

**GUILFORD COUNTY
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room
First Floor, Old Guilford County Courthouse
301 W Market St, Greensboro, NC 27401
**September 10, 2025
6:00 PM**

Call to Order

Chair Donnelly called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked staff to call the roll for those members present for the meeting.

I. Roll Call

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; Guy Gullick; Sam Stalder; and Cara Buchanan

The following members were absent from this meeting:

Ryan Alston; Jason Little

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

Jason Hardin; Planning and Development Deputy Director; Oliver Bass, Planning and Zoning Manager; Avery Tew, Senior Planner; Darby Terrell, Senior Planner; Troy Moss, Planning Technician; Andrea Leslie-Fite, County Attorney; and Robert Carmon, Fire Marshal

II. Agenda Amendments

Jason Hardin stated that there are no amendments to the agenda this meeting.

III. Approval of Minutes: August 13, 2025

Chair Donnelly asked if there were any corrections or amendments to the minutes of the August 13, 2026 meeting. He found just a few typos and forwarded his comments and corrections to Mr. Bass for clarification.

Dr. Bui moved to approve the August 13, 2025 Minutes as amended, seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted unanimously (6-0) in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Bui, Stalder, Drumwright. Nays: None.)

IV. Rules and Procedure

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

V. Continuance Requests

Oliver Bass stated that there were no continuance requests for this meeting.

Mr. Gullick arrived at 6:18 p.m. for the remainder of the meeting.

VI. Old Business

A. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #25-06-PLBD-00124: CZ-HB, HIGHWAY BUSINESS (Ref. Case #10-06-GCPL-02259) AND RS-40, RESIDENTIAL TO CZ-HB AMENDED, HIGHWAY BUSINESS AMENDED: 1119 STRICKLAND COURT. (APPROVED)

Oliver Bass stated that this request is to conditionally rezone the subject property from CZ-HB (Ref. Case #10-06-GCPL-02259) which includes an associated Sketch Plan to CZ-HB Amended (sketch plan not included in submittal) with the following conditions. Current Use Condition(s): All uses permitted in the HB zoning district, with the exclusion of the following uses: 1) junked motor vehicles; 2) recycle collections point; 3) go-cart raceway; 4) automobile repair service (major and minor); 5) automobile towing and storage services; 6) truck and utility trailer renting and leasing (light); 7) bar; 8) boat sales; 9) building supply sales (with storage yard); 10) manufactured home sales; 11) motor vehicles sales (new and used); 12) motorcycle sales; 13) truck stop; 14) construction demolition (C&D) landfill (minor); 15) land clearing and inert debris (LCID) landfill (minor); 16) radio/television/communications tower; 17) railroad terminal or yard; 18) billboards; and 19) temporary events.

Current Development Condition(s): 1. Along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of the subject property, the developer shall establish a 65-foot wide buffer consisting of a double row of Leland Cypress trees, staggered, and planted 15 feet apart. Buffer shall allow for emergency vehicle access as required by Guilford County Fire Marshal, storm water devices, and septic fields. 2. Entrance to the subject property shall be controlled by an electronic gate with personal code access. 3. No sign on the subject property shall exceed 6 feet in height. 4. Storage units located on the northern, eastern and southern portions of the subject property shall be accessed from the interior of the site. 5. All roofs shall be colored as opposed to bare metal.

Proposed Use Conditions: 1) Office (General); and 2) Warehouse (Self-Storage).

Proposed Development Conditions: 1. 30' Type B Landscape buffer along north and east property lines. This is consistent with the Type B planting yard (min. width 25', avg. width 30', max. width 50) required between HB and RM zoned properties under the County's UDO. District Descriptions

No cemeteries are shown to be located on or adjacent to the subject property, but efforts should be made to rule out the potential for unknown grave sites. Fire Protection District: Pinecroft-Sedgefield 1.5 Miles from Fire Station. Water and Sewer Services: Private Septic Systems and Wells Within Service Wendover Avenue Off-Ramp is 13,500 vehicles per NCDOT 2023 Traffic Count. Area: City of High Point water is available. Feasibility Study or Service Commitment: No Transportation.

