

**Guilford County
Planning Board
REMOTE/VIRTUAL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
August 12, 2020**

The Guilford County Planning Board held its Regular Meeting on Wednesday, **August 12, 2020** at 6:00 PM in the Blue Room, First Floor of the Old Guilford County Courthouse located at 301 W Market Street, Greensboro, NC 27401. **Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic we will conduct the meeting virtually, see attached *VIRTUAL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES*.**

Members Present: Mr. Apple (remotely); Mr. Alexander (remotely); Mrs. McKinley (remotely); Ms. Buchanan (remotely); Mr. Mann (remotely); and Mr. Jones (in person)

Members Absent: Ms. Hayworth, Mr. Thompson

Staff Present: Tonya Hodgin, Planning Technician; Leslie Bell, Guilford County Planning Director; Kaye Graybeal (remotely), Matt Talbott, Sr. Planner/Planner II, Oliver Bass; and Robert Carmon, Deputy Fire Marshal (remotely)

Chair Jones called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone in attendance. He then explained the policies and procedures followed in conducting the meeting.

AGENDA AMENDMENTS: Mr. Jones made a motion to remove Rezoning Case #20-07-GCPL-04438 7538 & 7540 McDerr Road from the Agenda, seconded by Mr. Alexander. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Ms. McKinley made a motion to approve the July 8, 2020 minutes and the July 9, 2020 voting session, seconded by Mr. Alexander. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion (Ayes: Apple, Alexander, McKinley, Buchanan, Mann and Jones Nays: None).

RULES AND PROCEDURES:

Chair Jones read the rules of procedure and stated: Cases are usually called as they are listed on the agenda. Withdrawals and continuances may be handled before other cases. We ask that if anyone in attendance wishes to speak on a matter to please add your name and address to the signup sheet and state your name and address for the record when you are called upon. For those wishing to speak who are participating remotely, you will be recognized by the Chair and provided an opportunity to speak.

At the conclusion of the public comment, we will close the floor to public discussion and take the matter up as a Board for questions, discussion, and a motion.

“Let the record show that the Guilford County Planning Board is conducting its July 9, 2020 Regular Meeting remotely and thus will follow the procedures and requirements as outlined in North Carolina General Statutes. For each case for which a public hearing is scheduled for this evening, both opponents and proponents will have an opportunity to speak, both those in person and those participating remotely, when the public hearing is opened for each case.

For Rezoning Cases:

- The staff will call the specific case, read a description of the request and summarize their recommendation.
- First, we will hear from the applicant and those in support of the request, followed by those in opposition.
- Each side will have a total of 20 minutes to present their case. That's 20 minutes inclusive of all speakers. So, if you have multiple speakers [in the room], I suggest you keep your comments brief, to the point, and not repetitive of previous speakers.
- At the end of the initial presentation of the case, each side **may** be granted, by the chair, a five-minute rebuttal period. During this rebuttal, no new information may be presented, only comments on previously presented information.
- A vote of 5/7's (71.4%) or more favor of a request constitutes final action, unless appealed.
- A vote of less than 5/7's (71.4%) on a motion to approve will be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners for a final decision.
- A tie vote on any motion constitutes denial of the request, unless appealed.
- Appeals may be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners within 15 days and must be in writing. There is a processing fee.

Also note that the new law requires that written comments can be made in writing for up to 24 hours after this regular meeting and can be mailed, hand delivered or e-mailed to THODGIN@GUILFORDCOUNTYNC.GOV.

A consequence of this requirement is that the public body (this Board) will not be able to take action on the matter immediately following the public hearing this evening. Thus, in order to meet the 24-hour requirement, the Guilford County Planning Board, following completion of the agenda this evening, will recess and reconvene on tomorrow at 6:30 pm at which time the Board will make its decision for each public hearing held this evening. Please refer to the posted notice for instructions for listening to the reconvened meeting.

