

**GUILFORD COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
NC Cooperative Extension – Agricultural Center
3309 Burlington Road, Greensboro NC 27405**

June 14, 2023, 6:00 PM

Call to Order

Chair Donnelly called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. He mentioned that there were Guilford County staff in the Lobby, who are part of the Guiding Guilford Comprehensive Plan, and there is a QR Code that anyone can download to participate in a survey. The County is trying to gather as much input as possible about the priorities as they move forward with updating Guilford County's Comprehensive Plan [*Guiding Guilford*]. This is a normal update that is done to the Comprehensive Plan and they are excited to participate.

A. Roll Call

The following Board members were in attendance in person for this meeting.

James Donnelly, Chair; Guy Gullick, Vice Chair; David Craft; Dr. Nho Bui; Cara Buchanan; Sam Stalder; and Rev. Gregory Drumwright

The following Board members were not in attendance at this meeting:

Ryan Alston and Jason Little

The following Guilford County staff members were in attendance in-person for this meeting:

J. Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director; Oliver Bass, Senior Planner; Aaron Calloway, Planner I; Jessie Baptist, Administrative Officer; Robert Carmon, Fire Inspections Chief; Andrea Leslie-Fite, Guilford County Attorney; and Matthew Mason, Chief Deputy County Attorney

B. Agenda Amendments

Ms. Buchanan moved that item F. Proposed Revised Rules & Procedures be moved to item H. Other Business; seconded by Mr. Craft. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

C. Approval of Minutes: May 10, 2023

Dr. Bui moved to approve the minutes [with a minor correction submitted by Mr. Donnelly and Mr. Bell] of the May 10, 2023 meeting; ; seconded by Mr. Stalder. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

D Rules of Procedure

Chair Donnelly provided information to everyone present regarding the Rules of Procedure followed by the Guilford County Planning Board.

E. Continuance Requests

None

F. Old Business**Proposed Revised Rules & Procedures**

To be addressed at the end of the meeting (Other Business) by unanimous vote.

Legislative Hearing Item(s)

REZONING CASE #23-01-PLBD-00035: AG, AGRICULTURAL, TO LI, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL: 107 MARSHALL SMITH ROAD (REQUEST TO CONTINUE UNTIL JUNE 14, 2023 REGULAR MEETING) Located at 107 Marshall Smith Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #170647 in Deep River Township), the subject of this request is approximately 290 feet north of the intersection of Marshall Smith Road and W. Market Street and comprises approximately 7.37 acres. This is a request to rezone the property from AG, Agricultural, to LI, Light Industrial. The proposed rezoning is not consistent with the Guilford County Airport Area Plan recommendation of Mixed Use; therefore, if the request is approved, a plan amendment to Non-Residential will be required. **(REQUEST DENIED)**

Chair Donnelly stated that [this case] **[REZONING CASE #23-01-PLBD-00035: AG, AGRICULTURAL, TO LI, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL: 107 MARSHALL SMITH ROAD (REQUEST TO CONTINUE UNTIL JUNE 14, 2023 REGULAR MEETING)]** was heard at the April meeting and during the course of the meeting the Board entertained the request to continue the case until a future point in time, and tonight is that point, in order to facilitate a neighborhood meeting. He would like to start this evening with the results of that neighborhood meeting, and they will follow a similar process like they would for a rezoning case. He will invite the applicant to come up and share any comments or questions from that neighborhood meeting and there will be an opportunity for the folks here to ask any questions, and then, similarly, provide an opportunity for those who may be in opposition to summarize their perspective from the meeting and any concerns that may still persist. Each side will have 15 minutes to speak and everyone will have a chance to speak. He pointed out that the Board members have a copy of the April meeting minutes to help refresh their memory on this case.

Aaron Calloway stated that this is Rezoning Case #23-01-PLBD-00035, located at 107 Marshall Smith Road. Essentially this request was originally heard in April. The parcel is Tax Parcel #170647, comprising approximately 7.36 acres, just north of the intersection of W. Market Street and Marshall Smith Road, and the request is to change the zoning from AG, Agricultural, to LI, Light Industrial. The facts of the case were presented during the April meeting and he pointed out that the surrounding area is predominantly Industrial – Light or Heavy. The two parcels that are directly adjacent, also are similarly zoned AG, Agricultural. There are some topographical varieties on the parcel, and there is a pond also on the property that would fall under watershed review for additional buffer requirements upon

receipt of a site plan. Staff recommends approval of this request because of its consistency with much of the surrounding development around that intersection and the different varieties of industrial uses. Mr. Calloway pointed out that this property is within the Airport Area Plan and the plan recommendation is for Mixed Use. If the request is approved, a plan amendment to Non-Residential will be required.

