

**MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JANUARY 21, 2026**

Z-26-01-001 and PL(P) 26-01: An annexation and original zoning request from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) for the property identified as 3800 Pineneedle Drive and a portion of Pineneedle Drive Right-of-Way, generally described as east of Pineneedle Drive and west of US Highway 29 North (0.63 acres). (RECOMMENDED APPROVED)

Ms. Harrison reviewed the summary information for the subject property and surrounding properties.

Ms. Harrison stated that the GSO 2040 Comprehensive Plan's Future Built Form Map currently designates the property as Urban General and as Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Staff determined the proposed original zoning request supports both the Comprehensive Plan's Creating Great Places goal to expand Greensboro's citywide network of unique neighborhoods offering residents of all walks of life a variety of quality housing choices and the Filling in Our Framework Big Idea to arrange our land uses for where we live, work, attend school, shop and enjoy our free time to create a more vibrant and livable Greensboro. The proposed R-3 zoning district is primarily intended to accommodate low-density single-family detached residential development of up to 3 dwelling units per acre. The request permits uses that are present on adjacent tracts. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Chair Skenes asked for any questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Skenes called the applicant to the podium to speak on the request. She reminded the applicant ten minutes was available to talk on the request.

In Support of:

Hugh Latham, 2500 Wilpar Drive, stated he purchased two properties 3800 and 3804 Pineneedle Drive to build single-family dwellings. He stated the single-family dwellings would blend in well with the surrounding single-family residences. Mr. Latham said he received feedback from residents regarding survey done for 3804 Pineneedle Drive. He noted the survey was done to locate the corners of the property based on deed description. Mr. Latham stated the survey revealed some of the markers were missing for 3804 Pineneedle Drive. While some of the markers for 3800 Pineneedle were placed incorrectly. Mr. Latham said the surveyor corrected the placement of the markers for both properties.

Chair Skenes reminded Mr. Latham the request was specific to 3800 Pineneedle Drive.

Mr. Latham stated that for the subject property, there was a question about the buildable area. He noted the issue was because of right-of-way. However, the survey corrected the issue.

Chair Skenes asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Downing asked about neighborhood outreach.

Mr. Latham stated he did not reach out the residents. However, he spoke with one resident. He noted two of the neighboring houses were vacant. Mr. Latham emphasized that the proposed dwelling would blend in with the neighborhood. He said he was not changing the zoning or doing anything special, he only wanted to build two houses.

In Opposition of:

Chair Skenes asked for further questions or comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, Chair Skenes then asked for persons wishing to speak in opposition to the request to come to the podium. Chair Skenes noted the residents had a shared total of ten minutes to speak on the request.

Ronald S. Powell, 1605 Lord Foxley Drive thanked the Commissioners for allowing him to speak. He stated he lived in the city for many years. He said he opposed the request for 3800 and 3804 Pineneedle Drive. Mr. Powell noted he owned 3808 Pineneedle Drive. He stated the subject property was zoned county. He said Mr. Latham mailed him a real estate form regarding his property at 3808 Pineneedle Drive. Mr. Powell also stated he was a licensed realtor/broker in the state of North Carolina.

Mr. Powell noted his concerns for the request was the zoning and safety. He said that the traffic situation with vehicles leaving Highway 29 in the vicinity of Lakeview Cemetery was dangerous. He said the subject property was narrow, almost like a triangle, with heavy overhead power lines. He said because of the overhead high voltage utility wires a variance would be required to building on the subject property.

Mr. Powell mentioned that the request was due to gaining access to city water and sewer. He noted that to be part of the city the annexation had to be volunteered. Mr. Powell said his property was in the county and annexation should not be forced. He referenced a court case of 2007, Cunningham, McLeansville versus the City of Greensboro. He said he was one of the parties in this lawsuit. He pointed out that for emergency vehicles, specifically fire trucks along the street with ditch on both sides. Mr. Powell said there were no sidewalk on the street. He said rezoning to R-3 was a higher density and asked the commissioners to take this into consideration. Mr. Powell said getting into and leaving the area was very dangerous. He said there were only single-family dwellings in the area. And allowing two or three homes on the subject property would not fit into the community. Mr. Powell stated the two vacant properties Mr. Latham mentioned, the owners were deceased. Mr. Powell said the request was not needed.

Chair Skenes asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Powell to explain the overhead power lines situation.

Mr. Powell, explained that the exit off Highway 29 leading to Pineneedle Drive was barricaded. He said in the vicinity of the subject property there were utility lines. He noted building could not happen under the power lines. Mr. Powell stated that if a dwelling should be built on 3804 Pineneedle, and to meet the required setbacks, it would encroach on his property. He encouraged the commissioners to do site visit to verify what he explained about the locations of the power lines.

Chair Skenes asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Chair Skenes explained to Mr. Powell that his property was not going to be annexed. She stated the request was a voluntary annexation.

Mr. Powell stated he understood his property would not be annexed. However, he expressed concerns with the density and traffic issues. Mr. Powell said with the request more individuals would be coming to the area. And the traffic pattern would be really bad.

Travis Powell, 1605 Lord Foxley Drive, added to the fact that 3808 Pineneedle Drive was not going to be annexed, however, the request constitutes spot zoning. He explained what he meant by spot zoning. He said having one property that was in the county to be annexed into the city would change the property taxes. Mr. Travis Powell questioned if there would be block grant money available for the property that would be annexed into the city. Since the taxes would be elevated. He said he researched and had questions, then referenced a court case the 1988 Chrismon versus Guilford County. He noted this case spoke about spot zoning.

