

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

NC Cooperative Extension – Agricultural Center  
3309 Burlington Road, Greensboro, NC 27405

**December 11, 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; David Craft, Vice Chair; Guy Gullick; Dr. Nho Bui; Sam Stalder; Rev. Gregory B. Drumwright; and Ryan Alston

The following members were absent from this meeting:

Cara Buchanan and Jason Little

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

J. Leslie Bell, Planning and Development Director; Oliver Bass, Planning and Zoning Manager; Troy Moss, Planning Technician; Matthew Mason, Chief Deputy County Attorney; and Bobby Carmon, Fire Marshal

**II. Agenda Amendments**

None

**III. Approval of Minutes: November 13, 2024**

Chair Donnelly stated that these minutes were from a Special Meeting held on October 23rd, for purposes of making a decision on the Summerfield property. The Board made a decision to approve the rezoning request by a majority less than a super-majority, so the Board of County Commissioners has scheduled to hear this case on December 19th. Because of that, these minutes will be part of the information they may use to review that case. The Board members now have the opportunity to make any changes or adjustments to the minutes. Mr. Donnelly noted one adjustment, as indicated by Mr. Bass, the minutes do not reflect the prohibition of the use of an outdoor theater, so that will be added. Mr. Donnelly added a few other smaller items to clarify information as the meeting went along.

He asked if there were any other questions or comments on the meeting minutes. Mr. Bell stated that Rev. Drumwright had questions and Mr. Donnelly responded that he had spoken with Rev. Drumwright earlier and he was now comfortable with the minutes.

Mr. Craft moved to approve the minutes for the October 23, 2024 meeting, as amended, seconded by Mr. Gullick. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Gullick, Craft, Alston, Bui, Drumwright, Stalder. Nays: None.)

#### **IV. Rules and Procedures**

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

#### **V. Continuance Requests**

None

#### **VI. Old Business**

None

#### **VII. New Business**

##### **Legislative Hearing Item(s)**

##### **A. CONDITIONAL REZONING CASE #24-11-PLBD-00100: CZ-LI, CONDITIONAL ZONING-LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (CASE #65-99) TO CZ-LI AMENDED, CONDITIONAL ZONING-LIGHT INDUSTRIAL AMENDED: 7838 JACKSON SCHOOL ROAD (APPROVED)**

Oliver Bass stated that the property is located at 7838 Jackson School Road (Guilford County Tax Parcel #112561 in Madison Township) approximately 728 feet south of NC Highway 150 and comprises approximately 1.51 acres. This proposed request is to conditionally rezone said parcel from CZ-LI (Reference Case #6599) approved by the Planning Board on October 13, 1999, with the following Use Conditions (1) Printing and Publishing to CZ-LI and requesting to amend with the following conditions: Use Conditions - Use of the property shall be limited to the following uses: (1) Office (General), (2) Personal Service, (3) Insurance Agency (Carriers and On-site Claims Inspections), and (4) Medical or Professional Office. Development Conditions: None offered.

The subject parcel is primarily in a low-density area of residential development and agricultural uses with areas of commercial and public and institutional uses nearby. The existing use on the parcel is a commercial printing service

business. Surrounding uses are a residential subdivision currently zoned RS-30. South of the property is rural residential, east there is a residential subdivision that is currently under review, and to the west there is rural residential and agricultural uses. The property is not served by public water and sewer utilities. Jackson School Road is classified as a Collector Street in the 2005 Greensboro MPO Collector Street Plan for Guilford County. The AADT for Jackson School Road is 650 vehicles per the 2023 NCDOT traffic count. There are no proposed road improvements in the area. Any new development is subject to an NCDOT driveway permit. The topography is gently sloping and there is no regulated floodplain on the property per FIRM Map # 3710880900J with effective date 6/18/2007, and there are no mapped wetlands on the property per the National Wetlands Inventory. The parcel is located in the Northeast Area Plan with a recommendation of Light Industrial. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Northeast Area Plan recommendation of Light Industrial land use designation. Light Industrial is designated to recognize land currently zoned or recommended to be zoned LI that is or could be developed under the LI standards of the Guilford County Development Ordinance.

