



Town of Jamestown  
Planning Board

*Welcome to the Town of Jamestown Planning Board meeting. We appreciate your interest and we encourage public participation in our meeting. Your comments are important to our decision making process. Please note that there will be opportunities during the meeting for you to address the Board members. The first opportunity will come if there is a public hearing on the agenda, when the Chair declares the hearing open for comment. The second opportunity to address the Board will come near the end of the agenda when the Chair will inquire if anyone wishes to address the members of the Board. Anyone addressing the Board will approach the podium; give your first and last name and your complete physical address. Comments may be limited to three minutes.*

TO: Planning Board Members

FROM: Matthew Johnson, AICP - Director of Planning

RE: **Regular Meeting**  
**Monday, October 12, 2020 – 6:00 PM**  
**Jamestown Town Hall, Council Chambers**

Items on the agenda:

1. Call to Order – Sarah Glanville, Chair of the Planning Board
2. Roll Call – Matthew Johnson, Assistant Town Manager/Director of Planning
3. Consideration of the adoption of the August 24, 2020, Special Called Meeting Minutes – Sarah Glanville, Chair of the Planning Board
4. Public Hearings:  
*Procedure: Staff will present the case to the Board, followed by commentary from the applicant. The Chair will open the public hearing and request to hear from both those in favor and those opposed. If you wish to address the Board during the public hearing, please come to the podium and state your name and address for the record. Speakers may have up to 3 minutes to address the Board. Please note, this is not a time for dialogue or discussion and the Board may or may not engage with you at this time, even if direct questions are asked. **Once the public hearing is closed, no one may speak on the issue unless specifically requested by the Board Chair.***
  - A. CONTINUED FROM THE September 28, 2020, special called meeting - Rezoning Request – Matthew Johnson, Assistant Town Manager/Director of Planning. A rezoning application has been received for the following parcels:
    - i. 2221 Guilford College Rd. (Parcel #159144) Approx. 27.89 ac +/- . From AG (Agricultural) to PUD (Planned Unit Development).
    - ii. 5300 Mackay Rd. (Parcel #159105) Approx. 30.70 ac +/- . From AG to PUD.

- iii. 2207 Guilford College Rd. (Parcel #159106) Approx. 384.49 ac +/- From AG to PUD.
- iv. 5303 Mackay Rd. (Parcel #158765) Approx. 0.6 ac +/- From AG to PUD .

***\*\*This will be a continuation of the standard public hearing format whereby the applicant and the Board will engage in dialogue about the proposal. The purpose of this meeting will be to allow the Board to further explore the plans for the development and to encourage a conversation amongst Board members to find solutions which meet the vision for the Board and the public. The meeting discussion will be facilitated by Benchmark Planning, consultants to the Town.\*\****

***\*\*The public will be invited to speak at this meeting. Due to COVID-19 restrictions and the limited space available in the Council Chambers there will not be space available for a public audience. The meeting is available to view live on YouTube at [www.youtube.com/c/TownofJamestownNC](http://www.youtube.com/c/TownofJamestownNC). Those wishing to speak should line up outside the Council Chambers doors at 6pm. An usher will escort you into the building one at a time and each speaker will have 3 minutes to address the Board. Temperatures will be taken with a contactless thermometer and face coverings are encouraged.\*\****

- b. Vote on recommendation to Town Council –Chair of the Planning Board (\*\*to be continued to a later meeting date\*\*)
  - c. Adoption of the Statement of Consistency –Chair of the Planning Board (\*\*to be continued to a later meeting date\*\*)
5. Discuss possible change of time and venue for next meeting – Matthew Johnson, Assistant Town Manager/Planning Director
- a. Staff recommends adjusting the time and location for this meeting to allow for longer periods of discussion amongst Board members and the consultant. A date will be discussed and decided upon during the meeting.
6. Public Comment – Sarah Glanville, Chair of the Planning Board
7. Adjourn
8. Next regularly scheduled meeting will be announced in agenda item #5.

***\*\*Due to COVID-19, restrictions on public entry to Town Hall will be observed. Public entry will be permitted at the Oct. 12, 2020, meeting during the public hearing as described above.\*\****

Anyone entering Town Hall must agree to have their temperature taken by a contactless thermometer and are encouraged to wear a face covering.