Strickland Court is a local street. Guilford College Road is classified as a major thoroughfare under the Greensboro MPO Thoroughfare Plan. The Average Annual Daily Traffic count of 13,500 vehicles on Guilford College Road near the W. No improvements have been proposed; an NCDOT driveway permit is required for future development. Environmental Assessment Topography: Per the USDA-NRCS Web Soil Survey, the topography of the parcel is nearly level to gently sloping. There is no regulated floodplain on the property, per FIRM map #3710782300J with effective date 6/18/2007. There are no regulated wetlands on the property, per National Wetlands Inventory. There are no mapped streams on the property, per USGS and NRCS Soil Survey Maps of Guilford County. Watershed: The property is partially within the High Point (East and West Fork Deep River) WS-IV, 3 General Watershed Area and partially within the Lower Randleman Lake (Deep River) WS-IV, General Watershed Area. Land Use Plan & Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan: Southwest Area Plan. Residential Multi-Family and Residential Single-Family. The Residential Single-Family designation recognizes land currently zoned or recommended for future residential uses. Anticipated land uses are those permitted in the Agricultural (AG), RS-40 Residential Single-Family, RS-30 Residential Single-Family, Planned Unit Development-Residential (PD-R), and Rural Preservation (RPD) zoning districts. Residential-Multi-Family designation recognizes land currently zoned or recommended for future multi-family residential uses. Anticipated land uses are those permitted under the Guilford County Development Ordinance's Residential Multi Family (RMF) zoning districts. Public water and sewer are necessary to rezone to the Multi-Family Districts.

Consistency

This request is inconsistent with the Southwest Area Plan recommendation of Residential Single-family and Residential Multi-family. Therefore, if the request is approved, an amendment to Moderate Commercial will be required. The requested rezoning is consistent with Objective 1.5 of the Future Land Use Element of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan, which states: • Objective 1.5: Recognize and respect the unique characteristics of Guilford County's unincorporated and emerging communities. The request to conditionally rezone the subject property from RS-40 and CZ-HB (Ref Case #10-06-GCPL-02259) to CZ-HB, Amended as conditioned, is reasonable because the potential use of the site will be limited to Office (General) and Warehouse (Self Storage). These uses are consistent with those near the intersection of Guilford College Road and Wendover Avenue. The proposed 30-foot Type B buffer along the perimeter adjacent to Greensboro city limits mirrors the County's landscape buffer required between HB-zoned and properties zoned for multi-family uses under the County's UDO. A Type A planting yard (min. width 40', avg. width 50', and max. width 75') will be required to buffer the southern boundary adjacent to RS-40 zoned properties from future development of the site. Staff recommended approval. This request is inconsistent

with the Southwest Area Plan recommendation of Residential Single-family and Residential Multifamily. Therefore, if the request is approved, an amendment to Moderate Commercial will be required.

Chair Donnelly opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of this item.

Chad Hockaday representing the developer, 7622 Bentley Road, stated that the proposed use conditions presented tonight is just self-storage and office, with conditions to develop the site. The owner of the property in the back stated that he would prefer a newer, more modern landscape than the Leyland Cypress trees described under the current conditions because that can become a problem over time. Mr. Hockaday noted that the property owner, Mr. Little, was present at the meeting. He is available for any questions the Board members may have.

Chair Donnelly asked, with the removal of the condition about access to the storage units, effectively it would still be the same, in that, the access is not going to be coming through the sides or back of the property based on the buffer. It is just being taken out as a condition, right?

Chair Donnelly clarified that when the case was originally presented there was anticipation that the property would be split zoned. He said for now this would be what it is going to be.

Mr. Hockaday stated that this is all internal for the property and there are no storage units visible from the outside. There is no gate anymore because there will be key pads at each door that is secured access for each tenant.

There being no other speakers in favor or opposed to the request, the Public Hearing was closed by acclamation.

Discussion

Mr. Craft stated that he thinks with the changes in the roads in this area in the last 10 years, going to this type of development is probably reasonable and provides an amenity that is needed for the area. This is really not an area to have a house and a family living there.

Mr. Gullick agreed with the statements made by Mr. Craft and would support the request for the same reasons.

