

**MINUTES OF THE  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
JUNE 16, 2025**

**Z-25-05-004: A rezoning request from PUD (Planned Unit Development) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) and consideration of the required Unified Development Plan for the properties identified as 3510-3516 West Friendly Avenue and 805-807 Hobbs Road, generally described as north of West Friendly Avenue and west of Hobbs Road (6.61 acres). (APPROVED)**

Mr. Nelson explained that PUD allowed for defined zoning and other development standards to better fit development patterns. He stated that, based on current development patterns, the applicant was modifying the existing PUD zoning district to include uses that were not allowed under the current zoning condition.

Mr. Nelson reviewed the summary information for the subject properties and surrounding properties.

Mr. Nelson advised that the applicant proposed the following condition:

1. Permitted uses shall include all uses allowed in the Planned Unit Development zoning district, except for the following: Eating and Drinking Establishments with Drive-through Facilities; Animal Shelters; All Community Scale Cultural and Community Uses; Day Care Centers; All Educational Uses; Governmental Buildings; Group Care Facilities; Clubs and Lodges; Shooting Ranges; Tourist Homes (Bed and Breakfast); Night Clubs; Funeral Homes and Crematoriums; Veterinary Services, Pet Grooming, Kennels; ABC Stores; Convenience Store with Fuel Pumps; Garden Centers; Pawnshops; Sexually Oriented Businesses; Vehicle Sales and Service; Car Washes; and Tattoo Parlors.

Mr. Nelson stated that the GSO2040 Comprehensive Plan currently designates the properties as Urban General and within an Urban Mixed-Use Corridor and adjacent to a Regional Scaled Activity Center on the Future Built Form Map. The Future Land Use Map shows that the property is located within the Friendly Avenue Area Plan. The Friendly Avenue Area Plan designates the properties as Mixed Use Commercial. Staff determined the proposed rezoning request supports the Comprehensive Plan's Filling In Our Framework Big Idea to encourage higher density, mixed-use, walkable infill development. It also supports the Comprehensive Plan's Growing Economic Competitiveness Big Idea to build a prosperous, resilient economy that creates equitable opportunities to succeed. The proposed PUD zoning designation, as conditioned, would allow a mix of residential and nonresidential uses that are complimentary to uses permitted in the surrounding area. The proposed uses and density are appropriate because the property is located along a major thoroughfare and directly adjacent to a Regional Scaled Activity Center. Care should be taken with respect to building orientation, building materials, building height, and visual buffers to ensure an appropriate transition to the lower density residential uses on adjacent properties. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair Magid asked the applicant and anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request to come to the podium. She noted they had ten minutes total to speak on the request.

**Nathan Duggins, 400 Bellemeade Street**, introduced: the traffic engineering team - Mr. John Davenport, Dionne and John Davenport III; his colleague Mr. Charles Worsham – engineer; Mr.

Paul Smith – Counsel; and Mr. Carroll – the applicant. Mr. Duggins acknowledged other members of the team.

Mr. Duggins gave a summary of the request and noted the request was maintaining a PUD zoning district. He highlighted the proposed uses as multi-family dwellings, hotel, restaurants, retail, office, self-storage, and structure parking.

Mr. Duggins stated that in December 2019 when the applicant bought the subject property a community meeting was convened. He said several residents participated in that meeting. During the same meeting the residents were asked for their opinion on how the subject property should be developed. Mr. Duggins noted it was clear the residents did not want: a strip center nor surfaced parking lots. He said with the incidents of Covid and other economic downturns, the project was on hold until February 10<sup>th</sup> of this year the applicant reengaged with the community. Mr. Duggins said they met with the First Evangelical Lutheran Church, west of the request. He said shared access was discussed with the Church representatives. Mr. Duggins said most conversations are still ongoing. He said on February 11<sup>th</sup>, April 21<sup>st</sup> and June 9<sup>th</sup> they met with about twelve neighbors from the Wedgewood Community Association, south of the request. Mr. Duggins stated they also met with the residents of Hobbs Landing, north of the request, on the same day they met with the other neighbors. He mentioned larger community meeting was held on February 24<sup>th</sup> at the Lutheran Church. He said over one hundred people attended the meeting. Mr. Duggins stated it could be concluded that the residents were aware of the request. He said information about the request was also on the news media. He emphasized that the residents' feedback was important. He said they were applauded at the community meeting and was supported by some of the residents.

