development.

Paul Irving, 1416 Bridgepoint Road, asked if the development will be Townhomes or rental properties, if any of the proposed units would be affordable housing, and for more details from the applicant about the improvements on Bridgepoint Road.

Vice Chair Bryson asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson advised the applicant had 5 minutes for rebuttal.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

Ms. Hodierne stated that there will be no access, vehicular or pedestrian, off Bridgepoint Road, and the applicant intends to preserve existing vegetation to buffer the properties on Janet Road. The subject property is currently vacant and the applicant can tailor the site plan to maintain appropriate buffering that the neighborhood can find satisfying. The environmental issues in the area are a County responsibility, but that because this development will be using City water services and the applicant must follow City stormwater management requirements, there will be no negative impact on local groundwater. She stated that any widening of Bridgepoint Road would be from the applicant's property and not that of neighbors. The Bridgepoint Road improvement plans are widening and resurfacing pending the finalization of the TIA but the plan did not require any signalization or other traffic controls and that the direct connection to Cedar Park Road should reduce cut-through traffic onto Bridgepoint Road. Ms. Hodierne stated she is happy to continue discussion with the neighborhood.

With the applicant's rebuttal time expired, Vice Chair Bryson then advised anyone speaking in opposition had 5 minutes for rebuttal. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson closed the public meeting.

Ms. Magid then made a motion to annex the property. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0). Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-22-10-004, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the properties at 3410-3432 McConnell Road; 1309, 1401, 1403, 1405, and 1407 Bridgepoint Road; and 3207 and 3211 Cedar Park Road from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family), County AG (Agricultural), and City R-5 (Residential Single-family - 5) to City PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 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 PUD zoning, 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. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Bryson, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0).

Ms. Skenes asked if the Commission is voting on the UDP in the presentation or if the new condition is included. Mr. Kirkman stated that the new condition would need to be recorded as part of the Unified Development Plan.

Ms. Magid then made a motion to approve the associated UDP with the new condition regarding access to Bridgepoint Road. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0). Vice Chair Bryson advised the approvals constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 15, 2022 City Council meeting.

Z-22-10-006: A rezoning request from CD-PI (Conditional District – Public and Institutional) and R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) and consideration of the

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

OCTOBER 17, 2022

required Unified Development Plan for the properties identified as a portion of 3216 and 3234 Horse Pen Creek Road, all of 3238 and 3240 Horse Pen Creek Road, and all of 4209 and 4213 Piermont Drive, generally described as south of Horse Pen Creek Road and west of Piermont Drive (9.37 acres). (RECOMMENDED DENIAL)

Z-22-10-007: A rezoning request from R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) to PI (Public and Institutional) for the property identified as a portion of 3234 Horse Pen Creek Road, generally described as south of Horse Pen Creek Road and west of Piermont Drive (0.56 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Mr. Kirkman reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties, and advised of the condition associated with the request. Mr. Kirkman stated the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Urban General on the Future Built Form Map and Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Filling In Our Framework Big Idea goal to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, and enjoy our free time can create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro, and the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places Big Idea's strategy of meeting housing needs and desires with a sufficient and diverse supply of housing products, prices and locations. The proposed PUD zoning district would permit a variety of uses inclusive of multi-family housing and recreational uses complementary to the existing recreational and residential uses on adjacent and nearby properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Vice Chair Bryson asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson inquired if the applicant was present to speak.

Amanda Williams, 4425 Monument Trace on behalf of BSC Holdings, stated that the applicant is requesting split zoning due to their work with the neighboring Spears YMCA. They are conducting a land swap to add parking for the YMCA. The development will not add access directly off Horse Pen Creek Road, but they will instead work with the YMCA to improve the traffic flow around the new signal at the existing intersection. She stated they feel this is a logical land use given the proximity of other multi-family residential and PI uses in the area. Their foreseen market segment is unlikely to create significant additional traffic as in some multi-family residential developments. Ms. Williams stated they spoke with neighbors and conducted a neighborhood meeting to hear the community's concerns and that traffic on Horse Pen Creek Road was the primary concern. She introduced the applicant's traffic engineer to discuss the project.

