

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

**NC Cooperative Extension Agricultural Center
3309 Burlington Road
Greensboro, NC 27405
May 11, 2022, 6:00 PM**

A. Roll Call

Chair Donnelly called the May 2022 meeting to order and asked for a roll-call of members present.

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

James Donnelly, Chair; David Craft; Sam Stalder; Ed Apple; Cara Buchanan; and Ryan Alston

The following Board members were in attendance remotely/virtually for this meeting:

Dr. Latoya Gathers

Member(s) not present at the meeting were:

Guy Gullick

Staff present in-person or virtually: J. Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director; Kaye Graybeal, Planning and Development Deputy Director; Oliver Bass, Senior Planner; Shannan Leonard, Senior Planner; Aaron Calloway, Planner I; and Jessie Baptist, Admin. Officer

B. Agenda Amendments

Oliver Bass stated that there were no Amendments to the Agenda

C. Approval of Minutes: April 13th, 2022

There being no changes or additions, Mr. Apple moved approval of the April minutes, as submitted, seconded by Mr. Stalder. The Board voted unanimously (7-0) in favor. (Ayes: Donnelly, Stalder, Craft, Apple, Buchanan, Gathers and Alston. Nays: None.)

D. Rules and Procedures

Chair Donnelly explained all rules of procedure that would be followed during the meeting.

E. Continuance Requests

None

F. Old Business

None

G. New Business**Non-Public Hearing Item(s):**

RESOLUTION OF INTENT FOR ROAD CLOSING CASE #22-04-GCPL-02477: CAHILL DRIVE AND LAMBERT LANE Request adoption of Resolution of Intent and to schedule a public hearing, as presented herein, to close a portion of Cahill Drive and all of Lambert Lane which fronts Lots 22, 23-24, 25-26, 26-28, 29, 31-32, 100-101, 102, 103-105, 106-108, 109, 110, 124, 125 & PT of 124, and 126, all as shown on Plat Book 11, Page 73 in Fentress Township as recorded in the Register of Deeds of Guilford County, and located on Guilford County Tax Parcels 135258, 135259, 135263, 135265, 135266, 135267, 135268, 135269, 135270, 135271, 135272, and 135275, running south from the intersection of S. Elm-Eugene Street and Highway I-85 N and terminating approximately 700 feet north of Creston Street. **(PUBLIC HEARING GRANTED FOR JUNE 8, 2022)**

Aaron Calloway, Planner, stated that Neither of the roads are maintained by NC DOT and that these roads are located southeast of the intersection of S. Elm-Eugene Street and I-85 North. The public hearing for this request will be held June 8, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Buchanan moved approval of the request for a Resolution of Intent to hold a Public Hearing to be held June 8, 2022, at 6:00 p.m., seconded by Mr. Apple. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Stalder, Craft, Apple, Buchanan, Gathers and Alston. Nays: None.)

Public Hearing Item(s):

ROAD RENAMING CASE #22-04-GCPL-02659: Presently known as Animal Shelter Road located in Friendship Township and running 0.20 miles south from W. Wendover Avenue and terminating to the northern property line of Guilford County Tax Parcel #152142. This is a road-renaming case initiated by Government action to change the name of Animal Shelter Road to Wellness Road. **(ROAD RENAMING GRANTED)**

Oliver Bass, Senior Planner, stated that generally, this petition is in response to confusion between locations of the old and new animal shelter. Renaming the road is necessary to avoid creating a situation that could jeopardize the public health, safety and general welfare and this Resolution has been presented to the Planning Board for adoption.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak either in favor or in opposition to this road renaming petition and no one came forward. The Public Hearing was closed by unanimous vote of the Board.

Ms. Buchanan moved to adopt the Resolution for the road re-naming to Wellness Road, as presented by staff, seconded by Mr. Apple. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Stalder, Craft, Apple, Buchanan, Gathers and Alston. Nays: None.)

CONDITIONAL ZONING CASE CZ #22-04-GCPL-02623: 1731 ROCK CREEK DAIRY ROAD, WHITSETT, NC; AGRICULTURAL (AG) TO CONDITIONAL ZONING-PLANNED DEVELOPMENT - RESIDENTIAL (CZ-PD-R) Guilford County Parcel #107431, approximately 53.74 acres, is located on the east side of Rock Creek Dairy Road approximately 170 feet south of the intersection with Beechdale Court and located north of Mount Hope Church Road. This is a request to conditionally rezone the property from AG to CZ-PD-R. The applicant proposes the following Use Conditions: Single-Family Detached Dwellings. Development Conditions: Maximum 51 lots. Application includes an attached Sketch Plan. The proposed Conditional Zoning is generally consistent with the Rock Creek Area Plan of AG Rural Residential, thus if approved, no plan amendment would be required. **(TABLED UNTIL A LATER DATE)**

Shannan Leonard, Senior Planner, stated that comments were addressed concerning the attached sketch plan. The Agricultural District is for making sure that there are Agricultural operations, farmland and farm housing on large tracts of land. It is also intended to reduce conflict between residential and agricultural uses. The proposed Conditional Zoning is generally consistent with the Rock Creek Area Plan of AG Rural Residential, thus if approved, no plan amendment would be required.

Leslie Bell joined the meeting virtually at 6:18 p.m.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in favor of this matter.

Norris Clayton, representing Hugh Creed & Associates Engineers, 1306 W. Wendover Avenue, is the Design Engineer for the project. He stated that Mr. Buchireddy is the owner and would like to establish a sustainable community development. He would like to create some small lots with large open spaces, having a community garden, community barn, orchards, all the houses would be solar energy houses, with a lot of walking trails throughout the property. They spoke with the Guilford County staff of what type of zoning would fit this type of criteria and came up with the Planned Development Residential zoning which allows the creation of lot sizes of a smaller nature to have more open space. They reviewed the Sketch Plan and it was reviewed and they came up with a great subdivision for this area. The septic systems will be grouped together instead of being on each individual lot and this would be more efficient for septic systems. Part of the zoning requires a 50-foot setback buffer around the total property and that has been shown on the sketch plan. They have added about 100 feet around the total property except for the tie-in street at Cloverdale Road. That stub street was required for having a second entrance into the property. That lot was turned around so it faces Cloverdale Road because the requirement for DOT is you have to have four driveways on a street before it can be maintained by DOT. They appreciate staff looking at this sketch plan with them and coming up with the proper zoning request. The site is entirely wooded, and they would leave as many trees as they can during construction and clearing for the lots and septic systems. They hope to keep it as natural as possible.