Mr. Duggins invited the applicant, Mr. Carroll, to the podium to talk about the development. He showed illustrations of the development and emphasized it was only for illustrative purpose. He noted the UDP provided to the commissioners, was essential in explaining the changes to the PUD zoning.

**Roy Carroll, 201 North Elm Street**, introduced himself as the president of the Carroll Companies. He said he was lifelong resident of Greensboro. Mr. Carroll stated the development was big project for the city and for his company. Therefore, community input was important to him. He said the feedback received on how they would like to see the site developed ranged from parks, single-family dwelling, offices, shops and restaurants. Mr. Carroll stated on thing clear from the residents' feedback was that the development needed to be walkable. He said he challenged the design team on this feedback. As such, parking would be an underground garage. Mr. Carroll also noted the site slope throughout by 16 feet. He said faced with this physical constraint they provided underground parking, which would not be visible. Mr. Carroll stated there were concerns about the "Bee Safe" (self-storage facility). He said the "Bee Safe" was basically a retaining wall buried underground with one story above the ground. He said this design was great use of space since windows were not required for storage. He felt the storage design was good.

Mr. Carroll stated the current PUD design was what the residents did not want. He said the current PUD design included strip center with extensive parking lot and parking lights. He emphasized the residents did not want the current PUD design. Mr. Carroll mentioned they are continuing working with the neighbors. He noted the request was a large mixed-use development comprised of apartments, office, retail and restaurants. He said he would like the neighbors be able to walk to the development. He said crosswalks and sidewalks could be added to the development.

Mr. Carroll displayed a concept site plan. He said the development had a central core; customer could park and walk around to the shops and restaurants. He stressed the plan was pedestrian friendly. He envisioned the development with outdoor bands and ice cream kiosk in the summer time. Mr. Carroll stated he received tremendous positive response from a lot of the neighbors about the proposed development. He noted they would continue the neighborhood outreach process. Mr. Carroll pointed out that the landscape buffer would continue to grow as they continuing working the neighbors. He noted the Bee Safe storage (northeast of the site plan) would be one story high.

Mr. Carroll showed the rendering for the hotel development and possible restaurant along Friendly Avenue. He said the aim was to design the hotel building to fit in with the surrounding residential development. He stated the architecture would not be vinyl siding or stucco but would be brick development. Mr. Carroll mentioned the development would be a legacy project with his family name attached to it. He said the project would be first class. Mr. Carroll told the commissioners he planned on living at the development. Therefore, the development would be well maintained. He acknowledged his daughter at the meeting and said she should maintain the development after him. He emphasized the development would stay in the family. Mr. Carroll said the request was the type of infill development that community should want.

Mr. Carroll thanked the commission for their consideration.

Chair Magid asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Magid asked for persons speaking in opposition to the request to come forward to the podium. She reminded that as a group they had a shared total of ten minutes to speak on the request. Chair Magid inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak online.

**Frank Burton, 3212 Hobbs Landing Court**, said he was present on behalf of the residents of Hobbs Landing Court. He asked the residents to raise their hands. He stated the residents supported the current PUD zoning. He said the proposed PUD zoning would allow massive density and uses that were inconsistent with any residential neighborhood. Mr. Burton noted that the current PUD approval restricted uses that were included in the rezoning request. Such uses were billboards, hotels and motels, bars and self-storage. He pointed out that the current approval was limited to one access along Hobbs Road with one point of access on Friendly Avenue. On the other hand, the request had an access from Hobbs Road, which traversed directly behind Hobbs Landing Court and exited on Friendly. The exit was proposed close to Lutheran Church. He found it difficult to imagine the proposed density would work for the site with the limited access. Therefore, the residents opposed the request.

**Stephen Marks, 3214 Hobbs Landing Court**, added that the residents worked extensively with the previous developer. He stated it was evident in the PUD approval with the landscape buffer for residential protection and safety. Mr. Marks said the request only showed astronomical increase in density. He said the proposed density was between eight to ten times greater than the current density. Mr. Marks noted it was difficult to know the exact density since the plans were illustrative. He made a comparison with adjacent shopping center on Friendly Avenue. Mr. Marks stated the shopping center was on acreage that was six times greater than the subject properties. While the development square footage for the shopping center was less than the rezoning request development area. He stated the adjacent shopping center had nice setbacks with green space. Mr. Marks acknowledged the concept site plan was work in progress, however, showed very little green space. He said the previous developer worked with tree surveys to formulate the current PUD.