Ms. Skenes stated the TIA displayed three access points into the YMCA property for access to the existing intersection at Horse Pen Creek Road and asked Mr. Kirkman if the YMCA parking lot was a public street. He stated it was not, and that access would require a shared access easement. Ms. Skenes expressed concern about adding traffic to the YMCA property given that the intersection backs up in peak hours. She stated the density and vehicular access bothers her. Ms. Williams stated that their agreement with the YMCA states they will be improving the parking lot, and that their current plan moves the first entrance to the intersection under guidance from GDOT. She stated that their

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

anticipated density might be lower than the maximum required and that in their experience, the tenants they typically attract tend to drive less.

Ms. Skenes asked to confirm that the applicant did not present the request as an over-55 community, and Ms. Williams stated that was correct. Ms. Skenes stated the Commission has to consider the request as presented, and the density proposed in this request is almost double that of nearby developments.

Ms. Magid stated she was also concerned with the number of dwelling units per acre. Ms. Williams stated that they have done similar developments in Greensboro and that their final density would be below the theoretical maximum.

Dionne Brown, 4600 Marriott Drive, Raleigh on behalf of Davenport, stated that their TIA used traffic counts during peak hours according to GDOT standards. She stated that questions involving the intersection would require coordination with GDOT, but that their models use a worst-case scenario to determine level of service. She stated that if neighboring communities increase traffic flow, there would likely be a need for changes to the intersection.

Barry Siegal, 4425 Monument Trace, stated that they have negotiated access to Piermont Drive for the YMCA, which will create cross access from their parking lot. While they are adding additional trips, he believes they are improving the traffic situation in the area with these changes to the YMCA parking lot.

With the applicant's speaking time expired, Vice Chair Bryson inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the request.

Margaret Scott, 4703 Hanberry Drive on behalf of the Montebello Homeowners Association, stated that her neighborhood's concern is about the concentration of traffic at the intersection. The applicant's proposal would add significant traffic to the area, and the applicant's traffic engineer states the level of service in the area would be very low. She stated that while this level of service may be common, it is unacceptable to the residents in the area, and that they are requesting specific signalization improvements for safety to support any additional development like this.

Ron Kohler, 3231-35 Horse Pen Creek Road on behalf of Northwest Day School, stated his concern is also about density and the safety of the children at his school. He has been in discussion with the applicant and their traffic engineers, and that while he supports allowing rezoning for the subject properties, he finds the requested density unacceptable. Displaying a land use map of the area, he indicated the multi-family residential developments in the area, some of which are very dense and have yet to be open for lease. He then displayed a photograph of the YMCA and a full parking lot with more vehicles entering it, and stated that his understanding of the site plan is that it would tie into traffic of the YMCA, which is already unacceptable. U-Turns at the intersection require serious situational awareness given the complexity of traffic flow in the area, and given the speeds vehicles travel there, it is extremely difficult to maintain safety. Mr. Kohler stated he would be comfortable with 18 dwelling units per acre, but 325 units is unacceptable for this neighborhood, and asked for the applicant to prepare a new proposal which is mutually beneficial.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

With opposition speaking time expired, Vice Chair Bryson advised the applicant had 5 minutes for rebuttal.

Amanda Williams stated that the density of their comparable projects they previously developed is 25 dwelling units per acre at New Garden Road and 39.2 dwelling units per acre in Winston-Salem, a property that has traffic access through an adjacent commercial property. She stated that the site plan calls for over 500 parking spots for the residents of the development in addition to the new parking for the YMCA.

Barry Segal stated that this project would create direct two-line access to Piermont Drive and ease into Horse Pen Creek Road with a right turn, which will reduce the traffic impact through the YMCA property. Other projects they have developed maintain reasonable traffic access with roughly this density level, and the TIA states this development will maintain current levels of service. He stated that they believe the density requested is reasonable given the improvements they intend to make and the work GDOT has done in the area.

Mr. Bryson asked if the other developments Ms. Williams had been referencing have similar arrangements of neighbors with dense activity and sensitive concerns about traffic. Ms. Williams stated that the New Garden development has adjacent office and medical uses, and the Winston-Salem development is in a heavily commercial area with a shared traffic flow and uses shared commercial parking lots with common access easements similar to what they are proposing here. Mr. Bryson asked Ms. Williams to confirm the level of traffic of neighboring parcels for the other developments she mentioned, and Ms. Williams stated there was substantial traffic around those areas but she did not have the traffic counts available.