Ms. Buchanan stated that in the Case #25-06-PLBD-00124, CZ CZ-HB, Highway Business (Ref. Case #10-06-GCPL-02259) AND RS-40, Residential to CZHB Amended, Highway Business Amended: 1119 STRICKLAND COURT, (Guilford County Tax Parcel #152186 in Friendship Township), approximately 170 feet east of the intersection of Guilford College Road and Strickland Court and comprises approximately 4.96 acres, she moved to approve this amendment request based on the following: This approval also amends the Southwest Area Plan and the zoning map amendment and associated Southwest Area Plan amendment are based on the following changes and conditions in the Southwest Area Plan. The plan recommendation is Residential Single Family and Multi-family and it would

need to be amended to moderate commercial. The amendment is reasonable because the proposed use will be limited to office and warehouse space, and those are already consistent with nearby properties, seconded by Rev. Drumwright. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Drumwright, Bui, Gullick, Buchanan, Craft and Stalder. Nays: None.)

VII. New Business

Legislative Hearing Item(s)

A. **CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #25-08-PLBD-00131: RS-40, RESIDENTIAL, TO CZ-AG, CONDITIONAL ZONING – AGRICULTURAL: 1804 PENNY ROAD (APPROVED)**

Avery Tew stated that the subject property was located at 1804 Penny Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #158770 in Jamestown Township), approximately 500 feet north of the intersection of Penny Road and East Fork Road, and comprised approximately 2.67 acres. Maps of the subject property were shown for illustration. Mr. Tew said this was a request to rezone the subject property from RS-40, Residential, to CZ-AG, Conditional Zoning – Agricultural, with the following conditions, as offered by the applicant:

Proposed Use Conditions: All uses permitted in the AG zoning district except: (1) Two-Family Dwelling (Twin Home or Duplex); (2) Caretaker Dwelling (Accessory); (3) Manufactured (HUD)/Mobile Home Dwelling (Class A & B); (4) Boarding House, 3 - 8 Residents; (5) Batting Cages, Outdoor; (6) Country Club with Golf Course; (7) Golf Course; (8) Private Club Recreation (incl. Indoor Batting Cages); (9) Swim and Tennis Club; (10) Shooting Range, Outdoor; (11) Place of Worship; (12) Daycare Center (Not In-Home); (13) Kennels or Pet Grooming; (14) Wireless Communication Tower – Non-Stealth Design; (15) Land Clearing & Inert Debris Landfill, Major; (16) Land Clearing & Inert Debris Landfill, Minor; and (17) Turkey Shoots.

Proposed Development Conditions: None offered.

Mr. Tew said the proposed rezoning was consistent with the Southwest Area Plan recommendation of Residential Single-Family. Therefore, if the request was approved, no land use plan amendment would be required. He said the request was also consistent with Policies 1.1.1 and 1.4.3 of the Future Land Use Element of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan, which state:

- Policy 1.1.1 – Planning staff will continue to utilize the future land uses depicted on citizen based Area Plans, in conjunction with the rezoning guidance matrix, as the basis for land use and policy recommendations.
- Policy 1.4.3 – Reference adopted Land Use Plans and recommended uses and densities/intensities, when applicable, in conjunction with rezoning staff reports presented to the Planning Board.

Mr. Tew concluded by saying that the request to rezone the subject property from RS-40 to CZ-AG was reasonable because the uses permitted under the proposed

district would be largely compatible with development on adjoining properties and could benefit the surrounding area by enhancing access to fresh food, if used for agriculture, or by providing essential services. Many potentially incongruous uses permitted under the AG district either (1) would be excluded from the proposed CZ-AG district through the use conditions offered by the applicant, (2) would be prohibited because the property is located in a Watershed Critical Area, or (3) would only be permitted with an approved Special Use Permit. The subject property's size, 2.67 acres, would also limit the potential scale of certain uses, such as agricultural uses, to an extent compatible with the surrounding area. Finally, the proposed CZ-AG zoning district was recognized as consistent with the future land use recommendation of Residential Single-Family within the Southwest Area Plan.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of this item.