CONTINUANCE REQUESTS: None.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:**

CONDITIONAL ZONING CASE #20-07-GCPL-04332: RS-40 to CZ-HB 4041-4045 Randleman Road. Located on the east side of Randleman Road, approximately 700 feet north from its intersection of S. Elm-Eugene Street. Being Guilford County Tax Parcel #142788 & #142778, approximately 1.78 acres owned by Afshan Sajjad. Proposed Conditional Zoning from RS-40 to CZ-HB limited to the following Use Conditions: All uses permitted in the Highway Business District except for the following: 1) Shelter for the homeless; 2) Caretaker Dwelling; 3) Junked Motor Vehicle; 4) Auditorium, Coliseum or Stadium; 5) Shooting Range (Indoor); 6) Fraternity or Sorority (University or College Related); 7) Go-cart Raceway; 8) Construction or Demolition Debris (C-D), Minor; 9) Land Clearing & Inert Debris (LCID) Landfill, Minor; 10) Taxi Terminal, along with the submitted Zoning Sketch Plan. The proposed Conditional Zoning is inconsistent with the Southern Area Plan land use classification of Agricultural; thus if approved, an area plan amendment to Moderate Commercial would be required. **(APPROVED)**

Matt Talbott stated that this property is located on the east side of Randleman Road, approximately 700 feet north from its intersection of S. Elm-Eugene Street. Being Guilford County Tax Parcel #142788 & #142778, approximately 1.78 acres owned by Afshan Sajjad.

There is no history of denied cases for this property. The proposed request is to for Conditional Zoning from RS-40 to CZ-HB limited to the following Use Conditions: All uses permitted in the Highway Business District except for the following: 1) Shelter for the homeless; 2) Caretaker Dwelling; 3) Junked Motor Vehicle; 4) Auditorium, Coliseum or Stadium; 5) Shooting Range (Indoor); 6) Fraternity or Sorority (University or College Related); 7) Go-cart Raceway; 8) Construction or Demolition Debris (C-D), Minor; 9) Land Clearing & Inert Debris (LCID) Landfill, Minor; 10) Taxi Terminal, along with the submitted Zoning Sketch Plan. The proposed Conditional Zoning is inconsistent with the Southern Area Plan land use classification of Agricultural. This RS-40 zoning is primarily intended to accommodate single family residential detached on large lots. The Conditional Zoning district is primarily established as every district in Section 4.2. All regulations in the General Use Zoning district also applies to companion conditional zoning. This request is in an area with a mixture of uses with varying lot sizes, small and large businesses, and industrial uses and is also adjacent to Highway Business setting districts. The existing land use on properties are undeveloped other than an existing billboard, to the north is residential single family properties, to the south is a gas station, to the east is residential single family and to the west is residential single family. The Land Use Plan is the Southern Area Plan with Agricultural and is inconsistent with the Land Use Plan Staff recommends approval, although inconsistent with the Southern Area Plan recommendation, zoning would extend the adjacent HB zoning to the proposed property in this request. There is also HB zoning properties less than 200 feet away. If approved, an area plan amendment to Moderate Commercial would be required.

Chair Jones opened the public hearing.

IN SUPPORT:

Mike Fox, attorney representing the applicant, stated that Joe Strickland, a representative of the developer is also available. The objective of this rezoning is to be able to develop a Dollar General store on this site. It has been determined by Dollar General that this location would be successful for this proposed store. They have a reputation of doing very high quality businesses and products. As an illustration, a sketch of one of their stores was shown to the Board members. Two sides of the structure will be masonry. The other two sides will be the back of the building. The sketch also shows entrances to the store from S. Eugene Street and Randleman Road. They also plan to add conditions to the request: a 6' shadow fence along the entire rear property which would stretch from S. Elm all the way over to Randleman Road; they are also going to do a row of Leland Cypress along the back near the fence on both sides of the building; and the masonry on the two sides next to the parking lot.

Chair Jones asked if the Board can vote this evening on the conditions. Leslie Bell stated that they could vote on the conditions this evening, and to make sure it is part of the motion for the final vote tomorrow.

Mr. Fox stated that in terms of neighborhood outreach, a letter was sent to all the people on the list provided by the County and they hears from one neighbor, Mr. Morgan, who is here tonight and will speak on this matter. He was very helpful in talking with them about the drainage in this area so their engineers would be aware of those concerns. He does not have any issue with the Dollar General store being there but is concerned about the drainage in this particular area.

Joe Strickland, Salisbury, NC, stated that he represents Dollar General stores and is Director of Operations and based out of Thomasville, GA, and they have an office in Salisbury, NC. They currently work in 22 counties in NC and are developers for Dollar General stores. He was on the acquisition team that chose this site for the proposed location of a new Dollar General Store. There are other commercial properties in the immediate area, so they feel this location is a very good one for a Dollar General store. The site will be on well and septic and those provisions are met. They have met with DOT and they have reviewed the preliminary drawings and given feedback

on their requirements. They feel there is a market in this area and hope the Board will approve this request.

