

**GUILFORD COUNTY
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING BOARD
Regular Meeting Minutes
NC Cooperative Extension – Agricultural Center
3309 Burlington Road, Greensboro, NC 27405
August 14, 2024
6:00 PM**

Call to Order

Chair Donnelly called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

I. Roll Call

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

James Donnelly, Chair; Guy Gullick, Vice-Chair; Jason Little; Ryan Alston; Sam Stalder; David Craft; and Rev. Gregory Drumwright

The following members were absent from this meeting:

Dr. Nho Bui and Cara Buchanan

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

J. Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director; Oliver Bass, Planning & Zoning Manager; Aaron Calloway, Planner I; Avery Tew, Planner I; Tim McNeil, Fire Plans Examiner; Andrea Leslie-Fite, County Attorney, and Matthew Mason, Chief Deputy County Attorney

II. Agenda Amendments

None

III. Approval of Minutes: July 10, 2024

Chair Donnelly stated that there were a few corrections to the July 10, 2024, meeting minutes. Chair Donnelly identified several items that he had some questions about. Mr. Bass passed out a revised set of minutes this evening. There was a piece in the minutes that captured a request by Reverend Drumwright, and it has been included. On the final motion there was some language regarding the

public interest that had not been included in the original minutes and that has now been included.

Chair Donnelly noted that Mr. Stalder had arrived for the remainder of the meeting. Rev. Drumwright moved approval of the minutes of the July 10, 2024, meeting as amended, seconded by Mr. Little. The Board voted 7-0 unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Gullick, Drumwright, Little, Alston, Stalder, Craft. Nays: None.)

IV. Rules and Procedures

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

V. Continuance Requests

Bo Rodenbough is an attorney with Brooks Pierce Law Firm, representing Mr. Bill Stover, one of the adjoining owners of the property that is up for an application for a Special Use Permit filed by Duke Energy. Mr. Stover is the principal of SA Associates Limited Partnership, which owns property that is identified as Parcel "B" on the adjacent properties map. Mr. Rodenbough stated that the item was heard by the Board on April 12, 2023, at which time Duke Energy made an almost identical application for a Special Use Permit on this same piece of property, and there was an evidentiary hearing convened, and the Board voted to deny that request. Mr. Rodenbough stated that no petition for appeal was filed with the superior court following that meeting. The opponents of this request, who are all adjoining owners on both McConnell Road and Andrew Farms Road, thought the matter was dead. However, they recently received the notice of this meeting tonight and have tried to spring into action to respond to this. One of the things they want to do to respond is to retain appraiser(s) to evaluate the diminution of their properties as a result of the location of this electric substation on this property, and they have clearly not had the time to do so at this point. They have checked with a number of appraisers who have said they could do it, but it would take at least 30 days for them to conduct an appraisal. On behalf of the owners who oppose this request, they would ask for a continuance of this case.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Gullick as to the reasons for the continuance, Mr. Rodenbough stated that along with appraisals, they want experts to testify about the public safety hazards of an electric substation.

Rev. Drumwright asked Mr. Rodenbough to speak a little more about the timeline of their awareness and their advisement to this matter. Mr. Rodenbough responded that he could not speak for all of the neighbors, but Mr. Stover received notice of the meeting on or about July 31, 2024.

Chair Donnelly asked Mr. Bell to remind everyone what the procedures are for notice so that information is available. Mr. Bell stated that according to NC General Statute 160D, notice must be given no less than ten (10) days and no more than twenty-five (25) days prior to the meeting. The staff tries to give as much notice as possible, given the deadlines. For legal notice on the County's website, posting the signs, and mailing the notice, staff tries to make all three of those notifications roughly within the same day or twenty-four (24) hours of the same day.

Rev. Drumwright stated that just because there are so many people here, and they brought legal representation to make this request, this is on day fourteen (14), so within the allowable period, but would staff speak to when they actually sent the notice out?