Vice Chair Bryson then advised anyone speaking in opposition had 5 minutes for rebuttal.

Sophia de Vries, 3110 Horse Pen Creek Road on behalf of Noble Academy, stated that the requested density is unreasonable for this area. More multi-family residential housing in the area would be sensible, but not at this level of intensity. Adding traffic to Piermont Drive and turning it into a cut-through for YMCA traffic makes them concerned about the safety of their students. She stated the school is grade levels 1-12 and many of the students have learning disabilities, and asked the City to consider this and make changes to the flow of traffic in the area.

Ron Kohler displayed a photograph of Horse Pen Creek Road around his school during the evening and stated that he did not see how a cut-through of a highly dense multi-family development's parking lot would improve traffic flow. Davenport conducted the TIA in February and June during the widening of Horse Pen Creek Road, with workers limiting it to a one-way road, and this may make the results not indicative of the true state of traffic on Horse Pen Creek Road now. He stated that the density of this request would make traffic unmanageable in the community.

Ms. Skenes stated that the TIA material she had available shows a date of July and September and asked when the applicant conducted the TIA. Mr. Kohler stated he learned from conversations with

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

Davenport that the studies happened in February and June and the facts compiled and presented in July and amended in September. Mr. Kohler asked the applicant to conduct a new TIA. Ms. Skenes asked Mr. Kirkman to confirm if that was accurate, and Mr. Kirkman stated that GDOT has specific information about the traffic counts.

Deniece Conway, on behalf of GDOT, confirmed that the engineers conducted TIA counts while construction was underway and that when a road is under construction they will sometimes add historical data with adjustment formulas but she is unsure of their use in this case. Ms. Skenes stated that if the TIA counts are from while Horse Pen Creek Road was under construction, the levels of service would be unacceptable.

Dionne Brown stated that they conducted the counts while school was in session in February for a different development, and in June. They completed the report in July and updated it in September after a request from GDOT regarding the planned access to the YMCA parking lot. She stated that to account for the construction on Horse Pen Creek, they applied adjustment factors based on historical data, and that a 2% or more growth rate is also always applied for future build volume scenarios.

Ms. Magid asked Mr. Segal if the plan called for the additional YMCA parking on the strip of land in request Z-10-007 and if it this would be complete before their project begins. Mr. Segal stated that the additional parking would be two additional rows down the length of the strip. Ms. Magid asked if the cars would be departing past the current rows of cars to turn right on Hanberry Drive and Horse Pen Creek. Mr. Segal stated that access from the YMCA's current drive would have access to their development and give the YMCA access to Piermont. Ms. Magid asked if all of the new parking for the YMCA would be on that new piece of land, and Mr. Segal stated that was correct. Ms. Magid asked if entry and egress from his development would be directly through the parking, and Mr. Segal stated that was correct, but they have not finalized the site plan yet. He stated that the development would not require all parking to go through the YMCA property, and that much of it would likely go through Piermont Drive. Ms. Magid asked about the applicant's development on New Garden Road, and Mr. Segal stated it would be very similar using the site's slope, but with additional access points.

Sophia de Vries stated that her school's students were not at school in June, so the TIA did not account for the full impact of their traffic.

Ms. Skenes asked about the plan associated with this request. Mr. Carter stated that staff distributed the UDP to Commissioners following TRC approval, and Mr. Kirkman displayed the UDP. Ms. Skenes stated the UDP showed the three access points on the parking lot side, very close to the traffic lanes around the YMCA parking.

Mr. Kohler stated that there has been no discussion of the impact on the schools in the area.

Mr. Buansi reminded the Commissioners that the Planning and Zoning Commission is required to make decisions solely based on land use and impact on surrounding properties. Ms. Magid asked if this would only be a recommendation given the number of Commissioners, and Mr. Buansi said that was

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

correct. Ms. Magid asked if the Commission could offer a continuance. Mr. Kirkman stated that could not be offered by Staff, but the applicant could request a continuance.

Ms. Skenes asked to clarify that density applies to Commission decisions, and Mr. Buansi stated she was correct that density could always be a consideration of the Commission.

With opposition rebuttal time expired, Vice Chair Bryson closed the public meeting.

