

**GUILFORD COUNTY
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

Old County Courthouse – Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room
301 W. Market Street, Greensboro, NC 27401

May 13, 2026

6:00 PM

Call to Order

Chair Donnelly asked that everyone hold a moment of silence in memory of Mr. Ed Apple, who was a prior member of the Planning Board. Mr. Apple recently passed away, and he wished to honor him.

I. Roll Call

Mr. Moss called the roll for attendance at this meeting.

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

James Donnelly, Chair; David Craft, Vice Chair; Dr. Nho Thi Bui; Rev. Gregory Drumwright; Ryan Alston; Guy Gullick

The following members were absent from this meeting:

Randy Little; Cara Buchanan; Sam Stalder

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

J. Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director; Jason Hardin, Planning and Development Deputy Director; Oliver Bass, Planning and Zoning Manager; Avery Tew, Senior Planner; Darby Terrell, Senior Planner; Troy Moss, Planner I; Grady Starnes, Fire Plans Examiner; Matthew Mason, Attorney

II. Agenda Amendments

None

III. Approval of Minutes: March 25, 2026 (Special Meeting) & April 8, 2026

Mr. Gullick moved to approve the March 25, 2026 (Special Meeting) and April 8, 2026 meeting minutes with the proposed changes submitted by Chair Donnelly, seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Bui, Drumwright, Craft, Alston and Craft. Nays: None.)

IV. Rules and Procedure

Chair Donnelly explained the policies and procedures followed by the Planning Board.

V. Continuance Requests

None

VI. Old Business**Legislative Hearing Item(s)**

Mr. Bass stated that the applicant for the Lees Chapel Road case was not present, and had informed the Planning staff the evening prior to the meeting that he would be unable to attend.

Attorney Mason asked if the applicant for 2701 Lees Chapel Road had requested to continue the request. Ms. Terrell responded that the property owner did not request a continuance and said that "anything the Board decides to do is okay".

Mr. Gullick stated that this matter has been continued previously and he would be in favor of hearing this case this evening.

Chair Donnelly stated that the Board seems inclined to hear the case this evening and would like to proceed with the hearing. Reverend Drumwright stated that he feels that the applicant should be present for this hearing to determine if he accepts the development conditions recommended by staff.

Mr. Hardin pointed out that after the previous meeting, the applicant confirmed with staff that he would attend this meeting.

Mr. Gullick moved to hear rezoning case #25-11-PLBD-00142 at this meeting, seconded by Rev. Drumwright. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Bui, Drumwright, Craft, Alston and Gullick. Nays: None.)

A. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #25-11-PLBD-00142: RS-30, RESIDENTIAL TO CZ-GB, CONDITIONAL ZONING – GENERAL BUSINESS: 2701 LEES CHAPEL ROAD (DENIED)

Ms. Terrell presented the staff report for Conditional Rezoning Case #25-11-PLBD-00142, located at 2701 Lees Chapel Road. Ms. Terrell informed the Board all posted and mailed public notices were made in compliance with the North Carolina General Statutes.

Ms. Terrell said that the request is to rezone the subject property from RS-30, Residential to CZ-GB, Conditional Zoning – General Business, comprising approximately 3.71 acres.

Ms. Terrell stated the applicant requested the following conditions: Proposed Use Conditions: 1) Special Event Venue 2) Retail (General). There were no development conditions requested.

Ms. Terrell explained that the vicinity of the subject property consists predominantly of rural residential and agricultural uses on lands zoned AG, Agricultural, RS-40 and RS-30 Residential. The commercial property to the north is zoned CZ-LB, Conditional Zoning-

Limited Business. She went on to say that a Type A planting yard would be required along property lines abutting RS-30 zoned parcels per the Guilford County UDO's buffer requirements if the request is approved. She also informed the Board that the property is located within the I-840 Scenic Corridor overlay district of which any proposed development would be required to comply with the development standards of, as well.

Ms. Terrell said the property is located near the intersection of Lees Chapel Road and Hillcroft Road. The classification of Lees Chapel Road changes from a major thoroughfare from the south starting in the City of Greensboro to a Collector street once the road passes the intersection of Scott Road and Miltonwood Road. Hillcroft Road is a Collector street.

Ms. Terrell noted the current Future Land Use Map (FLUM) classification for the subject property is Residential. A change to the Retail/Restaurant classification would be required if the proposed rezoning is approved.

Ms. Terrell stated the request is consistent with the Planning Theme: Resilient Economy: Action E1.1 and Action E1.2 under the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Terrell stated the request to rezone the property from RS-30 to CZ-GB is reasonable with the addition of the staff-recommended development conditions. The use conditions proposed by the applicant (and development conditions recommended by staff) exclude many potentially incongruous uses allowed in the General Business District and address use incompatibility concerns. While the surrounding area consists mostly of residential uses, there is a commercially zoned parcel located 400 feet north of the subject property (zoned CZ-LB). Additionally, the subject property is located along a Major Thoroughfare that would provide sufficient transportation infrastructure for any new development. This parcel is also located within the I-840 Scenic Corridor which puts further restrictions on the property including access restrictions and additional design restrictions for development. Staff recommend consideration be given to include the following development conditions: (1) Noise generated by any commercial use that is audible from any property line of the subject parcel shall cease by 11:00 p.m. and resume no earlier than 7 a.m. the following day. (2) Any proposed development of the property shall be in compliance with the I-840 Urban Loop Scenic Corridor Overlay requirements listed in the Guilford County UDO.