Mr. Marks noted that to accommodate the proposed development tremendous soil and tree removal would be needed. He said how the uses were laid out on the site a lot of time and energy was put into the current PUD site design. He had no doubt the applicant would do an attractive development or workmanship. He said his concern was with the density. He mentioned he lived in the area for over thirty years. He was familiar with the difficulty of the north and south traffic movement around the Hobbs Road and Friendly Avenue traffic light. Mr. Marks said this concern would be a GDOT concern, noting the residents were promised a right turn lane. He said without the development having a deaccelerating lane on Friendly Avenue, there would be tremendous afternoon traffic jam. The traffic would extend from Sternberger Elementary School, along Wedgedale Avenue to Friendly Avenue. He said turning left out of the site would be dangerous. He stated the intersection at Hobbs Road and Friendly Avenue was already having frequent traffic accidents. Mr. Marks said adding eighty hotel rooms, two hundred apartments, retails and restaurants would be adding thousand more trips in the area. He emphasized the request would be on 6.1 acres with very high density. He added the residents had concern with the building height, and the closeness to Friendly Avenue. He said the hotel building would appear as a six story building. He asked the commission to decline the request for these reasons.

**Chair Magid** asked staff if the commission could take into consideration the comparison between the current PUD approval and the proposed PUD zoning.

**Mr. Carter** advised that the commission could that the comparison between the existing and proposed zoning. He explained that determining reasonableness of a request the commission could consider the degree of the difference of the current and proposed land uses.

**Chair Magid** questioned, current land uses.

**Mr. Ducharme** clarified, taking the existing zoning, conditions and the UDP and compare them with the request.

**Chair Magid** asked if there were anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request, noting they had three minutes remaining to speak. Hearing no further comments, Chair Magid asked the applicant to come to the podium. She announced the speaker in favor of the request had five minutes total for rebuttal.

### **Rebuttal**

**Nathan Duggins** stated the applicant, Mr. Carroll would address the residents' concerns. Additionally, Mr. Davenport would address the traffic concerns raised by the residents.

**Roy Carroll**, said he was excited to talk about the request that he forgot to mention the hotel component. He thanked Mr. Burton for mentioning the hotel during his presentation. Mr. Carroll stated the hotel was not the traditional big hotel, instead he would be a boutique hotel. He explained the hotel would be top class hosting executives who want an outstanding place to stay. Mr. Carroll emphasized the city did not have a five star hotel.

**Mr. Carroll** said the Lutheran Church was an influential neighbor. Therefore, his team met with them discussing realignment of their driveway. He stated that his team would continue working with the Church on the realignment.

**John Davenport, 119 Brookstown Avenue, Winston-Salem**, said he represented John Davenport Engineering. He confirmed a traffic impact study (TIS) was conducted for the request.

He mentioned his company also did the TIS for the current PUD zoning, almost a decade ago. He highlighted the big difference was the request fit in the city's goal for land use planning. He stated the proposed development was truly a mixed use development. Mr. Davenport explained that while the proposed buildings were larger and denser than the current use, the development was not vehicle oriented. He listed there would be hotel, restaurants and other uses which complement each other. He noted the development design allowed for trips without using vehicles. Therefore, it is resulting to vehicle trips reduction. Mr. Davenport emphasized that while the request was denser having more square footage, it did not generate more traffic per square foot as the current strip center. Mr. Davenport mentioned the proposed design would be the trend for future mixed use development in the Triad. He said such projects which generate less traffic would be better for transit and pedestrians.

**Chair Magid** noted one of the residents' concerns about right turn existing the property. She added that the traffic concerns would be addressed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC).

**Mr. Davenport** stated a separate lane, for left turn, would be provided at the intersection at Hobbs Road and Friendly Avenue. He noted the proposed turn lane was the same as the current zoning approval. Mr. Davenport noted the driveway access and turn lanes would be provided by GDOT standards.

**Chair Magid** referenced the UPD. She noted there would be two access points on Friendly Avenue (in and out); and three access points on Hobbs Road (1 out and 2 in and out).