The applicant, Nia Cole, read a letter in support of the request. She said she could trace her roots back for over 200 years in Guilford County, and specifically to this property. In 2021, she transitioned to farming full-time to prepare to inherit this land. She said she plans to dedicate a portion of this land to creating a community garden supporting both Turners Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church and Florence Elementary School by hosting outdoor classes that foster inter-generational learning, while also supporting the church's soup kitchen that feeds 80 to 100 families weekly. Through the training and incubation aspect of the farm, she seeks to address the current challenges facing farmers in Guilford County and across North Carolina. Ms. Cole read several letters of support from the Florence Elementary PTA, Growing High Point, TC Community Table, and Turners Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in support or opposition to the request, and no one came forward. There being no other speakers in support or opposition to the request, the public hearing was closed by acclamation.

Discussion

Rev. Drumwright asked Ms. Cole how her first 4 years of farming had gone. Ms. Cole responded that it had been incredible. She had traveled all around the country supporting all kinds of farmers and farms. She felt very honored to be able to do this work. She said it had been very transformative to her as an individual and she was thankful for the ability to impact her community in so many different ways.

Mr. Gullick stated that he felt that Ms. Cole had a great presentation and he thought this was a good use of the land. He said he would support the request.

Dr. Bui stated that she was very moved to hear that Ms. Cole was using her farm to provide meals for the community. She applauded Ms. Cole for her work and support of the community residents.

Chair Donnelly stated that the Board invites applicants to reach out to the community as a part of their application. He said the level of support Ms. Cole had generated was really impressive and he appreciates her work. Clearly, the

community was behind her in this important task and he thanked her for her outreach.

Rev. Drumwright stated that Ms. Cole's work was very impressive and it meant a lot to the many African-American descendants of slaves that they would be uplifted in Guilford County to have her come before the Board and continue this legacy for her family.

Rev. Drumwright moved to approve the zoning map amendment, as requested, stating that, with regard to Case #25-08-PLBD-00131, a request to conditionally rezone the subject property at 1804 Penny Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #158770 in Jamestown Township), from RS-40, Residential, to CZ-AG, Conditional Zoning – Agricultural, the amendment was consistent with the Southwest Area Plan recommendation of Residential Single-Family, which is intended to recognize land currently zoned, or recommended for future residential uses, as well as Policies 1.1.1 and 1.4.3 of the Future Land Use Element of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan. He said the request was reasonable because the uses permitted under the proposed district would be largely compatible with development on adjoining properties and could benefit the surrounding area by enhancing access to fresh food, if used for agriculture, or by providing essential services, among other stated reasonable uses. The motion was seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion (Ayes: Donnelly, Drumwright, Bui, Gullick, Buchanan, Craft and Stalder. Nays: None.).

B. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #25-08-PLBD-00130: RS-40, RESIDENTIAL & CZ-RPD, RURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT (Ref. Case #19-11-GCPL-08684) TO CZ-RPD AMENDED, RURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT AMENDED: 5672, 5660, 5616, & 5658 CHURCH STREET (APPROVED)

Darby Terrell stated that this request is to conditionally rezone the subject property from RS-40 & CZ-RPD (Ref. Case #19-11-GCPL-08684) to CZ-RPD Amended with the following conditions: The amendment adds new property, an approximately 5.26 portion of Tax Parcel #139431, to the requested CZ-RPD, and revise a portion of #129264 as amended by this application. She stated all parcels will be under the amended conditions outlined below and with the rezoning sketch plan which revises the original sketch plan to include the changes of the subdivision plan. The rezoned area will be added to the current Cedar Oaks Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Ms. Terrell presented the following:

Current Use Condition(s): 1. Only single-family and customary accessory uses shall be allowed.

Proposed Use Conditions: 1. The property's use shall be limited to single-family detached homes and any customary accessory uses.

Proposed Development Conditions: 1. All buffer conditions as approved in Conditional Zoning Case #19-11-GCPL-08684 shall remain in full force and effect as shown on the approved Zoning Sketch Plan and Zoning Decision for said case.
2. See attached Zoning Sketch Plan.

Ms. Terrell stated the proposed Amended Conditional Zoning is consistent with the Northern Lakes Area Plan land use classification of Agricultural Rural Residential, if approved, no plan amendment would be required. The Planning Board is not limited to the proposed rezoning of these parcels and may consider substantial changes to the proposed rezoning. Ms. Terrell noted this request is in an area that has developed primarily as single-family residential, including major subdivisions. The subject parcels are within designated watershed critical areas.