Ms. Terrell stated staff recommends approval with addition of staff recommended conditions. The subject property is located in the Northeast Quadrant. The proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the subject property's current Future Land Use Map (FLUM) classification of Residential. Therefore, if the request is approved, an amendment to the Retail/Restaurant classification will be required.

Mr. Bell informed the Board that staff received an email from the applicant this morning, which stated that, "he wanted to ask that the Board consider at least 12:00 AM midnight and every event would be closed at that time."

Chair Donnelly pointed out that the line mapped immediately to the left of this property is a railroad track. He asked if, absent the previous conditions, is there a staff recommendation on the application as originally submitted? Ms. Terrell responded that the staff recommendation is denial without the addition of the recommended development conditions.

Chair Donnelly opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak in favor or in opposition to the proposed rezoning and no one came forward. Therefore, Chair Donnelly closed the Public Hearing by acclamation.

Discussion:

Vice Chair Craft stated that he is inclined to vote against the request for various reasons, such as lack of conditions for an event venue and he would be willing to make that motion.

Mr. Alston stated that he agrees with Vice Chair Craft because the applicant is not present it shows a lack of organization or maybe even a lack of care to get the rezoning approved. He could have simply sent a representative to show face here, today. Mr. Alston indicated he cannot make an informed decision on this case.

Mr. Gullick stated that he feels the Board's hands are tied, as the applicant has not agreed to the staff recommended conditions and he would be voting against the request.

Chair Donnelly stated that this proposal includes an interesting mix of uses with the retail component and special event center use. Absent a compelling reason to consider both of those, he indicated it is hard to consider anything other than denial.

Vice Chair Craft moved to deny the proposed Zoning Map Amendment located at Guilford County Tax Parcel # 126119 from RS-30 to CZ-GB as the amendment is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan due to the predominant classification of land in the area being residential. The amendment is not reasonable because it will create additional noise, traffic, and business activity concerns in a residential area, seconded by Rev. Drumwright. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Bui, Drumwright, Gullick, Alston and Craft. Nays: None.)

VII. New Business

Legislative Hearing Item(s)

A. ORDER TO CLOSE A PUBLIC ROAD CASE #26-02-PLBD-00012: A 0.2 MILE SECTION OF HOMEDALE DRIVE (APPROVED)

Mr. Tew presented the staff report for case #26-02-PLBD-00012. He stated that this is a request for the Board to adopt a Resolution to Close a Public Road and remove such road from dedication. Specifically, the request is to close a 0.2-mile section of Homedale Drive that begins at the eastern margin of Guilford County Tax Parcel #144346 in Sumner Township and runs west for 0.2 miles, terminating at the end of the Homedale Drive right-of-way. In total, Homedale Drive runs west for a length of 0.4 mi from its intersection with Coltrane Mill Road (SR 1103). Staff sent mailed notices to owners of properties adjacent to the road.

Mr. Tew noted that there is an North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) map included in the packet that shows the entirety of Homedale Drive with red "X's" over it and identifies the road as being "deleted."

Mr. Tew clarified that this map represents the NCDOT deleting the road from their road maintenance system. However, the request to close the road is only for the highlighted 0.2-mile section noted on the sketch plan and the maps produced by the County.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and asked anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request to come forward and identify themselves for the record.

Andrew Rumley, 6200 Steeple Chase Court, Greensboro, stated that he is the property owner and applicant. He owns a 204-acre parcel of land at the end of Homedale Drive that he plans to build his future home on. He does not want to develop it beyond that, just to have a rural farm. He does not think the public should be able to drive onto his property and that is why he wants the section of the road that extends into his property closed. He plans to pave the road but does not want to be required to improve the road to NCDOT standards.

Randy Blackburn, 6716 Coltrane Mill Road, stated that he owns the property identified by the letter "G" on the adjacent properties map. He agrees to the proposed road closing as long as he still retains access to his property.

Chair Donnelly asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition to the matter and no one came forward. Therefore, Chair Donnelly closed the public hearing by acclamation.

Dr. Bui stated that she does not have a problem with closing this section of Homedale Drive. This road is no longer being maintained by NCDOT and it seems that Mr. Rumley and his neighbor have spoken and have come to an agreement.

Chair Donnelly noted that Mr. Blackburn appeared to have additional comments. He stated that the public hearing would need to be re-opened if the Board wished to hear additional comments from Mr. Blackburn.

Mr. Alston moved to re-open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gullick. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Bui, Drumwright, Alston, and Gullick. Nays: None.)

Mr. Blackburn returned to the podium and stated that he was concerned about the fact that NCDOT was no longer going to maintain any of Homedale Drive. He said he understood that Mr. Rumley planned to pave or maintain the portion of the road extending into Mr. Rumley's property, but he wondered who would maintain the section extending to Coltrane Mill Road?