Mr. Ducharme advised that for property being annexed into the city versus remaining in the county would not constitute spot zoning. He stated spot zoning was rezoning an individual piece of property in a manner that would be inconsistent with extensive area of surrounding zoned properties. Mr. Ducharme noted the land use map showed surrounding properties to be zoned residential. Also, being in the county uses would still appear residential in nature. Therefore, the request would not be spot zoning.

Chair Skenes restated that the request would not be considered spot zoning since the surrounding zoning was residential. Also, R-3 was the lowest residential density in the city. She noted that for the subject property to receive water and sewer it had to be annexed. And for consistency assigned the lowest residential density.

Mr. Ducharme agreed with Chair Skenes. He added that spot zoning was a determination for the courts. Notwithstanding, this request did not meet the definition of spot zoning.

Chair Skenes again asked for questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Oliver asked staff whether the property (3802 Pineneedle Drive) between 3800 and 3804 Pineneedle Drive would be impacted by the requests.

Mr. Kirkman advised that 3802 Pineneedle Drive would not be impacted by the request. He explained that the request was to annex the subject property for the purpose of accessing city utilities and to build a house.

Mr. Oliver asked if the property owner for the property at 3802 Pineneedle Drive was not objecting the request.

Mr. Kirkman was unsure of the objection to the request.

Rebuttal

Chair Skenes informed Mr. Latham that he had five (5) minutes for rebuttal.

Mr. Hugh Latham, 2500 Wilpar Drive, address the three issues raised by residents opposing the request:

- 1) Power lines: the buildable area for the subject property, no dwelling should be built within 30 feet from the power lines.
- 2) Block grants: there are none, he would pay all required taxes.
- 3) Spot zoning: the request was not spot zoning because City R-3 and County 30 are equivalent.

Mr. Latham said there were houses on both sides of the street and two houses would not change the traffic pattern.

Chair Skenes asked for question from the Commissioners.

Ms. Magid stated Mr. Latham mentioned two houses. She asked if he meant one house on the subject property and another on 3804 Pineneedle Drive.

Mr. Kirkman clarified that there would be one dwelling on each property. However, the request was for 3800 Pineneedle Drive.

Mr. Latham agreed there would be one dwelling per lot.

Chair Skenes called on the residents speaking in opposition. She noted they had five minutes rebuttal time to speak.

Mr. Travis Powell, 1605 Lord Foxley Drive, noted that it was possible to overlook that the 30 feet setbacks could be met. He asked for the aerial map to be displayed. He pointed out that the setbacks, given the building foot print, could be met on paper but might not be on land. Mr. Powell spoke about the survey and tax for both properties. He said 3800 and 3804 Pineneedle Drive were considered one property, paying one tax.

Chair Skenes inquired if there was anyone else wishing to speak in opposition to the request. Hearing none, Chair Skenes closed the public hearing. Chair Skenes then asked the Commissioners for comments.

Ms. Glass pointed out that objecting to taxes was not an issue for the commission to consider. She noted that the commission focus was issues relating to zoning. And the county zoning was analogous to the request. She looked to staff to confirm her reasoning.

Mr. Ducharme agreed with Ms. Glass.

Mr. Kirkman agreed with Ms. Glass as well. He noted that county 30,000 was designated residential single-family in the county. While R-3 was designated residential single-family in the city.

Mr. Ducharme added that as it related to tax, 3800 and 3804 Pineneedle Drive were individual parcels of land. And two parcels of land being voluntarily petitioned to be annexed into the city.

Ms. Glass noted taxes were not land use issues.

Ms. Magid noted that the building layout would be determined by TRC.

Mr. Kirkman concurred and stated that where and how a structure would be built will be addressed through the city's technical staff through the building permit process.

Vice Chair Downing also agreed that the commission considered land use issues. He said he knew the area well. And read from the transportation data (staff report), there was 43,000 vehicles per day. He noted there were significant accident happening in the area. These items were indicators for attention for the proper development. However, he stated the commission focus was land use and not the tax base.

Chair Skenes asked for further comments from the Commissioners. Hearing none, she asked for the motion.

Commission Motion:

Annexation

Mr. Peterson made a motion to annex item **PL(P) 26-01** for the property identified as 3800 Pineneedle Drive and a portion of Pineneedle Right-of-Way. Mr. Gilmer, Sr. seconded the motion.

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

Original Zoning

Mr. Peterson then stated regarding item **Z-26-01-001**, the Greensboro Planning and Zoning Commission believes that its action to recommend approval of the original zoning request for the property at 3800 Pineneedle Drive and a portion of Pineneedle Drive Right-of-Way from County RS-30 (Residential Single-family) to City R-3 (Residential Single-family – 3) 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 R-3 zoning district** permits uses that fit the context of the surrounding area and limits negative impacts on 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 9 - 0, (Ayes: Chair Skenes, Vice Chair Downing, Magid, Glass, Turner, Gilmer Sr., Nichols, Peterson and Oliver). Nays: (None).

Chair Skenes advised the votes constituted a favorable recommendation and was subject to a public hearing at the Tuesday, February 17, 2026 City Council Meeting.