IN OPPOSITION:

Kyle Morgan, 5012 Forest Oaks Drive, stated that he is not in opposition to the store, but he would like to speak on this matter with regard to the water run-off and drainage for this area. He also owns property that is on the side of this property. There are some fields in the immediate area that they grow hay on and there are currently problems with flooding and drainage in this area. There needs to be a sufficient piping or a culvert that would route the water run-off to a safer area. He has spoken with Mike Fox about the foot traffic and he stated there would be a fence on the north and east side of the property and would go all the way to S. Elm Street. He feels that would be a great addition. There is one property owner that owns a lot of property on the Randleman Road side of this site. The façade of the facility should have a brick façade on all sides of the building to make it look better.

REBUTTAL

Mike Fox stated that they would like to add the following conditions to the application which were read into the record by Leslie Bell:

- Brick façade on three sides of the building, two sides facing the parking lot and then the north side of the building
- 6' shadow-box fencing along rear of property from S. Elm/Eugene Street to Randleman Road
- Plantings of Leland Cypress along the rear of the property

Chair Jones asked for a motion to add those conditions to the application.

Ms. McKinley moved approval of the conditions, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Apple. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Mann, Apple, Buchanan, McKinley, Alexander, Jones. Nays: None.)

There being no one else to speak in favor or in opposition, Chair Jones asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Apple moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Mann. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Mann, Apple, Buchanan, McKinley, Alexander, Jones. Nays: None.)

Chair Jones advised that the Planning Board would take a vote on this request at the reconvened meeting, Thursday, August 13, 2020.

REZONING CASE #20-07-GCPL-04164: LI to HB 814 Knox Road Located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Knox Road and Kivett Dairy Road. Being Guilford County Tax Parcel #116873, approximately 6 acres owned by Bob Rose, Jr. Proposed Rezoning from LI to HB. The proposed Rezoning is inconsistent with the Northeast Area Plan land use classification of Light Industrial; thus if approved, an area plan amendment to Heavy Commercial would be required. **(DENIED)**

Oliver Bass stated that this property is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Knox Road and Kivett Dairy Road. Being Guilford County Tax Parcel #116873, approximately 6 acres owned by Bob Rose, Jr. The request is to rezone property from LI to HB. The Light Industrial district is primarily intended to accommodate light manufacturing, warehousing, development related to multiple service activities with normal operations within that designation. There is little or no adverse effect upon adjoining properties. The Highway Business district is primarily intended to accommodate retail services and distributive services that could be located along thoroughfares providing locations for establishments that would require high visibility, good road access and

caters to passing motorist. The development generally has substantial setbacks. This is an industrialized area of the County with existing uses such as a multi-tenant industrial site, and to the west is industrial with residential parcels located to the west. The proposed Rezoning is inconsistent with the Northeast Area Plan land use classification of Light Industrial. The parcel is in an area that is primarily industrial. The existing zoning are engaged in manufacturing, distribution, and wholesale and other non-retail activities. If approved, an area plan amendment to Heavy Commercial would be required. Staff recommends denial based on the proposed inconsistencies with the recommendations of the Northeast Area Plan.

Chair Jones opened the public hearing.

IN SUPPORT:

James DuBose, the applicant, stated that they intend to use the location for funeral services in the area. They would also be able to be a wholesale distributor for other operators, as well. The hours of operation would be from 10:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday and Saturdays 10:00 am to 2:00 pm or by appointment only on Sundays. There would be an occasional visitation, which would be no later than 7:00 pm. Outsourcing would be done for cremation as well as embalming and all service vehicles would be leased, other than single service van that would be parked at the rear of the building. Parking needs would be minimal as most consultations would take place in the family's homes. This would be another opportunity to provide jobs for County residents, as well as to continue to increase the tax base in the future. His wife is a licensed Funeral Director and they feel this would be a good partnership with the community, as well as expand on the relationships and partnerships they already have with local churches in the area. This facility would not cause any undue stress or issues with other businesses in the area.

Teshuna DeBose stated that her husband covered their application and potential use of the property, but she wished to add that they have a desire to serve the community. There are no service providers in the nearby area and they hope to provide that service at a closer location.

