GUILFORD COUNTY
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Old County Courthouse – Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room
301 W. Market Street, Greensboro, NC 27401
August 12, 2026
6:00 PM

Call to Order

Chair Donnelly called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

I. Roll Call

The following members were in attendance in person for this meeting:

James Donnelly, Chair; David Craft, Vice Chair; Ryan Alston (exited at approximately 10:00 p.m.); Dr. Nho Thi Bui; Reverend Gregory Drumwright; Guy Gullick; Jason Randy Little; Sam Stalder

The following members were absent from this meeting:

Cara Buchanan

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

Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director; Jason Hardin, Planning and Development Deputy Director; Oliver Bass, Planning and Zoning Manager; Samantha Lockwood, Senior Planner; Darby Terrell, Senior Planner; Troy Moss, Planner I; Amira Yassin Fort, Planning Technician; Michael Townsend, Fire Marshal; Ashton Roberts, Deputy County Attorney

II. Agenda Amendments

There were no agenda amendments.

III. Approval of Minutes: July 8, 2026

Chair Donnelly referenced the minutes from the July 8, 2026, meeting, and called attention to the amendments distributed to board members by staff members. The first correction acknowledged that the Special Use Permit associated with one of the cases was not currently active. The second correction clarified comments from Board members about data centers, as requested by Reverend Drumwright.

Reverend Drumwright moved to approve the minutes of the July 8, 2026, meeting as amended. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Craft. The Board voted unanimously, 8-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Alston, Bui, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: None.)

IV. Rules and Procedures

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

V. Continuance Requests

None

VI. Old Business

None

VII. New Business

LEGISLATIVE HEARING ITEM(S)

A. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE # 26-06-PLBD-00021: RS-40, RESIDENTIAL TO CZ-LB, CONDITIONAL ZONING - LIMITED BUSINESS: 5100 OLD RANDLEMAN ROAD.

Ms. Lockwood presented the staff report for Case #26-06-PLBD-00021. She confirmed that three public notice signs were placed on the subject property and the abutting and adjacent property owners were sent public notice letters consistent with the North Carolina General Statutes. The subject property is located at 5100 Old Randleman Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #141754 in Sumner Township), located at the intersection of Old Randleman Road and Kivett Drive, and comprises approximately 1.5 acres. There was no history of denied cases on this parcel. This request is to conditionally rezone the subject property from RS-40 (Residential) to CZ-LB (Conditional Zoning - Limited Business).

Proposed Use Conditions:

Uses of the property shall be limited to the following as listed in Article 4, Table 4-3-1 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO):

1. Kennels or pet grooming
2. Convenience store (with gas pumps)
3. Service station, gasoline
4. Office
5. Medical or professional office
6. Museum or art gallery
7. Bank with drive-through
8. Insurance agency
9. Retail (General)
10. Bakery
11. Bank without drive-through

Ms. Lockwood noted the application included no proposed development conditions. She went on to explain that the proposed conditional rezoning is inconsistent with the subject property's current Future Land Use Map (FLUM) classification of Residential. If approved, an amendment to the Retail/Restaurant classification will be required.

Ms. Lockwood reviewed the zoning district descriptions as follows:

The **RS-40, Residential District,** is primarily intended to accommodate single-family residential detached dwellings on lots in areas without access to public water and sewer services. The minimum lot size of this district is 40,000 square feet. Conservation subdivisions may be developed in this district.

The **LB, Limited Business District,** is primarily intended to accommodate moderate-intensity shopping and services convenient to nearby residential uses and is typically located at intersections of collectors or thoroughfares.

The **CZ, Conditional Zoning District,** is established as a companion district for every district established in the Unified Development Ordinance. All regulations which apply to a general use zoning district also apply to the companion conditional zoning.

Ms. Lockwood stated the vicinity of the subject property is generally characterized as residential with an adjacent religious institution. The vacant land to the east of the subject property is zoned as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) within the City of Greensboro. The approved Unified Development Plan (UDP) for the PUD limits the proposed development to residential uses, including single-family detached and zero lot line; traditional house; twin home; townhouse; duplex; and multi-family per the UDP. The existing land use on the property is vacant/undeveloped.

Ms. Lockwood said the parcel is located in the Pinecroft-Sedgefield Fire Protection District and is 2.9 miles from the fire station. A private septic system and well would serve the parcel, and the parcel is not within a service area. The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) 2025 Annual Average Daily Traffic count was 2,801 cars on Old Randleman Road. Additionally, Kivett Drive is considered a Minor Thoroughfare per Greensboro Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (GUAMPO). The NCDOT 2025 Annual Average Daily Traffic count was 2,817 cars. There are currently no known proposed road improvements in the area. Any new development would be subject to NCDOT review and would need to obtain any required approvals.

Ms. Lockwood explained that the parcel is nearly level to gently sloping; there are no regulated floodplains, mapped wetlands or mapped streams on site. The property is located within two water supply watersheds: Polecat Creek WS-III and Lower Randleman Lake WS-IV.

Ms. Lockwood stated that the current Future Land Use Map Classification is Residential, and the parcel is located in the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) southwest quadrant. The requested conditional rezoning is inconsistent with the property’s current FLUM classification of Residential, as this designation is not intended to accommodate commercial land uses. The proposed conditional rezoning to the CZ-LB district would be consistent with the FLUM classification of Retail/Restaurant because of the uses included in the conditional rezoning request and the property's location. Properties designated as Retail/Restaurant are typically located near key intersections and busy corridors that serve the daily needs of local residential neighborhoods. While inconsistent with the current land use classification for the subject parcel, the requested rezoning is consistent with the goals, policies, and actions of the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Lockwood said the request to conditionally rezone the subject property from RS-40, Residential, to CZ-LB, Conditional Zoning – Limited Business, is reasonable as it is consistent with the following elements found in the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan:

(1) The Plan's Guiding Principle of Areas to Enhance, which states that the area "could benefit from strategic infill development or precise tactical improvements to meaningfully enhance the quality of life for the people who inhabit those areas."
(2) The Planning Theme of Resilient Economy's Goal Statement, which states to "Promote a healthy, sustainable economy that fosters partnerships, supports small business, incentivizes retention of farmland, and creates an economic climate that will attract and retain both job-generating businesses and their employees."
(3) Action Item E1.1 under the Resilient Economy Goal, which states to "Ensure areas best suited for economic development, such as the US 421 Corridor, are secured for such use, while balancing the needs for housing, recreational amenities, agricultural, and commercial uses." and
(4) Action Item E1.2 under the Resilient Economy Goal, "Evaluate economic development opportunities by considering their effects on the fair distribution of benefits and resources within the community." Finally, the proposed use conditions would exclude potential incongruous land uses with adjacent residential properties. The subject property is located at the intersection of two minor thoroughfares (Kivett Drive & Old Randleman Road), which aligns with the LB zoning district's intent to support businesses in proximity to residential uses. Finally, existing unconditionally LB-zoned properties are less than a half mile to the southwest along Kivett Drive. Therefore, a map amendment to the CZ-LB designation would be consistent with the existing development pattern in the general area.

Ms. Lockwood confirmed the staff recommendation was approval. The proposed conditional rezoning is inconsistent with the subject property’s current Future Land Use Map (FLUM) classification of Residential. If approved, an amendment to the Retail/Restaurant classification will be required.

Mr. Hardin pointed out that there is an existing gas station along Randleman Road that is zoned as RS-40 making it legally nonconforming.

Chair Donnelly inquired what the conditional zoning request meant in terms of the flexibility for the Board and the conversation. Ms. Lockwood stated that during the hearing the Board could discuss other conditions as well and see if the applicant was amenable to adding those conditions.