Jyothi Prakash Buchireddy stated that he is the COO of Sustainable, 134 Oak Haven Lane, Apex, NC 27523. They intend to build houses that are sustainable, and they will build

communities in North Carolina. They are starting now with two other counties, Forsyth and Chatham. They would like to make this development now in Guilford County and keep it as a country setting. They also wanted to have the community close to a supermarket. The use of solar energy will help the homeowners reduce the cost of their utility and energy bills and this is a very important concept for many people. They also plan to use geo-thermal wells in the area.

In response to questions, Mr. Clayton stated that they will be adding more buffer area than is required so that the surrounding neighbors can feel more comfortable with these new homes. He feels the use of solar energy will provide a healthier neighborhood. He hopes that the Board will accept this proposal and approve the request.

Chair Donnelly asked if the applicants had reached out to the neighbors or held any kind of neighborhood meeting to allow the current residents to ask questions and get a better understanding of the proposed development. Mr. Buchireddy responded that he tried to reach out to a few of the neighbors from (mentioning that he lives in the Raleigh-Apex area) and had difficulty in either reaching them or getting them to speak with him. He would like to share this vision with them to make them comfortable with the proposed development.

Ms. Buchanan stated that she feels one of the major complaints will be about increased traffic and asked if NC DOT will require a turn lane coming in and out of this neighborhood off Rock Creek Dairy Road. Oliver Bass stated that once they ask for a driveway permit, NC DOT will do an analysis and identify the need for a left and right-turn lane at the property and then make their recommendations. Ms. Buchanan pointed out that it appears the new neighborhood residents will be able to access Clover Hill Road to Rockcliff Drive and she does not see on the maps provided, where the access would be for them. Chair Donnelly clarified that it was at the intersection of Long Meadow and Rock Creek Dairy Road. Mr. Clayton stated it would be two-lane tar and gravel roadway.

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

Allen Branson, former Guilford County Commissioner, stated that he owns property across the street, and he has not been contacted by the developer. One of the biggest things he sees here is there was a lack of information concerning whether these homes would be on a slab or a foundation. On this particular site, it shows no septic tank area and he has been in the construction industry all his life and he thinks one of the biggest things that has been asked is that there has been no traffic study. There have been numerous accidents there at the curve where the main road is, ending in fatalities. Where a two-lane asphalt road adjacent to I-85/40 with American Express and some other developments, Lake MacIntosh, Waterberry, and there is a tremendous amount of traffic currently in the area. With the addition of 51 new houses that would add another 100 cars of people and morning and afternoon peak hours are already very busy. Being a former Commissioner, he fought the NCDOT on trying to get a four-lane roadway and access in that area. This is also slated as a major thoroughfare. That being said, there is no doubt that there would be the need for a left-hand and right-hand

turning lane for NC DOT. There are lots of unanswered questions and the schematic drawing does not show enough information. He would like to know the price-range of the proposed houses and if the road that is going to be cut into the development is going to be to state specifications. There are also questions about the proposed geo-thermal wells and whether they would be able to produce enough water to the number of homes proposed. He would like to look at one of the developments in Chatham County.

In response to the TRC review question, Chair Donnelly stated that this is not a full review of a plan, it is an initial review of a development plan. Oliver Bass stated that this is a sketch plan where the uses and how the uses are going to be made and how the lots are going to be laid out and streets and so, it is just the general layout of the proposed subdivision in terms of what density is going to be available on the site. In regard to the well evaluation, that has to be submitted and it has to go through a subdivision use process and that is when they get into the design specifics with the Engineers. It would also have to go through an evaluation through Environmental Health and have a soil scientist evaluate the subhedral and they are proposing to use sub-surface subjects within that general common area, but that has to work out during the Engineering process. With regards to home sizes and prices and foundation elements, that is not something that the Planning Board can regulate. Foundation requirements would go through the permitting process on each lot.

Brittany Clark, 1701 Rock Creek Dairy Road, stated that her home is right in the corner. She has lived in this area for 28 years and four years ago they built their dream home. She never would have imagined that all this acreage beside of her would become 51 new neighbors. Her neighbors, family and friends who go to church together all are a tight-knit community and she feels safe letting her children play out in the yard. With a walking trail being located right next to her property make it a dangerous situation for her kids, her chickens, and her cats. She is really concerned about all their safety, including the extra traffic that will be out on the road. There have been several very serious accidents out on Rock Creek Dairy Road. There are several trees in front of her yard and if the road is widened, she would lose those trees and her privacy. She also has not been contacted by the developer, so is unaware of their plans for the property.

Michael Neese, 6440 Armps Road, Whitsett, NC, stated that he is retired from the City Transportation Department. The traffic in this area is terrible on Rock Creek Dairy Road every morning and afternoon. They do not need more traffic going up to the highway. With Amazon and other businesses moving in, it is really a mess from 4:00 o'clock on until 6:00 o'clock. The condition of the existing roads are horrible. NC DOT is not keeping up the roads like they should be, although they are getting ready to go in and tar and gravel some of the other extensions out in that area. He does disapprove of this request but does not welcome it. He showed a map from 1996 and the City of Greensboro proposed to do a major thoroughfare through Rock Creek Dairy Road in and out US 62, 421 and 220. This development will be the beginning of a major thoroughfare running down Rock Creek Dairy Road. This area needs to stay AG. They do not need a development on that side of Lake MacIntosh, it needs to stay on

the other side. He hopes the Planning Board will put this request on hold and not make a vote tonight, so that there can be careful consideration of this request.

Chair Donnelly asked those who agreed with Mr. Neese to stand up and be recognized and about 12 people stood up.

In rebuttal in favor of the request, Mr. Norris Clayton stated that this is just a rezoning case to see what is a good use of the property and they want to get a zoning that fits that use. The septic systems, traffic, NCDOT are going to review it and determine if it will need turning lanes, and if it does, they will be built. Instead of having 51 individual wells, there would be two community wells, which is required by the state and there are regulations that must be approved. They are also concerned about safety in the neighborhood.

Ms. Neeraja Dasari Lokanadham, a property owner, stated that she is the co-founder and Administrator for this particular development. She is a mom and has two (2) kids so she understands the concerns voiced by the speakers. She believes in this environment as eco-friendly and sustainable. She wants everyone to come together and build a safe community for everyone and ensure that everyone is safe and happy. Her daughter is a teenager and drives on that same road, so she is worried about her too. She assures that safety is their number one concern.

Kaye Graybeal, Deputy Director, stated that what was submitted is a sketch plan, so it is an overall general layout for feasibility and to show in concept that the use is feasible and can support the rezoning. There will be further review for septic, the road turn lanes, foundations of the structures and other items related to the request before it could go forward.