Ms. Terrell presented the Existing Land Use(s) on the Property Residential, Single Family Detached (Cedar Oaks Subdivision).

Surrounding Uses:

North: Residential (Cadence Subdivision)

South: Residential (Cedar Oaks South, under development)

East: Residential/Agricultural

West: Residential/Agricultural.

Ms. Terrell stated there are no inventoried historic resources located on or adjacent to the subject properties. No cemeteries are shown to be located on or adjacent to the subject properties, but efforts should be made to rule out the potential for unknown grave sites.

Ms. Terrell presented the Public School Facilities report, for 2024-25 20th Day Enrollment Mobile Classrooms Estimated Additional. See Below:

Northern ES 760 622 3 18-20

Northern MS 1152 780 0 11-13

Northern HS 1370 1253 0 18-20

Remarks: (1) Elementary K-3 capacity assumes reduced class sizes per applicable classrooms; (2) Fourth grade, fifth grade, Middle and High School built capacity assumes 30 students per core academic classroom. Source: Guilford County Schools.

Ms. Terrell stated the Fire Protection District is Fire District 13, which is Approximately 2.2 miles from the Fire Station.

Ms. Terrell stated Private Well and Septic will serve the subdivision. She then presented the existing road conditions, Church Street is a major thoroughfare with 5,800 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) per North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). NCDOT driveway permit has been issued to the Cedar Oaks subdivision and is currently being used.

Ms. Terrell read from the staff report, which stated the USDA Soil Survey map, the topography for parcel 139431 and the eastern portions of parcels 139425, 129264 and 129266 showed a range of slope steepness from nearly level to very steep, depending on location and soil type. The western portion of parcels 139425, 129264 and 129266 are currently covered by an active grading permit and are undergoing changes in topography based on their approved grading/sediment and erosion control plan. There is a regulated 100-year floodplain (Special Flood Hazard Area) on parcel 129264. There are mapped wetlands on parcels 139431, 129266, and 139425 per the National Wetlands Inventory. There are mapped features on all 4

properties, per the USGS Topographic and NRCS Soil Survey maps of Guilford County. All 4 properties lie within the Greensboro (Reedy Fork Creek) area.

Ms. Terrell stated staff recommends approval for the proposed Rezoning and amendment to the existing conditions are consistent with the Northern Lakes Area Plan land use classification of Agricultural Rural Residential, if approved, no plan amendment would be required.

Chair Donnelly opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of this item.

Amanda Hodierne, attorney representing the applicant, 804 Green Valley Road, Ste: 200, stated that she is the attorney representing the applicant(s) and finishing developer (D.R. Horton) of the project. She stated, Ryan Moates with D.R. Horton, was the Project Manager for Cedar Oaks and also Dalton Moore who is the Civil Engineer and designer who has been with this project since the beginning. They are in attendance and available to answer any questions Board members may have.

Ms. Hodierne stated this project has a unique and complicated set of factors that set it off so she would reiterate and emphasize some of those and make some of the sharper identifications. (Slides were shown for informational purposes.)

Ms. Hodierne presented where North Church Street runs north to south up and down onto the center left of the street and the project area is represented in the presentation. She stated the Cadence subdivision is in close proximity to the proposed development. Cedar Oaks is a Planned Unit Development, under Conditional Zoning Rural Preservation district. This designation has been approved since January 8, 2020. Ms. Hodierne stated Cedar Oaks South is already built, plotted and sold and people are living there, but Cedar Oaks North is still in process. She stated zoning is aspirational and is not a mandated requirement, that means is that it sets limits, sets ceilings, like the 200 unit limit for the rezoning sketch plan that was approved in 2020. However, after this the engineer has to make sure it all works together in fine detail.

Ms. Hodierne then addressed Rev. Drumwright's question, on why there is a change in the lot counts. By stating the number of lots that can be supported changed and decreased.

Ms. Hodierne stated the owner/developers are now going through the fine tuning of the project of the Cedar Oaks North area. They have carried forward with the conditions related to the buffers because they wanted to create continuity and assurances that nothing was changing there. They are seeking to add 5.26 additional acres (the sliver of a parcel) into Cedar Oaks North and Cedar Oaks South (the RPD), because they want it to be a part of all of those controls and confines development scheme that governs the rest of that 282.0 acres.