Mr. John Stratton, the applicant, 1105 Sunset Drive, Greensboro, NC, spoke in favor of the application and provided additional information. He reported that he had been in the business of building and developing in Guilford County since 1977. The property was an opportunity to benefit the entire community as well as to benefit Mr. Stratton. Mr. Stratton discussed the new jobs being created in the area and the area's overall growth. The existing property conditions were poor, with abandoned outbuildings, weeds, and overgrown bushes. The existing well was last documented in 1990, so it would need to be redone, and the septic would also need to be redone. Traffic was expected to continue increasing, especially with the new elementary school being built nearby. The 100-acre property across the street was recently purchased, and it could support a potential 900 units for residents. The property's tax valuation was currently $40,000, and the new development would likely increase it to $2.5 million, increasing tax revenue for the county. Mr. Stratton presented preliminary concepts. He stated that they preferred single-use units.

Mr. Gullick asked about the residential property to the southwest and whether any additional buffers were considered. Mr. Stratton stated that they would prefer having a buffer, but they had not determined a plan.

Mr. Gullick discussed the surrounding residential areas and asked whether any conditions for hours of operation had been considered. Mr. Stratton stated that what the neighborhood wanted dictated the uses and times, and he was willing to agree to some conditions for operations.

Vice Chair Craft asked what type of buffer would be required. Mr. Bass stated that a Type B Buffer between the business and the adjacent zoning would be required. Type B requires a minimum 30-foot vegetative buffer.

Mr. Gullick and Vice Chair Craft asked about hours of operation. Mr. Stratton confirmed that he did not want it to be a 24-hour operation and was open to restricted hours.

Reverend Drumwright asked if any neighbors had been engaged. Mr. Stratton stated that he had not reached out to neighbors, but he did answer all the questions of one neighbor who reached out to him.

Mr. Hardin noted that the concept plan being presented by the applicant had not yet been reviewed by the Technical Review Committee (TRC), any site plan would have to go through the approval processes.

Chair Donnelly stated that the Board had the flexibility, as a conditional zoning requirement, to make adjustments if they were agreeable to all parties including the property owner. Those would then be adopted as part of the application for Board action.

Mr. Gullick suggested 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. as operating hours.

Mr. John Starr, the property owner, and Mr. Stratton asked to extend the hours to 12:00 a.m. The hours of 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. daily were agreeable to everyone and added as a condition.

Mr. Little asked about a tree barrier instead of a fence, but Mr. Gullick noted that tree barriers must be maintained so they do not decay and get removed. Mr. Gullick stated that the fence would be in addition to the vegetative buffer.

With no further speakers from the public, Chair Donnelly closed the public hearing by acclamation.

Vice Chair Craft stated that he believed the proposal would benefit the area.

Mr. Gullick moved to add the conditions discussed to Conditional Rezoning Case #26-06-PLBD-00021: to have hours of operation from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. (midnight) and to have a six-foot opaque fence on the southwest side of the property. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Craft. The Board voted unanimously, 8-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Alston, Bui, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: None.)

Mr. Gullick moved to approve Conditional Rezoning Case #26-06-PLBD-00021 (Guilford County Tax Parcel #141754) from RS-40, Residential to CZ-LB, Conditional Zoning; this approval amends the Future Land Use Map: Southwest Quadrant and the zoning map amendment and associated Future Land Use Map amendment from Residential to Retail/Restaurant in the Southwest Quadrant; While inconsistent with the current land use classification for the subject parcel, the requested rezoning is consistent with the following goals, policies, and actions of the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan:

- **Guiding Principles:**
  - **Areas to Enhance:** Areas to Enhance include existing developed areas, such as established residential communities and employment hubs such as office and retail centers, that are now stable, but which should consider small-to-medium improvements over the long-term to keep up with changing economics, technologies, consumer preferences, and age-related deterioration. These areas are not likely to experience wholesale change or redevelopment but could benefit from strategic infill development or precise tactical improvements to meaningfully enhance the quality of life for the people who inhabit those areas.
- **Planning Theme:** Resilient Economy
  - **Goal Statement:** Promote a healthy, sustainable economy that fosters partnerships, supports small business, incentivizes retention of farmland, and creates an economic climate that will attract and retain both job-generating businesses and their employees.
  - **Action E1.1:** Ensure areas best suited for economic development, such as the US 421 Corridor, are secured for such use, while balancing the needs for housing, recreational amenities, agricultural, and commercial uses.
  - **Action E1.2:** Evaluate economic development opportunities by considering their effects on the fair distribution of benefits and resources within the community.

The amendment is reasonable as it is consistent with the following elements found in the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan: 1) The Plan's Guiding Principle of Areas to Enhance which states that the area "could benefit from strategic infill development or precise tactical improvements to meaningfully enhance the quality of life for the people who inhabit those areas." 2) The Planning Theme of Resilient Economy's Goal Statement, which states, "Promote a healthy, sustainable economy that fosters partnerships, supports small business, incentivizes retention of farmland, and creates an economic climate that will attract and retain both job-generating businesses and their employees." 3) Action Item E1.1 under the Resilient Economy Goal which states to "Ensure areas best suited for economic development, such as the US 421 Corridor, are secured for such use, while balancing the needs for housing, recreational amenities, agricultural, and commercial uses." and 4) Action Item E1.2 under the Resilient Economy Goal, "Evaluate economic development opportunities by considering their effects on the fair distribution of benefits and resources within the community." Finally, the proposed use conditions would exclude potential incongruous land uses with adjacent residential properties. The subject property is located at the intersection of two minor thoroughfares (Kivett Drive & Old Randleman Road), which aligns with the LB zoning district's intent to locate businesses near residential uses. Finally, there are existing, unconditionally LB zoned properties less than a half mile to the southwest along Kivett Drive. Therefore, a map amendment to the CZ-LB designation would be consistent with the existing development pattern in the general area. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Craft. The Board voted unanimously, 8-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Alston, Bui, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: None.)

B. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #26-06-PLBD-00023: AG, AGRICULTURAL TO CZ-RS-40, CONDITIONAL ZONING – RESIDENTIAL: 5731 COBLE CHURCH ROAD

Ms. Terrell presented the staff report for Case #26-06-PLBD-00023. She stated that the subject property is located at 5731 Coble Church Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #125161 in Clay Township), approximately 4,400 feet north of the intersection of Coble Church Road and NC Highway 62 East and comprises approximately 4.43 acres. There was no history of denied cases for the parcel. All of the properties on the map received mailed notice of the meeting. Staff posted notices on the subject parcel.

Ms. Terrell said the request received by staff was to conditionally rezone the subject property from AG, Agricultural, to CZ-RS-40, Conditional Zoning – Residential, subject to the following conditions:

Proposed Use Conditions:
Uses of the property shall be limited to the following as listed in Article 4, Table 4-3-1 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO): (1) Single Family Detached Dwelling. (2) Subdivision (Major) – Residential (6 or More Lots)

Proposed Development Conditions:
Development of the property shall occur in accordance with the following standards and requirements in addition to those specified in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO): (1) Not to exceed (4) lots.

Ms. Terrell stated the vicinity of the subject property is generally characterized as rural residential and agricultural. The existing land use on the property is a single-family, detached dwelling. Guilford County Schools estimated additional students for the four lots. The projected increase of students was two to three for Nathaniel Greene Elementary School, and one to two students for both Southeast Middle School and Southeast High School.

Ms. Terrell explained that the current parcel has a private septic system and well and is not within a service area. The applicant did not provide a feasibility study or service commitment. Coble Church Road is considered a Minor Thoroughfare per Greensboro Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (GUAMPO). The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) 2024 Annual Average Daily Traffic count was 650 cars off of Coble Church Road.

Ms. Terrell said the topography is nearly level, gently sloping, and strongly sloping. There is no regulation floodplain on the property per the effective FIRM and no mapped wetlands on the property per the National Wetlands Inventory. A mapped/buffered stream exists at the rear of the property per the Guilford County Soil Survey Map. No stronger conditions would have to be considered for the rezoning case.