Ms. Buchanan asked if there is currently a budget or any written project for the widening of this road. Oliver Bass responded that he has not seen anything in the Transportation Improvement Plan that indicates that this is a project on their list for at least the next 15 years.

Lori Hancock, Ingold Road, Whitsett, NC, stated that she was raised right across the road on the farm place there. She asked why people want to come out to their agricultural place where there are cows, hogs, goats and chickens and bring all that city stuff out to their area. Why don't they do it in their neighborhood?

Chair Donnelly stated that he apologized because he thought she had a technical question to ask that they would be able to answer. That is not a question that the Planning Board is in a position to answer.

There being no other speakers, the Public Hearing was closed by unanimous vote.

Discussion

Chair Donnelly stated that he thanked everyone for coming out to participate in these discussions. Part of the process is hearing from interested parties. He asked the Board members if anyone wished to speak.

Ms. Buchanan stated that she has comments. She stated that their job as the Planning Board is to decide if the zoning on this piece of land can be changed. Development is inevitable and is coming to the area as we need more housing. She loves the idea of the neighborhood and the open space and pasture land and bee hives, et cetera, because that helps even out the uses of the land. She is concerned about traffic because she is familiar with the road and making a left turn out of anywhere along that road during rush hour traffic is very difficult. She does not live there but she goes there for work and it is a tough road.

Mr. Craft stated that on a positive for the project, using less land for the housing and leaving more undisturbed land is something they are probably going to see more of and it is good for the area and disturbs the wildlife less. Traffic is a concern and they can only be so interested in the traffic aspect because it is really not a major part of the whole land use decision. Perhaps the parties need a little more time to get together and exchange information and that might be the better outcome of tonight.

Ms. Buchanan stated that the traffic issue is only going to be up to NCDOT and not this Board and asked at what point a traffic study is done.

Kaye Graybeal stated that NCDOT takes traffic counts and then from the data they collect develop their Transportation Improvement Projects list, but she does not know where they are in that data collection on Rock Creek Dairy Road.

Mr. Craft stated that he would like to make a motion to table this particular case to give the applicant an opportunity to speak with the neighbors in the surrounding area and bring this back to the Board at a later date. Mr. Alston seconded the motion and the Board voted 4-3 in favor. (Ayes: Donnelly, Craft, Buchanan, and Alston. Nays: Apple, Gathers and Stalder.)

H. Other Business**Nomination of Planning Board member to serve on the Consultant Selection Committee for the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan Update**

Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director, stated that this is just the first step in that process to select a firm to move forward with this process. Kaye Graybeal stated that Guilford County has a Comprehensive Plan that looks at land uses and building patterns throughout the whole County and is updated every five to six years or so. A Planning Board member is needed to serve on the Consultant Selection Committee. The Plan helps to guide the staff rezoning recommendations in the staff reports and decisions by the Planning Board.

Chair Donnelly asked if anyone would like to participate in this Plan Update and no one responded.

Chair Donnelly stated that he would be willing to volunteer.

I. Adjourn

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Mr. Apple moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the request. (Ayes: Donnelly, Apple, Craft, Gathers, Alston, Buchanan, and Stalder. Nays: None.)

THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING IS TO BE HELD JUNE 8TH AT 6:00 P.M.

GUILFORD COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Regular Meeting Agenda

**Board of Commissioners' Chambers,
Old County Courthouse, 2nd Floor
301 W. Market Street, Greensboro, NC 27401**

July 13, 2022, 6:00 PM

A. Roll Call

Chair Donnelly called the July 13, 2022 meeting to order and asked for a roll-call of members present.

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

James Donnelly, Chair; Sam Stalder; Ed Apple; Cara Buchanan; David Craft; and Ryan Alston.

The following Board members were in attendance remotely/virtually for this meeting:

Dr. Latoya Gathers

Members not present at the meeting were:

Guy Gullick

Staff present in-person: J. Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director; Kaye Graybeal, Planning and Development Deputy Director; Oliver Bass, Senior Planner; Aaron Calloway, Planner I; Jessie Baptist, Admin. Officer; and Rachel Teague, PT Office Specialist.

B. Agenda Amendments

J. Leslie Bell stated that there were no amendments to the Agenda, but he would like to add a brief discussion of the Unified Development Ordinance website.

C. Approval of Minutes: June 8, 2022

Mr. Donnelly stated that he had a few minor corrections to be made and those have been submitted to staff. He stated that at the last meeting there was discussion about how the vote is handled when a Board member leaves the meeting without being excused. The minutes reflect the discussion and outcome of that discussion, so everyone is clear.

Mr. Craft moved to approve the Minutes from the June 8, 2022 meeting, as corrected, seconded by Ms. Buchanan.

D. Rules and Procedures

Chair Donnelly explained the Rules and Procedures that would be followed by the Board during this meeting.

E. Continuance Requests

Mr. Bell stated that there were no Continuance Requests for tonight's meeting.

F. Old Business**Public Hearing Item(s)**

Chair Donnelly explained that this is a continuation of a Conditional Zoning case that was previously heard on May 11, 2022. There was a full public hearing in which the developer and individuals who were opposed to this development were each provided twenty minutes to present information, as well as the five-minute rebuttal period.

Through the comments that were made during the hearing and in the discussion following the hearing, it became apparent that there had been limited interaction between the developer and the community and there was also some uncertainty about NC DOT plans for the Rock Creek Road corridor. At that time, the Planning Board voted to table this matter to provide an opportunity for both of those things to be addressed. Chairman Donnelly stated for the benefit of the members of the public attending that “community meetings are an important opportunity for developers and neighbors to get an understanding of what the development case is all about. It also provides an opportunity for the community to identify issues that they may be concerned about. In the course of a community meeting, you may hear things that may lead to an accommodation or an adjustment on those conditions that make a mutually beneficial situation or may limit a negative consequence.” Finally, it provides an opportunity for relationships to be built to allow communities and the developers to work through issues that may evolve during the development process. Because this is a planned development, a sketch plan, as a concept plan, is necessary for our review. This is not a full-blown development review and should this case be approved, a development plan would have to be submitted and will go through a full review process.

Mr. Bell stated that when this item first appeared before the Board, there was a question as it relates to NC DOT improvements may be planned for Rock Creek Dairy Road and he asked Kaye Graybeal, Deputy Director, to address review any new information, unless Mr. Bobby Norris was in attendance.