Additionally, it is consistent with the Future Land Use Element of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan Objective 1.1, which states "Continue to use community-based area plans as the cornerstone for future land use and policy decisions," and the associated Policy 1.1.1, which states "Planning staff will continue to utilize the future land uses depicted on citizen-based Area Plans, in conjunction with the rezoning guidance matrix, as the basis for land use and policy recommendations." Therefore, staff recommends approval. The request to conditionally rezone the subject property to CZ-LI with the proposed conditions is reasonable and in the public interest because it is consistent with the Northeast Area Plan's Light Industrial recommendation and Objective 1.1 and Policy 1.1.1 of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan as presented above. The uses permitted under the proposed use conditions are consistent with those permitted under the current zoning. Also, they are listed in commercial zoning districts established to provide services to nearby neighborhoods, such as the MXU, NB, or LB commercial districts. Since the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Northeast Area Plan recommendation of Light Industrial, if the request is approved, an amendment to the Northeast Area Plan will not be required.

Chair Donnelly asked if there were any questions by Board members for Mr. Bass.

Mr. Craft asked if there are any development conditions that would come into play, such as a buffer or anything like that or are they grandfathered in? Mr. Bass responded that the building is existing and it would kick in the adjustment to the building area or the parking area.

Chair Donnelly pointed out that when he went out to the property he noted that the pictures do not represent that there are currently houses on the lots that front Jackson School Road. He also asked about the Permitted Use Schedule. Mr. Bass stated that the table shown indicates what uses would be permitted under the current zoning and it provides a comparison to other zoning districts where the use would also be permitted, which include the uses allowed in the Limited Office Mixed Use neighborhood business and Limited Business, which is the least restrictive zoning in the LI zoning district.

Chair Donnelly opened the public hearing and asked if any speakers wanted to come forward to speak on this case.

Robin VanDeMoere, 7838 Jackson School Road, stated that they represent Windmill Developers, the property owner and applicant for this request. The purpose of the presentation is to request the addition of several complementary uses for the existing zoning which allows only printing and publishing. They are printers and purchased the property for that use. The building is 6,000 square feet and they did not change or modify the building. They did renovate the inside of the building over the last several months. They currently occupy 2/3 of the building. They realized that they have 1/3 of the building that could be used as a rental or some other usage, but the zoning was for printing and publishing only. They have been in business for 30 years and this is the fourth commercial property they have owned. They are hoping to add the following uses for this property, as mentioned by Mr. Bass: Office, Personnel Services, Insurance Agency or Medical and Professional Offices. They want to lease out the extra space to another clean business like theirs. They are printers but they are modern printers, as all of their papers are recycled and forestry certified and the inks are pulverized toners and are not liquid ink. It is digital printing which is very clean. Jackson School Road is situated in a well-established area and, currently, the property serves as the located for their printing business. They recognize the opportunity to better utilize that space and expand the allowable uses in a way that serves the broader community and generates sustainable growth. The location is conveniently positioned with easy access to major roads, making it an ideal place for range of offices or businesses. The surrounding areas include a mix of commercial and residential properties which would benefit from the proposed additional business in the area, so there would be no disruption to that area. The proposed additional uses are compatible with the surrounding area, which includes other office space and light commercial businesses. The addition of new uses would not create any significant changes to the neighborhood and will instead complement the area's development goals. The request to expand the allowable uses is designed to bring a variety of benefits to the community by permitting general office uses, personal services, insurance agency or medical office uses and will help meet the demand for local services, perhaps create jobs, and increase economic viability of the property and better serve the residents in Browns Summit and the surrounding areas. They have carefully considered the impact of these

proposed uses and believe that it will enhance the community's character and contribute to growth in a positive, sustainable manner. They ask for the Board's support in approving the zoning change and appreciate the Board's time and consideration. Some booklets were given to the Board members for their review.

Mr. Gullick asked if they would consider including a condition for "no long-term parking on the subject property" to address, for example, car storage for an insurance agency. Ms. VanDeMoere responded that they do not anticipate the chosen insurance agency to need to have auto storage on the property. They would be willing to accept that as a condition.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Craft, Mr. Bass stated that based on how the conditions are written, it does not prohibit outdoor storage of automobiles. They would have to be screened, but it does not prohibit their storage.

Mr. Stalder stated that just removing "On-Site Claims Inspections" might address that concern. Rev. Drumwright asked if an insurance agency that processes claims would store cars on-site or if cars would be inspected but would not remain on the property for a long time.

Mr. Gullick stated that he is just trying to protect the surrounding uses from having a large amount of long-term storage of vehicles on the property. He just thinks there should be some protection for that. Rev. Drumwright stated that he agrees with that.