**Mr. Davenport** agreed with Chair Magid. He added that the driveways would not be similar for those used for drive through restaurants. He likened the proposed operations using uber or concierge for moving customers. He noted there would not be a lot of parking lots on the site; the design would be to get customers to the building.

Chair Magid asked for any questions from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Magid noted the applicant had 2.3 minutes remaining for rebuttal in favor of the request.

**Mr. Duggins** asked for any questions the commission had for his team. He expressed the team was excited about the proposed development. Mr. Duggins stated the request was a good infill project for the site. He mentioned there was a huge job announcement and said it was time for the city to have such infill project. He asked the commission to approve the request.

**Ms. O'Connor** had a question about the proposed density. She said the request was mixed use with a combination of several uses. She asked how the commission could view the proposed density.

**Mr. Duggins** stated the UDP showed the design of the PUD and included the density. He explained the plan consisted of no more than two hundred and fifty apartment units; no more than a certain amount of retails or self-storage units. The uses are controlled and the UDP vetted by staff. He agreed the request was denser than the mixed use development on neighboring properties (Friendly Center). However, he pointed out the development (Hawthorne at Friendly) on adjacent property was six stories tall. He stated that Hawthorne at Friendly worked well in the area. He mentioned residents were selling their residences in Wedgewood and moving to Hawthorne. He stated residents wanted to live north of Friendly to enjoy the walkability to the Friendly Shopping Center. Mr. Duggins said that the proposed development was an extension of the walkability environment. He emphasized his team was excited about the project design, and to offer such community to the city.

Chair Magid asked for persons speaking in opposition to the request to come to the podium. She noted they have a shared total of five minutes for the rebuttal.

**Frank Burton**, stated that the traffic explanation did not give specific numbers the community would be facing. He noted there would be two access points on Friendly Avenue and three access points from the short distance from Friendly Avenue to Hobbs Landing Court. Mr. Burton said there was very little explanation on the traffic. He specifically mentioned the access road that would turn off Hobbs Road, traversing north of the site along Hobbs Landing Court and existing on Friendly Avenue beside the Lutheran Church. Mr. Burton stated their expert estimated parking requirements, for the request, for seven vehicles. He said the proposed parking deck could not accommodate the required parking. He stated the parking deck might be five stories in the future to accommodate the seven hundred vehicles.

Mr. Burton stated the residents of Hobbs Landing Court were very concerned with the access being directly next to them. He said the access could become a cut-through from Hobbs Road to Friendly Avenue. Mr. Burton said drivers currently uses Northline Avenue through the Hawthorne apartments to get onto Hobbs Road. Mr. Burton corrected that the Hawthorne apartment building was not six stories but four stories tall. He reinforced that the access road coming from Hobbs Road, adjacent to Hobbs Landing Court and existing at Friendly Avenue has the potential of becoming a major thoroughfare.

Chair Magid asked for anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing no further objections to the request Chair Magid closed the public hearing. She then asked the Commissioners for any comments.

**Mr. Nichols** stated that as commissioners they have their own personal experiences and bias. He said before moving to Greensboro he lived in Singapore for eight years. He said describing the request as “massively dense” and “astronomical density” he said compared to the most densely populated cities he lived the request was not massive density. In fact, he said the illustration displayed was how development should look like moving forward. He mentioned massive influx of people would be coming to the city to work at sites currently preparing for growth. Mr. Nichols said that unless we are willing to give up more of our green space, we need to have more densities.

Mr. Nichols said the two main arguments against the request were massive density, which he did not agree to. He agreed the request was denser. He mentioned the request should not be compared to the Friendly Center, which was built at a different time, circumstances with different deliverable. He did not find the comparison persuasive. He noted there would be a few more trips generated and there could be traffic collisions. However, the movement towards higher density development near major centers of activities is absolutely the direction the city needed to embark on. Mr. Nichols emphasized that when the city take this initiative it should be done by someone who demonstrated the ability to execute such projects. He said Mr. Roy Carroll and the Carroll Companies fit the description.

Mr. Nichols, however, stated he had reservations on the self-storage component of the request. He said the explanation provided by building a retaining wall disguised as storage space was not convincing. Mr. Nichols said the retaining wall should be used for other things. Overall, he understood the project and despite his reservation on the self-storage aspect, he supported the request.