Kaye Graybeal stated that she had an opportunity to speak with Bobby Norris, who is an engineer for NC DOT, about any plans for transportation improvement projects in this area. She stated Mr. Norris relayed that there is an STIP (State Transportation Improvement Project) to improve the I-85/40 interchange at Rock Creek Road in which they would improve that interchange, as it is not functioning as it should. This is an approved project to help move traffic through that area more efficiently. NCDOT is hoping to expand that project to also get a further extension of this project approved that would add three or four lanes to Rock Creek Dairy Road between that interchange and south to McConnell Road. Although this is not an approved project yet, NCDOT understands that there is an immediate need for improvements in that area. NCDOT would also be improving the bridge over Interstate 40 at that interchange. The project would begin in 2028 with right-of-way acquisitions which would take a couple of years. However, NCDOT does want to try and accelerate the project to accommodate new development traffic in that area.

CONDITIONAL ZONING CASE #22-04-GCPL-02623: 1731 ROCK CREEK DAIRY ROAD, WHITSETT. AGRICULTURAL (AG) TO CONDITIONAL ZONING-PLANNED DEVELOPMENT - RESIDENTIAL (CZ-PD-R) Guilford County Parcel #107431, approximately 53.74 acres, is located on the east side of Rock Creek Dairy Road approximately 170 feet south of the intersection with Beechdale Court and located north of Mount Hope Church Road. This is a request to Conditionally Rezone the property from AG to CZ-PD-R. The applicant proposes the following Conditions: Single-Family Detached Dwellings (Use Condition) and Maximum 51 lots (Development Condition). Following the May 11th Planning Board public hearing at which the item was tabled, the Applicant held a community meeting on May 26th, and as a result of input, added two further proposed Development Conditions: Fifty (50)-foot buffer along Rock Creek Dairy Road to remain natural; and, the rule “No Parking on Any Subdivision Streets” to be included in Homeowners’ Association documents. The application includes a Sketch Plan modified to show the two newly added conditions. The proposed Conditional Zoning is generally consistent with the Rock Creek Area Plan of Agricultural-Rural Residential (AGRR), thus if approved, no plan amendment would be required.

Chair Donnelly asked for those speaking in favor of the case, to please come forward to the Podium. Anyone who is attending the meeting remotely will be asked to state their name and address for clarification during the meeting. Chair Donnelly asked for those planning to speak to stand or let him know. There were approximately 9 to 10 people who wished to speak. He asked that the Public Hearing be re-opened to allow these speakers the opportunity to be heard at this time.

A motion was made by Mr. Apple, seconded by Mr. Alston and approved unanimously by roll-call vote. (Ayes: Apple, Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Gathers, Craft and Donnelly. Nays: None.)

Chair Donnelly reminded the speakers that they would be allowed ten (10) minutes to speak at the Public Hearing.

Norris Clayton, with Hugh Creed Associates, the design Engineers for the project, 1306 W. Wendover Avenue, Greensboro, NC. He stated that since the last meeting, there was a community meeting at the local fire station and it was very well attended by approximately 40+ people there who had concerns and were interested people. There was a lot of discussion and they came up with a couple of the major items on which there were discussions - of course, transportation and traffic in the area and the water situation. They wanted more understanding and explanation about how public wells would be put in and what safeguards they would have against their wells. Once they get into the project more, there would be other levels of approvals and this is just the first stage, to obtain the rezoning of the subject property. They added two (2) conditions based off the discussion at the community meeting.

- 1) There will be a 50-foot natural buffer left along Rock Creek Dairy Road; and
- 2) No on-street parking in the community, as documented by the Homeowner Association.

That was the results of the meeting and they would like to add those two conditions to the rezoning request.

Mr. Buchireddy stated that they had really good discussions during the meeting. They were happy to hear that there would be a 50-foot buffer and in some areas, there will be 100-foot buffer. There were also good discussions about the water situation that is proposed for this development. They want to make sure that it would be sustainable and not affect the residents' quality of life in any way. He has spoken with Terry Barr, a resident of the area and he and his wife are really excited about this project. Anything that they can do to make the neighbors happy they are willing to discuss and come to a mutual agreement.

In response to a question by Mr. Apple concerning the barn facility, Mr. Buchireddy stated that the barn facility will continue to be used for the animals owned by people in the community, and for the neighbors in the new project. Mr. Norris added that if someone owns a horse, they would be able to use the barn facilities.

Mr. Craft moved to accept the two (2) added conditions as submitted, seconded by Mr. Apple. The motion was approved 6-1 by roll-call vote. (Ayes: Apple, Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Craft and Donnelly. Nays: Gathers.)

Chair Donnelly asked for those speakers who are opposed to the rezoning to come forward and state their name and address for the record. There would be a total of ten (10) minutes time for these speakers.

Don Lee, 3731 Old Julian Road, stated that at the May 6th meeting he wanted to speak toward the end of the meeting, but he was unable to speak because the public hearing had been closed. He asked about the entrance and exit into this particular development. He stated that no one has mentioned anything about the current development along Long Meadow Drive which is a tar and gravel road currently not State maintained, but he is unsure about that. There is a stop sign and no turning lanes and no markings on the road. The road is in very bad condition, and he would like to bring this to everyone's attention that it is crucial in this type development that there be an entrance and exit for all the 1st responders' vehicles. This particular development is something that we don't see in this community, as most everything is RS-40 zoning, which he is more familiar with and more acceptable to on a one-acre lot with a well and septic system for each individual parcel. And an exit with the tar and gravel road would not be appropriate for this

development. There will be an additional 100+ vehicles, which will be very difficult and should be upgraded and maintained by NC DOT. Those are his concerns and he would welcome comments from the other neighbors.

Melody Clapp, 1720 Rock Creek Dairy Road, stated that she lives directly across from where they are planning this development. Her concerns are about the DOT and they are only talking about at McConnell Road and she is concerned about another mile and a half to two miles down the road which is only double-lane traffic and with there being an additional 100+ vehicles, she is concerned about the traffic and accidents that will come. She has already had a car end up in her front yard just by people not paying attention there at the curve there. If they want to put a driveway there at the curve, that will be very dangerous. She does not think it is appropriate for them to come out of that development in that particular area and it should be moved for safety reasons. She and her family had 36 acres and when they wanted to put their houses on the property, they were told they could only put three personal homes in that area on 36 acres, but now they have 51 acres and they can put 50 houses there. That just does not make sense to her.

Leslie Bell responded that this is actually subdivided property and Planned Unit Development.

