

**MINUTES OF THE  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

**Z-24-08-010: A rezoning request from LI (Light Industrial) to C-M (Commercial – Medium) for the property identified as a portion of 2645 Randleman Road, generally described as east of Randleman Road and north of Corliss Street (0.45 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)**

Mr. Carter reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties. He pointed out that the current zone for most of the property is C-M (Commercial Medium). He stated that approximately one-third to the rear of the property is zoned LI (Light Industrial). He explained that the request is to rezone the LI portion to C-M.

Mr. Carter stated that the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map currently designates this property as Urban General within an Urban Mixed-Use Corridor and the Randleman Road Reinvestment Corridor. The GSO240 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates this property as Commercial. 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 and the Comprehensive Plan's Filling in our Framework strategy to encourage higher density, mixed-use, walkable infill development. The proposed C-M zoning district is intended to accommodate a wide range of retail, service, office, and multi-family residential uses in a mixed-use environment. The proposed uses are compatible with the existing uses on adjacent tracts. The proposed zoning request is appropriate given the property's location along a major thoroughfare. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair O'Connor asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked for the applicant or anyone else to speak in favor of the request to come to the podium.

**Kameron Dozier, 143 North Main Street, Kernersville**, on behalf of O'Brien Architecture said he was representing the applicant. Mr. Dozier said the applicant also owned the adjacent property which contained an auto shop. He explained that the business use on the subject property would remain, however, the applicant wanted additional parking for a special event center on the adjacent property. He mentioned that City staff advised a Traffic Impact Analysis would not be required. He said the main reason for the request is to allow shared parking which could not happen under the current LI zone.

**Chair O'Connor** asked Mr. Dozier if the subject property was shared with the adjacent property.

**Mr. Dozier** stated that was the case and it would require additional steps. He pointed out that even without the shared parking, the applicant wanted the subject property to have one zone, the C-M zone.

Chair O'Connor asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak further in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor asked for anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request to come to the podium.

**Sharon Hightower, 6 Belles Court**, stated there were improvement projects happening along Randleman Road, being a major corridor in Greensboro. She mentioned she attended several community meetings focused on revitalizing the area and wanted to know if the applicant had any

community outreach. Mr. Hightower said that the area was deserving of improvements since it has been in the past underserved, overlooked and neglected. She felt that the residents of the Randleman Road and surrounding areas should be included and should have the opportunity to talk about the request.

Chair O'Connor inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she asked if the applicant wished to speak further on the request.

**Mr. Dozier**, stated the applicant has been operating in the community for a while. He said he was unsure about the community outreach. He mentioned that they sent copy of the proposal to the notification mailing list received from staff. He stated they did online survey for feedbacks on the request. He said they did not hold a community meeting. Mr. Dozier mentioned the special event center would be beneficial to the community.

**Mr. Kirkman** advised the Commissioners that the applicant submitted the summary of neighborhood communications, which was found in their package.

**Ms. Skenes** sought for clarification of the request and stated that the applicant owned 2645 and 2649 Randleman Road. She noted that the applicant planned on using the back portion of the building on the adjacent property as a special event center.

**Mr. Dozier** corrected that the front portion of the building on 2649 Randleman Road would be used for the special event center. He said they intended to remodel the front of the building to improve the roadside appearance.

**Ms. Skenes** restated the front of the building on 2649 Randleman Road, which was not the subject of the request, would have the special event center.

**Mr. Dozier** concurred with Ms. Skenes and said half of the building would be a special event center and the remaining half used for the auto shop.

**Ms. Skenes** noted that for the special event center to operate additional parking was required. She stated that the additional parking could be allowed in the C-M zone and not in the LI zone.

**Mr. Dozier** agreed with Ms. Skenes and said as he understood after meeting with staff.

**Mr. Kirkman** explained that the parking associated with the use should be the same zone because special event centers were not allowed in LI zone.

**Mr. Engle** asked about the property having split zones. Mr. Kirkman advised how that could have happened.

**Ms. Skenes** continued to clarify the request; she said that the subject property has two zones. She stated that the request would allow the subject property to be one zone, rezoning the back portion from LI to C-M.