Ms. Terrell stated that the current Future Land Use Map classification is Rural Living and is in the southeast quadrant. The requested rezoning is inconsistent with the Rural Living FLUM classification. Rural Living is typically characterized by one dwelling unit located on several acres of property. The proposed rezoning to CZ-RS-40 would fit the Land Use Map Classification of Residential because the RS-40 district allows major subdivisions, permitting increased density. The Residential classification includes a mixture of low- and medium-density development, typically up to four dwelling units per acre.

Ms. Terrell said when examining consistency with the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan, it was found to be consistent with the following goals, policies, and actions of the Comprehensive Plan under the Attainable Housing planning theme.

Ms. Terrell stated the request to conditionally rezone the subject property from AG (Agricultural) to CZ-RS-40 is reasonable, as it is consistent with the Guilford County Attainable Housing Planning Theme's Goal Statement, which states: "Focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design." The request is also consistent with Policy 1 under the Attainable Housing Theme, which states: "Enable the creation of new housing units that will provide a mix of housing types that meet the needs of residents." The requested use condition limiting allowed use of the subject property to Single-Family, Detached Dwellings aligns with adjacent land uses. Also, the proposed development condition restricting any subdivision of the subject property to no more than four (4) lots provides a reasonable limitation to altering the character of the general area. The subject property is located along Coble Church Road, which is classified as a minor thoroughfare capable of accommodating the four (4) lot development. Finally, existing unconditionally zoned RS-40 properties are located within a mile of the subject property. Therefore, a map amendment to the CZ-RS-40 district would be consistent with other properties within the surrounding area. The proposed conditional rezoning is inconsistent with the subject property’s current FLUM classification of Rural Living. If approved, an amendment to the Residential classification will be required.

Mr. Gullick asked if Rural Living was designed to be one unit per acre. Ms. Terrell confirmed this was the case.

Mr. Gullick noted that septic was also required for each unit.

Vice Chair Craft asked if the applicant could do what they wanted if the parcel had not already been divided five times. Ms. Terrell confirmed this was the case, however, because the parent parcel had already been subdivided three times, the proposed subdivision of four lots would exceed the number of lots permitted for a minor subdivision. Therefore, approval was required to further subdivide the lot.

Chair Donnelly asked about the potential conflict between the development condition limiting the parcel to four lots and the use condition allowing six or more lots. He asked if it caused an issue. Mr. Bass clarified that there was no conflict in the conditions since the parent parcel had already been divided three times. Three or more additional lots would constitute a major subdivision.

Vice Chair Craft asked if it was common to return to the parent parcel when making conditions. Mr. Bass explained that this requirement exists as some developers subdivide lots to piecemeal developments to circumvent a jurisdiction's major subdivision requirements.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to the podium to share additional information.

Chair Donnelly pointed out that the applicant provided a power of attorney to allow the representative to act on behalf of the owner.

Jim Galyon, 421 Spring Garden St, stepped to the podium and introduced Mike McMillan (5826 Cadiz Rd). Mr. Galyon noted that Mr. McMillan had the property owner's power of attorney because his client was out of the country. Mr. McMillan had the authority to speak on his behalf and accept any amendments.

Mr. Galyon stated that the property at 5731 Coble Church Road was acquired by his client in April 2026 and contains approximately 4.43 acres. The request was to rezone the parcel from Agriculture to CZ-RS-40. An existing home on the property was occupied by a tenant. The proposal was to construct three additional homes on the property, for a total of four homes. The existing and three new homes would be developed as single-family, detached dwellings. Access to the four lots would have one curb cut, and NCDOT approval would be required. There would be a private driveway and also be a T-turnaround. There would be a very small impact on traffic and schools. Since it was one unit per acre, it is in the agricultural field. Mr. McMillan sent letters to neighboring property owners and invited surrounding neighbors to look at an illustrative engineer. A civil engineer had not yet drawn up a site plans. The property was tested for the septic system and wells, and it can handle what was proposed. They believe that the proposal provided an appropriate use of the property and provides a rural setting.

Reverend Drumwright asked about any conversations being held with neighbors. Mr. Galyon reported that Mr. McMillan sent letters to the neighbors. One family visited the site to review the site plans.

Chair Donnelly asked whether neighbors raised any concerns and what was done to address them. Mr. Galyon stated that there were questions about the fire department, tree removal, impact on wells, and the general plans for the property.

Mr. Hardin noted that a T-turnaround would be allowed only for private roads, and cul-de-sac were required otherwise. Mr. Galyon stated that they would be okay with either a T-turnaround or cul-de-sac.

Chair Donnelly asked if the current drive would be replaced with a curb cut. Mr. Galyon stated that it would be determined with the help of NCDOT. Mr. Bass stated that direct lot access was not permitted from a thoroughfare. Mr. Galyon stated that those details would be addressed with the NCDOT. The intention was to have one drive and one curb cut serving all four lots.

Mr. Alston inquired if there was already an existing septic system on the land. Mr. Galyon confirmed that there was one for the existing home. The remainder of the property was tested and could accommodate up to four septic systems.

Mr. Alston asked if a preliminary soil evaluation had been done. Mr. Galyon confirmed that it had been done.

Mr. Gullick asked if the parent parcel had already been divided four times. Mr. Bass reported that it had been divided into three lots.

Chair Donnelly invited anyone else in favor of the request to step to the podium.

No one was present to speak in favor of the rezoning request.

Chair Donnelly invited anyone against the request to step to the podium.

Charles Moon, 5702 Coble Church Rd, stepped to the podium for public comment. He asked the Planning Board to deny the zoning request and retain the existing AG zoning. He noted that the most important point was not whether the property could be used residentially, but that the requested rezoning was primarily about increasing the intensity of development to create four residential lots, and he believed the record had not demonstrated a compelling reason for the change.
He discussed that the Rural Living designation indicated that one dwelling unit be located on several acres. If rural living properties were repeatedly rezoned to accommodate higher-density development, the cumulative result was a gradual loss of the rural character that the county's planning framework was intended to preserve. Under North Carolina's Chapter 160D, the reasonableness analysis specifically allows the board to consider property size, physical conditions, and the benefits and detriments to neighbors and the surrounding community. The Board was asked to consider the site's actual characteristics: it is approximately 4.43 acres, and increasing density would create additional demands on septic systems, water supply, stormwater management, emergency access, and other infrastructure. Surrounding residents also raised concerns about the compatibility of the proposed homes with the existing community, including their design materials, construction, form, scale, and appearance. Mr. Moon stated that selling four homes for more than $400,000 each did not, by itself, demonstrate a specific unmet affordable housing need at this location, and it did not automatically mean the rezoning was appropriate. The Board was asked to follow the County's adopted plan planning framework and deny the case. Mr. Moon also discussed the need for applicants in rezoning cases to reach out to and engage with surrounding property owners.

Mr. Alston asked if there were other issues aside from not all neighbors receiving the letters due to the zip code mistake. Mr. Moon stated that he received one of the two letters. None of the residents in the south area received any notice. The notice was also posted within a two-week period, which greatly impacted individuals' ability to be at the meeting.

Mr. Charles Moon stated that not all properties received notice. Mr. Bass confirmed that letters were sent to all the lettered properties on the adjacent properties map.

Dr. Bui asked if the county received any undelivered mail. Mr. Bass stated that the County had not received any returned mail to date.

Mr. Moon noted that he had a petition to oppose the rezoning, signed by all surrounding neighbors and many residents within a quarter mile.

Reverend Drumwright asked if the notice sign was one-sided. Mr. Bass stated that the sign was two-sided. Since there was only one street frontage, only one sign was posted.

Mr. Alston asked about circumstances like the current one, in which multiple residents stated they were not properly notified. How does the Board move forward? Mr. Bell responded that staff had not received any returned mail from the letters that Guilford County sent to adjacent property owners based on the tax listing.