The meeting will be broadcast live on the Town’s YouTube channel at:

<https://www.youtube.com/c/TownofJamestownNC>

Click “Subscribe” and tap the “bell” icon to be notified when we go live.

**WORKING AGENDA**

*Items on the agenda:*

**1. Call to Order – Sarah Glanville, Chair of the Planning Board**

- i. Welcome to the **October 12, 2020, Regular Planning Board meeting**. In order to allow all attendees to be able to hear Board business, I would ask that at this time, members of the board and the audience please set your cell phones to “SILENT”. Thank you.

**2. ROLL CALL**

	Present	Absent
Sarah Glanville	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dennis Sholl	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Eddie Oakley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ed Stafford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Russ Walker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Richard Newbill, ETJ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Steve Monroe, ETJ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cara Arena, ETJ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sherrie Richmond, ETJ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rebecca Rayborn, Council Rep.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3. Consideration of the adoption of the August 24, 2020, Special Called Meeting Minutes – Sarah Glanville, Chair of the Planning Board**

- a. Motion to adopt minutes:
- b. Second:
- c. VOTE:

**4. Public Hearings**

- A. CONTINUED FROM THE Sept. 28, 2020, special called meeting. Rezoning Request – Matthew Johnson, Assistant Town Manager/Director of Planning. A rezoning application has been received for the following parcels:
  - i. 2221 Guilford College Rd. (Parcel #159144) Approx. 27.89 ac +/-.  
From AG (Agricultural) to PUD (Planned Unit Development).
  - ii. 5300 Mackay Rd. (Parcel #159105) Approx. 30.70 ac +/-.  
From AG to PUD.
  - iii. 2207 Guilford College Rd. (Parcel #159106) Approx. 384.49 ac +/-.  
From AG to PUD.

- iv. 5303 Mackay Rd. (Parcel #158765) Approx. 0.6 ac +/- . From AG to PUD .
  - b. Vote on recommendation to Town Council –Chair of the Planning Board (\*\*to be continued to a later meeting date\*\*)
  - c. Adoption of the Statement of Consistency –Chair of the Planning Board (\*\*to be continued to a later meeting date\*\*)
  
- 5. **Discuss possible change of time and venue for next meeting – Matthew Johnson, Assistant Town Manager/Planning Director**
  - a. Staff recommends adjusting the time and location for this meeting to allow for longer periods of discussion amongst Board members and the consultant. A date will be discussed and decided upon during the meeting
  
- 6. **Public Comment – Sarah Glanville, Chair of the Planning Board**
  
- 7. **Adjourn**
  - a. **Motion to adjourn:**
  - b. **Second:**
  - c. **VOTE:**
  
- 8. **Next regularly scheduled meeting will be announced in agenda item #5.**

**DRAFT**

**Planning Board Special Meeting  
August 24, 2020  
6:00 pm in the Civic Center  
Minutes & General Account**

**Planning Board Members Present:** Sarah Glanville, Chair; Ed Stafford, Vice Chair; Eddie Oakley, Russ Walker, Dennis Sholl, Richard Newbill (ETJ), Steve Monroe (ETJ), Sherrie Richmond (ETJ), & Cara Arena (ETJ)

**Council Member Representative:** Rebecca Mann Rayborn

**Staff Present:** Kenny Cole, Matthew Johnson, & Katie Weiner

**Visitors Present:** Kerry Miller, Jane Walker Payne, Amanda Hodierne, Zach Tran, Jeff Hochanadel, Beth Blackman, & Neal Beasley

**Call to Order-** Glanville called the meeting to order.

Glanville welcomed the newest ETJ Planning Board Member, Cara Arena.

Arena introduced herself to the Board, and Glanville thanked her for being willing to serve.

**Roll Call-** Johnson took roll call as follows:

Sarah Glanville- Present  
Dennis Sholl- Present  
Eddie Oakley- Present  
Ed Stafford- Absent  
Russ Walker- Present  
Richard Newbill- Present  
Steve Monroe- Present  
Cara Arena- Present  
Sherrie Richmond- Present

Rebecca Mann Rayborn- Present

**Public Hearing for Rezoning Request for the following parcels: 2221 Guilford College Road, 5300 Mackay Road, 2207 Guilford College Road, 5230 Mackay Road, and 5303 Mackay Road from AG (Agricultural) to PUD (Planned Unit Development)-** Glanville opened the public hearing that had been continued from the August 10<sup>th</sup> Regular Planning Board meeting.