Ann Emery, Rock Cliff Road, stated that unfortunately, she was not aware of the other two meetings that were held. The signs that the County puts out for these meetings are very, very small and hard to read. She agrees with Mr. Lee about the tar and gravel roads and that they will easily be torn up unless the State upgrades them. She is concerned about the water supply as she has been in the area about 11 years and their well dried up and they had to dig a new well that cost them about \$7,000. Most of the wells in that area are 100 to 110 feet deep and a lot of the neighbors still have issues with their water supply. Putting a community well to feed all these houses is going to take a lot away from the people who have been in that area for a long time. There are some people who have been in that area for 50 to 60 years.

Chair Donnelly asked that the map be brought back up so that everyone could view the particular area.

Leslie Bell stated that Rock Cliff Drive is considered a secondary road.

Marilyn Bower, 1740 Rock Creek Dairy Road, speaking on-line, stated that she has concerns about the well issues for this area. Her family has lived at this location for well over 40+ years and they have well issues and neighbors on both sides of her have well issues. Another concern is that this is a very curvy road and to put an entrance/exit in the proposed location is very dangerous. There have been numerous fatal accidents in this immediate area. The neighborhood cannot sustain additional students in the school system in this area, as well as the impacts on EMS, local grocery stores. They are maxed out right now and cannot sustain another 100+ people in this area. The only person that would benefit from this is the developer and the community is not well thought out for any benefits on this. This development needs further discussions before anything final is done.

[Correspondence received via e-mail (all in opposition) prior to the meeting were provided to Planning Board members for consideration]

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

Mr. Craft moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Ms. Buchanan. The Board voted and approved unanimously by roll-call vote to close the public hearing. (Ayes: Apple, Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Gathers, Craft and Donnelly. Nays: None.)

Board Comments

Mr. Apple stated that he was at the community meeting and they didn't gather a whole lot of additional information, he didn't think.

Chair Donnelly stated that there are clearly some concerns about the capacity of the wells in this area. That is not something that falls to the Planning Board's purview, they are looking at what the land use is and that kind of determination is done as a part of a Plan Review Process. One of the things that was helpful at the meeting, for him, was an explanation of the detailed process that is gone through when a well is tested. A well is dug and then wells that are within a certain radius of that well are monitored for 24 hours during the testing of that well to measure well capacity. So, there is certainly a more detailed technical process that provides some assurance for folks that it has been tested. The Fire Station was a really good location for that meeting and he appreciates both the community and the developer for putting in the effort to hold that meeting and having a conversation about what the concerns really were.

Mr. Apple stated that he has a problem with 9,600 square foot lots and a 3,500 square foot house. He has a problem with a house that is only 20 feet away from their neighbor. He has seen two different situations, one in McLeansville where a house caught on fire and the next-door neighbor gets a lot of damage. The siding gets puckered up, the roof gets melted, and he just don't like the Archie Bunker type of living where you can reach out your window and shake hands with your neighbor. He knows that there is going to be growth in this area, but he does not think this is the right type of development for this particular area.

Mr. Craft stated that even though this carried in a little different manner, PUD, it is really pretty consistent with breaking it up into acre lots and building 50 houses. If someone doesn't mind being 20 feet from their neighbor, that is a decision they make when they purchase their property. There is a lot of open space to look at, which he thinks is a real plus, and the community element of a shared area, shared trails and shared activities is a positive, as well.

Mr. Alston stated that in the last meeting when they first spoke about this case, his main concerns were failure to communicate between the developer and the community. Since that has been addressed and all questions seem to have been addressed, he thinks it is inevitable for a development of some sort, whether now or sometime in the future, and he feels that he would support this application.

Chair Donnelly stated that this is certainly a development that is different in style from some other developments and it seems to be designed around a particular lifestyle, folks who are interested in sustainability. He thinks the desirability of the development will be determined in its implementation. There are some very valid concerns about the traffic and the water situations, and he feels that NC DOT will have an opportunity to address those concerns. Again, he reiterated that the Board's charge is to determine whether the land use is an approved use for the area. He asked if anyone was ready to make a motion.

Mr. Craft made a motion to approve the zoning map amendment located at Guilford County Parcel #107431 from AG to CZ-PDR because the amendment is consistent with the applicable plans because the request is actually for 51 single family dwelling units is generally consistent with the Rock Creek Dairy Plan, the Agricultural Rural Residential is designated and recognized land zone and recommended for future agricultural and residential uses, and anticipated uses are those permitted in the AG, RS-30, RS-40, PUD-R and RPD zoning districts. The amendment is reasonable and in the public interest because it is adjacent to RS-40 -MH-zoned property and it also provides residential development opportunities under the UDO Plan, seconded by Mr. Stalder. The request was approved 5-2 by roll-call vote. (Ayes: Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Craft and Donnelly. Nays: Apple and Gathers.)

Chair Donnelly stated that any appeal would be required to be submitted within 15 days, July 28, 2022. There is a processing fee and the appeal would be heard by the Board of County Commissioners. This motion has been approved but will not be final until heard by the Board of County Commissioners.

G. New Business

Non-Public Hearing Item(s)

RESOLUTION OF INTENT FOR EASEMENT CLOSING CASE #22-05-GCPL-03393: Request adoption of a Resolution of Intent and to schedule a public hearing for August 10, 2022 as presented herein, to close all of four 10-foot utility easements and a 30-foot drainage maintenance utility easement, located on lots 6, 7, and 8 as shown on Plat Book 158, Page 122 and located in Monroe Township on Guilford County Tax Parcel #128107, north of Chickasha Drive and east of Shoshone Court.

Public Hearing Item ROAD RENAMING CASE #22-06-GCPL-04250: RICHARDSONWOOD ROAD Presently known as Richardsonwood Road located in Monroe Township and running 0.56 of a mile north from Fairgrove Church Road and terminating to the southern property line of Rockingham County Tax Parcel #138635. This is a road renaming case initiated by Government action to change the name of Richardsonwood Road to Maple Grove Drive.

Aaron Calloway stated that this is a

RESOLUTION OF INTENT FOR EASEMENT CLOSING CASE #22-05-GCPL-03393: Request adoption of a Resolution of Intent and to schedule a public hearing for August 10, 2022 at 6:00 at the Agricultural Department Extension Building, as presented herein, to close all of four 10-foot utility easements and a 30-foot drainage maintenance utility easement, located on lots 6, 7, and 8 as shown on Plat Book 158, Page 122 and located in Monroe Township on Guilford County Tax Parcel #128107, north of Chickasha Drive and east of Shoshone Court.