Oliver Bass stated that the notices went out on approximately July 26 or July 27 and were mailed to the owners of the subject property, the adjacent properties, and the applicant.

Mr. Rodenbough stated that they did contact Duke Energy's counsel the day before yesterday to let them know they were going to make a motion to continue.

Mr. Gullick stated that it sounds like they need a minimum of 30 days, and he suggested they may need as much as 60 days because it may be difficult to get appraisals done within that 30 days.

Chair Donnelly stated that Special Use Permit continuances could be allowed for a maximum of 60 days.

Chair Donnelly asked if the counsel for the applicant would come forward at this time.

Anthony Fox, the attorney for Duke Energy, stated that he did receive a call from Pearson Cost with Brooks Pierce yesterday. and he sought to review the Rules of Procedure for this Board concerning continuance and was not able to find anything that governed the granting of a continuance by this Board. He also is familiar with General Statute 160(D) with regard to timing. The staff has complied with the Statutory requirements for notice of a Special Use Permit as well as a zoning matter. The adequate notice has been met. His client is prepared to proceed this evening and is well-represented here with a number of subject matter experts to answer any questions that this Board may have, and that is at a substantial cost to his client. In addition, this is a matter that is of the utmost urgency for the client in that the reason they are here tonight for a Special Use Permit is because of the growth that this community is experiencing. The longer they delay, the more it jeopardizes his client's ability to meet the demands of the growth that the community is experiencing. On behalf of his clients, Mr. Fox opposed the request for a continuance tonight.

Chair Donnelly asked Mr. Bell if either of the next two (2) Planning Board meetings would be appropriate to continue this matter. Mr. Bell stated that the next scheduled meetings are September 11 and October 9.

Mr. Gullick disclosed that his daughter works for Parker Poe Law Firm in Raleigh. Mr. Fox works for Parker Poe Law Firm in Charlotte. He stated that they (his daughter and Mr. Fox) do not know each other, they have never met to his knowledge, and he wants everyone to know that fact, and if anyone is uncomfortable with him being involved in this decision, now is the time to say something. There did not appear to be anyone who objected to Mr. Gullick being involved in this matter. The staff attorneys also stated that there was no reason for a conflict in this matter.

Andrea Leslie-Fite, County Attorney, confirmed with Mr. Gullick that he did not know Mr. Fox, he was not a member or a recipient of any funds committed to Parker Poe, he has not engaged in any conversation with Mr. Fox about this case, and he can be impartial regarding this case. Chair Donnelly asked board members if they had any concerns with Mr. Gullick's participation in this case. No concerns were expressed.

Discussion

Mr. Craft stated that he appreciates that Duke Energy has brought expert witnesses and understands the costs involved, but a continuance is not unusual for this Board to grant, particularly with the timing and additional information that the neighbors are asking for. He does not feel that they have had a reasonable amount of time to gather their information, and he would support a 60-day continuance.

Mr. Gullick stated that he agreed with Mr. Craft. Rev. Drumwright stated that everybody is here, and he recognizes it is a disappointment to the applicants to entertain this request for a continuance, but he believes that the residents have to live with this near their properties if the request is granted; therefore, he feels it is reasonable for them to have this opportunity to do due diligence.

Counsel Mason stated that the October meeting date will fall beyond the 60-day time period, and he would suggest that the wording of the motion be changed to "up to October 9th, 2024."

After consulting with the applicant's counsel, it was confirmed that a date of October 9 would not be appropriate and asked this Board to entertain a special meeting for purposes of hearing this matter on October 2, 2024. Mr. Rodenbough stated that this would be amenable to his clients.