Mr. Moon stated that some nearby residents did not receive letters from Guilford County.

Chair Donnelly asked if any of the board members had questions about the comments shared by Mr. Moon.

Reverend Drumwright commented that the public notice was not a small issue, and it should be taken into consideration. If there were assertions that notice was not provided, it should not be minimized. He asked if people were asserting they did not receive notice of the hearing was grounds for postponement. Mr. Bell stated that because the property owners were present, they were aware of the hearing, and that any issue could be due to mail delays.

Mr. Moon stated that other individuals may not have received the mail and were not present. He stated that it was not a small matter affecting them.

Chair Donnelly stated that he did not want to minimize any concerns and that their role was to consider all factors, but they could decide whether the Board felt there was not enough information before them. He stated that the Board can decide to consider continuation if they do not feel there is enough information to decide. He asked how many individuals in the audience were supportive of Mr. Moon's statements and wanted the request denied. Eight members in the audience raised their hands to express their desire for the request to be denied.

Mr. Hardin placed an email for the board from a resident who had expressed similar opposition.

Laurie Scotton, 6108 Phillipi Rd, stepped to the podium for public comment. She stated that she was a farmer and was representing the farmers in the audience. She stated that they happened to drive by the notice sign but had received no letters. She discussed the issues that farmers were facing, including expensive farmland and the aging farmer population. She discussed the importance of the local farms and the ability to eat local food and preserve agriculture, the environment, and water quality. She stated that if farmland becomes too expensive, they will have to leave North Carolina.

Dr. Bui asked if there were any conversations with the applicant regarding her concerns. Ms. Scotton reported that she had not, and the landowner was from a Florida-based company.

Mr. Hardin noted that Ms. Scotton would not have received a notice since she was not an abutting or adjacent property owner.

Terrie Yaw, 5866 Coble Church Rd, stepped to the podium for public comment. She asked that the request be denied because it moved away from the area's current Rural Living designation. She stated that her concern was bigger than the one property since it would set a precedent for more rezonings in the area and change the character of the community. Ms. Yaw commented that the continued reduction of rural and agricultural land is a dangerous path and that the decisions could have devastating long-term effects on the future of the community. She asked the board to deny the request for rezoning.

David Scotton, 6108 Phillippi Rd. stepped to the podium for public comment. He said it was important to consider the property's future, not just the current request. He raised concerns about increased traffic from farmers and the many cyclists who use the road. He stated that there were small farms in the area, and it was dangerous to move farm equipment with more development. He raised concerns about the impact on wildlife habitat.

Dr. Bui asked how many years Mr. Scotton had lived in the area. Mr. Scotton reported that he had been in the area for over 34 years. Dr. Bui asked if he had seen changes since living in the area. Mr. Scotton explained that the parent property at hand had been divided before they moved in. He discussed the changes to another neighboring property and noted the additional homes built. He stated that if enough people build homes on one acre of land, there would be no farmland left.

Victor Moon, 5861 Coble Church Rd, stepped to the podium for public comment. He stated that he had not received any letters and lived next door to the property. He stated that the surrounding area consist of pasture, corn, and hay, and said that the proposed development was from an out-of-state developer who did not care about the surrounding farmland.

Dr. Bui asked if Mr. Moon had any conversations with the applicants. Mr. Moon stated that the applicant was not even in the state, but he did raise his concern with the contractor that it was only a transfer of money. He noted that it could be different if it was someone who lived in the community.

Stacey Coleman, 5544 Watchtower Rd, stepped to the podium for public comment. She said she did not have much to add to the others' comments. She reported that she was a real estate agent and a realtor. The Rural Living designation was intended to preserve farmland, and adding more homes and traffic would set a precedent for allowing more homes and subdivisions, which would negatively impact farmers.

Dr. Bui asked if the approval would affect the property value of the surrounding area and how it would impact it. Ms. Coleman stated that property value is based on what a buyer is willing to pay and that it was hard to provide a definitive answer, but it would definitely have an impact.

Chair Donnelly invited those in favor of the request to rebuttal to any comments in opposition.

Mr. Galyon and Mr. McMillan stepped to the podium. Mr. Galyon stated that he had lived in Greensboro his entire life, owned a farm, and respected farmers. He noted that he was also a realtor and respected the neighbors' wishes, but a precedent was already set at a nearby lots, and he did not see the land becoming farmland again. Mr. McMillan noted that sending their own letters was voluntary and not required.

Chair Donnelly invited those against the request to rebuttal to comments in favor.

Mr. Scotton stated that small farms were a necessity, and farms could be very successful on just a few acres. If houses replaced the property, it could not become farmland.

Mr. Charles Moon reiterated that the county's FLUM identified the property as Rural Living, and that was how they wanted to keep it. The Rural Living was designed for lower-density areas and identified single-family dwellings on several acres of land, which the proposed development did not meet. He asked the Board to deny the rezoning request. There are plenty of areas in the county that are designated for attainable housing

There being no further speakers, Chair Donnelly closed the public hearing by acclamation.

Mr. Alston commented that it was not the first time he had heard similar instances during his time on the Board. People are moving to the rural areas. He stated that he felt for the community and the farmers, but the community needed a proactive plan. He discussed the need for a proactive position by the community rather than a reactive one. People moving to the area need somewhere to live. He recommended the neighbors work together to purchase land they wished to preserve.

Mr. Gullick commented that they needed to be careful about what precedent they were setting. Southeast Guilford County could be changing, but there needed to be a very compelling reason to change the FLUM. He stated that he did not see a compelling reason for the change in the instance.

Reverend Drumwright thanked all of the members of the public for their comments. He said they had seen several similar cases, but he could not recall an instance with three working agricultural farms next to the property in question on all sides. He stated that he believed, where there are working farms, it would set a dangerous precedent to ignore the concerns raised by the community. He believed that the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan should not be ignored. One near-term action under the Resilient Economy Strategy was to continue promoting the County's voluntary agriculture district, enhance voluntary agriculture district ordinances, and establish a farmland preservation initiative. If the county ignores the near-term action of the plan and input from community would be a disservice.

Vice Chair Craft stated that the County followed the ordinance regarding public notice. He stated that the Board should not consider property ownership when considering rezoning requests. He noted that he was sensitive to the area. From a land use point of view, we are putting a cul-de-sac and three houses in a primarily rural area. Land in the area was already being subdivided. There had been many instances of rezoning agriculture zones to residential zones, and he stated that he supported the rezoning for the current case.

Reverend Drumwright read an email sent to Mr. Hardin from Lisa Sterling for the record. In the letter, Ms. Sterling asked that the Planning Board not approve the rezoning request. She wrote that the Florida-based development company requesting the change had no interest in living in the area. She wrote about the land, the surrounding area, the wildlife, the and the dairy. The area was designated as Agricultural/Rural Living for many decades, and it was asked that a change not be made for the developer. Ms. Sterling wrote about the creek at the rear end of the lot and concerns about septic tank drain and run-off from roads and driveways.

Chair Donnelly discussed that it was a challenging case for a few reasons. The Planning Board's role was to determine whether the rezoning was reasonable and consistent with the surrounding area in the context of public interest. There were properties up the road that were of similar size, so he believed the request was reasonable in that context. As to consistency with the surrounding area, he stated that he had never had a case that was surrounded by working farms. Three comparably sized houses sounded reasonable, but the change to the FLUM from Rural Living to Residential is not taken lightly. He noted that property ownership could not legally be considered when making a decision. He stated that because of the change from Rural Living to Residential and the potential for making a precedent, he was inclined to vote to deny the request.

Dr. Bui stated that she supported building more houses in general, but the request and plan were not in harmony with the area and the existing farms. She stated that they had to consider whether or not the proposal was in harmony when making a decision, and from her perspective, she would not vote in favor of the request.

Mr. Gullick stated that Chair Donnelly's point about setting a precedent was spot on, and he did not see a compelling reason for the rezoning.