Jeff Allred, 8065 Coble Mill Road, stated that he owns two businesses in this particular building. He does not feel that the proposed use would have any negative impact on his business. He owns a fish and game facility next door and this would not affect the foot-traffic for his sports business or his land surveying business.

Ms. McKinley asked if there would be a Chapel at this location. James DuBose responded that there would be a small Chapel and they are expecting to have no more than 40-50 people at a time. They have partnerships with two churches so any large services would be held at one of those churches.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Mann, Ms. DuBose stated that most of the embalming and cremation would be done at an out-source facility and not on-site.

Mr. Alexander asked why staff recommends denial of the request. Leslie Bell stated that it would create a non-conforming use, so that was the main concern. As tenants come in and leave, it limits allowed uses in the surrounding properties.

IN OPPOSITION:

None

There being no one else to speak in favor or in opposition, Chair Jones asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Ms. McKinley moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Mann. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Mann, Apple, Buchanan, McKinley, Alexander, Jones. Nays: None.) Chair Jones advised that the Planning Board would take a vote on this request at the reconvened meeting, Thursday, August 13, 2020.

REZONING CASE #20-07-GCPL-04218: AG to PD-R 3670 & 3682 Brick Church Road
Located on the west side of Brick Church Road, approximately 1200 feet north from its intersection of Holts Store Road. Being Guilford County Tax Parcels #109522 and #109519, approximately 35.08 acres owned by Sylvia Jean Gilliam and Shirley Ann Clapp. Proposed Rezoning from AG to PD-R along with the submitted proposed Zoning Sketch Plan. The proposed Rezoning is consistent with the Rock Creek Area Plan land use classification of Agricultural/Rural-Residential; thus if approved, no plan amendment would be required. **(APPROVED)**

Oliver Bass stated that this property is located on the west side of Brick Church Road, approximately 1200 feet north from its intersection of Holts Store Road. Being Guilford County Tax Parcels #109522 and #109519, approximately 35.08 acres owned by Sylvia Jean Gilliam and Shirley Ann Clapp. The proposed Rezoning from AG to PD-R along with the submitted proposed Zoning Sketch Plan. The Zoning Sketch Plan was revised in response to the Technical Review Committee (TRC) comments within the attached letter. The AG district is primarily to accommodate uses of an agricultural nature, with farm residents and tenant housing, and to accommodate non-farm residences, but is not intended for major residential subdivisions. The PD-R district is intended to accommodate a variety of housing types, developed by large tracts in accordance with the Unified Development Plan. The PD-R district also accommodates neighborhood business and office uses, which primarily serve nearby residents. The primary use in the area is agricultural and low density residential single family. There are two existing single wide manufactured dwellings on nearby parcels. The applicant has indicated that those would be removed after rezoning for this development. Current uses are a farm church and residential and agricultural uses in the area. The parcel is in the Rock creek Area Plan and in 2016 and recommends the area for AG rural residential. The proposed Rezoning is consistent with the Rock Creek Area Plan land use classification of Agricultural/Rural-Residential. The rezoning will allow other preservation of the environment in sensitive areas around the site and will permit single family residential development under the control of the Unified Development Plan consistent with the development in the area. If approved, no plan amendment would be required. Staff recommends approval of the request as it is consistent with the recommendation of the Rock Creek Area Plan.

Chair Jones opened the public hearing.

IN SUPPORT:

Jeff Allred, 8065 Coble Mill Road, stated that this is a 35-acre tract of land and the application complies with the low-density requirements of 1 residence per acre. The PD-R zoning helps this property. There are several acres of wetlands with a creek running to the south. There are quite a few drainage ditch issues that will be addressed as they move forward with development. There are several areas of common area and open space to keep the agricultural feel to it. The two lots that are on Brick Church Road are a little larger and they also will have a landscape buffer to keep this property separated. In the common area they are utilizing for off-site septic systems. They may lose a couple of the lots in trying to address the drainage and erosion issues.

IN OPPOSITION:

William Newlin, 3693 Brick Church Road, stated that he has lived there since 1990 and he opposes this application for the development of this property. There are several issues related to development of this property, such as environmental, social, and traffic concerns as well as flooding concerns in this particular area. This property is in a flood plain and his concern that any increase

in land disturbance will cause even more flooding issues in the future. There has already been a lot of erosion along the creek in heavy rainfalls.