Johnson stated that staff did find through their research that 5230 Mackay Road had already been annexed into Greensboro. He added that there would be more information on those findings later. He noted that it would not cause a problem with the ongoing public hearing.

Johnson gave a brief overview of the agenda for the meeting. He noted that the topic of overcrowding in Guilford County Schools had come up at the previous meeting. He added that the Mayor, staff, and Glanville had been in touch with some of the Guilford County School representatives. He noted that a

letter had been sent regarding the issue to the Planning Board. He said that there was someone present from the Guilford County School system that could answer questions that the Board Members may have.

Glanville called Amanda Hodierne forward. She stated that she was representing her client, Diamondback Investment Group. She said that her office was located at 804 Green Valley Road, Suite 200 in Greensboro. She noted that the following people from the Diamondback team were present: Zach Tran (the Principal of Diamondback Investment Group), Beth Blackman (representative of the design professional team), Jeff Hochanadel (representing the traffic engineers), and Neal Beasley (the arborist consultant).

Glanville stated that there were numerous issues regarding the rezoning request that the Board needed to discuss. She encouraged everyone to focus on one issue at a time in order to have a more organized, productive conversation. She suggested that the Board discuss the school issue first.

Hodierne said that Diamondback remained a ready and willing participant in the conversations regarding the school. Glanville asked Hodierne to provide the Board with information regarding school projections that would result from the development.

Glanville stated that she had reached out to the Guilford County School Board about potential impacts that could result from the development. She added that Deena Hayes-Green, Chairperson of Guilford County Board of Education, sent her a letter which had been distributed to the Board. She noted that she had learned that the Guilford County Board of Commissioners (BOCC) also needed to be involved in the conversation about funding of schools. She added that the BOCC had already identified \$1.6 billion in unmet facility needs across the district without the addition of the development. She highlighted the bond referendum that would be on the ballot for the school system in the upcoming election. Glanville was very concerned about the lack of funding for schools and the unmet needs that already existed within the community. She suggested that the developer consider donating 40 acres of the Johnson property for the construction of a new school. She also underscored the importance of being aware of the Guilford County Schools Master Plan while ensuring that it was aligned with growth.

Stafford arrived at the meeting at 6:20 pm.

The Board Members discussed the Facilities Master Plan, the reduction of density within the development, and the potential of land donation from the developer.

Glanville asked the school representatives to come forward.

Angie Henry, Chief Operating Officer with Guilford County Schools, came forward. She thanked the Planning Board for allowing her to be a part of the conversation. Henry distributed copies of the Guilford County Facilities Master Plan Recommendations to the Planning Board Members. She highlighted certain aspects of the Plan that related to Jamestown. She also gave a brief overview of the Master Facilities Plan in regard to the Jamestown area. She noted that it would take millions of dollars to fund the upgrades to the schools that were listed in the Master Plan. She stated that it was important to encourage the BOCC to continue to prioritize funding improvements and maintaining the schools.

Glanville asked Henry if there were options to address overcrowding that she had seen be successful. Henry said that there was precedent for developers to donate land for a school. She noted that it had occurred a couple of times within the last several years.

Glanville discussed the school bond that would be on the ballot in November with Henry.

Planning Board Members discussed the details of the Master Facilities Plan with Henry.

Glanville thanked Henry for attending the meeting on such short notice and for answering the Board's questions. She said that everyone she had reached out to about the issue had been very responsive.

Glanville asked Khem Irby if she had anything that she would like to add to the discussion.

Khem Irby, School Board Representative for District 6, came forward. Irby thanked the Planning Board Members for reaching out to the School Board. She noted that it was important for everyone to engage in a holistic conversation about the county school system. She added that the Superintendent had taken the initiative to create a Master Plan to ensure that every school's needs were taken into consideration. Irby encouraged everyone to be supportive of the Master Plan and to be mindful of the long-term needs of the schools within Guilford County. She thanked the Planning Board for inviting her to be a part of the conversation regarding the new development and its potential impacts to the school system.

Glanville called Hodiernne forward to continue the discussion about the details of the proposed rezoning.

Hodiernne stated that she was aware of the Master Facilities Plan for the Guilford County schools. She said that she was grateful that the representatives could attend and give everyone more context about the issue. She noted that it would be important for everyone to figure out how to work together within that context moving forward. She added that it may be best to discuss the issue within the parameters of development infrastructure and potential community impacts.