Mr. Apple moved approval of the Resolution of Intent for Easement Closing to be held August 10, 2022, seconded by Mr. Stalder. The request was approved 7-0 Unanimous roll-call vote. (Ayes: Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Craft Apple, Gathers and Donnelly. Nays: None.)

Public Hearing Item(s)

ROAD RENAMING CASE #22-06-GCPL-04250: RICHARDSONWOOD ROAD

Presently known as Richardsonwood Road located in Monroe Township, the road runs 0.56 of a mile north from Fairgrove Church Road and terminates at the southern property line of Rockingham County Tax Parcel #138635. This is a road renaming case initiated by government action to change the name of Richardsonwood Road to Maple Grove Drive.

Leslie Bell stated that subsequent to the notifications going out for the public hearing held this evening, they were made aware of the history of Richardsonwood Road, and they also received some written e-mail comments which have been shared with the Board members. Since this information was not made available prior to the packet going out, staff would like to hold its recommendation until after the public hearing and comments. He asked Aaron Calloway to make the staff report at this time. Also, Steven Dew, the County GIS Manager will speak on this matter.

Aaron Calloway stated that the petition for this request was initiated by government action and it is a resolution to rename the northern segment of Richardsonwood Road (secondary road # 2503) as shown on the presentation screen. The subject segment of Richardsonwood Road runs approximately .56 miles north of Fairgrove Church Road and terminates at the southern property line of Rockingham County Parcel #138635. This proposal was generated in response to confusion between the two disconnected segments, as shown on the map. Guilford County staff saw that a road renaming was necessary to prevent a situation that could jeopardize public health, safety, or general welfare. Steven Dew, Guilford County GIS Manager, was present to speak on this matter.

Mr. Dew stated that the chronology of the steps taken during the initial contact which began in early March with the subdivision case review. Guilford County staff discussed the options with Rockingham County, and subsequently mailed letters to the impacted property owners on April 20th which asked for name suggestions. On May 5th, staff

mailed letters to the property owners listing road names on which they could vote. Letters suggesting recommended names were submitted to GIS staff for review. Maple Grove Road was the most suggested new name.

Mr. Craft asked if the neighbors on the street were the majority that picked this name. Mr. Dew responded that was correct. Mr. Craft stated that it sounded rather confusing to him.

Chair Donnelly asked what some different options may be that exist to create alternative names, due to the information that has come to light in terms of the heritage of the community, as well as the sequence of the naming of a road. Mr. Dew stated that it could be renamed at the Board's request, because there is no final recommendation at this time. This issue is not directly addressed in the Ordinance. Ms. Buchanan asked how long the sign on this portion of the road had been in place, and Mr. Dew stated he thought it had been there about 15 years. It was renamed from Pagewood Road to Richardsonwood Road about 30 years ago.

Chair Donnelly asked who would be speaking on this matter, and there were five people in the room who wanted to speak, as well as a ~2 people online. Chair Donnelly stated that there would be a total of 20 minutes for speakers on this matter.

Dwayne Franks stated that there are a lot of family homes on Richardsonwood 8523 and 8525. He wanted to acknowledge all the folks at the meeting and asked them to stand showing their opposition to the name change of this particular road. There were about 10 people in opposition. He presented a petition that has been signed by over 300 people showing their opposition to the request. He pointed out that the County had not tried to develop relationships with the residents; no letters had been received by the residents; and he felt it was blatant and intentional on behalf of the County. One of the maps that was submitted to him shows all of the impacted homes on this road from the beginning all the way into Rockingham County. Ms. Graybeal had sent him maps of the properties in Guilford County that were impacted. He repeated that the people that are most impacted did not receive any letters or notifications. In regard to the history of the road, the Richardsons have owned property on that road for over 150 years throughout slavery and beyond. The road was originally named Pagewood Road because black folks could not have a road named after them. Then 30 years ago, some of the elder Statesmen petitioned to have that road named to Richardsonwood Road. This was well before Pearson Farms, which is the other community on the map, was ever developed. They came in 15 years later and the County broke their own Ordinance by allowing that community to have a road named Richardsonwood Road that was not contiguous. It didn't even own property or have an easement to make it contiguous. Now, the County is wanting the current residents to change the name of the road that has been the same for the past 30 years and erase their heritage from that road name. That is just unfair to all these residents and would be hurtful to everyone here.

Mr. Richardson read the petition that was signed by over 350 people:

"July 13, 2022, a public hearing will take place by the Guilford County Planning Department concerning the renaming of Richardsonwood Road to Maple Grove Drive. This was an alarming notice to the Richardson family for which the road is named after and who live on a portion of Richardsonwood Road that is a majority in Rockingham County, which is State Road #2425. We believe any aspect of the road that is to be renamed should be the portion in Guilford County which is in Pearson Farms subdivision. Richardsonwood Road has signified our heritage for over 30 years and our ancestors lived on this road since they walked off the Richardson Plantation in Reidsville in 1865. The road began in Guilford County at the juncture of Fairgrove Church Road and was renamed to Richardsonwood Road from Pagewood Road in the late 1980s. This change was initiated by the late Walter L. Richardson who resided at the property address located at 8535 Richardsonwood Road in honor of Walter G. Richardson, his grandfather. The man responsible for making sure the land is presently being occupied by his descendants. We, the remaining descendants feel the need to preserve the Richardson heritage by keeping the name of this road in its entirety, starting in Guilford County and continuing into Rockingham County, as Richardsonwood Road. It is our understanding that Guilford County's problem in keeping the Richardsonwood Road name is because

there are two locations in the said County with the same name. The second Richardsonwood Road name is in nearby Pearson Farms subdivision. Let it be noted that the second naming of Richardsonwood Road, as they were informed, was contingent upon this road being connected to the existing Richardsonwood Road when the Pearson Farm subdivision was to be expanded. We now understand, for whatever reason, the Pearson Farm Richardsonwood extension could not go forward as was originally planned, thus, causing the double naming, which is a violation of policies that are in place that would have prohibited this situation. We are signing that the problem should have been corrected by changing the name Richardsonwood Road located in Pearson Farms to Maplewood Lane. We have already lived through the renaming of this road to Pagewood Road because it couldn't be named after black people even if they owned the majority of the land. Our family fought hard to be recognized and finally won the right to have the name changed to Richardsonwood Road in 1988, over 30 years ago. To change the name of this road now would be an insult to the Richardson family and our legacy. Please support us by signing this petition to keep Richardsonwood Road name unchanged for this intersection at Fairview Church Road."