Ms. Hodierne stated the rezoning sketch plan needs to be changed as part of the zoning that runs that land, so if they need to change that, they have to come back before the Board for approval of that. There is no increase in density or adding more units. She clarified the 172 homes would be the results, if approved, that Cedar

Oaks South, in totality, would be allowed to build out to under the new rezoning sketch plan. There are no changes to the adopted conditions from the 2020 case, no changes to Cedar Oaks South, no change to the remainder of Cedar Oaks North. She stated, Staff has detailed the policies from the Northern Lakes Area Plan and this request furthers those policies. Approval of this request does not alter the use or the intensity of the land use that is already possible on the additional acreage.

Ms. Hodierne stated thirty-eight letters were sent out to the neighboring residents explaining the plans for this project. There was also a virtual information meeting on August 28th that everyone was invited to and there was very good turnout with approximately 30 participants. There were concerns raised about the connection of Pony and Fairmont Drives and concerns about the loss of the wooded property, which is the sliver referred to previously. She stated there were also concerns voiced about the construction traffic in the area, and there is already a controlled aspect related to the erosion and grading control purposes.

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

Idhali Cuahontem, 6300 Cadence Drive, stated that the Cadence Committee met and they submit their concerns with the proposed development and potential connection into Cadence Run. She stated traffic and pedestrian safety are concerns because the proposed connection at Pony Drive could convert their internal residential streets into through roads. The Cadence streets are intentionally narrow with no sidewalks in the daily use by the children in the area on bikes and scooters. She highlighted that if there is more traffic it would significantly increase the vehicles and speeds creating unsafe conditions for pedestrians and other livability of the neighborhood. This plan, as proposed is inconsistent with those objectives in the Ordinance. Emergency access can be present without full connections. Cedar Oaks already has two entrances and exits that serves its residents and allow emergency access.

Ms. Cuahontem stated they also want to address drainage and watershed impacts. The current drainage problems for existing Cadence homeowners, especially on Pony Drive, has a natural low point near the existing turn-around, and a new connection will direct run-off eastward worsening flooding issues that they are already experiencing. They are in the Jordan Lake Watershed District where Guilford County enforces strict stormwater and there are buffer protections. She stated the elimination of the preservation of the neighborhood and natural buffers would eliminate the privacy and reduce property values and would destroy wildlife habitat. Even a modest buffer of trees would provide meaningful mitigation. The plans to designate the green space within the Cedar Oaks community and this space will be restricted to only the residents, which is not providing any benefit or buffer to Cadence. As a result, she presented, the Cadence residents will bear a negative impact of tree loss and additional traffic without any protections or amenities. They have proposed alternative design solutions and ask consideration of the signage, which does not promote connectivity without sacrificing safety and quality of life, maintaining natural buffers along property lines, replacing the road connections with multi-use paths for pedestrians and bicycles, establishing emergency only access points for fire and rescue services. This approach meets

primary objectives for multimodal connectivity while aligning with public health and safety standards.

Issac van der Merwe, 6306 Cadence Drive, near Pony Drive. He asked how much of the construction traffic would be diverted through Pony Drive? The answer they received previously was that the construction traffic would be light and they would not be parking in any driveways. He stated this does not seem to be a conclusive answer to their question. Mr. van der Merwe stated it was suggested to leave construction on Pony Drive to the end so they can prevent that type of traffic from becoming an issue and they also did not get a conclusive answer to that question. With the initial development, these lots were all perpendicular and what is proposed now is property A and property B, upon elevation, looking into their back yards and the 2nd story of their houses and that would affect their privacy.

Nicole Bergen, 200 Church View Drive, which is off Church Street. This is a watershed area and she cares very much about environmental impact and would ask the Board to consider water and the environmental impact. The proposed cul-de-sac is closer to the watershed area and she wanted to know if there are differing environmental impact with this proposal.