**Mr. Downing** noted he liked the overall concept and the lifestyle the project promoted. He said he too had issues with the self-storage units. But having the storage placed underground and one level above ground he felt it was acceptable. Mr. Downing felt the design was intentional to not have another ostentatious storage facilities. He said there were too many storage facilities throughout the city. He mentioned he did some research on development trend. He stated in 2015 the city focused on the 2025 “the connections comprehensive plan”, which was ten years ago. Currently, the city is guided by the 2040 comprehensive plan. He said there is a new direction, new paradigm that the city was looking towards.

Mr. Downing acknowledged the residents’ concerns. However, things began to evolve. He said based on Mr. Carroll’s presentation; he demonstrated he cared about the proposed development. He supported the request. He reminded that the current zoning approval was ten years old and the commission considered the current PUD zoning. Notwithstanding, their decision was guided by the 2040 Comprehensive Plan for the infill and making the city attractive, a great place to do business and to live.

**Mr. Gilmer, Sr.** acknowledged the applicant’s business creditability. He said he met the applicant about twenty years ago when he opened the first Sheets (fuel station). He said Mr. Carroll was a pioneer and well respected in the city and across the east coast. He supported the request and stated such a design was well overdue. He expressed appreciation to the residents; however, he felt it was time to move in the direction of such a request.

**Mr. Downing** added that the commission was not supporting the request just because of the applicant. He emphasized that the support for the request was due to the design and what the development was promoting.

**Vice Chair Skenes**, stated she had the pleasure to be part of the commission to decide on the previous zoning approvals for the subject properties. Now, another request was before her. She said compared to the previous projects the request was “hands above”. Vice Chair Skenes stated the request was prettier, well laid out, and more respect for the surrounding neighbors. She said the development came a long way. Vice Chair Skenes agreed with Commissioner Gilmer, Sr and said it was time to move in the direction of the request. She felt the request was a good mixed use development. She mentioned the shops at the Friendly Center revealed that the residents of Wedgewood socialized there. Hence the same could be for the request. Vice Chair Skenes said the request has redeeming values in addition to having the intersection remedied. She stated the residents were told for some time that intersection at Friendly Avenue and Hobbs Road would be remedied. However, the intersection could only be redone when development came to the area. Vice Chair Skenes felt this development would provide the opportunity to remedy the intersection.

Vice Chair Skenes acknowledged the intersection was not related to zoning. However, there would be a lot of positive coming from the project. She supported the request and noted she lived in Wedgewood Community.

Chair Magid asked for further comments from the Commissioners.

**Chair Magid** agreed with the Commissioners. She added that tremendous thought was given to the city’s Development Plan in the project design. Chair Magid said that the design showed what the next level should be for the city. She noted that such type of development was occurring across the country and has not happened in the city. She agreed that the design was a “cutting edge” project. Chair Magid said with the recent announcement that more people are coming to

the city to live, they would appreciate the request. Chair Magid hoped more of this project type to be duplicated throughout the city.

**Vice Chair Skenes** added that she researched on google about the Hawthorne Apartment Complex. She said the building was four stories tall with an underground garage. She stated that the request would not have the tallest building in the neighborhood.

Chair Magid noted the proposed retaining wall adjacent to Hobbs Landing would have vegetation above. She felt this design would create a form of privacy for the neighbors.

**Commission Motion:**

Ms. O'Connor then stated regarding item **Z-25-05-005**, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the rezoning request for the properties at 3510-3516 West Friendly Avenue and 805-807 Hobbs Road from PUD (Planned Unit Development) 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 permits uses that fit the context of the 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. Gilmer, Sr. seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8 - 0, (Ayes: Chair Magid, Vice Chair Skenes, O'Connor, Turner, Gilmer Sr., Downing, Nichols and Peterson). Nays: (None).

Ms. O'Connor made a motion to approve the Unified Development Plan associated with **Z-25-05-005** for the properties identified as 3510-3516 West Friendly Avenue and 805-807 Hobbs Road. Ms. Turner seconded the motion.

The Commission voted 8 - 0, (Ayes: Chair Magid, Vice Chair Skenes, O'Connor, Turner, Gilmer Sr., Downing, Nichols and Peterson). Nays: (None).

Chair Magid advised the vote constituted a final action, unless appealed in writing and the appeal fee paid within 10 days. Anyone may file such an appeal. All such appeals would be subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, July 15, 2025 City Council Meeting. All adjoining property owners will be notified of any such appeal.