Chair Donnelly pointed out that this is a rezoning request and it requires a map amendment. He asked for the applicant or anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request to come forward, give their name and address and present the case information.

Oscar Threatt (applicant), 5010 Shady Grove Lane, stated that there was a meeting and he explained what is going to happen to the stream through the property. He assured the attendees that an engineer was going to design the sediment pond, so those issues would be covered. They also talked about buffers which he explained to Wayne Marshall. He wants to build a small warehouse on the property to rent. There is a rental house next door to the north and a restaurant to the south that already has a buffer in place. They talked about Conditional Uses and they [the opposition] could not come up with anything. He just is asking for a straight rezoning of the property to build the warehouse.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to this request.

Mike Flanders, 291 Marshall Smith Road, stated that he wanted to thank Wayne Marshall for the great job he has done with helping the neighborhood to understand a little more about this request, so they could speak with Mr. Threatt at the neighborhood meeting to get a better understanding. They are concerned about the amount of traffic that the proposed warehouse might create and the changes at that intersection for people trying to get in and out of that area. They also are concerned about what types of materials might be housed in the warehouse. It could be something hazardous or unsafe being stored there. There are already some environmental impacts that they are concerned about. They are asking that the Board deny the request. They have asked if Mr. Threatt would consider selling the property.

Jamie Samakis, 149 Marshall Smith Road, stated that there are families in this area that have been there over 10 years and they have enjoyed this area for their homes. This property has been sort of a buffer from the traffic on Market Street. At the neighborhood meeting, several people had concerns about what the actual plans are for the property and Mr. Threatt had no response to that except that he wanted to build a warehouse to rent out. He [Mr. Samakis] doesn't feel that the community got enough information because they don't know what type of business might rent the warehouse.

Thomas Burchette, 168 Marshall Smith Road, stated that he moved in his home in 1948. It [Marshall Smith Road] was a dirt road with no electricity, but they did get electricity a year later. They got cable TV in about 1965 and it was a rural road with 4 houses during that time. The road has progressed through the years and he doesn't feel like they need any commercial buildings on the road with all the traffic they have in the area now. Sometimes he has a hard time getting out of his driveway because of all the traffic.

Jeff Little, 123 Marshall Smith Road, stated that he and his mother own the property, which is just due north of the subject property. His concerns have already been addressed by the other speakers in opposition. He is concerned about the pond that is on the property line between his property and Mr. Threatt's property, and what will come into play with a retention pond. In the meeting they asked for

some kind of guidance about how that can be addressed and what was going to happen, and they have not gotten that information. So, they are now dealing with the unknown for the future for this area. They feel that this is not the place for a warehouse, and he is asking the Board to deny the request.

Chair Donnelly asked for those in the audience that were opposed to stand. There were approximately 13 people in attendance who were opposed.

Chair Donnelly asked that anyone wishing to speak in rebuttal in favor of the request to come forward. Mr. Threatt came to the speaker's table and stated that there will be a retention pond designed by an engineer, and that should address the concerns of the neighborhood. Also, the buffer for the property will be addressed.

Chair Donnelly then asked for anyone speaking in rebuttal in opposition to come forward.

Mike Flanders stated that there are going to be apartments or townhouses across the street, consisting of 210 units. That traffic has already been planned for and agreed that it is reasonable. Now, we are adding trucking and other traffic going in there. The pollution that has been discussed will come from trucks being refueled and leaking and going across the road. It [the pollution] is from gravel being thrown out, and silt and mud when it rains, into the springs along the property line which will flow to the pond. The pollution will only be exacerbated by fueling on the property and additional activity.

Chair Donnelly asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Gullick moved to close the public hearing; seconded by Mr. Craft. The public hearing was closed by unanimous vote. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

Board Discussion:

Ms. Buchanan asked, "What are the buffer requirements for this particular property?" Mr. Calloway responded that it would be a Type "A" buffer, consisting of a minimum width of 40' along the property lines and a mix of trees would be required within that 40' of buffering.