Melissa Burroughs, 5638 N. Church Street, stated that her questions and concerns have already been shared about the watershed, about the environmental impacts in this area, and specifically, going to the stream buffer and when is that enforced? All buffers should be labeled as 50' buffers. She is a little confused about that as to whether they are referring to these buffers that were already existing in the previously approved plan or if they just apply to this new area? She would like more clarification on that. Her concern with the stream buffer is that there was vegetation and she would like to know if that vegetation would be replanted or not? Currently, that previously existing vegetation has been clean cut and she would like it to be replanted.

Question & Answer

Amanda Hodierne stated that she would address some of the questions and concerns raised by the speakers. Chair Donnelly stated that staff and the Board members would be interacting during the Q&A. Ms. Hodierne responded that there were questions about where the flood plain location is and how that gets applied, questions about how the stream buffers are managed and regulated, what is the watershed and environmental impact of the proposed plan, as compared to the previous plan, general size of the buffers and are they going to be as they were originally articulated as a part of the development plan, movement of the septic fields and construction traffic concerns.

Ms. Hodierne stated in addition to one of the things suggested on the call was if they could just put up a sign that they are intending construction entrance only off N. Church Street. She stated yes, they can do that and will do that. In an attempt to be very transparent and manage the expectations, she stated they are not allowed to close any of the streets for this construction. During construction, a couple of things are relevant, and they will communicate to the General Manager that this is the construction entrance, and to be used for that purpose.

Ms. Hodierne stated they also have the existing regulatory control of the approved watershed and grading permit plan that dictates where that access point has to be for those initial clearing and grading and road activities. Ms. Hodierne reiterated, no one is allowed to use Pony Drive for all initial construction traffic and has a regulatory control technique in place. The first access point will be from North Church Street.

Ms. Hodierne clarified, in regard to the septic requirements, it was not approved until now because that part had to be approved after other processes are done. In regard to the watershed impact and increase in buffers, she asked Dalton Ward to speak to that. Mr. Ward, Hugh Creed & Associates, stated that he is the design engineer for this project. At this point, Mr. Ward stated, the rezoning sketch plan they are working with is still very preliminary. There are a lot of technical aspects to continue to go through and this revision will require another revision to the preliminary plat, as reviewed by the TRC with Guilford County and NC DOT and many other entities for their aspects of the plan. He answered with regarding the watershed buffers, all surface waters have a 50' buffer and the first 30' is undisturbed, the second 20' can be disturbed but must be revegetated once construction is complete. Mr. Ward confirmed the stream crossings are included and have been permitted by the Army Corp of Engineers and Department of Environmental Quality, as well. Mr. Ward stated the drainage indicates that it will be a better situation with a road that will contain and be able to take some of that drainage from the road and from the houses and keep it in the roadside swales, put it into designated drainage easements.

Chair Donnelly asked if it has been distinguished what is a riparian buffer and a buffer that might have been proposed as a part of the original development plan and why those are different sizes. Mr. Ward answered that the riparian buffers are on surface waters and the other buffers are undisturbed buffers adjacent to property lines.

Chair Donnelly asked if there were questions from the Board members before they got to the rebuttal period.

Dr. Bui asked if the "sliver" they are discussing is level land or is it higher or lower than the original plan? Mr. Bass responded that the high point looks like it is along where the road would be and then goes down toward Cadence in that stream from there. Some of the area in this proposed request is significantly higher than some of the property in Cadence.

In response to a question from Ms. Buchanan, Mr. Ward stated that there are elevation changes currently, there is approximately 10-12 feet of elevation change from the Lot #165. Mr. Ward answered it is traveling downhill and this topography doesn't account for the grading that's happened within Cadence, but there is topography change. However, he has already had to work out the way that these streets are going to connect and will actually have to cut the street down 6 or 8 feet in order to make the street connection acceptable by NC DOT standards.

Chair Donnelly asked if staff could speak to managing water that starts on your property and goes to someone else's property. Jason Hardin stated that there is a watershed and stormwater division that is part of the Planning and Development,

and they are part of the TRC, and they review any site plan or preliminary subdivision plat that comes through for review. So, any time you are looking at new development dealing with stormwater, they will look at where the water is going to flow and whether it will require drainage, dry pond, wet pond or whatever the intensity requires. Also, erosion control is considered, mud flow and the engineer has to submit an erosion control dedicated plan to them. All those elements are reviewed during the process.