Chair Donnelly responded that he did not believe the maintenance of the road was within the Board's purview with respect to the decision before them. The only question before the Board was whether or not to close the portion of the road that extends into Mr. Rumley's property.

Mr. Bell stated that if NCDOT was maintaining the road, and there was a petition to remove the road from NCDOT's maintenance system that was approved by the Board of Transportation, then the road is not NCDOT's responsibility to maintain. It would be up to the property owners to decide who is responsible for maintaining the road.

Mr. Blackburn stated that he has a statement signed by Mr. Rumley saying that he agreed to maintain the road. Mr. Bell responded that is not part of the Board's purview to determine who will be responsible for maintaining the road.

Mr. Rumley stated that several property owners along Homedale Drive signed the petition to remove the road from state maintenance and sent it to NCDOT. The road has been abandoned by NCDOT already. There have been some potholes and he repaired them with gravel. He stated that he does intend to pave the whole road from Coltrane Mill Road all the way to his property. He reiterated that it was up to the property owners collectively to decide who would maintain the road now that it has been removed from NCDOT maintenance. He added that the requested road closing would not affect Mr. Blackburn's property, and Mr. Blackburn would retain access to his property from Homedale Drive.

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

Mr. Alston stated that he feels this might be a sticky situation. He also felt that it may have been a mistake to remove the entire road from NCDOT maintenance. Now Mr. Blackburn needs to rely on Mr. Rumley's promise to maintain the road. He said he did not feel comfortable with the road closing because it could create unintended consequences.

Mr. Bell clarified that the road had been removed from NCDOT maintenance regardless of the Board's decision on the requested road closing.

Mr. Alston asked whether it would be possible to add the road to the NCDOT maintenance system again? Mr. Bell responded that the property owner would need to petition that to NCDOT.

Rev. Drumwright asked whether closing this portion of the road would mean that the road is now under Mr. Rumley's sole domain? Mr. Bell responded that the entire road would not be under Mr. Rumley's domain.

The only portion that would be closed is the portion extending into Mr. Rumley's property. He stated that he did not perceive that Mr. Blackburn was losing any access to his property.

Mr. Gullick stated that this looks like a simple matter to him, because no one is losing access to their property. In fact, this could be a win for everybody. If Mr. Rumley paves the entire road, then that would also give Mr. Blackburn a paved access to his property. He would be in favor of this.

Mr. Bell noted that access will remain available from Homedale Road to adjacent properties.

Attorney Mason stated that the decision on this request would not be a Resolution, as indicated on the draft document, but it is actually an Order and should be titled as such.

Mr. Gullick moved to adopt the Order Closing and Removing from Public Dedication a public road, which Order he incorporated into the motion by reference, for Road Closing Case #26-02-PLBD-00012. The motion was seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Bui, Drumwright, Alston, and Gullick. Nays: None.)

B. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #25-11-PLBD-00140: AG, AGRICULTURAL AND HI, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL TO AG, AGRICULTURAL AND CZ-HI, CONDITIONAL ZONING – HEAVY INDUSTRIAL: 5143 RANDLEMAN ROAD (DENIED)

Ms. Terrell presented the staff report for case #25-11-PLBD-00140. She stated the subject property is located at 5143 Randleman Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #144107 in Sumner Township). This request was to rezone approximately 3.68 acres from AG, Agricultural & HI, Heavy Industrial (Reference Case 104-70) to AG, Agricultural & CZ-HI, Conditional – Zoned Heavy Industrial. Per the submitted Sketch Plan, 0.96 acres are to remain AG, and approximately 3.68 acres rezoned to CZ-HI. The applicant has provided the following conditions: Proposed Use Conditions: (1) Automobile Repair Services; (2) Equipment Repair, Light; (3) Truck Washing. No Proposed Development Condition were offered.

Ms. Terrell pointed out that the vicinity of the subject property includes a mixture of commercial to the west of Randleman Road and low-density residential, and some agricultural to the north, east, and south. The topography is nearly level, gently sloping, and strongly sloping to moderately steep. There are mapped streams on-site per the soil survey maps for Guilford County. It is located in Polecat Creek WS-III.

Ms. Terrell said the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Classification for the subject property was Rural Living for the AG portion and Residential for the HI portion and is located in the Southeast Quadrant.

Ms. Terrell explained that for the purposes of this report, staff would be evaluating the following two geographic sections of the proposed rezoning. The property contains two distinct zoning districts and land use classifications, each of which would be affected differently by the proposed rezoning. Evaluations of each section include an independent Consistency statement and Reasonableness statement.