Reverend Drumwright moved to deny the request for Conditional Rezoning Case #26-06-PLBD-00023, located at 5731 Coble Church Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #125161 in Clay Township), from AG to CZ-RS-40, as the amendment is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) classification of Rural Living. Rural Living is typically characterized by one dwelling unit located on several acres of property. The proposed rezoning to CZ-RS-40 would fit the Land Use Map Classification of Residential due to the allowance of major subdivisions in the RS-40 district permitting increased density. The Residential classification includes a mixture of low and medium density development, typically consisting of densities of up to four dwelling units per acre. Additionally, the amendment was not reasonable in uplifting the Future Land Use Map as stated in the Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan on page 10 of the staff report which uplifts the opportunity for the County to establish farmland preservation and the character of the application is not consistent and in harmony with surrounding parcels. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted, 7-1, in favor of the motion to deny the request. (Ayes: Alston, Bui, Donnelly, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: Craft)

Chair Donnelly stated that the decision was still subject to appeal and that any appeal must be filed within 15 days to be heard by the Board of County Commissioners.

A five-minute break was taken.

C. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE # 26-07-PLBD-00028: AG, AGRICULTURAL TO CZ-RS-30, CONDITIONAL ZONING RESIDENTIAL: 568 NC HWY 62 E

Ms. Lockwood presented the staff report for Case #26-07-PLBD-00028. She confirmed that two notice signs were posted on the property, one on Highway 62 East and one in the adjacent subdivision. The adjacent property owners were sent public notice letters. The subject property is located at 568 NC Hwy 62 E (Guilford County Tax Parcel #241960 in Fentress Township), approximately 1,755 feet southwest of the intersection of Hunt Road and NC Hwy 62 E, comprising a total of approximately 48.31 acres. There is no history of denied cases.

Ms. Lockwood stated that the request is to conditionally rezone an approximate 32.96-acre portion of the subject property from AG, Agricultural, to CZ-RS-30, Conditional Zoning - Residential, subject to the following conditions:

Proposed Use Conditions:
Uses of the property shall be limited to the following as listed in Article 4, Table 4-3-1 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO): (1) Single Family Detached Dwellings. (2) Subdivision (Major) – Residential (6 or more lots). (3) Subdivision (Minor) – Residential. (4) Accessory Apartments/Dwelling Units.

There were no proposed development conditions.

Ms. Lockwood reviewed the AG and RS-30 district descriptions. The vicinity of the subject property is predominantly characterized as residential and vacant agricultural land. The surrounding zoning is mostly AG, with an adjacent CZ-RS-30 district abutting the property to the east. The subject property is currently enrolled in the Present-Use Value program for tax-deferred status with a Forestry Management Plan. The existing land use includes a single-family, detached dwelling. The impact on the public schools was an estimated 11-13 additional students for the elementary school, six to eight additional students for the middle school, and nine to 11 additional students for the high school. The parcel is located within the Pleasant Garden Fire Protection District and is approximately 3.7 miles from the fire station. A private septic system and well serve the property, and it is not within a service area.

NC Hwy 62 East is considered a Major Thoroughfare per Greensboro Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (GUAMPO). The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) 2025 Annual Average Daily Traffic count was 5,260 cars. An improvement project began in 2023 for NC Hwy 62 East under the Highway Safety mode and is described as installing pavement markings. TIP: HS-2007E. Any new development would be subject to NCDOT review and would need to obtain all required approvals. The parcel's topography ranges from nearly level to gently sloping, and from strongly sloping to moderately steep. There are no regulated floodplains, mapped wetlands, or mapped streams. It is located in the Lake Mackintosh water supply watershed.

Ms. Lockwood said the property is located in the Working Farm/Agriculture FLUM classification in the southeast quadrant. The Working Farm/Agriculture Land Use Classification represents land that is actively used for agriculture or forestry activities, including cultivated farmland, livestock, woodlands, or timber harvest. The lands may or may not support the primary residence of the property owner and outbuildings associated with activities on the property. Working Farms and Agricultural Lands may include both residential and non-residential uses and typically have parcel sizes larger than five or ten acres.

Ms. Lockwood stated the requested conditional rezoning is inconsistent with the subject property’s current FLUM classification of Working Farm/Agriculture. Working Farms and Agricultural Lands typically apply to parcels larger than five or ten acres. If it were rezoned, it would be classified as Residential due to the lot sizes and increased density. The Residential Land Use Classification represents lands that typically consist of lots of varying sizes that are in a grid or curvilinear pattern and primarily consist of low-density, single-family residential uses. They include both existing development and new areas that are currently undeveloped and may be developed with medium- and high-density uses in areas where municipalities continue to grow outward into the county or along primary transportation corridors.

Ms. Lockwood further explained that while inconsistent with the FLUM, the requested rezoning is consistent with the following goals, policies, and actions of the Guiding Guilford Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan, including the Goal Statement for the Attainable Housing Planning Theme which states: "Focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design," and Attainable Housing's Policy 1 to "enable the creation of new housing units that will provide a mix of housing types that meet the needs of residents." The subject property portion is contiguous to an existing, developed neighborhood to the east that is zoned CZ-RS-30, with an existing stub street extending from Rogers Farm Road intended for future connection to the subject property portion. Therefore, the requested map amendment to CZ-RS-30 aligns with the development pattern of the surrounding area and would facilitate strategic infill development connecting to existing infrastructure. She noted that the staff recommendation is approval.

If approved, an amendment to the Residential classification will be required.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and invited the applicant and anyone speaking on behalf of the zoning request to speak.

Nolan Franz, 3854 Battleground Avenue, Suite 300, stepped to the podium. Mr. Franz reported that he was representing JCB Development, Inc., which was proposing 35 single-family home lots. The property is intended to be rezoned to match the neighboring area that is zoned CZ-RS-30. NCDOT roads will serve the site, and two creeks cross the western property line, acting as a buffer between the site and the neighborhood.

The site was intended to be a future phase of the existing neighborhood, but the owners decided to hold it so one developer would not own an entire swath of land.

Dr. Bui asked how many access points there would be and from where. Mr. Franz reported that there would be a single access point from Rogers Farm Road.

Chandler Bradford, 924 Happy Hill Road, the power-of-attorney designee, confirmed his attendance.

Mr. Gullick stated that he was close to the area and familiar with the project. He noted the concerns raised by citizens. It was confirmed that a neighborhood meeting was held to raise those concerns.

Mario Mareno, 219 Cassell Street, the Senior Project Manager for JCB Development, stepped to the podium. He stated that he spoke with the adjourning neighborhood, Rogers Farm, and HOA President. He put notices in and around the neighborhood and down Highway 62. He stated that he spoke to many residents and no one aside from Rogers Farm residents had opposition, only questions about the use. Rogers Farm residents had concerns due to the ongoing construction they have dealt with. He stated a permanent entrance will not be provided from Highway 62, but construction access will be provided. The McCombie family owned some of the surrounding properties and were selective about who purchased the property. JCB Development is a small, family-oriented company. Piedmont Environmental completed the soil analysis, and there was no negative feedback on the impact of septic systems. One of the large concerns of Rogers Farm residents was to provide a playground area in the leftover open common area, so that was being worked on.

Mr. Gullick asked whether they were in a position to put conditions on the request at this time. Mr. Mareno stated that they had not had enough conversations to have conditions in place.

Chair Donnelly asked about the possibility of a 30-day continuance to allow all parties to finalize items. He asked if they were willing to do so. Mr. Mareno stated that they were not, and Mr. Bradford clarified they were open to it but first wanted to hear what the opposition was. They anticipated that the biggest opposition would be construction traffic, and there were people in attendance who could address those concerns.

Dr. Bui asked how many homes were intended to be placed on the lot and how large they were. Mr. Mareno reported that the current intention was to put in 35 homes because the current development has 75 homes.