Rev. Drumwright asked about the apartments that are being built behind the trucking company. Aaron Calloway stated that in looking at the aerial, there are images that he pointed out that indicate the location of the proposed apartments.

Mr. Gullick stated that he is not in favor of this request because, as a County, they have worked very hard on Land Use Development Plans and without a compelling reason, he just does not see why this should be changed. Ms. Buchanan stated that she struggled with this because the intersection itself is across the street from commercial or industrial and skirts on the edge of it and there needs to be a component reason. Mr. Gullick added that Light Industrial is a very broad category. Mr. Craft stated that he is also not in favor because there are 70 potential occupancies and many of them can be "x-ed" out, but that is not being requested here. This is just a general rezoning from one use to another use and it does back up to Greensboro property, which is the restaurant zoned commercial, across the street from commercial so that is one reason that you could reasonably alter the Land Use Plan. This one is so open-ended and across the street from these other uses. Chair Donnelly stated that he also is not in favor because he noticed when he looked at the map, this particular parcel is surrounded by AG on well over 75% of the boundary of the property. The boundary areas are going to work best when there is a collaboration amongst the developers and the community. At this time, there does

not seem to be that kind of collaboration in this case. Rev. Drumwright stated that he is not in favor of the request because he visited the property and there seems to be a good community in which a warehouse just would not fit and may be an eyesore to the neighborhood.

Motion

Mr. Gullick moved that Case #23-01-PLBD-00035, 107 Marshall Smith Road, for rezoning from AG, Agricultural to LI, Light Industrial be **denied** because there has been no information presented to indicate that the requested zoning promotes complimentary Land Use Development patterns intended for the Airport Area Plan. The Amendment is not reasonable and in the public interest because Light Industrial (LI) without conditions is a broad zoning category. This fact could endanger adjoining property values and could be detrimental to the community as a whole. This Amendment is not consistent with applicable plans because there has been no information presented to indicate the requested zoning promotes a complimentary Land Use Development pattern intended for the Airport Area Plan; seconded by Dr. Bui. The request for rezoning in Case # 23-01-PLBD-00035 was denied by unanimous vote. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.) Therefore, this case has been **denied**.

Chair Donnelly thanked everyone for their hard work on this particular case and reminded attendees about the Comprehensive Plan survey and there is information on that in the Lobby.

G. New Business

Legislative Hearing Item(s)

ROAD RENAMING CASE #23-05-PLBD-00045: LITTLE CHUTE LANE, GREENSBORO, 27409 (RESOLUTION APPROVED)

Aaron Calloway stated that this is a road renaming case initiated by voluntary petition of greater than 51% of the adjoining property owners to change the name of Little Chute Lane to Joseph Creek Lane. The existing name of the road is Little Chute Lane and the proposed name is Joseph Creek Lane. This road is located in Bruce Township and runs approximately 0.33 miles east from Northwest School Road and terminates at the northern property line of Guilford County Tax Parcel #232914. He noted that the proposed road name was being lifted from the name of the subdivision. A map was shown that highlighted parcels whose owners signed the petition.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone wishing to comment on this request.

Daniel McKelvey, 7459 Little Chute Lane, stated that he is speaking for a lot of his neighbors on this request. The neighbors feel that "Chute" as a derogatory name actually has a negative connotation in the Indian culture which is why this request came up. They feel it would be best to just use the name of the actual subdivision. That is the reason for this request.

Chair Donnelly pointed out that there was a signed petition, which has been presented, showing the neighbors that are in favor of the name change.

Mr. Gulick asked if there had been a neighborhood meeting concerning this request. Mr. McKelvey responded that there have been discussions and they are aware of all that is involved in changing a street name, and they want to move forward on that.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request and no one came forward.