Mr. Craft asked if a motion to amend the condition to strike "On-Site Claims Inspections" would address these concerns? Mr. Craft added that a vehicle might be on-site for a day or so to give the insurance agent time to inspect the vehicle for damages, but generally vehicles go to a body shop to get inspected and to determine exactly what repairs have to be done. If the Board wishes to strike that phrase, he has no problem with that.

Chair Donnelly asked Ms. VanDeMoere if she has had communication with any of the neighbors about their proposed plans for the subject property. Ms. VanDeMoere responded that they have spoken with the neighbors several times and they have not indicated any concerns. She stated that there is not a lot of walk-in business and most of their business is done on-line. They do have deliveries from FedEx and UPS and DHL, but very few walk-in customers.

Chair Donnelly stated that in the Permitted Use Table, the Insurance Agency use is not included under LO and he wanted to make sure that he understands the typical intensity of those uses that would have them excluded from those categories. Mr. Bass responded that the LO district is less intense and that the Insurance Agency use generally would not be compatible with LO based on the

description of the zoning district. It is limited office, meaning less intense office uses.

Taylor Howell, realtor for the applicant, stated that with the use of Real Estate Agency and Insurance Agency, if they strike the phrase "On-Site Claims Inspections", would that cause a problem for Farm Bureau, which is someone they have been talking with about renting the space.

Rev. Drumwright stated that this gets into what he was speaking about earlier. If you strike the ability to process claims, solely because you don't want long-term car storage, which everyone seems to agree to, even the owners, then you may prohibit the ability for an insurance carrier to do business there. Rev. Drumwright stated that he is concerned that if the Board prohibits the ability for an insurance carrier to do business there, he asked if the Board could limit the use of the space from being used to house long-term car storage, but not strike insurance carriers' ability to process claims there. Mr. Bass stated that that would be a development condition. Rev. Drumwright asked if that gets to the essence of Ms. Howell's question.

Ms. Howell stated that it does, but she wants to make sure that in striking that out, even though they are not going to have long-term vehicle storage on the property, she doesn't want to negate the fact that they have insurance people that they have been speaking with and then not be able to rent to them.

In regard to a concern posed by Mr. Craft concerning possibly putting up a fence on the property, Ms. Howell stated that if they put in a fence, it would impede the driveway to get back into the community, so they asked that a fence not be required on the property.

Mr. Bell added that if this is addressed through the Permitted Uses Table, it would actually be a Use Condition. An example would be Automotive Towing and Storage Services, which is allowed with development standards in the LI zoning district. That use is excluded, but if the Board wants to put another condition that, if it is an insurance carrier, that you do not want vehicles there over a certain amount of time, then the Board could have this discussion about that, but in terms of the long-term storage of vehicles, he thinks that is addressed and has been excluded as a use.

Chair Donnelly stated that they might have a condition that disallows anything beyond single, overnight storage in association with insurance carriers. Mr. Bell stated that was correct, if the applicant agrees to that.

Mr. Craft stated that he feels the Board is kind of micro-managing, as the uses are so limited and long-term storage is already excluded, and he does not feel that they need to talk about any additional conditions. On-site claims

inspections are generally going to get done at a body shop or somewhere else, not at the insurance office.

Mr. Bell stated that he had some damage to his vehicle and the inspections were all done remotely. He said he doesn't know how relevant that is but that is a way of doing business now.

Chair Donnelly asked for the Board members to let him know how they feel about the consideration of including that as an additional use condition.

Mr. Stalder stated that he feels it should be left like it is now. He does not think they need to add an additional development condition to it.

Mr. Gullick stated that he would agree with Mr. Stalder.

Mr. Alston stated that he would agree with that also.

Dr. Bui stated that she also agrees, especially with the realtor saying that they have a potential tenant that wants to come in, and if a condition is put in place, it would probably cause some delay or issues. Looking at the location of the property, it is actually in a country-side area and she doubts that there would be much traffic or cars that would be parked there long-term. She feels it should just be left as it is.

Chair Donnelly asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to this matter. No one coming forward, Chair Donnelly asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Gullick moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Dr. Bui. The Board voted unanimously 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Gullick, Craft, Alston, Bui, Drumwright, Stalder. Nays: None.)