**Mr. Kirkman** concurred with Skenes about the property having one zone.

**Ms. Skenes** then noted the request was a "zoning cleanup" and downzoning moving from LI to C-M and looked to staff for clarification.

**Mr. Kirkman** agreed with the zoning cleanup but stated that for the most part both LI and C-M zoning districts allowed for similar uses.

**Ms. Skenes** reaffirmed that the request would make the subject property one zone and provide additional parking for the special event center.

**Mr. Dozier** agreed with Skenes.

**Vice Chair Magid** summarized that the request would make the subject property one zone, C-M. She mentioned that the subject property would be used for additional parking, and that the special event center would be in an appropriate zone and was not part of the request.

**Mr. Dozier** agreed and noted that he only mentioned the special event center to better explain the request.

**Mr. Peterson** inquired about the community feedback from the survey.

**Mr. Dozier** replied he was unsure of any response and stated the survey was sent out later in the previous week.

**Mr. Peterson** mentioned that the residents had a vision for Randleman Road, he also noted there was another special event center in proximity to the subject property. He said he would prefer the applicant to meet with the residents.

**Mr. Engle** noted that the letter mailed to the residents had no date and assumed it was sent the previous week.

**Mr. Dozier** pointed to the date on the registered mail slips.

**Mr. Engle** after reviewing the registered mail slips noted the letter were mailed on September 11<sup>th</sup> few days prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Engle asked the applicant if he was opened to continuing the request to allow for community outreach.

**Mr. Dozier** said he hoped to have feedback from the community in time for the meeting. He stated that even if they should be open to community engagement there would not be any substantial reason against the request. He expressed that the request would benefit the neighborhood in terms of making the area looks better. He mentioned he was working on design drawings for the proposed development.

**Mr. Peterson** asked the applicant if the plan they are working on was better than what the City envisioned for Randleman Road.

**Mr. Kirkman** advised the Commissioners that the special event facility use was allowed in the C-M zoning district. He pointed out that both the front section of 2645 and all of 2649 Randleman Road are C-M zone. He stated the applicant owned both properties and for the owner to have the special event facility the associated parking should be provided in the appropriate zone. He clarified the Commissioner's questions and asked if the applicant was opened to the 30 days continuance to the October Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to allow for community outreach.

**Mr. Downing** consented with Mr. Kirkman and added that the notices were late, and the residents would need more time to respond. He stated it would be better to have the residents' input on the request. He noted that even with the applicant's good intension of sending notices it appeared no community outreach took place. He acknowledged that the City was working on the Randleman Road corridor plan, and he felt that the request should be considered in this context.

**Chair O'Connor** recognized the applicant's efforts in sending notices to the residents. She explained to the applicant that the usual approach would be to hold community meetings where the applicant and the residents get together to discuss the request. However, she stated that the request was for a corner of a property which is differently zoned. She mentioned the logical approach would be to have one zone.

Chair O'Connor asked for additional questions or comments from the Commissioners.

**Mr. Engle** stated that the use would be permitted but the construction would not be permitted. He said should there have been community outreach he could easily support the request. He expressed that he highly value the neighborhood engagement process and there was none for consideration. He again asked the applicant if he would be opened to the continuance of the request for more community outreach.

**Mr. Gilmer, Sr** sought Mr. Ducharme advice on the 30 days continuance to allow for the community outreach.

**Mr. Ducharme** advised that the applicant had the choice to agree to the 30 days continuance or proceed with the hearing.

**Mr. Dozier** asked the Commissioners to proceed with the hearing.

**Mr. Downing** indicated he would not be supporting the request. He pointed out there were community meetings held on September 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> to discuss the Randleman Road Corridor Plan.

Ms. Glass asked staff for clarification on the requirements for the notification of adjacent property owners.

**Mr. Kirkman** stated that the notification would be done by city staff. He said that the notices should be sent by first class mail between 10 to 25 days prior to the Hearing. He noted there are no requirements for the applicant as it relates to communication with residents. He pointed out that the request was for straight zoning and what the LDO addresses would be for conditional zoning districts with residential uses within the notification buffer. He said in the latter case, the applicant would be required to demonstrate steps taken to communicate with the adjacent property owners. He said the Commissioner had the discretion for additional conversations, between the applicant and adjacent property owners, but he wanted the Commissioner to be aware of the LDO requirements.