Mr. Craft moved to approve the request and adopt the Resolution for the Street Name Change; seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) TEXT AMENDMENT CASE #23-05-PLBD-00048 TO ADD SECTION 4.10, SPECIAL PURPOSE LOTS, AS REFERENCED FROM THE GUILFORD COUNTY DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE, ARTICLE 4, SECTION 4-9: SPECIAL PURPOSE LOTS, AND TO AMEND SUBSECTION 5.14.A.2.C WITH THE CORRECT CORRESPONDING REFERENCE (TEXT AMENDMENT APPROVED/STAFF REPORT ADOPTED)

Aaron Calloway stated that staff has identified the need to add text (Item 1) within the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) addressing the unique development challenges with respect to street frontage, minimum lot area, internal setbacks for single projects comprised of multiple parcels, and minimum lot dimensions for lots that site family or church cemeteries, sewer lift stations, radio, television, and communication towers, and other utility uses that are supportive and ancillary to the surrounding development. As demonstrated in previous iterations of Guilford County's development ordinances, [the] aforementioned will benefit from particular exceptions to Ordinance development standards. Such uses rarely require high volumes of on-site traffic for maintenance. Further, these uses do not warrant the same degree of scrutiny in plan review as heavy or light commercial or industrial uses which often can be high traffic generators that necessitate greater minimum access availability.

The proposed language for Special Purpose Lots, carried from previous iterations of Guilford County's ordinance, define what uses may be subject to Special Purpose Lots, and provides a pathway for the Technical Review Committee (TRC) to determine if the proposed lot and access are sufficient. Item 2 will update the reference (change from UDO Section 4.9 to 4.10) for Special Purpose Lots found in Section 5.14.A.2.c. for Individual Development Standards for wireless communication towers.

Proposed new text is shown highlighted while text proposed to be deleted is shown with strikethrough.

Staff recommends approval of this Text Amendment.

Mr. Gullick moved approval of the above-mentioned Text Amendment CASE #23-05-PLBD-00048, as submitted by staff, and adoption of the Staff Report; seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) TEXT AMENDMENT CASE #23-05-PLBD-00050 TO AMEND SECTION 6.1, PARKING STANDARDS, SUBSECTION D, MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPACES PERMITTED, SUCH THAT REFERENCES TO PARKING CREDITS, COMBINED PARKING, AND LOW-IMPACT DESIGN STORMWATER POLICIES ARE REMOVED AND ARE REPLACED WITH CLEAR CRITERIA FOR AN ALTERNATIVE PARKING PLAN DERIVED FROM A PARKING ANALYSIS BY AN ENGINEER LICENSED IN THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, AS WELL AS SPECIFYING STORMWATER PROTECTION

MEASURES ASSOCIATED WITH EXPANDED PARKING PER THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY STORMWATER DESIGN MANUAL (TEXT AMENDMENT APPROVED/STAFF REPORT ADOPTED)

Aaron Calloway stated that staff has identified the need to remove one subsection entirely that is redundant in plan review, 6.1.D.1, as well as eliminate references to Section 6.1.F Parking Credits, Section 6.1.L Combined Parking Credits, and Section 9.1.F Low-Impact Design for the approval of an alternative parking plan required by Section 6.1.D to exceed one hundred seventy-five percent (175%) of the minimum number of parking spaces required in Table 6-1-1: Parking Requirements. The language within the UDO for parking credits and shared parking refers to reduction of the minimum parking requirements and are, therefore, not pertinent in plan review for instances where developers wish to exceed the maximum requirement. Also, the UDO does not enumerate standards for Low-Impact Design which can be objectively measured against submitted plans. The UDO sites a Low-Impact Design process which currently is not finalized by the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ). However, the North Carolina Stormwater Design Manual does include Low Impact Design which will be referenced as part of this proposed Text Amendment.

Mr. Calloway reported that staff performed a survey of comparable jurisdictions which curate methods of exceeding maximum parking requirements. The jurisdictions included in the research were Durham County, Wake County, Orange County, Buncombe County, New Hanover County, Greensboro, Wilmington, Raleigh, Charlotte, Asheville, and Hillsboro. The proposed language to amend Section 6.1.D is constructed to mirror standards from those comparable jurisdictions within North Carolina. The proposed language introduces three (3) exemptions from maximum parking calculations: small developments with twenty (20) or fewer spaces, parking lots which directly serve government facilities, and parking within a structure (regulated by built upon area standards). Furthermore, the language proposed for this amendment will require a parking analysis on the proposed use based on data from relevant journals or a primary study of comparable uses within the market area, Greensboro – High Point Metropolitan Statistical Area. Finally, this amendment will require appropriate stormwater controls for all additional spaces above the maximum allowable spaces.