Warren Richardson, 8519 Richardsonwood Road, and his daughter wrote a letter to the Board that says that this problem was created when Pearson Farms named their road Richardsonwood Road in the new subdivision. It was against the policy of the Planning Department, to have two names in the same County. They don't understand how it first got approved and now they want to change the original name because it's a violation of a policy, which was already in existence.

Baretta Richardson-Nunley, 8531 Richardsonwood Road, stated that her father, Rubert Lee Richardson, was one of the individuals that created this name "Richardsonwood," because there was already a Richardson Road in Rockingham County. Again, Pearson Farms came into Richardsonwood Road planning to connect it with their road. At the point that they did not do that, they should have renamed that subdivision road and let their name remain Richardsonwood Road. Changing the end of that road to make Maple Grove, she agrees with Mr. Craft that it is very confusing. At this point in time, there is no confusion with deliveries. The names that were suggested by the County were like a slap in the face. They are not in Chicago and should not even consider Chicago Cubs Drive for this area in North Carolina. It appears that no one even did any type of investigation on probable names for this road.

Jackie Lee, speaking on-line, stated that she agrees with the previous speakers and there should be no change to the current name of Richardsonwood Road in this location.

Rasheon Jackson, 8569 Silver Road, stated that he agrees with the other speakers and is opposed to the name change for this area.

Tory Lee Humber, stated that she lives at 8505 Richardsonwood Road, which is on the Guilford County side and she would be impacted by a name change on this road. She has lived there for four years and runs a business out of her home and it would cause a lot of confusion if the name is changed. Sometimes she receives packages that are perishable and cannot be returned and so far, she has not had any problems with deliveries. She agrees to keeping this named Richardsonwood Road to honor the people who are related to this road and suggested that it just be left alone.

Sherry Lee, speaking on-line, stated that the road has had the same name since she was a child and is related to her family heritage. The history should not change for this road and is part of her legacy.

Lawanda Daniels stated that she lives in Beaufort, NC, but she has lived in Greensboro and other areas of North Carolina. She wanted to speak to the future of the road and was also a Commissioner on the North Carolina African Heritage Commission for 10 years. It was quite an honor to serve on that Commission. It is important to preserve the African-American heritage and family legacy here in North Carolina. It is important to leave the name of this road in place as it has been for the last 30 years.

Mr. Alston stated that there was a request for the family to have “Old” in front of the original name and asked if this was something that could be considered. Ms. Graybeal responded yes, but that some of the family property owners had conveyed that this option was not acceptable to them.

Chair Donnelly asked that the Board vote to close the public hearing.

Mr. Craft made a motion to close the public hearing seconded by Mr. Stalder. The Board voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. Ayes: Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Craft Apple, Gathers and Donnelly. Nays: None.)

After a short discussion, Mr. Bell suggested that this item be tabled until the August meeting to allow some more investigative work on it.

Mr. Alston moved to table the request to a future meeting to give an opportunity for staff to work with addresses in the area, seconded by Mr. Craft. The Board voted 7-0 unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Craft Apple, Gathers and Donnelly. Nays: None.)

Chair Donnelly asked that there be a short break at this time as moved by Mr. Alston, seconded by Mr. Craft. There was a roll-call vote, 7-0 unanimously in favor of the motion. Ayes: Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Craft Apple, Gathers and Donnelly. Nays: None.)

The break was from 7:44 p.m. until 7:51 p.m.

CONDITIONAL ZONING CASE #22—05-GCPL-03518: Brightwood Farm (BWF) Unified Development Plan (UDP) Modification, Plat Book 193, Pages 35-37; from Conditional Zoning Planned Development Residential (CZ-PD-R) to Conditional Zoning Planned Development Residential (CZ-PD-R) Amended.

Oliver Bass stated that this is a request to amend Conditional Zoning Case #33-02 (Approved on July 10, 2002), which established conditional zoning for the Brightwood Farm Planned Development located at the northwest intersection of Brightwood Church Road and Burlington Road and contained 512 acres. The Sketch Plan of the Brightwood Farm Unified Development Plan in Plat Book 193, Page 25 established the maximum number of dwelling units allowed in Section A at 2,034 units on 459.81 acres, of which no more than 535 may be attached dwellings, including multi-family (apartments), condominiums, townhouses, twin homes, and duplexes. The proposed amendment provides that the maximum number of total dwelling units will remain at 2,034; however, the maximum number of attached dwelling units would increase from 535 to 855 dwelling units. The additional 320 attached dwelling units would be reserved for Phases 3A, 3B and 5A (shown on Sheet 2 of UDP Phasing Plan), which includes parcels located at 6440 and 6440 ZZ Piney Rd., 433 ZZ Gantwood Lane, 567, 581, 593 Brightwood Farm Pkwy, and a portion of 6818 Preakness Pkwy; being Guilford County Tax Parcels 107637, 105606, 107843, 105628, 106381, 106271 and part of 106272 respectively, totaling approximately 114 acres. All other conditions for the current UDP will remain unchanged.

The request is inconsistent with the Northeast Area Plan land classification of Residential Single Family, thus, if approved, a plan amendment to Mixed Use land classification to accommodate mixed-use PD-R developments with public water and sewer would be required.

Marc Isaacson, attorney representing the applicant, Forestar Real Estate Group, stated that Donna Crowder, Bob Dischinger, Civil Engineer – Evans Engineering, and Ronald Stevenson, Randy Kemps Office, the Transportation Engineer. Forestar is under contract to acquire these parcels that are the subject of this rezoning request. They are a national land developer and typically acquire the land and make sure that it is titled properly and then subdivide the property according to the anticipated uses and sell those lots to home-builders. This project, Brightwood Farms, began in the early 2000s as what was contemplated as a Unified Development. Unfortunately, that plan did not go forward. In the 2007-2008 range the recession hit and the lender on this project foreclosed on the available parcels. They sold off those parcels to bidders in the process and it became a fractured development plan. Over the next several years