Dr. Bui asked if one fire station can serve more than 99 homes. Michael Townsend, Fire Marshal, reported that it does not apply to fire stations, and that 99 homes is the buildout ceiling before a second access point is triggered, unrelated to this specific request. If there were 100 homes or more, a secondary egress was needed. If there were 99 homes or fewer, only one access point was required. Based on the anticipated total of 99 homes, one access point would be needed.

Reverend Drumwright asked for confirmation that the number of homes would be 34 instead of 35 given the access point requirements. Mr. Bradford confirmed that they would have 34 lots.

Mr. Little asked if HOA annexation could be added as a condition. Attorney Ashton Roberts stated that there was some leeway to add social equity conditions, but encouraged the community to work with the developer on those items rather than having the Planning Board include them as a condition.

Vice Chair Craft asked if uniform lighting could be included. Staff confirmed that it could be.

Sarah McCombie, 829 Norfolk Road, stepped to the podium. She stated that she and her husband owned the adjoining property and were the sellers for the property in question. She discussed the property, which had served as part of the Underground Railroad and still had a log cabin on it. She stated that they wanted to protect the land. When an opportunity came up to purchase what would become Phase Four of Rogers Farm, they decided to do so to minimize development of the land. They wanted to ensure the property would be developed in the right way and respect the land's heritage. Ms. McCombie stated that she and her husband were excited to develop some of the land in such a way that would respect the land. She stated that they were excited to have new neighbors and strengthen the community as a whole.

Mr. Bell clarified that the blasting was not a function of the Technical Review Committee’s review, and that grading was part of the development review and was intended to protect adjacent properties from soil erosion.

Mr. Gullick asked about the "for sale" sign on Highway 62 and if it was for the current property. Ms. McCombie stated that another piece of land was sold to their neighbors across the street, and the sign encompassed that piece of land, the acreage being discussed at the current meeting, and a piece of land they hoped could be retained for a small farm.

Vice Chair Craft stated that he was trying to ensure both parties understood what could be included in conditions and what could not. He commented that it seemed the applicant and neighbors needed to work together and come forward with a package that was more aligned with each other. Mr. Mareno stated that their goal was to not have access through the McCombie's property, and they wanted to have a productive discussion about the best way to complete the construction. Vice Chair Craft noted that Planning Board meetings were not time for discussions among applicants and community members.

Chair Donnelly invited anyone who was opposed to the rezoning request to the podium to speak.

Jerry Thompson, 6463 Rogers Farm Road, stepped to the podium to provide public comment. He noted that he was the President of the Rogers Farm HOA. He stated that the current proposed conditions by the developers left critical gaps. The developer was presented with seven specific reasonable conditions that the HOA would like to move forward with where possible. The first condition related to construction access, and Rogers Farm wanted to require that construction not go through their neighborhood. Mr. Thompson raised concerns about the increased traffic. The second condition was that all heavy equipment, materials, deliveries, and construction traffic must access the site from Highway 62 and not through Windrose Way and Rogers Farm Road. All construction was requested to go through the construction access until homes were put up for sale. The HOA annexation was asking to be part of the Rogers Farm, and there had been many negative experiences related to construction. Uniform lighting was another condition. It was asked that the developer build the homes to the same safety and structural standards as Rogers Farm.
Mr. Thompson requested that the Planning Board deny the request unless there was agreement to the conditions or grant a 30-day continuance to allow the developer time to discuss and solidify the conditions.

Mr. Little asked whether the Rogers Farm HOA opposed the development. Mr. Thompson stated that they were opposed to it, but they did not have the resources to fight it. He said they would love to keep the woods and nature there.

Mr. Stalder commented that the construction access was a good idea and several of the conditions were possible. He stated that his concern was that the zoning conditions would stay with the property until it was rezoned, and some of them could cause issues once it was subdivided and sold to individuals. He stated that future lot owners would be forced to follow restrictions. He asked whether other ways could be explored to work out the issues. Mr. Thompson stated that they wanted whatever was decided in writing.

Vice Chair Craft asked whether the roads in the current subdivision were state maintained. Mr. Thompson stated that all of them except for "Section 3" were state maintained.

Vice Chair Craft asked whether there could be wording requiring the construction entrance until the last home was built. Staff stated that they were not familiar with an expiring condition as a land-use option, but they could look further into it.

Chair Donnelly stated that he was aware of prior cases with construction entrances and asked what would make those cases different from the current one. He stated that he believed there were already multiple entrances in the past, but the current request was to add another entrance. Staff stated that they would look into the issue.

Timothy Halstead, 6623 Rogers Farm Road, stepped to the podium to provide public comment. He stated that the developers had been very transparent, and he appreciated it. He commented that his only concern was the access point. If there were an evacuation, it would be difficult with only one access point. He discussed emergency traffic flow and noted that it was a one-way road.

Michael Padrick, 406 Stonewall Court, stepped to the podium to provide public comment. He said his biggest concern was the construction coming through the neighborhood. He stated that residents have already had to replace tires because screws were left from prior construction. There were also safety concerns about the construction.

Chair Donnelly invited those in favor of the request to provide rebuttal to the comments from those opposed.

Ms. McCombie stated that she was unfamiliar with any LLC, clarified that it was unrelated to her and her husband, and she was happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Franz commented that the roads were state roads that were sized for the current development. The current developers did not own the property to the north, so requiring an easement to the north would require additional approval from that property and from NCDOT.

Chair Donnelly commented that it sounded like the speakers had ownership of the northern property related to the development to allow construction access. He added that he appreciated the need for NCDOT approval.

Mr. Mareno stated that he believed a contingency on the rezoning of a construction entrance would cause future difficulties for the individual homeowners. He stated that they were fully transparent and would work with the Rogers Farm HOA, but adding the condition would create additional hardships.

Chair Donnelly asked what would occur if an agreement could not be reached. Mr. Mareno stated that he believed that an agreement can be reconciled.

Mr. Gullick commented that the smartest option seemed to be to continue the conversations together to determine what could and could not be agreed to. Mr. Mareno stated that, from a business standpoint, the financial impacts were considerable.

Vice Chair Craft asked the applicants if they were willing to offer any conditions that could be added to the request at the current meeting. Mr. Bradford confirmed that they would not do any blasting. He stated that all of the requests were reasonable aside from the construction easement. The concern about the road widths was understandable, but they were able to withstand the prior construction traffic. The fire access concern was acknowledged, but the regulations allowed 99 homes to be built in total.

Chair Donnelly clarified that the conditions offered were uniform lighting and a minimum of 25% brick, stone or fiber cement for the front façade and raised foundations.

Attorney Roberts reiterated that they would not recommend including the HOA annexation as a condition.

Mr. Bradford stated that they are willing to include the two conditions and that they are willing to pursue all options that they can come up with for the temporary access, but they did not feel it would be appropriate to make it a condition in case NCDOT does not grant them necessary access.

Chair Donnelly asked the applicant to confirm that the strong preference was not to have a 30-day continuance. Mr. Bradford confirmed that this was the case.

Chair Donnelly invited anyone in opposition to the request to provide rebuttal comments.

Mr. Thompson commented that the biggest concern was the construction insurance due to the safety concerns and that the neighborhood had dealt with construction issues for five years.

There being no further speakers, Chair Donnelly closed the public hearing by acclamation.

Reverend Drumwright asked staff whether the Planning Board could make construction access a condition. Attorney Roberts confirmed that the landowner would have to consent for it to be a condition. Reverend Drumwright stated that he would have preferred more time to confer among the developer and the community, but he acknowledged that the developer would incur millions of dollars in costs. Rev. Drumwright referred to construction costs based on photos presented at the hearing. He stated that his work on this Board is to advocate for the community, as they are the ones that will live and play there. He stated he was at a true crossroads due to the temporary construction access not being a development condition.