The proposed language introduces three (3) exemptions from maximum parking calculations: small developments with twenty (20) or fewer spaces, parking lots which directly serve government facilities, and parking within a structure (regulated by built upon area standards). Furthermore, the language proposed for this amendment will require a parking analysis on the proposed use based on data from relevant journals or a primary study of comparable uses within the market area, Greensboro – High Point Metropolitan Statistical Area. Finally, this amendment will require appropriate stormwater controls for all additional spaces above the maximum allowable spaces.

Proposed new text is shown highlighted while text proposed to be deleted is shown with strikethrough.

Mr. Craft moved approval of the above-mentioned Text Amendment **CASE #23-05-PLBD-00050**, as submitted by staff, and adoption of the Staff Report; seconded by Mr. Stalder. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

H. Other Business

Rules of Procedure Update

Mr. Bell stated copies of the proposed changes have been submitted to each Board member. Changes made during the last review are shown in light yellow [gold] and the relatively newer changes are shown in bright yellow [other colors shading text also reflect proposed changes and include changes proposed by the County Attorney's office or additional changes proposed]. He went on to say that this references General Statute 160(D) in terms of what the Board is charged to do. Under Item B, references are made to 160(D) as opposed to 153A, which previously is where the Planning and Zoning legislation was comprised for counties. The Guilford County Board of Commissioners' Resolution establishing Policies and Procedures For Appointments... is referenced and serves as an "umbrella" for the Planning Board Rules of Procedure as Board members. For example, if you [a Planning Board member] are appointed to the Board for more than two (2) consecutive terms, then you have to get a waiver by the Board of Commissioners for subsequent appointments. Again,, it serves as the umbrella so your Rules of Procedure, the best way to look at that, is that you have the Guilford County Board of Commissioner Policy and then you have the Planning Board's Rules of Procedure which fit under that.

Under Officers and Duties, it says that in the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair would assume those responsibilities for that meeting, and in the absence of both the Chair and Vice Chair, then the Board would select (or elect) someone to serve as Temporary Chair for that meeting.

On page 12, what is in RED, is actually some additional strike-throughs or additional text added. Under Members, just a reenumeration of those. In the previous version, those were enumerated, so those are enumerated by A, B, C, D, et cetera. Also, under Item 3, again, regular members should not serve more than two (2) consecutive full terms without an exception appointment by the Board of Commissioners.

On page 4, basically the Board members already know this, but just to reiterate and emphasize, that all Board meetings are open to the public and as such, subject to Open Meeting laws of the State of North Carolina.

Item B, basically just changes the venue. There is a space study being conducted and is currently in progress by Guilford County. They are looking at conference rooms, adaptability of conference rooms to house certain types of meetings, not only with size, but also technology. At some point this Board may be in a situation where there is a room that the acoustics and technology are already in place. It basically says that this venue location is where the meetings will be held unless otherwise noted.

Under Item E, this indicates that if a member is participating from a remote location, it would be simultaneous. In-person meetings are encouraged. This does exclude quasi-judicial hearings. Some members already are familiar with that, because during the pandemic, when we were doing a Wednesday/Thursday meeting, then we would typically hold the quasi-judicial hearing on the Special Use Permit on that Thursday in-person. The in-person meetings for quasi-judicial cases avoid potential issues of agreements in terms of standing from parties and so it is more streamlined and easier, and given the number of quasi-judicial hearings (cases) the Planning Board has, it was deemed more appropriate. This also follows the Board of County Commissioners because they have the same[policy] regarding quasi-judicial hearings, as well.

Page 6 basically indicates that each member, unless there is a conflict, is expected to vote either "yes" or "no", as opposed to abstaining.

Page 8 reiterates three (3) different scenarios for disclosure of interests for Board members where there is any personal or financial interest in a case before the Board when it concerns property in which the Board member, a close relative (defined in 160D as a spouse, parent, child, brother, sister, grandparent, or grandchild. The term includes the step, half and in-law relationships), a business associate or employer.

We also wanted use “he/she” and “her/him” throughout. Finally, the last page includes a flow chart illustrating the rezoning process taken from the Unified Development Ordinance.

Mr. Craft stated that he really wanted to thank staff for all the colors, attachments, slides and pictures. They really did a great job of making something that is very complicated much easier for folks to get through. Mr. Bell stated that he appreciates the comments by the County Attorney’s office.