**Mr. Glass** asked whether the applicant providing notice to adjacent property owners was a practice and not a requirement.

**Mr. Kirkman** agreed it is a practice that staff encouraged knowing it would be the desired approach for the Commission and City Council. He said that staff could not dictate how or when notice were done by the applicant.

**Mr. Ducharme** added that the matter of applicant sending notice to adjacent property owners is an established practice as opposed to Statutory requirements.

**Mr. Carter** addressed the split zone concerns and stated that the LI boundary followed a former property line. He explained that the property lines were revised, and the zoning would not change.

Chair O'Conner inquired if there was anyone wished to speak further in opposition to the request. She asked if the applicant had additional comments.

**Mr. Dozier** noted he asked staff for assistance with the community outreach. He stated the community coalition reached out asking about the community outreach. He said he wished the contact was earlier allowing for community engagement.

Chair O'Connor asked if the applicant or anyone else wished to speak further in favor of the request. Hearing none, Chair O'Connor asked for anyone wishing to speak further in opposition to the request.

**Sharon Hightower, 6 Belles Court**, highlighted that the community was working towards improving the Randleman Road corridor. She said the way in which growth and development happened in the community needed to be done in a respectful manner. She stated that with big economic project such as Toyota being in such proximity more focus was on the Randleman Road area and Southeast Greensboro. Mr. Hightower said that an event facility could be good but what type of facility would it be, the resident could not say what would be the associated impacts. She emphasized that the resident's input should be respected.

Chair O'Connor inquired if anyone else wished to speak further in opposition to the request. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Chair O'Connor then asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners.

**Ms. Turner** wanted to know how the determination on the request would be affected by the Randleman Road Corridor Plan to be considered at the next meeting in October.

**Mr. Clegg** introduced himself as the Manger of the Land Range Division. He said staff has been working on the corridor plan since late last year. He stated that through community outreach the residents desired the revitalization and modernization, along with diverse land uses along the corridor. He stated that the straight zoning request did not call for detailed information hence it was not easy to know how the request would fit into the Corridor Plan.

**Vice Chair Magid** wanted to know if the Commissions determination would be a final action and whether the applicant could appeal.

**Mr. Kirkman** confirmed the determination would be final action and the applicant had ten (10) days to appeal. He noted the appeal would be presented at City Council meeting.

**Mr. Engle** stated that it appeared the applicant could not take advantage of the small area of land under the C-M nor the small area of land under the LI.

**Mr. Kirkman** explained that the special event use was allowed in the C-M zoning district and could have associated parking. He reminded the Commission of a similar request where

associated parking for a restaurant use would be on adjacent property which was rezoned to allow the parking. He advised the Commission that the request before them was the same concept.

**Ms. Skenes** said that the focus was on the special event center which was not part of the request. She stated that the request would be rezoning from LI to C-M allowing the subject property to have one zone.

**Mr. Engle** said there would be prohibited uses on the subject property based on the current zone, and therefore required zoning change. He said that the proposed zone would allow more uses to be available. He was concerned that the surrounding property owners had no opportunity to comment on the request. He said he would be inclined to favor a conditional zoning district but as a straight zoning more scrutiny should be given.

**Vice Chair Magid** restated, the building for the special event facility existed and was in the appropriate zone C-M. She stated that the focus should be on the portion zoned LI on the subject property.

Vice Chair Magid then stated regarding agenda item Z-24-08-010, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the property at a portion of 2645 Randleman Road from LI (Light Industrial) to C-M (Commercial – Medium) 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 C-M zoning district permits uses that 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. Turner seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 5-4, (Ayes: Chair Sandra O'Connor, Vice Chair Catherine Magid, Skenes, Gilmer Sr. and Turner). Nays: (Downing, Peterson, Engle and Glass).

Chair O'Connor advised the votes was less than the required six count and constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, October 15, 2024 City Council Meeting.

Chair O'Connor urged the applicant to improve on the community outreach and be prepared to make presentation for the request to the City Council.