Mr. Bryson stated he was familiar with that area, and was uncomfortable with the proposed density given the variety of uses surrounding the subject property and new multi-family development in the area. He stated that given that neighbors were under a misconception during the applicant's outreach, more discussion should take place, and he cannot support the request as presented.

Mr. Egbert stated that he has lived on Horse Pen Creek Road and visited that YMCA regularly. The City has many busy streets, and the density proposed is reasonable given the sustained increased activity in the area. He stated he supports the request.

Ms. Skenes noted the density bothers her, and that she cannot remember the Commission approving anything with a "D", "E" and "F" level of service. She also stated that the PUDs the Commission has approved in the area previously are of a much lower density than this request.

Ms. Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-22-10-006, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties identified as a portion of 3216 and 3234 Horse Pen Creek Road; all of 3238 and 3240 Horse Pen Creek Road; and all of 4209 and 4213 Piermont Drive from CD-PI (Conditional District – Public and Institutional) and R-3 Residential Single-family – 3) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 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 PUD 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. Mr. Egbert seconded the motion. The Commission began a vote, which Ms. Skenes and Ms. Magid voted against and Mr. Kirkman asked Ms. Magid to clarify if she meant to use the motion language to approve the request. Realizing the mistake the Commission abandoned this motion.

Ms. Magid then stated the request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The proposed PUD zoning district, as conditioned, does not limit negative impacts on the adjacent properties nor does it permit uses which fit the context of surrounding area; (3.) The request is not reasonable due to the size, physical conditions, and other attributes of the area, it will be a detriment to the neighbors and surrounding community, and denial is in the public interest. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-1, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Bryson; Nays: Egbert).

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

Mr. Buansi stated this was not a final action, and was a recommended denial for the City Council.

Ms. Magid then made a motion to deny the associated UDP. Ms. Skenes seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-1, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Bryson; Nays: Egbert). Vice Chair Bryson advised the denial constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 15, 2022 City Council meeting.

Ms. Skenes asked if the Commission could vote on Z-22-10-007, given that they seem to be related. Mr. Buansi stated they were related, but separate requests.

Ms. Skenes then stated regarding agenda item Z-22-10-007, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property identified as a portion of 3234 Horse Pen Creek Road from R-3 (Residential Single-family - 3) to PI (Public and Institutional) to be consistent with the adopted GSO2040 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 PI zoning district 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. Mr. Alford seconded the motion. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Skenes, Magid, Alford, Egbert, Bryson; Nays: 0). Vice Chair Bryson advised the approval constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 15, 2022 City Council meeting.

Vice Chair Bryson advised there would be a 5-minute break at 8:02 p.m., and the meeting resumed at 8:08 p.m.

PL(P) 22-26: A street closure request for Washington Road from the Southern Right-of-way Line for Fremont Drive and southwestward to its terminus (\pm 410 feet); Fremont Drive from the Eastern Right-of-way Line for Guilford College Road southeastward to the western Right-of-way line for Oak Avenue (\pm 645 feet); and Oak Avenue from the Northern Right-of-way line for Fremont Drive southwestward to the northern Right-of-way line for Sapp Road (\pm 375 feet).

Mr. Carter reviewed the information for the request and stated that property owners bordering 98% of the road right-of-way had signed the request for street closing. He noted the conditions necessary for the city to consider when closing a street and stated that TRC recommended approval of the street approval request at its September 23 meeting with the follow condition:

1. Street closures shall become effective upon the recording of a plat in the Guilford County Register of Deeds that combines all of the lots with frontage Washington Road, Fremont Drive, and Oak Avenue with abutting property so that the resultant lot or lots have frontage and direct vehicular access to a public street.

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

Mr. Carter stated that staff recommended approval.

Vice Chair Bryson inquired if there were questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson inquired if the applicant was present to speak.

Brian Wise, 7010 Cross Hook Court, Summerfield, speaking on behalf of Fall Line Development, stated that the streets in question were never constructed. There is no current access, as they exist only on paper. He stated he is willing to prepare a new plat according to the condition proposed by TRC.