Ms. Terrell said the first section to be evaluated was the request was to rezone the current HI, Heavy Industrial zoned portion of the property, comprising approximately 0.96 acres, to CZ-HI, Conditional Zoning – Heavy Industrial. She stated the requested rezoning is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map's classification of Residential. If approved an amendment to the Industrial/Innovation Center Classification will be required. The request is consistent with the following policies and goals of the Guiding Guilford Moving Forward Together Comprehensive Plan: 1) Resilient Economy's Goal Statement, which is 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. The Resilient Economy Planning Theme's Policy 2, which is to support existing businesses and industries, while seeking to increase high-wage jobs and employment opportunities throughout the County. She said the proposed rezoning for this property section also met the Planning Theme's Community Character's Goal Statement which is to Celebrate Guilford County's unique sense of place by balancing agricultural preservation with desired development patterns, context-sensitive site design and placemaking.

Ms. Terrell explained that the second geographic property section was evaluated as a request is to rezone the current AG-zoned portion of the property, comprising approximately 3.68 acres, to CZ-HI, Conditional Zoning – Heavy Industrial.

The requested rezoning was inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map's classifications of Rural Living and Residential. If approved, an amendment to the Industrial/Innovation Center Classification will be required for the CZ-HI portion of the property. She noted the request was also inconsistent with the following goals, policies, and actions of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan: Planning Theme Community Character's Goal Statement, which is to Celebrate Guilford County's unique sense of place by balancing agricultural preservation with desired development patterns, context-sensitive site design and placemaking.

Ms. Terrell said the first section to be evaluated for reasonableness was the request to rezone the 0.96 acres currently zoned HI, Heavy Industrial, to CZ-HI, Conditional Heavy Industrial. She explained that the request is reasonable because it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Planning Theme Resilient Economy, specifically its Goal Statement and Policy 2, by supporting the continued operation of an existing job-generating business while ensuring compatibility with adjacent agricultural and residential uses. Restricting industrial activity to the current HI portion is consistent with the Planning Theme of Community Character, as it maintains the existing development pattern and prevents further industrial encroachment toward rural and residential areas. Supporting considerations include:

- 1) Limiting use of the existing HI-zoned area is reasonable because it reduces the intensity of potential intensive industrial uses near adjacent agricultural and residential properties.
- 2) Rezoning this portion of the property to CZ-HI is within the current unconditioned Heavy Industrial zoning area of the property.

Ms. Terrell stated the second section evaluated for reasonableness was the request to rezone 3.68 acres from AG, Agricultural to CZ-HI, Conditional Zoning – Heavy Industrial. She indicated that the request was not reasonable as the proposal was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Planning Theme Community Character and its Goal Statement which states to "Celebrate Guilford County's unique sense of place by balancing agricultural preservation with desired development patterns, context-sensitive site design and placemaking." Expanding Heavy Industrial uses beyond the existing HI-zoned portion would alter the existing development pattern, remove an area which serves as a separation buffer between industrial and residential areas, and introduce new industrial encroachment toward agricultural and residential zoned properties.

Supporting considerations include: 1) The expansion of Heavy Industrial uses closer to agricultural and residential properties would remove the existing AG land serving as a de facto buffer between use types. 2) The proposal would not maintain the established development pattern of the surrounding area, which is not characterized as industrial.

Ms. Terrell noted per G.S. 160D-601(d), any reduction of the proposed CZ-HI area requires property owner consent.

Ms. Terrell stated that staff recommends approval to rezone the 0.96-acre portion currently zoned HI, to CZ-HI, Conditional Zoning – Heavy Industrial as it limits industrial uses within the existing unconditional HI footprint in a non-industrial characterized area. Staff recommends denial to rezone the 3.68-acre portion currently zoned AG, Agricultural to AG and CZ-HI, as the expansion of industrial zoning was inconsistent with the property's Future Land Use Map Classification of Rural Living, the Comprehensive Plan's Community Character Goal Statement, and the proposal was inconsistent with the surrounding area's rural residential, agricultural, and limited commercial development pattern.

Ms. Terrell stated the request is inconsistent with the subject property's current Future Land Use Map classifications of Rural Living (AG portion) and Residential (HI portion). Therefore, if the request is approved, an amendment to the Industrial/Innovation Center Classification will be required for the CZ-HI portion of the property.

In response to a question posed by Chair Donnelly concerning the operation of the business and buffering around the outside edges of the property, Ms. Terrell indicated that a 50-foot landscape buffer would be required along the property line abutting residentially zoned properties. The site plan will include the current vegetation in place that may be included in that required 50-foot buffer.

Mr. Gullick asked if they can operate 24 hours per day? Ms. Terrell responded that there were no development conditions proposed by the applicant or staff that would limit their business operation hours.

Chair Donnelly opened the Public Hearing and asked for those in favor of the request to come forward and identify themselves for the record.

Christy Harris, 4818 Bisbee Drive, Greensboro, NC, stated that Mr. Loflin purchased this property and started a lease with the tenant who started a truck repair business. He was made aware that there was a zoning issue, so they looked at the property and how it was zoned. He found only one acre of the lot, could be used for the truck repair facility. They want to do a conditional zoning for this property to correct the zoning violation, and they met with the surrounding property owners. Most of the issues identified by the neighbors came from the previous property owner who was renting out to a business that was doing salvage work and that business was making a lot of noise. The proposed rezoning will not make noise and will not have a negative impact on the neighbors. She indicated the owner is open to removing the truck washing use as a condition. There were some property owners who were concerned because they have wells on their property from truck washing and they were worried about the run-off impacting those wells. There were also concerns about truck parking on the property. Some of the trucks were parked in areas where they were not supposed to be. They want to be in compliance. The owner has cleaned up the property and has made it look a lot nicer.