Chair Donnelly asked for a motion to adopt the Rules and Procedure as reviewed and presented this evening.

Mr. Craft made a motion to adopt the Rules of Procedure; seconded by Rev. Drumwright. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

Other Business

Chair Donnelly asked Dr. Bui if she had an important announcement to make. Dr. Bui stated that her daughter graduated from high school and college at the same time. She graduated from Davidson County Community College with an Associate’s Degree and her CMA at the age of 15, and then had to wait until she turned 16 to graduate from high school because of State law. She has gotten a full scholarship to High Point University as well as a \$1.5M scholarship. She was featured on Channel 2 News and CBS, as well. She said after saving for college all these years, she thinks she will just take a vacation.

Mr. Craft stated that his two kids got Masters Degrees – his daughter from Chatham University in Pittsburg, PA where she works, and his son a Masters in Public Administration from UNCG and he is working for Randolph Economic Corporation.

Mr. Bell advised that a public hearing needed to be opened for public comments on each text amendment, and then closed.

Counsel Leslie-Fite stated, procedurally, Chair Donnelly should ask the Board to reconsider the two (2) Text Amendments previously acted on in this meeting.

Mr. Gullick moved to reconsider the two (2) Text Amendments previously acted on in this meeting; seconded by Mr. Craft. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

Chair Donnelly stated that in the case of the first Text Amendment which specifically addresses Special Purpose Lots, he would like to formally open a public hearing for that Text Amendment. He asked if there was anyone present who wished to comment on that hearing and no one came forward.

Chair Donnelly then asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Gullick moved to close the public hearing for the first Text Amendment; seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

Chair Donnelly then asked for a motion to adopt the Special Purpose Lot report provided by the staff and the associated language for the Unified Development Ordinance.

Mr. Gullick moved to adopt the Special Purpose Lot report provided by the staff and the associated language for the Unified Development Ordinance; seconded by Mr. Craft. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

Chair Donnelly opened a public hearing for a Text Amendment around the revision of Parking Standards and asked if anyone wished to speak on this matter. No one came forward. Therefore, Chair Donnelly asked for a motion to close the public hearing for that Text Amendment.

Mr. Craft moved to open a public hearing for a Text Amendment around the revision of Parking Standards; seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

Chair Donnelly asked for a motion to adopt the staff report for the Text Amendment related to Parking Standards and the associated Ordinance language.

Mr. Gullick moved to adopt the staff report for the Text Amendment related to Parking Standards and the associated Ordinance language; seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly; Gullick; Craft; Bui; Buchanan; Stalder; Drumwright. Nays: None. Absent: Alston and Little.)

Commentaries (2) for informational purposes only

Major Subdivision Workflow – Preliminary plat may be submitted in lieu of a sketch plan. Mr. Bell stated that they provide commentaries to help explain requirements, and while they are not considered Text Amendments, he felt this was an opportunity to present this evening. The first one is Major Subdivisions and in lieu of submitting a sketch plan, it is perfectly acceptable that you can submit a preliminary plan. Additionally, the Commentary indicates that a separate sketch plan is needed for procedures that require Planning Board approval such as Planned Unit Development Rezoning, Conditional Zonings and Special Use Permits.

Planned Unit Development (PUD) Workflow - Planned Unit Development Districts Plan step incorporates the rezoning and sketch plan review

Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Bell stated that things are going well with the Comprehensive Plan and the surveys still are being administered. There is a soft survey deadline of July 10, 2023, and staff is working with the consultant who is looking to bring on board someone from The Lee Institute (Charlotte, NC) that has done strategic planning work as it relates to public engagement. Currently, staff is working on tentative public engagement meetings scheduled for the end of July and beginning of August. Also, staff is working to schedule the next steering committee meeting. This Public Engagement Specialist also

would be helpful in making sure that the direct mailings are targeted appropriately to get as much input as possible from the unincorporated area of Guilford County.

Chair Donnelly stated his appreciation for all staff's effort and hard work on behalf of the citizens to obtain good information so it will become a great foundation for the Board.

Mr. Bell stated that next month there are [tentatively] three (3) rezoning cases and one (1) Text Amendment relating to Map Standards.

I. Adjourn

Chair Donnelly stated that there being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

The next scheduled meeting is July 12, 2023 at 6:00 p.m.