Mr. Craft amended his original motion and moved for a continuance for this case to a special meeting on October 2, 2024, seconded by Mr. Gullick. The Board voted

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

VI. Old Business

Legislative Hearing Item(s)

A. **CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #24-04-PLBD-00077: AG, AGRICULTURAL TO CZ-LI, CONDITIONAL ZONING–LIGHT INDUSTRIAL: 5541 MACY GROVE ROAD AND 423 FARLEY DRIVE. (GRANTED)**

Avery Tew, Guilford County Planner, stated that this is a request to conditionally rezone the portions of Guilford County Tax Parcels #169155 and #227088, located at 5541 Macy Grove Road and 423 Farley Drive, identified by the North Carolina Geodetic Survey as being within Guilford County's jurisdiction, the acreage of which is currently unknown but estimated to be approximately 15.13 acres, from AG, Agricultural to CZ-LI, Conditional Zoning-Light Industrial, with the following conditions:

Use Conditions – Uses of the property shall be limited to the following: (1) Automotive Towing and Storage Services; (2) Caretaker Dwelling.

Development Conditions – (1) To the extent that such land is in Guilford County's jurisdiction, property owner will develop a 24-36 inch berm alongside: 5529 Macy Grove Road; 465 Farley Drive; Farley Drive, between 465 Farley Drive and 417 Farley Drive; 417 Farley Drive; and 411 Farley Drive. (2) For traffic related to the use of the property as Automotive Towing and Storage Services: no more than twelve vehicles per day will enter the property, and ingress and egress will be exclusively through Macy Grove Road.

To the west and southwest of the properties are single-family residences and medical facilities located within the town of Kernersville and its extraterritorial jurisdiction. To the north is a large warehousing and distribution facility within the town of Kernersville, and the rest of the area is predominantly residential. The subject parcels are located in both the Guilford County Airport Area Plan and the Heart of the Triad Area Plan. The Town of Kernersville boundaries are immediately to the north and south, and all the surrounding properties within Guilford County's jurisdiction are zoned AG. The existing use of the property consists of an Automotive Towing and Storage Services operation, a single-family house and various residential outbuildings. The subject properties are associated with an active zoning violation case #22-04-GVPU-00129, which is related to the use of the properties for Automotive Towing and Storage Services on AG-zoned property. In terms of historic resources, there are no historic resources within the subject properties and no cemeteries are shown to be

located on or adjacent to subject properties. There is no anticipated impact on public school facilities. The closest fire station is #16 in Colfax, approximately three miles away from the subject properties.

Staff recommends denial of the request to conditionally rezone the subject properties from AG to CZ-LI because it is reasonable and in the public interest due to the proposed rezoning being inconsistent with the Heart of the Triad Area Plan recommendation of Business Center. There is also a lack of uses similar to Automotive Towing and Storage Services in the immediate vicinity, and there are no uses allowed under the subject properties' current AG zoning, which are comparable to Automotive Towing and Storage Services. Denial of the request is consistent with Objective 1.4 and Policy 1.4.3 of the Future Land Use Element of Guilford County's Comprehensive Plan, which states:

Objective 1.4 – Seek coordination and compatibility of land use plans among Guilford County, its incorporated cities and towns, and neighboring jurisdictions.

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.

Area Plan Amendment Recommendation:

The subject parcels are located in both the Guilford County Airport Area Plan and the Heart of the Triad Area Plan. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Airport Area Plan recommendation of Non-Residential, but inconsistent with the Heart of the Triad Area Plan recommendation of Business Center. If the requested rezoning is approved, an amendment to the Heart of the Triad Area Plan will be required.

Chair Donnelly stated that it is his understanding that if this Board were to approve this request, that is just the beginning of the process, and this site would then go under a site plan review in order for this to move forward. Mr. Tew stated that was correct.

Mr. Craft asked for some clarification regarding the illustrative map submitted by the applicant.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and asked for those wishing to speak in favor of the request to come to the speaker's table and state their name and address for the record.