Rebuttal

Amanda Hodierne stated that there had been a question about the connection within the project concerning safety and she wanted to reiterate that this is not a condition created by this request, so when the sliver of property Parcel 139431 (5672 North Church St), comes in for development, by anyone, this concern will be triggered because the stub roads already exist and they were asked for during the TRC process that governed Cadence approval when it came through on a similar time-line in 2019. This is just that policy coming into fruition and it would have either with or without this project. Ms. Hodierne stated it certainly is not a type of connection that is going to increase trip volume or speed or type of travel through either neighborhood because it does not get to somewhere in either space to somewhere different by going through the other's neighborhood.

Opposition Rebuttal

Issac van der Merwe stated that he still does not understand why it is important to change the sliver of land to use as a road access.

Idhali Cuahontem stated that she is still concerned about water run-off from Cedar Oaks to her neighborhood. She is really concerned about that and the possibility of flooding her neighborhood.

Oliver Bass stated that as part of the major subdivision review, when reviewing the preliminary plat, the engineer would have to present a watershed development plan that will be reviewed by the County Stormwater Section. They are part of the TRC as well as Erosion Control and any grading plan would have to be approved by Soil Erosion Control Section of the Planning Department staff.

Chair Donnelly stated that if this plan should be approved and move forward, it will require an erosion and grading permit for this area that should address the concerns voiced by the speakers.

Jason Hardin stated that they would be glad to provide the contact information for the Soil Erosion Department.

There being no other speakers in favor or opposed to the request, the Public Hearing was closed by acclamation.

Discussion

Mr. Craft stated that he supports this request as it seems that this is a refinement of what was approved in 2020 and it seems reasonable.

Mr. Gullick stated that these cases are always hard for him, as he struggles with the same concerns other people have. It is his hope that the additional development is going to help with some of the problems that are currently having with erosion or water control. He will also support this request.

Mr. Stalder stated that he thinks with the plat that was approved in 2020, there were also some issues with that, which brought them back today, and he thinks it is important to approve so that some of the best practices will be used. He thinks it is a good revision they are using.

Chair Donnelly thanked the residents of this area for coming out today and sharing their comments and concerns. The role of the Board is to look at land use and determine if this is consistent and is it reasonable. There are a number of technical processes in place that address some of the specific concerns that have been raised, so it is often a two-part process.

While Rev. Drumwright indicated that he would vote in support of the measure, he also hoped that Atty. Hodierne's client would have been more open to the concerns stemming from the many voices of the community, given their immensity and their engagement around this request, and encouraged them to do so in the future. He also would thank the residents for coming out tonight to make their comments and doing their due diligence in making their appeals. He really enjoyed driving around in the neighborhood and enjoying the scenery and homes in this area.

Mr. Gullick moved to approve the zoning map amendment located in Guilford County, (Guilford County Tax Parcels #139431, 139425, 129266, & 129264), from RS-40 and CZ-RPD-CZ-RPD Amended because the request for the zoning is consistent with Policies 1.1.1 and 1.4.3 of the Future Land Use Element and Goal #1 of the Housing Element for Guilford County. The request to rezone the subject property from RS-40 to CZ-RPD to CZ-RPD Amended is reasonable as it aligns with the Northern Lakes Aea Plan recommendation for AG Rural Residential Development. The proposed CZ-RPD Amended will expand housing opportunities while prohibiting uses that would conflict with the established residential character of the surrounding area. Additionally, the rezoning promotes connectivity consistent with Guilford County UDO Subsection 8.5 Major Subdivision, Section C, connectivity by link of the adjacent subdivision. The request is also consistent with the surrounding development pattern including Cedar Oaks Planned Unit Development currently under construction to the south, to which rezoning will be added, seconded by Mr. Stalder. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Drumwright, Bui, Gullick, Buchanan, Craft and Stalder. Nays: None.)

Reverend Drumwright left the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

VIII. Other Business

A. Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Jason Hardin stated that the Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners at their meeting last week, and he thanked everyone for

their role in that process. There will be some small group opportunities to talk about the new Comp Plan and how it is going to be used and how it will be shown in the staff reports and how the Board can use it in their assessments in evaluating cases.

IX. Adjourn

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:49 p.m.