Chair Jones stated that this Board is not available to address the concerns about water run-off and drainage issues in a flood plain. The purpose of this Board is to determine whether the use of the land as residential purposes is consistent with the zoning. That is consistent with the Area Plan, and if there are questions about density or too many lots, those can be considered by the Board, but environmental issues are something that are reviewed through the TRC and other departments in the County.

Mr. Newlin stated that he thought this was the place where residents would be able to speak in opposition to this request. He pointed out that the developer is proposing a 300% increase in population on this property and it would change the nature of the environment of the whole community. He also has concerns about displacement of the wildlife and intrusion into the agricultural crops and farming community. He pointed out that there is hunting in the immediate area and people do shoot guns and would cause a safety issue to anyone living in the proposed new development. Again, his main concern is the stormwater run-off in this area. He asked that the developers consider: establish a baseline for water quality among the existing residences; cover any costs for remediation or repair of the water sources of existing residences, an environmental study to be done; send a written offer to each property owner of record to establish well water or a baseline; he also asked that each lot be 40,000 sq. ft. .

Paul Mann, 3673 Brick Church Road, stated that he lives right across from this property. He is concerned about the crossover pipe that is currently on the property. He has called DOT and the pipe is not big enough to handle the water run-off and there is the possibility that a bridge will be put in. He asked who is going to pay for damages to his property and his neighbor's property when there is more flooding than usual. The proposed development would be a detriment to the whole neighborhood.

Nick Tuttle, 3687 Brick Church Road, stated that with so many houses in the proposed development there certainly will be a change in the stormwater run-off and erosion in this area.

Leslie Bell stated that the County has staff that addresses issues concerning water run-off and erosion. That department addresses stormwater and watershed impacts and regulations are met. and the development would accommodate whatever run-off that might create on this property.

Nick Tuttle continued by saying that there are fences along that creek and every time it rains, it is a battle to fix that fence again.

Paul Mann, 3679 Brick Church Road, stated that his home is right across the street from this property. He is concerned about 31 more houses being built on this property. It would cause safety issues for his children and family and the other people who live in this area. There would also be a lot more traffic which would also cause more safety issues. There is already a lot of traffic on that road from people going to Piedmont Drag Strip. There is too much risk to the community.

Jill Greeson, 7152 Shea Road, stated that they own the property shown on the map near this proposed development. She is concerned about the habitat for the wildlife in this area and also about the water problems for the residents. If there are 31 more homes. Thomas Greeson added that there are natural springs in this area and the water already backs up on that property. He asked what are the plans for addressing that issue. He added that there has been asphalt and shingles dumped on the property which causes an environmental issue. He asked if that had been investigated and if there is going to be any kind of barrier between the proposed development and the existing landowners.

REBUTTAL IN FAVOR:

Jeff Allred, the applicant, stated that in regard to animals on the neighbor's property, the neighbors will have to handle their own agricultural needs. For the stormwater issue, when the designs are submitted for review, and the run-off cannot exceed whatever numbers they get. Stormwater measures will have to be in place and they have to comply with those requirements. Anything that is going on now, will continue to go on. It probably will not get any better, but it should not get any worse. They will have to put measures in to control stormwater run-off.

Chair Jones stated that the applicant can continue this matter to next month to have additional communication with the neighbors. Jeff Allred stated that he would like to go ahead with the vote tomorrow evening. He understands the concerns voiced by the neighbors.

REBUTTAL IN OPPOSITION

Nick Tuttle, 36887 Brick Church Road, stated that there has been no communication from the developer on this project. It would have been nice to know what their plans are for this property.

Paul Mann, 4673 Brick Church Road, stated that Brick Church is considered as a neighborhood property and with the property that adjoins it and everybody with the church is against this development. They have not had time to get everybody together to address their questions and concerns.

There being no one else to speak in favor or in opposition, Chair Jones asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Mann moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Ms. McKinley. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Mann, Apple, Buchanan, McKinley, Alexander, Jones. Nays: None.)

Chair Jones advised that the Planning Board would take a vote on this request at the reconvened meeting, Thursday, August 13, 2020.

THERE WAS A SHORT RECESS FROM 7:35 UNTIL 7:42 P.M.