Pearson Cost, Brooks Pierce Law Firm, Raleigh, NC, representing the applicant, Mr. Angel, stated that he would like to address Mr. Craft's previous question. The Planning staff had originally asked the applicant to have a representational map to show the three (3) properties that were listed, in terms of where the berm would need to be located. Because they are not proposing a berm across the entire property, they decided to list the condition for the berm based on the properties that it would be adjacent to and those were originally, before the revised application, 411 -417 Farley and 5529 Macy Grove Road. They have now extended that from those properties to be fully connected from one end to the other. Mr. Angel runs a successful towing and repair business throughout Forsyth, Stokes, Randolph, Davidson and Guilford Counties. This business has been in operation for many decades. The primary location is in Forsyth County where they conduct the majority of the business operations, including all of the repair side of the business. The intended use of this property is simply to store vehicles.

Throughout this process, Mr. Angel has shown a willingness to do whatever it takes to make this rezoning work. He has followed up with the Planning Department's questions and revision requests. In February, there was a pre-application conference, and in follow-up discussions, the Planning staff advised him to rezone to Light Industrial for Automotive Towing and Storage Services. In April, they conducted a neighborhood meeting, and several neighbors attended, and they discussed the application. As soon as the rezoning request was explained, and assurances that the use would be conditioned to automotive towing and storage, no one had any issues. Because Mr. Angel wanted to ensure that his use of the property did not detrimentally affect his neighbors, he asked if there was anything else he could do. In addition to the UDO requirements, there will be site plan review to mitigate the effects on their land. Certain neighbors, represented by the three (3) properties, suggested that a berm may be helpful to the situation.

Shortly before the June Planning Board meeting, they heard several of the Planning staff's concerns over the initial application, which is why they sought the continuance. Mr. Angel revised the application to take care of all the concerns staff had at the time. Since June, Mr. Angel has increased the length of the berm and added conditions limiting traffic to twelve (12) vehicles per day, exclusively accessing the site from Macy Grove Road. He highlighted that Mr. Angel grew up on these properties with many of the same neighbors that are there now. In part, due to that relationship, Mr. Angel is eager to do whatever he can to shield any potential harm from those neighbors. Signatures were collected on a petition in support of this rezoning, which was submitted to the record. All these neighbors support the rezoning request. The property is almost entirely surrounded by neighbors who support the request.

This area is in a period of transition, and whether today or in the future, this property will transition to some type of business-like use. The Heart of Triad Plan is one example of this region's commitment to economic development, and transitioning away from agricultural use targets this area for transition. Mr. Angel is proposing to continue this transition with a limited, non-residential business-like use that considers his neighbors and overall community. Regarding the staff report, in the revised report, Planning staff removed their concerns about detrimental impacts on neighbors. The staff includes concerns of a lack of similar uses in the area, and an inconsistency with the Heart of Triad Area Plan. They respectfully disagree with staff's assessment on similar uses. There is something similar to automotive towing and storage in the immediate vicinity; in fact, there are substantial non-residential and business-like uses directly adjacent and in the immediate vicinity. Immediately to the north, adjoining the Macy Grove property is 53 acres, zoned Business Industrial, and this continues to various properties north of that.

Regarding the Heart of Triad Area Plan, they also disagree with staff's assessment for the same reasons. That Plan was published nearly fourteen years ago, and it recommends business center use for this property. The Planning staff are reading the plan too technically. Instead, this Board should focus on the overall plan for this area within the greater community. Allowing this use would make the area more consistent with the Heart of Triad Area Plan. The issue is not whether the proposed use fits precisely into the business support category or the overlapping definition of business center, but rather, the focus should be on the fact that the current agricultural use of the greater area does not fit into those descriptions at all. Therefore, approval of the rezoning today would make the area more consistent with the Heart of the Triad Area Plan. They ask that this rezoning request be approved and allow this successful business to continue to thrive in Guilford County, which would continue the transition that the County started seeking long ago.

In response to questions concerning what some of the outbuildings were, Chair Donnelly asked the applicant to come forward.