Mr. Alston stated that he did not feel that they, the Board, had any true standing to hold the developer accountable for a construction entrance. He noted a similar situation in which the Board voted against it, an appeal was filed, and then the County Commissioners approved it. He said there seemed to be no way around it, given the laws and the stipulations in place.

Mr. Gullick asked Mr. Mareno about interest payments and if the purchase was already processed. Mr. Mareno stated that they were in the process of buying it.

Mr. Little stated that the FLUM designation of the land as Working Farm/Agriculture and that he would not support the zoning change. He noted the time and effort put into developing the FLUM. He stated that he would not support this.

Vice Chair Craft noted that part of the adjacent property was RS-40 and part was RS-30. He commented that there did not seem to be anything that could be done about the construction easement. He noted that he would appreciate seeing the easement through the McCombie's property to Highway 62. Ultimately, the decision was related to the reasonableness of the use of the land.

Mr. Gullick stated that, regarding the FLUM, he believed that the zoning change request was reasonable given that the surrounding property was residential. He stated that there is a compelling reason to amend the FLUM from Working Farm. He noted that he would appreciate seeing a separate construction entrance.

Dr. Bui noted that the difference between the current and previous case was that development already existed adjacent to the property. She stated that she felt that the zoning change request fit the goal statement of attainable housing planning and was also in harmony with the surrounding area. Even though the applicant had been very transparent, the community still had unanswered questions. She stated that the applicants would likely have a stronger position if they returned after more conversations with the community.

Chair Donnelly stated that the Board was specifically intended to weigh the benefits and detriments to the surrounding community. He stated that he would also like to see an agreement between the community and applicants, but he would weigh the balance of benefits and detriments.

Reverend Drumwright commented that he did not believe 30 days of conversation would help in regard to the temporary construction easement. The road would either be built or not, but they cannot compromise and build half of a road. He also stated that whether NCDOT would allow the access is a big consideration as the Board does not have an answer to that question. The developer does not know if that is something the state would allow.

Mr. Gullick stated that, from a land use standpoint, the proposal was appropriate. He said he would favor the development. He noted that the county has a shortage of housing and they are willing to accept some conditions.

Mr. Alston asked whether it was possible to ensure that the other requests from the community were granted if the road is used for construction traffic.

Chair Donnelly stated that the two potential conditions are the only ones they are able to bring forward.

Vice Chair Craft moved to add the conditions of uniform lighting (all internal street lighting, fixtures, pole designs, and spacing intervals should mirror the fixture style and installation specifications currently in place in the Rogers Farm community), and that the construction shall match the existing neighborhood, including a minimum of 25% brick, stone, fiber cement, front façade, and raised foundations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gullick. The Board voted unanimously, 8-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Alston, Bui, Craft, Donnelly, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: None)

Vice Chair Craft moved to approve the zoning map amendment located on Guilford County Tax Parcel #241960 from AG to CZ-RS-30 and this approval also amends the Future Land Use Map: Southeast Quadrant. The zoning map amendment, and associated Future Land Use Map amendment, from Working Farm/Agriculture to Residential in the Southeast Quadrant are based on the following changes in conditions: while inconsistent with the map, the subject parcel is adjacent to a neighborhood that has parcels currently shown under the Working Farm designation and there are also RS-30 and RS-40 adjacent to the parcel, and it also addresses the planning theme of Attainable Housing by providing much-needed housing in a growing part of the county; the amendment is reasonable because it supports key elements of the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan, including the Goal Statement for the Attainable Housing Planning Theme which states: "Focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design," and Attainable Housing's Policy 1 to "enable the creation of new housing units that will provide a mix of housing types that meet the needs of residents." The subject property portion is contiguous to an existing, developed neighborhood to the east that is zoned CZ-RS-30, with an existing stub street extending from Rogers Farm Road intended for future connection to the subject property portion. Therefore, the requested map amendment to CZ-RS-30 aligns with the development pattern of the surrounding area and would facilitate strategic infill development connecting to existing infrastructure. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gullick. The Board voted, 6-2, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Alston, Bui, Craft, Drumwright, Gullick, Stalder. Nays: Little, Donnelly)

Reverend Drumwright encouraged the developer to do whatever they could to benefit the existing community.

D. UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) TEXT AMENDMENT CASE #26-06-PLBD-00022: AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 3 (PERMITS AND PROCEDURES) SUBSECTION 3.5.M (PROCEDURES FOR SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS - REZONING (CONVENTIONAL & CONDITIONAL) / MAP AMENDMENT) TO ADD TEXT TO ALIGN WITH NCGS 160D601 AND CURRENT PRACTICE REGARDING REQUIRING OWNER CONSENT FOR DOWNZONING

Chair Donnelly asked whether Board members had sufficient understanding of the text amendments to vote at the current meeting. All Planning Board members stated that they were.

Mr. Alston requested to exit the meeting.

Vice Chair Craft moved to excuse Mr. Alston from the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stalder. The Board voted unanimously, 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bui, Craft, Donnelly, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: None).

Mr. Moss presented the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Text Amendment Case #26-06-PLBD-00022: An Amendment To Article 3 (Permits And Procedures) Subsection 3.5.M (Procedures For Specific Applications - Rezoning (Conventional & Conditional) / Map Amendment) To Add Text To Align With NCGS 160D601 and Current Practice Regarding Requiring Owner Consent For Downzoning.

Mr. Moss stated that the proposed Text Amendment amends Article 3 Permits and Procedures, Subsection 3.5.M Procedures for Specific Applications – Rezoning (Conventional & Conditional) / Map Amendment to add clarifying language to the Guilford County Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) regarding written consent being required of all affected property owners when downzoning any property consistent with NCGS 160D-601 and current departmental practice.

The following amendment is proposed:

3.5 PROCEDURES FOR SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS…
M. REZONING (CONVENTIONAL & CONDITIONAL) / MAP AMENDMENT…
4. Procedure…
e. Planning Board Review and Decision
(1) The Planning Board, after conducting a legislative hearing, shall review and provide a decision on the request.
(2) The decision shall be one of the following:
(i) Adoption of the rezoning as proposed
(ii) Adoption of the rezoning to a zoning district designation of lesser intensity <u>with written consent of all affected property owners</u>.
(iii) Denial of the rezoning
(iv) Remand of the rezoning application to staff for further consideration.

Mr. Moss stated that the proposed Text Amendment is consistent with the following elements of the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan: Planning Theme: Community Character. The goal statement is to celebrate Guilford County's unique sense of place by balancing agricultural preservation with desired development patterns, context-sensitive site design, and placemaking. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Future Land Use Framework for Sensible Growth outlined in the Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan.

The Plan's Vision states, "In order to house this growth, the County needs to begin implementing measures, policies, and regulations to ensure that future development patterns are reflective of the community's Vision." Additionally, this Text Amendment aligns the UDO with current State law (NCGS 160D-601) and current departmental practice.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and invited comments on the proposed text amendment.

Hearing none, Chair Donnelly closed the public hearing by acclamation.

Vice Chair Craft moved to recommend the Proposed Text Amendment Case #26-06-PLBD-0002 to the Board of Commissioners, as presented, finding the Amendment consistent with the Planning Theme of Community Character as the Goal Statement "Celebrate Guilford County's unique sense of place by balancing agricultural preservation with desired development patterns, context-sensitive site design and placemaking" under Guilford County's Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment is consistent with the Future Land Use Framework for Sensible Growth outlined in the Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan.