Cliff Loflin, 9854 Highway 49, Denton, NC, indicated he is the property owner and stated that sometimes they have to park the trucks in an area while waiting for parts to be delivered for repair work. The biggest problem is the parking.

Mr. Gullick asked Mr. Loflin if he did any grading to clean up the property. Mr. Loflin stated that they removed all the old metal that was all over the property. They did not expand anything and didn't get near the creek.

Ms. Harris indicated that there was some confusion as to where, on the property, the actual industrial zoning was located. It took some digging to find out where it was.

Mr. Gullick said that there are a lot of trucks on the property and it looks rather cluttered. He pointed out that there are quite a few violations on the property. The Zoning

Compliance Officer has spoken with Mr. Loflin, indicating what those violations are and the fact that there is only one acre to work with.

Chair Donnelly asked if the property owner would be willing to accept the additional conditions recommended by staff to leave the current HI portion to CZ-HI and leave the remaining portion AG. Ms. Harris responded that it would not.

Heather Hayes, 213 Depot Street, stated that they are the owners of the business that is currently operating on the property. The business, itself, is not operating on the property 24/7, however their phone line is open 24/7 for emergency contact. They need somewhere to park the disabled trucks that are waiting to be repaired or waiting on parts. They have spoken to some of the neighbors, and they found that a lot of the people who are opposed to the change are not as informed as they should be. The neighbors feel that this current operation is still part of the previous salvage and scrap yard that was there, that caused a lot of noise and mess on the property. They have done their best to clean up the property and they don't make a lot of noise.

They are also bringing services to the existing businesses in the area, especially the restaurants and convenience stores that are close by. They are no longer interested in providing truck washing services on the property.

Dustin McDaniels, 213 Depot Street, stated that he just needs a place to park his equipment and the customer's truck and/or trailer when there has been a breakdown on the highway. He has tried to be very respectful of the neighbors, as far as noise and interference with their daily lives. The shop area is not open after 8:00 p.m. In response to a question from Rev. Drumwright, Mr. McDaniels stated they would be willing to limit business hours as a part of the application.

Mr. Donnelly ask if this application is not approved as it is submitted, would you be able to operate the business. Mr. McDaniels stated that they would be willing to remove Truck Washing but they will not be able to operate their business without the additional space.

Mr. Gullick ask if they knew what is stored within the trailers that are being parked on the property. Mr. Loflin responded that it is just general freight, and he does not know or ask what is stored inside each trailer.

Terri Cooke, 2253 Racetrack Road, stated that she feels this is a good business for this area. Now, the property is very different than when it was operating as a salvage/scrapyard.

Harley Medler, 2019 Mayflower Drive, stated that he works at the existing facility and it was previously a scrap yard and his father owned it and sold it to the previous owner. It is now much cleaner than when it was a scrap yard.

Ms. Harris returned to the podium and stated that a lot of the complaints came from the previous scrap/salvage yard. They really want to be flexible and aware of their operation in relationship to the neighbors.

Bobby Cooke, 2253 Race Track Road, stated that there is no heavy equipment maintenance from the south of Asheboro to Greensboro, so this facility is very much

needed for the truckers going through this area that have a break-down and need help for their trucks. He feels this is a good idea to be able to provide this service in this area.

Chair Donnelly asked for those wishing to speak in opposition to come forward and identify themselves for the record.

Thomas Ziegler, 107-A Mersey Road, stated that his property is adjacent to the subject property. Mr. Ziegler stated that the business is bringing trailers on the property, and he thinks the business owner is renting spaces to park trailers on the property. The trucks come into the property at all hours of the night. He is also concerned about the additional traffic on Randleman Road. He expected the area next to him to remain agricultural zoning, not heavy industrial. He doesn't like going down his driveway and looking at tractor trailers next door.

Robert Bass, 744 Hogan Road, stated that he is glad to see that the salvage/scrap yard is gone. There are still some concerns about property values and tax values. He wanted to know if there were any hazardous materials that are being left in the trailers that are being parked on the property. He is also concerned about the additional traffic on Randleman Road and Old Randleman Road. There is also the issue of trucks waiting to get on the property and blocking Randleman Road and there is a hill there that could be a potential traffic hazard.

Tammy Seagraves, 5133 Randleman Road, stated that her property backs up to the subject property. She wanted to know what someone could do on this heavy industrial property. She pointed out that there is a creek on the property and she is concerned about the well-being of that creek and the run-off from the subject property. There are diesel spills and oils that contaminate the land. She is concerned about the well on her property and the wells on her neighbor's property.

Diana Sheffield, 106 Mersey Road, stated that this road has a lot of children on it, and she feels they are in danger because of the increased tractor trailer traffic. If there is an incident with one of the trucks carrying hazardous materials, who would be responsible for any damages that would be impacted by the water that is tainted.