Bill Angel, 423 Farley Drive, the applicant, stated that the outbuildings are the shop and adjacent to that to the north of it was a shed, from when they farmed the land. To the left side is a stick barn and a car shed. There are also three small car lots that his dad used, and there is another shop on the other side of the house. His dad was a mechanic for many years and had several buildings for different uses until he passed away. He continues to use the large shop that is located in Forsyth County.

Mr. Bell stated that the way that the Tax Department works is that there may be a parcel that shows up or part of a parcel that shows up in both counties,

but it was described to him as there is a gentlemen's agreement that maybe Forsyth will decide to tax it or Guilford may decide to tax it. Currently, it is being taxed in Forsyth County.

Counsel Cost stated that they would be willing to consider a condition that moved the line that does not take all of both of the properties or possibly table this to another meeting for them to fully understand everything that is involved and what that would mean for the required buffers and all of that.

In response to a question concerning whether the signed petition should be certified or notarized, Counsel Leslie-Fite stated that these particular signatures are not required to have notarized signatures of that type, the signatures are just taken as information and guidance that has been tendered.

Scott Murray, 5543 Macy Grove Road, stated that he did sign the petition, and he does agree with it. He does have the longest border on the east side, and he does have concerns about the area because it has been a mess for many, many years. He is curious about this being spot zoning, and he doesn't understand why the entire area wouldn't be at least available to be rezoned. He does support Mr. Angel's request.

Mr. Gullick asked Mr. Angel if he felt that he needed more time on this to come at it from other angles? Mr. Angel responded that if they just do the larger parcel, as far as the driveway, it would come in from an abutting property, and they have used that driveway for a very long time, and it would be hard to put a buffer there. But, if he does that, he wouldn't be able to use the shop.

Counsel Cost advised Mr. Angel to table that, if it came to suggesting a condition, simply because they have not analyzed what the buffer and planting requirements would be under that new proposal. They would also need to consider the legal ramifications and the economic ramifications first.

Mr. Craft said, just for historical perspective, this property was farmed and was used for mechanical purposes, and over time, the farming went away, and the mechanical part grew. At what point were vehicles starting to be stored on the property in significant numbers? Mr. Angel stated that was about 20 years ago.

Counsel Cost added that this is not a legal quandary that they set up; this has been a very difficult situation to navigate on this County line, and nobody knows about complying with two different UDOs, to the extent that staff is not able to enforce buffers, he doesn't know a way around that in a conditional zoning request. They are certainly willing to comply with the conditions and do whatever they can to get this rezoning approved.

Chair Donnelly asked, as a suggestion, if it would be more acceptable to his colleagues if there was a planted berm, and that way to have any consideration of all of these other barriers but have created something that they would have some confidence might provide the protection everyone is trying to provide. Mr. Angel stated that he has spoken with the neighbors about planting a type of tree that stays green and grows really fast, and he would certainly be agreeable to that. Mr. Cost asked if there is a way that they can officially propose that as a condition. Chair Donnelly stated that any new condition would have to be offered and approved by the Board members.

Mr. Gullick stated that one other suggestion might be to continue the case, allow them to figure out exactly what is needed to develop a new plan, and come back.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak either in favor or in opposition to the request.

Crystal Ridge, 5529 Macy Grove Road, stated that they live adjacent to this property, and they support this business and are not in opposition to the request, but much of the discussion tonight pertaining the County line and the question there is very much of a concern. One moment, there will be berms, and then in another moment, they can't be enforced, so they are a little confused. She pointed out that the property lines on the maps shared are also very confusing and not where they thought they should be. They pay taxes in Forsyth County and have for the past 23 years.

Counsel Cost stated that the maps they provided were for demonstration purposes and because there is the uncertainty about where the line is and what that would mean for the buffer requirements.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request, and there being none, the public hearing was closed by acclamation.

Discussion:

Mr. Alston asked if he could entertain a motion to table this until a later meeting. It seems as though that there may be a few things that they need to work out, as far as the buffers and things of that nature. He feels that there needs to be a little more clarification.