REZONING CASE #20-07-GCPL-04438: RS-40 to RS-40-MH 7538 & 7540 McDerr Road Located on the north side of McDerr Road, approximately 575 feet east from its intersection of East Fork Road and Penny Road. Being Guilford County Tax Parcels #158822 and #158823, approximately .96 acres owned by Patricia Scott. Proposed Rezoning from RS-40 to RS-40-MH. The proposed Rezoning is consistent with the Southwest Area Plan land use classification of Residential Single-Family; thus if approved, no plan amendment would be required. **(WITHDRAWN)**

REZONING CASE #20-07-GCPL-04508: AG to HB 2546 Nelson Farm Road Located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Nelson Farm Road and I-85 S. Being Guilford County Tax Parcel #118024, approximately 7.09 acres owned by Battle Brands & Co, LLC. Proposed Rezoning from AG to HB. The proposed Rezoning is inconsistent with the Alamance Area Plan land use classification of Residential Single-Family; thus if approved, an area plan amendment to Heavy Commercial would be required.

Oliver Bass stated that this property is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Nelson Farm Road and I-85 S. Being Guilford County Tax Parcel #118024, approximately 7.09 acres owned by Battle Brands & Co, LLC. The proposed rezoning from AG to HB. The AG district is primarily intended to accommodate uses of an agricultural nature including farms, houses and

residents. It also accommodates care of mini farm residents on large tracts of land. The Highway Business district is primarily intended to accommodate retail services and distributive uses that are typically along thoroughfares. The district is established to provide locations for establishing that need with high visibility and good road access and caters to passing motorists. In terms of the character of the area, it is largely undeveloped with single family residential homesites scattered along Nelson Farm Road. In regards to the land use plan, it is located in the Alamance Area Plan and the Plan recommends the area for residential single family designation is to accommodate low to moderate density with higher density development of 4 units per acre served by water and sewer. The HB district is generally not anticipated for land under this designation. Staff recommends denial of the HB zoning, because the HB zoning is inconsistent with the recommendations of the Alamance Area Plan land use classification of Residential Single-Family. If approved, an area plan amendment to Heavy Commercial would be required.

Chair Jones opened the public hearing.

IN SUPPORT:

Marcus Battle, Battle Brands & Co., LLC. 2546 Nelson Farm Road, stated that he proposes to create an agricultural based family complex on the site. With respect to it being located in a single family residential and agricultural area, he feels this will fit in very well with the surrounding area. He plans to preserve the agricultural feel and look of the area. This would be a farm-to-table based opportunity for the local farmers to sell their produce, so it would be used for commercial purposes. There is a restaurant and grocery store that is being proposed for that area. These would be between 320 and 600 square feet, so that would also be an addition to the traffic in the area. The traffic to his site would be from the local farmers delivering their produce. This would increase the economic benefits of farmers for this area. There would be designated areas for food and vegetable gardens which would also support the agricultural feel of the area.

Chair Jones stated that what the Board is seeing is really specific and well laid out, but the challenge is that he is not bound to do any of the things he is speaking about and showing on the plan. Today, the Board is being asked to address the use of the land and not anything that would be happening on the land. Any use for Highway Business would be considered within this rezoning. He encouraged Mr. Battle to consider whether he wants to file a Conditional Zoning application. Mr. Battle stated that he is still considering other options and appreciates guidance from the Board. He will continue to speak with the neighbors about his plans. He is open to making an application to add restrictions that would be sufficient to move the request along.

IN OPPOSITION:

Charles Causey, owns property at 3722 E. Lee Street, that backs up to the proposed property. He stated that he does not want this facility on this property because of the traffic. He doesn't want people at the site late at night, having gatherings and parties, possibly some shootings and fighting. He feels the property should stay zoned agricultural and that's all it would be used for.

REBUTTAL IN FAVOR

Marcus Battle thanked Mr. Causey for his opinion. He feels it may be in his best interest to delay because of the specific responses that may become conditions. He wanted to highlight some research that he has done and he would like to share the site plan with Mr. Causey.

IN OPPOSITION

Sandra Garner, 2520-2524 Nelson Farm Road, stated that she is opposed to the request. She asked that the request not be approved because she never got the site plan or enough information for a decision. She also talked to several of the impacted neighbors and they are still asking questions and need additional information. They received a mailing last Thursday and she spoke briefly with Mr. Battle on Friday who gave her an overview of the plan and why he was making the

request. She did feel better about having someone that was concerned and had family values in that plan, but she also needed to have some more significant information and have their considerations addressed on restrictions. She asked that the Board consider the community and make an informed decision to ensure that because it is a growing neighborhood, it would also be cognitive to the agricultural community. She is concerned that once this facility is in place, there would be something else coming along, like a domino effect, taking over the look and feel of the agricultural neighborhood. She is also concerned about the increase in traffic in this area with a two-lane country road.