Tony Welborn, 5139 Randleman Road, stated that he moved to this area in 1992 and the zoning for this area has continued to allow businesses and heavy industrial uses in this area. This is detrimental to the neighbors and the land, as a whole. Another business may come on this land and make the water table go down or cause the water to suffer for the homeowners in the area.

Linda Routhfield, 110 Mersey Road, stated she has the same concerns that have already been stated.

Rebuttal in Favor

Heather Hayes returned to the podium and stated that there were concerns about the gate being open all night. She clarified that they keep the gate open so that truck drivers can access the property after business hours and not block the roadway and causing a hazard to traffic.

Dustin McDaniels addressed several additional concerns regarding the property and business operations. He stated that there is a stream adjacent to the property and that the business contracts with a company to collect and properly dispose of coolants, oil, and other chemicals. Mr. McDaniels said he also offered Ms. Seagraves a parking space for a truck on the property. He stated that there is no reason for trucks to travel down Mersey Road to access the property and that he will not allow trucks displaying hazardous material placards to enter the site. Most trucks visiting the property are not expected to be carrying cargo, as deliveries would already have been made prior to arrival.

Additionally, Mr. McDaniels stated that he no longer intends to conduct truck washing activities on the property. While he plans to expand the business to another location in the future, he intends to remain at the current site for the foreseeable future.

Chair Donnelly asked for clarification on if there is any repair activities in the portion of the property zoned Agricultural. Heather Hayes clarified that only repairs happen in the heavy industrial portion of the property and the Agricultural portion is only used for parking.

Christy Harris added that the conditions being proposed for the property will remain with the land even if the current business moves.

Mr. Hardin clarified that commercial parking for trucks would not be permitted with the current conditions being proposed.

Mr. McDaniels stated that he does not intend to rent parking spots.

A member of the audience asked how many trucks Mr. McDaniels owns. Mr. McDaniels answered that a majority of the trucks on the property are his.

Rebuttal in Opposition

Robert Bass stated that there are signs required by the DOT that indicate whether hazardous materials are on the trailers. He also stated that he is glad that Mr. McDaniels may have outgrown the location.

Linda Routhfield stated that there are already violations on the property, and she feels that the owners should already know the laws and make efforts to follow those laws.

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

Discussion

Chair Donnelly stated that the applicant has determined that the truck washing use would be eliminated from the proposed use conditions.

Mr. Alston noted that he thinks a specific cut-off time for trucks to come in and out of the property and late-night noise are concerns, elimination of the truck wash, and not to allow any trailers carrying hazardous materials onto the property. He would like to see these as conditions.

The property owner, Mr. Loflin, responded that he agreed to stop repairs at 8:00 p.m. and have their business hours limited from 8:30 am until 8:00 pm; there would be no truck washing on the property and he would also agree to check trailers for hazardous material and not allow them to park on the property.

Mr. Alston moved to accept the additional conditions, as proposed by the owner, seconded by Mr. Gullick. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Bui, Drumwright, Craft, Alston and Gullick. Nays: None.)

Mr. Gullick said that it is clear that the applicant has run out of storage space for the trailers on the property. He feels that the HI zoning really does not belong on this property as it is not in line with the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map. There is no compelling reason to change it. To expand that zoning district in this area goes against everything that the Planning Board talks about, especially regarding the Future Land Use Map. He has concerns about the groundwater in the immediate area being compromised. He sees no reason to approve this request.

Vice Chair Craft stated that he would like to support this request because it is a business in an area that is important for transition in this area. He does not feel they are quite ready to have this level of HI in this area at this point in time.

Chair Donnelly stated that he feels he cannot support this request as there are too many concerns in expanding the HI zoning in this particular area. He stated that he has concern about the significant shift in the Future Land Use Plan to industrial for this property.

Mr. Gullick moved to deny the zoning amendment located in Guilford Tax Parcel #144107 from AG and HI, to AG and CZ-HI because the amendment is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and conflicts with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), as it could possibly change the character of the area, and have a negative impact on the public health and safety of the area. The amendment is not reasonable because it is not in the best interest of the public and the current zoning orientation better serves the public and expanding the HI zoning district could create incompatibility with surrounding uses, seconded by Vice Chair Craft. The Board voted 3-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft and Gullick. Nays: Alston, Bui and Drumwright.)

Chair Donnelly stated that the failure of the motion to deny means that no action has yet been taken on the rezoning request. Since the motion to deny failed a new motion to approve the request can be put forth. Under the Rules of Procedure, if there is not a majority vote in favor of the motion to approve, the proposed rezoning would be denied as there is a tie vote.

Dr. Bui stated that the property owner has made many improvements from what the previous owner had and has been willing to accept every additional condition recommended.

Rev. Drumwright stated he is conflicted with this request.