The Plan's Vision states, "In order to house this growth, the County needs to begin implementing measures, policies, and regulations to ensure that future development patterns are reflective of the community's Vision." Additionally, this Text Amendment aligns the UDO with current State law (NCGS 160D-601) and current departmental practice. The motion was seconded by Reverend Drumwright. The Board voted unanimously, 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bui, Craft, Donnelly, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: None)

E. UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) TEXT AMENDMENT CASE #26-07-PLBD-00024: AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 4 (ZONING DISTRICTS); SUBSECTION 4.2.1 (AG-AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT); SUBSECTION, 4.2.17 (MXU- MIXED USE DISTRICT); AND SUBSECTION 4.3 (USE MATRIX) TO ADJUST DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SINGLE- AND TWO-FAMILY-DWELLINGS IN THE AG, AGRICULTURAL AND MXU, MIXED USE ZONING DISTRICTS AND ADD TWO-FAMILY DWELLINGS AS A PERMITTED USE IN THE RS-40, RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Ms. Terrell presented the staff report on proposed text amendment Case #26-07-PLBD-00024, An Amendment To Article 4 (Zoning Districts); Subsection 4.2.1 (AG-Agricultural District); Subsection, 4.2.17 (MXU- Mixed Use District); And Subsection 4.3 (Use Matrix) To Adjust Dimensional Requirements For Single- And Two-Family-Dwellings In The AG, Agricultural And MXU, Mixed Use Zoning Districts And Add Two-Family Dwellings As A Permitted Use In The RS-40, Residential District. This proposed Text Amendment to the Guilford County Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) amends Article 4 Zoning Districts, Subsection 4.2.1 AG-Agricultural District; Subsection 4.2.17-MXU Mixed Use District; and Subsection 4.3 Use Matrix. If approved, the amendment will align the dimensional requirements for two-family dwellings with single-family, detached dwellings in the AG district, reduce dimensional requirements for minimum lot width at the building line for single-family, detached dwellings in the MXU district, and add two-family dwellings (twin homes and duplexes) as a permitted use by right in the RS-40 district.

Ms. Terrell stated that this proposal addresses several priorities and recommendations in the Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan, which prioritizes the creation of new housing, including what is known as "Missing Middle Housing."

This term is defined as: "A term that refers to creating a spectrum of housing types that are typically absent from more recent housing development. Is a range of medium-density multifamily units – from duplexes to cottage units to apartments – that can provide housing opportunities that are in scale with single-family neighborhoods but can house more people and are often at a lower, more attainable price point." It was also highlighted that duplexes are identified as a recommended primary land use within both the Rural Living and Residential Land Use Classifications of the FLUM. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are currently allowed in all residential zoning districts (one per lot). ADUs are defined as: "A dwelling unit that exists either as part of a principal dwelling, or as an accessory building, and is secondary and incidental to the use of the property as single-family residential." Under the UDO's Development Standards, ADUs may be either detached or attached to the principal dwelling. It was noted that ADUs are not allowed as accessories to Duplexes. Therefore, the amendment does not alter the existing density limitations of the RS-40 district and makes lot size requirements in the AG district consistent between one- and two-family homes, with two dwelling units currently allowed on a 40,000 square foot lot (a principal dwelling and an ADU). Finally, reducing the minimum lot width at the building line for one- and two-family dwellings in the MXU district aligns with the character of a Mixed-Use District as a moderately dense and walkable area.

Ms. Terrell said this proposed Text Amendment is consistent with multiple elements of the Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan, including the Planning Theme: Attainable Housing Goal Statement, which states, "to focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design". The proposed Text Amendment is also consistent with Policy 1, which states "Enable the creation of the new housing units that will provide a mix of housing types that meet the needs of residents." The proposal is also consistent with the following action items: Action H1.7 "Update the UDO to allow developers of new subdivisions to provide multiple lot sizes and/or house types to encourage additional housing variety." and Action H2.3: "Complete a code audit to identify any barriers related to the creation of missing middle housing and implement recommended code changes from the audit." Staff recommended approval.

Ms. Terrell outlined the proposed text amendment as follows:

- Subsection 4.2.1 (AG) – (1) Reduces the minimum lot size from 60,000 sf to 40,000 sf and minimum lot width from 200 ft to 150 ft for Two-Family Dwellings to align with the lot dimensional requirements for Single-Family, Detached Dwellings in the AG District.

- Subsection 4.2.17 (MXU) – (1) Clarifies that dimensional standards for Single-Family, Detached Dwellings also apply to Two-Family Dwellings in the MXU district. Reduces Single-Family, Detached and Two-Family Dwelling minimum lot width at the building line from 50 ft to 40 ft for interior lots and reduces the minimum lot width at the building line for Single-Family, Detached and Two-Family Dwellings on corner lots from 70 ft to 50 ft in the MXU District.

- Subsection 4.3 (Use Matrix) – (1) Amends Table 4.3-1 Permitted Use Schedule to add Two-Family Dwelling (Twin Home or Duplex) as a permitted use by right under the RS-40 use matrix. She stated that the proposal addresses the priorities in the comprehensive plan to create attainable housing types that are typically absent, such as duplexes, cottage units, and apartments, that can provide housing opportunities in scale with single-family neighborhoods that can house more people at an attainable price point. Duplexes are identified as a recommended primary land use in both the Rural Living and Residential land use classifications.

Ms. Terrell presented illustrative showings of a 2,200 square foot Single-Family, Detached Dwellings, a 2,200 square foot Single-Family, Detached Dwelling with a 600 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), and a 2,200 square foot Duplex on a residential lot. Ms. Terrell clarified that the UDO does not allow an accessory dwelling on a lot with a duplex.

Chair Donnelly asked about the driver for the reduction in the interior lot and corner-lot widths. Mr. Bell reported that there were three areas in the county with access to water and sewer that do not require annexation: the Stony Creek area, the Rock Creek area, and the Liberty Road Woody Mill area. To promote housing, the lot width was reduced so that for every four houses you could add another lot.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and invited comments on the proposed text amendment.

Hearing none, Chair Donnelly closed the public hearing by acclamation.

Mr. Gullick moved to recommend the Proposed Text Amendment Case #26-07-PLBD-00024 to the Board of Commissioners, as presented, and stated the proposed Text Amendment is consistent with the Guilford County Guiding Guilford: Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan Attainable Housing Planning Theme's Goal Statement which states to: "Focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design." The proposal is also consistent with the Attainable Housing Planning Theme's Policy 1 which states to: "Enable the creation of the new housing units that will provide a mix of housing types that meet the needs of residents." Furthermore, the proposed amendment is consistent with the following near term Action Items under the Attainable Housing Planning Theme: (1) Action H1.7 which states to "Update the UDO to allow developers of new subdivisions to provide multiple lot sizes and/or house types to encourage additional housing variety." (2) Action Item H2.3 which states: "Complete a code audit to identify any barriers related to the creation of missing middle housing and implement recommended code changes from the audit." The motion was seconded by Reverend Drumwright. The Board voted unanimously, 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bui, Craft, Donnelly, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: None)

VIII. Other Business

A. Election of Vice-Chair

Chair Donnelly asked if anyone was interested in serving as Vice Chair.

Mr. Gullick moved to nominate Mr. Little, seconded by Dr. Bui. Mr. Little accepted the nomination.

The Board voted unanimously, 7-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bui, Craft, Donnelly, Drumwright, Gullick, Little, Stalder. Nays: None)

B. Recognition of Board Member Service: David Craft

Chair Donnelly thanked Mr. Craft for his service. He also welcomed newly appointed Board member, Amy Kemp, who was sitting in the audience.

Mr. Craft said he enjoyed working with everyone and continued to admire the staff and all of their work.

Chair Donnelly noted that the Board received a letter requesting a meeting on data centers. If anything came to the Planning Board from the Board of County Commissioners, there would be an opportunity for public comment, but no action was being taken on the letter at this time.

IX. Adjourn

There being no further business before the Board, Chair Donnelly adjourned at 10:27 p.m. by acclamation.

The next regular meeting of the Guilford County Planning Board is scheduled for September 9, 2026, at 6 p.m. in the Board of Commissioners Chambers, located on the second floor of the Old Guilford County Courthouse, 301 W Market St, Greensboro, NC 27401.