Counsel Cost stated that they would certainly be willing to table the request; however, he is not aware of anything that they can provide in writing that is going to bind them by the Planning staff's interpretation, outside of Guilford County's jurisdiction. If they had another month, they would take that time

to consider just rezoning the Macy Grove property and talk about plans if there is anything else they can do to get this binding on them. They are willing to take that on, but that opportunity has not been presented to them.

Chair Donnelly stated that it is his understanding that Mr. Alston wanted to make the motion to table this request. Mr. Alston affirmed that was correct.

Leslie Bell stated that he would ask for consideration in accordance with the Ordinance to say, “up to two (2) months” because they still have to juggle a few things with existing cases.

Mr. Gullick stated that he would second Mr. Alston’s motion.

Chair Donnelly stated that the motion that is on the table is to continue this request for up to two (2) months to allow for some additional work on conditions and options to be brought back at that point in the future, seconded by Mr. Gullick.

Mr. Little stated that he was unsure whether their counsel was saying that they can come back with something if they work with staff or not? Mr. Gullick stated that he felt it would be helpful if the neighbors would come and speak on this matter. Rev. Drumwright stated that it was his understanding that was why they signed the petition.

Mr. Alston stated that there was one witness here who stated that he had signed the petition, but he didn’t really understand what he was signing. That was a red flag for him, and he would like to hear back from some of the other neighbors as to whether they are clear about what is being presented and requested. Rev. Drumwright pointed out that that was not a requirement and before this applicant is sent back, what happens if those neighbors decline to attend the next time? The gentleman that spoke earlier, as a neighbor, did clarify that he has not changed his support, even after hearing all that he had heard tonight. He feels that should be taken into consideration also. In addition, the applicant has said there’s really not any more that they can do, even given more time.

Counsel Leslie-Fite stated that there has been a motion and a second, but no vote has been registered as yet. She asked them to be clear about a date-certain motion, if they could. Mr. Bell interjected that he knows what is on the schedule for the next couple of months, and there are already two (2) special meetings to do. Staff still sends notices out to the public because some people may not be here, and they need to be here. He would much prefer that they have the latitude of when to do that, and they would send notices out because they normally do that anyway. He would prefer that it be stated as “up to two (2) months” rather than a date-certain motion.

Mr. Gullick stated that when he made the statement about bringing neighbors in for the meeting, that is certainly not a requirement, and that was not his intention to make it sound like that. That was just simply for discussion.

Chair Donnelly stated that there is a motion on the table and properly seconded to continue the request for up to two (2) months. He asked for a roll-call vote. The Board voted 2-5 and the motion to continue was denied (Ayes: Alston and Gullick. Nays: Craft, Drumwright, Little, Stalder and Donnelly). Therefore, the motion to continue was denied and the case continued to be heard.

Discussion:

Mr. Craft stated that areas redevelop when landowners get together or developers come in and consolidate land and create office parks and business centers. This is a well-established business in this area and has evolved and grown, and it is generally supported by the area. It is the type of business that is extremely limited in the zoning. This is not opening up the Light Industrial genie bottle. This is not an unusual business right off a major highway and interstate.

Mr. Little stated that he is very familiar with this area, and it goes well with the area, and it is a very limited type of business.

Rev. Drumwright stated that counsel did a great job of presenting the information to the staff's recommendation to not approve it, but he feels that the proposed use is well within the description of the use of this particular property. He would support the request with the added conditions.

Mr. Stalder stated that he would support Mr. Craft's motion. He is fearful that not rezoning this now, it would lead to something where the area ends up in limbo and doesn't end up developing at all. The existing use has outgrown the AG zoning in the area.

Chair Donnelly pointed out that having a business there is something that is valuable for the community and could be considered reasonable and in the public interest. This is a relevant consideration in what the Board does here. This does not fit neatly into a box, and there are some challenges associated with the County line here. There are buffers and protections that will help those neighbors, and it sounds like there may also be some in the adjoining jurisdiction. The conditions articulated here seem to address the concerns of some of the neighbors. He will be inclined to support the request.