Mr. Alston moved to approve Case # 25-11-PLBD-00140. The requested rezoning from HI to CZ-HI is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map's (FLUM) classification of Residential. If approved an amendment to the Industrial/Innovation Center Classification

will be required. The request is consistent with the Guiding Guilford Moving Forward Together Comprehensive plans policies, goals, and action items of the 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. Policy 2: Support existing businesses and industries, while seeking to increase high-wage jobs and employment opportunities throughout the County. Planning Theme: Community Character Goal Statement: Celebrate Guilford County's unique sense of place by balancing agricultural preservation with desired development patterns, context-sensitive site design and placemaking

The requested rezoning from AG to AG and CZ-HI is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map's classifications of Rural Living and Residential. If approved, an amendment to the Industrial/Innovation Center Classification will be required for the CZ-HI portion of the property. The request is also inconsistent with the following goals, policies, and actions of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan: Planning Theme: Community Character Goal Statement: Celebrate Guilford County's unique sense of place by balancing agricultural preservation with desired development patterns, context-sensitive site design and placemaking.

Although the request is inconsistent with the current Future Land Use Map designation, he believes the proposed zoning map amendment, with the additional conditions agreed to by the property owner, is reasonable and in the public interest because a portion of the property is already zoned Heavy Industrial and the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding character of the corridor and the rezoning represents a logical transition and expansion of the existing industrial activity along Randleman Road. The amendment is reasonable because the amended application with additional conditions to restrict business operation hours and storage of hazardous materials have been accepted by the owner and the applicant is willing to come into compliance and proposes conditions which favor the existing residents, seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted 3-3 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Bui, Drumwright, Alston. Nays: Craft, Gullick, Donnelly.)

Chair Donnelly indicated that the vote is a tie, 3-3, and therefore constitutes a denial of the rezoning request. This decision can be appealed to the Board of County Commissioners within fifteen (15) days and there is a processing fee. He thanked everyone who came out this evening to give their thoughts and opinions.

At this time there was a recess from 9:20 until 9:27 p.m.

C. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #26-02-PLBD-00013: AG, AGRICULTURAL TO CZ-RS-30, CONDITIONAL ZONING – RESIDENTIAL: 5602 CHURCH STREET (APPROVED)

Ms. Terrell presented the staff report for Case #26-02-PLBD-00013, a request to rezone the subject property from AG, Agricultural to CZ-RS-30, Conditional Zoning – Residential. She indicated that the subject property is located at 5602 Church Street (Guilford County Tax Parcel #243534) in Monroe Township. This is a rezoning of approximately 0.59 acres of 4.96 acres.

Ms. Terrell said the applicant has provided the following conditions: Proposed Use Conditions: All uses permitted under RS-30 except: (1) Athletic Fields; (2) Club or Lodge; (3) Country Club with Golf Course; (4) Golf Course; (5) Public Park or Public Recreation Facility (incl. Indoor Batting Cages); (6) Swim and Tennis Club; (7) Place of Worship; (8) Elementary School; (9) Secondary School; (10) Emergency Services; (11) Cemetery or Mausoleum; (12) Beneficial Fill Area; (13) Wireless Communication Tower – Stealth Camouflage Design; (14) Utilities, Major; (15) Utilities, Minor; (16) Construction or Demolition Debris Landfill, Minor; (17) Land Clearing & Inert Debris Landfill, Minor; and (18) Temporary Events/Uses. There were no development conditions offered.

Ms. Terrell explained that the surrounding area was primarily characterized by a mixture of low to medium density single-family detached residential developments. The surrounding zoning districts include CZ-RS-30, RS-40, Agricultural, and a Rural Preservation District. She pointed out that this property is located within the Watershed Critical Area, specifically in the Greensboro Reedy Fork Watershed Tier 4.

Ms. Terrell said the property is located within the City of Greensboro's Growth Tier 1 Service Area. Ms. Terrell stated Church Street (SR 1001) is a major thoroughfare, which has an Annual Average Daily Traffic Count of 8,719 per North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) in 2025. She also noted the majority of the subject property is level to gently sloping with a small portion strongly sloping.

Ms. Terrell stated that the requested rezoning is inconsistent with the subject property's current Future Land Use Map (FLUM) classification of Rural Living. Rural Living is typically characterized by one dwelling unit located on several acres of property. She said the proposed rezoning to CZ-RS-30 would fit the Land Use Map Classification of Residential due to reduced lot size requirements leading to slightly increased density.

Ms. Terrell explained that while inconsistent with the current land use classification for the specified parcel, the requested rezoning is consistent with the following goals, policies, and actions of the Comprehensive Plan. The first being the Guiding Principle, Areas to Enhance. The second being the Planning Theme: Attainable Housing's Goal Statement which is to focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design. As well as Attainable Housing's Policy 1, which is to enable the creation of new housing units that will provide a mix of housing types that meet the needs of residents. Ms. Terrell stated the request to rezone an approximate 0.59-acre portion of the subject property from AG to CZ-RS-30 is reasonable as it aligns with the established development pattern in the surrounding area. The proposed uses to be permitted under the requested conditional zoning district are compatible with the surrounding area and exclude potentially incongruous land uses. Additionally, the subject property abuts an existing CZ-RS-30 zoning district with identical use conditions to those proposed under this request (Reference Case #25-10-PLBD-00135). Furthermore, the proposal supports key elements of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan, including the Guiding Principle "Areas to Enhance": to "Include existing developed areas, such as established residential communities and employment hubs, which should consider small-to-medium improvements over the long term. 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." The proposal is also consistent with the Attainable Housing Planning

Theme's Goal Statement: to "Focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design" and the Attainable Housing Planning Theme'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". This rezoning would facilitate strategic infill development and expand opportunities for additional housing units in a manner consistent with the County's long-term planning objectives.