different home builders and developers built in Brightwood Farm on different parcels, and unfortunately, the concept of the Unified Development Plan that was approved by the County in the early 2000s fell apart. They have been dealing with this ever since then. He presented a larger Plan to the Board members for their review. The initial goal was to have both attached and detached family dwellings on these properties. They are asking to amend the request in regard to an increase in the number of townhomes dwellings permitted because the number is already almost reached. That happened because another developer came in and acquired a parcel toward the front of the property and is putting apartments there. So that utilized a lot of the cap that was then allowed. The existing UDP allows a total of 2,034 units both attached and single family detached units. Based on the total number of units that are in the process of being built, when you subtract that number from the 2,034, what is permitted by right at this point, is up to 740 more single-family detached units. Forestar has identified a shifting preference in the housing market for greater variety of housing options and townhomes have become much more popular during the last 20 years. That change needs to be addressed in this UDP and that requires a rezoning, as heard from staff. A lot of people are moving to this area from other states and there is now a critical housing shortage in this community. They are asking for approval to reallocate those remaining 740 single family detached to allow 320 townhomes to be built here. This area can well handle that increase. In terms of density it is consistent because there is a mix of single-family detached and attached already in the immediate area. The precise unit breakdown will be determined by the site planning process. If approved, the engineers would begin on the detailed site plan process. Sketch plans were provided to the Board members for their review, showing the placement of the single-family homes, the proposed townhomes locations. No new traffic impact study was required as a result of this request. NC DOT reviewed the proposal and the County TRC reviewed it and this plan was submitted to County TRC and received conditional approval. On the UDP there is an area for a connector road that leads to the traffic circle. Forestar would like to acquire that land, and as soon as it become available, they will acquire it. Under the UDP, the development in Section 3B cannot begin until this connector road is built. They have sent notice by letter to those property owners on the County's notification list and they have held a neighborhood meeting and approximately 30 people attended the meeting. There was about a 90-minute discussion during the meeting and it was a healthy discussion and a lot of questions were asked and answered. The Brightwood Farms HOA has submitted a letter of support for this rezoning request. This is a request to supplement and extend what is already in place with more and diversified housing types to meet a changing market. They are only asking that they be allowed to reallocate the number of dwellings out of that remaining single-family dwellings that are allowed to allocate some to townhomes and the rest to single-family detached. The only condition to move forward is the approval of this rezoning request.

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

Terri Gary, 600 Gray Rock Road, in Stoney Creek, Whitsett, NC, stated that she represents the Stoney Creek HOA team and they do not really have objections or protests, but there are many questions that need to be answered. The main one is whether there are going to be more homes built in that blank space. They are an established area that has been there 20 years and there has recently been some new house buildings in the immediate area and that has caused several problems. They are concerned about the large trucks that would be coming through their neighborhood as well as more traffic in the area. They wanted to know when Burlington Road is going to be expanded and when there are going to be traffic signals put there. There is a wonderful walking trail along the creek which divides them from Stoney Creek and Brightwood and the more areas that are paved, the more there is water runoff in an area causing flash flooding and washout considerations. Building at the Landing has caused two of her neighbors to experience a lot of flooding in this back yard. They have been to the County on that and have been told that there is nothing to be done about it and everything was done properly.

Mike Ellington, 934 Golfhouse Road West, President of the Stoney Creek HOA, stated that in looking at the map, their main concern is the connector turning everything there on Brightwood into their neighborhood.

Marc Isaacson stated that they are not going to build the connector at 3A and the Fire Marshall has already approved that as part of the TRC review. That would be across a flood plain area and is not advisable to build anything there.

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

Mr. Apple moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Craft. The motion was approved by 7-0 unanimous roll-call vote. (Ayes: Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Craft Apple, Gathers and Donnelly. Nays: None.)

Chair Donnelly asked if there was more discussion, and being not, he asked for a motion related to the request for this amendment.

Mr. Craft moved approval of the zoning amendment related to Guilford County Tax Parcels 107637, 105606, 107843, 105628, 106281, 106271 and part of 106272 from CZ-PDR (Case #33-02) to CZ-PDR-AMENDED. This approval also amends the Northeast Area Plan. The Zoning map amendment and associated Northeast Area Plan amendment are based on the following changes and conditions in the Northeast Area Plan: Due to the changing housing needs of the people in the area, the makeup of what can be built in the subdivision should be amended to allow multi-family residences. This amendment is reasonable and in the public interest because it will provide current and future residents of Guilford County with a greater variety of housing options and opportunities as supported by Goal #1 of the Housing Element of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan, Goals and Objectives and Policies documented and adopted September 21, 2006, seconded by Mr. Apple. The Board voted 7-0 unanimously in favor of the motion to approve the request. (Ayes: Alston, Stalder, Buchanan, Craft, Apple, Gathers and Donnelly. Nays: None.)

H. Other Business

Comprehensive Plan

Kaye Graybeal stated that since the last meeting, the selection committee chose a consultant, Design Workshop out of Asheville. They are looking forward to working with them and the Purchasing Department approved them and they can go ahead and start working with the Consultant on the final proposal, which they expect to get about the middle of next week. They are ready to go ahead and hit the ground running as soon as it is signed off on. They are looking forward to putting together a Steering Committee. She will keep the Board members posted on the progress being made.

Chair Donnelly stated that there is an opportunity for members to participate in a Steering Committee, and when the opportunity is provided, we'll be able to give a sense of what the time commitment entails, and see who is interested, in the formal Comprehensive Plan process.

Unified Development Ordinance enCodePlus Platform

Leslie Bell thanked the Clerk's Office for their support on this project as the new enCodePlus platform will also be used for all of the County Ordinances. It has been a multi-year effort to replace a 30-year-old ordinance. He stated that this is an interactive platform in that it contains links to access resources and documents external to the UDO (e.g., rezoning applications and links to Guilford County's GIS website) including a FAQ section to assist those in navigating the document. -He briefly went through some of the items on the new UDO document platform to show members how to use the website to its best advantage.

Mr. Bell demonstrated how the platform links to the UDO, for which the Articles can be searched by clicking on links in the Table of Contents. Links to the Comprehensive Plan and the Area Plans are now all in one location and the plan maps are linked to the GIS data viewer directly from the site. Area Plans can be viewed with details such as executive summaries, public meeting dates, and mapped areas of water/sewer and annexation acreage showing development trends. Having all this info on the same site is important because NCGS 160D requires a statement of consistency and an explanation of reasonable public interest for rezoning cases.

Underlined terms throughout the document are linked to definitions. Tables and flow charts are designed to be more pleasing to the eye graphically. Referenced articles are just a click away. Additionally, an interactive built-in calculator is provided to help compute, for example, the number of required parking spaces.

Commentaries are now included and are intended to clarify where text can be interpreted in more than one way, and also indicate local legislative bills. The local legislative bills are now memorialized in this format for clarification and transparency and are accessible through on-line links to eliminate the need to search for them.

Mr. Donnelly stated that utilizing the UDO now looks easier, but he knows there is a lot that goes on behind implementing such a project and thanked the team for all the work. Mr. Bell stated that this was a team effort with the Clerk's office and he is working with them on an official launch date.

Mr. Bell then listed potential items for the August agenda.

I. Adjourn

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.

The next scheduled meeting is August 10, 2022