Mr. Carter noted Mr. Egbert has left the meeting, and asked if the Commission had a quorum to proceed. After consultation between staff and the City Attorney, Mr. Kirkman stated that staff was attempting to contact Mr. Egbert to regain a quorum. Vice Chair Bryson asked if they would have to continue the last two items, and Mr. Kirkman stated they would. Vice Chair Bryson asked when Mr. Egbert left the meeting, and Mr. Kirkman stated he did not know.

Mr. Bryson tabled the item.

ITEMS FROM PLANNING DEPARTMENT:
GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan Update and East Gate City Boulevard Study

Russ Clegg presented the second annual update for the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the Greensboro Planning Department was proud to announce it had won the American Planning Association's prestigious Daniel Burnham Award for Comprehensive Plans. He gave a summary of current conditions and stated that no trends indicate a need for significant amendments to the comprehensive plan. Many projects in progress are working toward the plan's Big Ideas, indicating a tangible connection between the City's goals and actions. Mr. Clegg noted that staff determined there is sufficient maintenance of industrial land to keep Greensboro economically productive. There has also been a large increase in annexations for residential uses along with significant infill development. He stated that Planning is looking ahead to work with Greensboro's communities to achieve sustainable growth.

He then presented the East Gate City Boulevard study and detailed the community outreach measures taken and the study's key findings. Staff heard a need to help strengthen community identity by improving wayfinding and working with the arts community to emphasize the history and culture of the area. He stated that staff anticipated the Windsor-Chavis project would have a significant impact on the area, serving as a hub for the neighborhoods and beyond across the region while maintaining access to services for the people who live there. Mr. Clegg stated Planning was working to connect residents of the neighborhood to utilize resources from Neighborhood Development and Code Compliance for reinvestment in the area while Planning completes its redevelopment goals. Reshaping East Gate City Boulevard under Complete Streets principles to increase transportation access is a priority, as this becomes a major transit hub. He stated that they were using the activity centers identified in the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan and encouraging development in the area that adds land uses currently missing and taking advantage of opportunities to diversify the stock of housing. Planning is conducting a survey

**MEETING OF THE
GREENSBORO PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 17, 2022**

and a draft of the plan will be available soon, to be reviewed in November and December for a vote by City Council in January.

Mr. Kirkman stated that Mr. Egbert has reconnected to the meeting.

PL(P) 22-26: A street closure request for Washington Road from the Southern Right-of-way Line for Fremont Drive and southwestward to its terminus (\pm 410 feet); Fremont Drive from the Eastern Right-of-way Line for Guilford College Road southeastward to the western Right-of-way line for Oak Avenue (\pm 645 feet); and Oak Avenue from the Northern Right-of-way line for Fremont Drive southwestward to the northern Right-of-way line for Sapp Road (\pm 375 feet). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

Vice Chair Bryson asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition of the application. Hearing none, Vice Chair Bryson closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Bryson made a motion to recommend the street closing with the condition referenced. The Commission seconded the motion by assent. The Commission voted 5-0, (Ayes: Egbert, Skenes, Magid, Alford, Bryson; Nays: 0). Vice Chair Bryson advised the approval constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, November 15, City Council meeting.

ITEMS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Vice Chair Bryson asked about next month's caseload, and Mr. Kirkman stated that it is six so far. Ms. Skenes asked about the training session. Mr. Kirkman stated that staff has not yet set a date but is working toward it. Ms. Magid asked if staff will send a notification about dates, and Mr. Kirkman stated they would. Vice Chair Bryson asked for staff and Legal for clarification about when the Commission should receive communications on the day of meetings. Ms. Skenes agreed staff is doing what it needs to do by passing information on to the Commission, but it might be better to have late information included in the packets as opposed to piecemeal via e-mail. Vice Chair Bryson stated he would prefer that, and Ms. Skenes stated it would be easier for staff as well. Ms. Magid asked what the cutoff point would be, and Vice Chair Bryson stated he wanted to establish one. Ms. Skenes stated she did not mind getting the information, but that late e-mails are hard to process, and suggested a time of 5 p.m. on Friday. Vice Chair Bryson stated he supported that, and he thought some applicants may send information at the last minute on purpose, and this would allow the Commission to better review late material. Ms. Magid stated she thinks this happens a lot, and supported having last-minute information added to their packets. Mr. Kirkman stated that staff needed to discuss procedures and determine what they can do.

Vice Chair Bryson adjourned the meeting.

There being no further business for the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.