Ms. Terrell indicated that staff's recommendation was approval.

Chair Donnelly opened the Public Hearing and asked that any speakers in favor of the request come forward and identify themselves for the record.

Pankaj Jinwala, 7099 Toscana Trace, Summerfield, NC, representing the applicant, stated that they purchased almost 40 acres adjacent to the subject property last December. Unfortunately, their engineer did not calculate the watershed density requirement exactly correctly and they cannot achieve their density goals. They are including this portion of land into the adjacent residential development so they can keep the original plan to have 40 lots.

Chair Donnelly asked for those wishing to speak in opposition to the request to come forward and identify themselves for the record.

Patty Frascone, 2305 Farmgate Road in Browns Summit stated that she is not an immediate neighbor, but does live nearby. She has no objection to this particular request. Her understanding is that this is just an addition to what has already been approved. She has had a question for a long time about why development is done the way it is done. The houses are needed, but if you look at the aerial map, it shows that all the vegetation and trees that will be removed for this development. She wishes they could leave the natural habitat. If developers would take a little more care and not clear-cut all the vegetation, people would be happier with development near them. Mr. Jinwala returned to the podium and stated that they just finished another neighborhood in High Point and they tried to save as many trees as they could and they plan to do the same thing here on this property. He shares the speaker's concern about the trees and wildlife.

There being no other speakers of this matter, Chair Donnelly closed the Public Hearing by acclamation.

Discussion

Rev. Drumwright said that he supports this request.

Dr. Bui stated noted she also supports the request. This area is growing faster than imaginable. There is a need for housing. The applicant's understanding of the concerns about the environment, the trees, and the wildlife is a positive.

Vice Chair Craft moved to approve the zoning map amendment on Guilford County Tax Parcel #243534 from AG to CZ-RS-30. This approval also amends the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Northeast Quadrant, from the Rural Living classification to the Residential

classification based on the following: While inconsistent the FLUM classification, the request is consistent with the following goals and policies and actions of the Comprehensive Plan: the Guiding Principle “Areas to Enhance” to include existing development areas such as established residential communities and employment hubs, which also consider small to medium improvements over the long term.

These areas are not likely to experience wholesale change or redevelopment but could benefit from strategic infill development and precise tactical improvements to meaningfully enhance the quality of life for people who inhabit these areas. The Planning Theme for Attainable Housing’s Goals Statement to focus on showing the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents, while emphasizing safety and high quality, sustainable designs and Attainable Housing Policy 1, enable the creation of new housing units that will provide a mix of housing types to meet the needs of residents. The amendment is reasonable because the request to rezone an approximate 0.59-acre portion of the subject property from AG to CZ-RS-30 is reasonable as it aligns with the established development pattern in the surrounding area. The proposed uses to be permitted under the requested conditional zoning district are compatible with the surrounding area and exclude potentially incongruous land uses. Additionally, the subject property abuts an existing CZ-RS-30 zoning district with identical use conditions to those proposed under this request (Reference Case #25-10-PLBD-00135). Furthermore, the proposal supports key elements of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan, including the Guiding Principle Areas to Enhance: to “Include existing developed areas, such as established residential communities and employment hubs, which should consider small-to-medium improvements over the long term. 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.” The proposal is also consistent with the Attainable Housing Planning Theme’s Goal Statement: to “Focus on supporting the creation and retention of housing types to accommodate all residents while emphasizing safety and high-quality, sustainable design” and the Attainable Housing Planning Theme’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”. This rezoning would facilitate strategic infill development and expand opportunities for additional housing units in a manner consistent with the County’s long-term planning objectives, seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0, in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Bui, Drumwright, Craft, Alston and Gullick. Nays: None.)

VIII. Other Business

Chair Donnelly spoke about the ongoing scam attempts on applicants in regard to impersonating the Planning Board members. Mr. Bell stated that this is an issue that is larger than Guilford County and is occurring in other jurisdictions, as well. Staff has been working with the Communications Department as well as the Legal Department. Staff will continue working on this matter and relay information to the Board members as it becomes available.

Chair Donnelly asked Mr. Bass about upcoming cases for the June meeting.

Mr. Bass stated that there are 3 Rezoning requests and 1 Special Use Permit submitted for the June Agenda.

IX. Adjourn

There being no other business before the Board, Chair Donnelly adjourned the meeting by acclamation at 9:55 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the Guilford County Planning Board is scheduled for June 10, 2026, at 6 p.m. in the Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room, located on the first floor of the Old Guilford County Courthouse, 301 W Market St, Greensboro, NC 27401.