

**MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 13, 2025**

PL(P) 25-03: Zoning, Planning and Development Text Amendment: Amending Section 30-7-7.2 PUD (Planned Unit Development) of the Land Development Ordinance. (RECOMMENDED APPROVAL)

In support of:

Christopher Andrews introduced himself as the Land Development Division Manager within the Planning Department. He noted he would be making the presentation on the amendment to Section 30-7-7.2 of the LDO, PUD (Planned Unit Development) standards.

Mr. Andrews stated that the PUD zoning district intended to allow a diverse mixture of residential and/or nonresidential uses and structures that function as cohesive and unified projects. The district encouraged innovation by allowing flexibility in permitted uses, design, and layout requirements in accordance with a Unified Development Plan. He noted that what led to the amendment was discussions with city leaders, residents, related professionals and developers. He said they have requested added flexibility including the permitted use standards, street designs and off-street parking ratios. Mr. Andrews noted that the text amendment would better support the city council strategic goal for the provision of attainable housing; and the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan in creating great places and becoming car optional.

Mr. Andrews said that updating the Ordinance was an important part of the requirements of the development regulations. He noted that such changes could result to a change in state Statues, to facilitate development trends or due to difficult development standards. He said recently PUD applicants made staff aware of the need to have PUD standards that would allow for more distinct development. He summarized the amendment as follows:

- 1) Additional use standards that related to specific principles or accessory uses within the PUD district. He noted examples such as hours of operations and percentage or measure of uses within use classifications.
- 2) Alternative street design standards such as arrangement of bike lanes, curbs, lane configurations and other items within the street profile.
- 3) The minimum off-street parking ratios would be established through the UDP (Unified Development Plan). He mentioned that this would give the developer more flexibility in parking provisions.

Mr. Andrew stated that staff determined the amendment to the PUD district would better support the City Council strategic good of providing an abundance of attainable housing, as well as the goals of the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan in creating great places and becoming car optional. He said the amendment is reasonable as it would allow developers to create more distinct PUD designs. He asked that the commission recommend approval of the PUD amendment.

Commission Discussion & Motion:

Ms. O'Connor asked for an example of how street designs could change under the PUD amendment.

Mr. Nolan gave an example; he said typically it would be required to provide bike lanes on both sides of the street. He said with the amended PUD standards a developer could propose to locate both bike lanes on one side of the street, separating cars on one side and bikes on the other side of the street. He said this design was not typical in Greensboro, and such design would be different and interesting.

Ms. O'Connor thanked staff stating it was a great example.

Mr. Andrews noted that with a PUD district usually a lot of planning goes into the project. He said associated with the project would be the UDP, traffic studies and significant discussions and input before the request tabled before the commission and the City Council.

Mr. Kirkman highlighted that in the LDO it stated that should the developer not address specific items in the UDP then the plan would revert to the general development standards as per the LDO. He noted that all while all aspects of the PUD zoning could be different, developers can still follow some of the LDO standards.

Mr. Nichols asked about the policy rationale behind the change as it related to parking and loading.

Mr. Andrews read from the Ordinance the section related to off street parking. It stated that "Off-street parking must be provided in accordance with Article 11, Off-Street Parking and Loading." He noted that within this article are minimum parking ratios which would be the requirement for the PUD design. He said that the amendment would give more flexibility where the developer could propose a parking ratio less than the required parking set out in the LDO.

Mr. Nichols thanked staff and indicated he understands the reasoning behind the change.

Chair Magid stated that PUD district has been changing, some are more residential and some having other uses.

Mr. Andrews concurred with Chair Magid and said staff has noticed as well.

Chair Magid asked for further questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Ms. Turner thanked the staff and stated she appreciated the comments and the examples given by staff. She felt that the text amendment was very good proposal since currently the default was the only option.

Hearing no further comments Chair Magid closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kirkman advised the Commission action should be to recommend approval of the text amendment as proposed, they could make changes or recommend denial.

Mr. Peterson then stated regarding item PL(P) 25-03, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the text amendment request for the Planned Unit Development District Technical Amendments 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 allowing development that supports the Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map and Future Land Use Map; (2.) The text amendment better supports the Greensboro City Council strategic goal of providing an abundance of attainable housing, and also supports the goals of GSO 2040, the City's Comprehensive Plan in Creating Great Places and Becoming Car Optional; (3.) The request is reasonable due to the fact that the proposed amendments would allow for applicants to create more-distinct developments that have not previously been proposed in Greensboro, supporting the intent of the Planned Unit Development District. Mr. Gilmer, Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 9-0, (Ayes: Chair Magid, Vice Chair Skenes, O'Connor, Gilmer Sr., Glass, Turner, Downing, Nichols and Peterson). Nays: (None).

Chair Magid advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and were subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, February 18, 2025 City Council Meeting.