REBUTTAL IN FAVOR

Marcus Battle stated that thanked Ms. Saunders for her concerns and he would be happy to speak with her again about his plans. He pointed out that there is a nursery facility further down the road that is in run-down condition and he hopes someone will take it over and refurbish it at some time in the future. It is his understanding that someone has recently purchased that property, but he is not aware of the new owners' intent for the property. In the meantime, they will continue to come to the property to take care of any trash or eyesores on his property. He pointed out that there is still another 20 acres for sale on Nelson Farm Road that may be purchased in the future and developed for individual residential properties, which would cause a traffic increase.

There being no one else to speak in favor or in opposition, Chair Jones asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Ms. McKinley moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Mann. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion and the public hearing was closed. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Mann, Apple, Buchanan, McKinley, Alexander, Jones. Nays: None.)

Chair Jones advised that the Planning Board would take a vote on this request at the reconvened meeting, Thursday, August 13, 2020.

REZONING CASE #20-07-GCPL-04697: LI (City of Gboro) to LI (County) 2335 Campground Rd Located approximately 1,800 feet southwest from the intersection of S Holden Road and Campground Road. Being Guilford County Tax Parcel #228250, approximately 8.205 acres owned by Oliver Enterprises of Greensboro, LLC. Proposed Rezoning from **LI (City of Greensboro) to LI (Guilford County)**. The proposed Rezoning, for which the subject property was de-annexed by the City of Greensboro, is consistent with the Southern Area Plan land use classification of Light Industrial; thus, if approved, no plan amendment would be required. **(APPROVED)**

Mr. Talbott stated that the subject parcel is located approximately 1,800 feet southwest from the intersection of S. Holden Road and Campground Road. Being Guilford County Tax Parcel #228250, approximately 8.205 acres owned by Oliver Enterprises of Greensboro, LLC. Proposed Rezoning from **LI (City of Greensboro) to LI (Guilford County)**. The proposed Rezoning, for which the subject property was de-annexed by the City of Greensboro, effective June 30, 2020 and is consistent with the Southern Area Plan land use classification of Light Industrial; thus, if approved, no plan amendment would be required. The property owner is required to ask for rezoning of the property within 60 days of the property becoming un-zoned. The proposed request is to reestablish the previous zoning of Light Industrial and also coincides with the zoning designation LI, designated by the City of Greensboro by the annexation. The request is also consistent with the Guilford County Southern Area Plan as Light Industrial land use classification for the parcel. Given that the property was notified about re-establishing Light Industrial zoning designation for the subject property and conforms for support. The LI district is to accommodate manufacturing, wholes and warehouse and research and development. The request is primarily moderate to low density residential agricultural uses on various tracts of the property and there are also industrial uses and factory uses in the area. The property is currently vacant. To the north is Interstate 85, to the south, vacant with

distribution warehouse, to the east is the Wet 'N Now waterpark, and to the west is heavy equipment sales. The recommendation is Light Industrial and is consistent with the Southern Area Plan, and staff recommends approval of the request.

Chair Jones opened the public hearing.

IN SUPPORT:

None

IN OPPOSITION:

None

Chair Jones advised that this is a staff-initiated request.

There being no one to speak in favor or in opposition to this case, Chair Jones closed the public hearing and asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Alexander moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion and the public hearing was closed. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Mann, Apple, Buchanan, McKinley, Alexander, Jones. Nays: None.)

Chair Jones advised that the Planning Board would take a vote on this request at the reconvened meeting, Thursday, August 13, 2020.

OTHER BUSINESS:

UDO Project Update:

Leslie Bell stated that staff is in the final stages of ensuring everything is in place for the UDO Project. The goal is to have something scheduled for a public hearing before the end of December. The Board will be receiving updated information within the next few weeks.

RECESSED:

There being no further business before the Board, the *virtual* Regular meeting was recessed at 8:25 pm and will reconvene on Thursday August 13, 2020 at 6:30 pm for the Voting session.

The next scheduled meeting will be held on September 18, 2020 [next meeting is September 9, 2020]