Mr. Craft moved to approve this zoning map amendment located on Guilford County Parcels # 169155 and 227088 from AG to CZ-LI and noted that

although this approval does not amend the Airport Area Plan, as the requested action is consistent with that plan, it does amend the Heart of the Triad Area Plan recommendation to Business Support. The zoning map amendment and associated Heart of the Triad Area Plan amendment are based on the following changes and conditions of the Heart of the Triad Area Plan; this is an existing use that has operated here for many years close to a major highway and generally supported by surrounding residents in an area that is evolving with many different types of uses. This amendment is reasonable and in the public interest because it helps coordinate Comprehensive Planning efforts with Greensboro, High Point, incorporated towns, and neighboring counties to promote thoughtful and complementary land development patterns and policies. Mr. Stalder seconded the motion. The Board voted 6-1 in favor of the motion, and the request was granted (Ayes: Donnelly, Alston, Craft, Drumwright, Stalder, Little. Nays: Gullick).

Mr. Alston asked to be excused from the remainder of the meeting as he has another engagement.

Mr. Craft moved to excuse Mr. Alston, seconded by Mr. Little. The motion was approved by acclamation.

VII. New Business

Legislative Hearing Item(s)

- A. ROAD RENAMING CASE #24-06-PLBD-00086: CLEGGSMITH ROAD.** Presently known as Cleggsmith Road, this road is located in Fentress Township running approximately 0.16 miles north from Wiley Lewis Road and terminating at the northern property line of Guilford County Tax Parcel #222993.

Aaron Calloway, Guilford County Planner, stated that WHEREAS, pursuant to NC. General Statute 153(a)-239.1, Notices were posted for the Public Hearing for this road is located in Fentress Township running approximately 0.16 miles north from Wiley Lewis Road and terminating at the northern property line of Guilford County Tax Parcel #222993. This renaming request to rename the road to Richmond Jones Lane is in response to a voluntary petition filed and signed by greater than 51% of the property owners along the road.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Cathy Richmond, 3707 Cleggsmith Road, stated that she just bought this property from the Cleggsmiths, and she would like for the road to be

renamed for her family as Richmond Jones Lane. There is another neighbor who has their mailbox sitting on that side of the road, but who actually lives on Wiley Lewis Road. He has already signed the petition, and she has met with other neighbors, and no one has any objections.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak on this matter, and no one came forward. Therefore, the public hearing was closed by acclamation.

Rev. Drumwright moved to adopt the road renaming petition, as presented, seconded by Mr. Gullick. The Board voted unanimously, 6-0-1, in favor of the motion (Ayes: Donnelly, Gulick, Little, Stalder, Craft, Drumwright. Nays: None. Excused: Alston).

Evidentiary Hearing Item(s)

B. SPECIAL USE PERMIT CASE #24-05-PLBD-00084: ENERGY SUBSTATION (MAJOR UTILITY): 1872 ANDREWS FARM RD (CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 2 - SPECIAL MEETING)

Located at 1872 Andrews Farm Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #229086 in Jefferson Township) at the northwest intersection of McConnell Road, this parcel comprises approximately 12.53 acres and is zoned AG, Agricultural.

VIII. Other Business

Comprehensive Plan Update

Leslie Bell stated that the Comprehensive Plan public review and comment period has been extended until August 31, 2024, and it is available on the County's website for any responses.

On August 21, there will be a legislative hearing on approximately 1,000 acres de-annexed from Summerfield. Members may have received or should receive information on this hearing via US Mail. Chair Donnelly also indicated that there will be a Zoom option for those who want to listen and/or watch virtually.

IX. Adjourn

There being no further business before the Board the meeting adjourned at 8:23 P.M.

A called special meeting will take place August 21, 2024.

The next regular meeting will take place September 11, 2024.