#### Discussion

Mr. Craft stated that he is inclined to support the request as presented, and he moved to approve the zoning map amendment located on Guilford County Tax Parcel #112561, from CZ-LI to CZ-LI Amended, because the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Northeast Area Plan recommendation of Light Industrial and that designation recognizes land zoned and recommended to be zoned for LI that could be developed under LI standards under the Guilford County Unified Development Ordinance. It is consistent with future land use elements of the Guilford County Comprehensive Plan Objective 1.1, which states, "Continue to use community-based plans as the cornerstone for future land use and policy decisions," and Policy 1.1.1, which states "Planning staff will continue to utilize future land use depicted on citizen-based area plans in conjunction with rezoning guidance matrix as the basis for land use plans and policy recommendations." The request to rezone the subject property to CZ-LI

Amended, with the proposed conditions is reasonable and in the public interest because it is consistent with the Northeast Area Plan LI recommendation and Guilford County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element Objective 1.1 and Policy 1.1.1. The uses permitted under the proposed use conditions and are consistent with those permitted under the current zoning. Also listed in commercial zoning districts and establish to provide services to nearby neighborhoods. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Guilford County Northeast Area Plan recommendation of Light Industrial, so if approved, an amendment to the Northeast Area Plan will not be required. The motion was seconded by Rev. Drumwright. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Gullick, Craft, Alston, Bui, Drumwright, Stalder. Nays: None.)

## **VIII. Other Business**

### **A. Comprehensive Plan Update**

Mr. Bell stated that, as the Board may recall, there was a thirty (30) day comment period after the draft of the Comprehensive Plan was made available to the public for review. The responses are included in the Board members' packets as well as a summarization of those comments. 80.8% of participants expressed support of the Comprehensive Plan as drafted. Overwhelmingly, almost 28.5% was concerned about preservation of the rural character, agricultural heritage and environmental spaces in Guilford County. Overall, the responses indicated concern about development, again, in rural areas and reflect the desire to protect the rural character of the County. Chair Donnelly and Vice-Chair Gullick were involved in the meeting held last week with Design Workshop as well as the Steering Committee representative, Mack Sims. This was reviewed and it is seen as a transition point from the Steering Committee to the Planning Board. The next steps will be, based on a sub-committee that the Steering Committee agreed upon, which included Chairman Sims, the Vice-Chair of the Planning Board, after review there will be some changes to the Plan and he will let the Planning Board know what those changes are, so they will have an idea about that. In the Plan, the timeline for the initiatives are between 0 and 3 years, 4 years to about 6 years, and then beyond 6 years, with some in each of those timeframes listed as ongoing, as well. The most near term, 0 to 3 years, will be the ones that will be highlighted that will be presented to the Planning Board, as well as the Commissioners, and then secondly, as a hand-out, the main policy themes will be condensed to 1 to 2 pages with illustrations or graphics that highlight comments and some of the recommendations. Staff anticipates that maybe within the next 30 days or so and then move it forward to the Planning Board.

Chair Donnelly stated that they had the opportunity to review the document that came out as a part of the packet and he has gone through the Executive Summary as well as the comments and there was discussion with the folks at



the Design Workshop about some of those comments. There are clearly some people who don't fully understand how the Comprehensive Plan relates to the work they do in the community. One of the things that they are going to do, as they are making the modifications to the document, is try to articulate more clearly what this document is and what is it not so that everybody can understand that and at least have expectations that are consistent with what the document attempts to cover. The piece that got some folks excited in the follow-up comments, was the rural character and agricultural heritage. The consultants talked about way they can highlight that, but what they have done is indicate how the Plan already addresses that. It does not need to be added to the Plan, but is something that is already in the Plan that can be highlighted in some places, as necessary.

Mr. Bell stated that the draft is available for review on the Guilford County website on the Planning and Development Department's web page.

#### **B. Final Planning Board CY2025 Meeting Schedule**

Chair Donnelly stated that there has been discussion concerning moving the meeting location to the Carolyn Q. Coleman Conference Room in the Old Guilford County Courthouse, located downtown. It has been confirmed as being available, so the schedule in the packets reflects that that will be the new meeting location beginning January 2025.

#### **C. Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Mr. Gullick nominated Mr. Donnelly to remain serving as Chair, seconded by Mr. Craft. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Gullick, Craft, Alston, Bui, Drumwright, Stalder. Nays: None.)

Mr. Gullick nominated Mr. Craft to serve as Vice-Chair, seconded by Mr. Stalder. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Donnelly, Gullick, Craft, Alston, Bui, Drumwright, Stalder. Nays: None.)

#### **IX. Adjourn**

There being no further business before the Board, Chair Donnelly declared the meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

*The next regular meeting will take place January 8, 2025.*