Glanville asked Hodiernne if the developer would be willing to consider donating a portion of land for a new school to be constructed. Hodiernne stated that there would need to be further discussions about the details of a potential donation of land with the School Board. Hodiernne added that it would need to be a much larger conversation, but the developer would be open to it.

Glanville called for a five minute recess at 6:55 pm.

Glanville called the meeting back to order at 7:00 pm.

Glanville stated that she was grateful that the Board had such a thoughtful conversation about the development's impact on the school system. She asked the Planning Board Members which item they would like to discuss next. It was decided that the Board would discuss the square footage of the homes and lot sizes.

Hodiernne stated that it seemed that one of the main concerns that the Board had with lot/home sizes was compatibility with existing neighborhoods. She said that it could be dangerous to think about the homes in terms of whole price and final numbers and how that may compare with areas like Cedarwood. She added that it may be more useful to consider the homes in Castleton Village in terms of price per square foot. Hodiernne said this would allow for everyone to take into consideration that there

were buyers in the market that were looking for different things. She stated that the Board could then consider what elements contribute to the price per square foot.

Hodierne stated that she understood that the development would be located next to multiple different neighborhoods that already exist. However, she said that it was important to remember that the property was almost 500 acres. She noted that it would establish its own neighborhood with a unique feel. Hodierne stated that the new development should complement existing areas and certainly not detract from them. Hodierne added that this would be the first Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) in the Town of Jamestown. She noted that lot sizes were usually a little bit smaller in a TND. She said that the development would need to be compatible, but it would not look exactly like the neighborhoods that have already been developed in the Town.

Richmond was concerned that there would be division between Castleton Village and the rest of Jamestown. She noted that she had heard from several people that they were worried about potential negative impacts to their home values that may result from the development. Hodierne said that everyone wanted to build the best community possible, and she did not believe that the development would lower existing home values.

Monroe stated that the developers would not be able to duplicate Cedarwood, but that Castleton Village should complement the surrounding neighborhoods. He noted that Bourdoux Retreat along Renaissance Parkway was a good example of a development that flattered the existing area.

Sholl said that he had some questions about the dimensions of the townhomes and the size of their garages.

Hodierne requested that Beth Blackman, design representative, provide more information on the design of the townhomes.

Blackman introduced herself to the Board. She noted that she worked for Timmons Group and her office was located at 5410 Trinity Road Suite 102, Raleigh, NC 27607 for the record. She said that the townhomes were generally between fifty and fifty-five feet deep. She said that the garages could accommodate one car.

Sholl discussed the size of the garage with Blackman. Sholl was concerned that the garages would be too small. He added that most people had two cars and that they would probably have to park in the driveway or on the street. Sholl stated that the Town may have to provide garbage totes if the development were annexed because of an increase in demand for trash collection. He was worried that a garbage toter would not fit in the garage along with a vehicle.

Blackman said that there were potential design solutions that could be used to address the concern about the garbage totes. Hodierne stated that the development team would be open to looking into providing an indent within the garage for storage.

Planning Board Members discussed the need for more parking options within the development. Hodierne stated that the developer had planned to provide auxiliary parking. She noted that she would provide more information about where those lots would be located and their specific capacities. Planning Board Members discussed their concerns about the density of the development with Hodierne. Arena stated that she was concerned that the density statistics that were provided by the developer



included public spaces. Hodiernie said that she understood her concerns. However, she noted that smaller lot sizes would allow for more amenities to be provided to the residents of Castleton Village. She added that it was a balancing act and she wanted to be sure that she understood the priorities of the Board.

Sholl was concerned that some of the residents would not be able to walk to the proposed commercial areas. Arena suggested that the developer consider moving the amenities towards the center of the development in order to increase accessibility.

Arena asked whether the amenities would be available for community use. Hodiernie stated that most of the amenities would be available to the residents of Castleton Village through homeowner association dues. She added that the greenway and the proposed baseball field would be dedicated to the Town.

Glanville stated that she was concerned about the "Civic" area being placed at the corner of Guilford College Road and Guilford Road. She noted that it would increase traffic and that any sort of use that would involve sirens would be detrimental to the neighborhoods that already exist surrounding it.

Hodiernie said that the parcel was not very accessible from Guilford College Road. Therefore, the development team believed that it would be best to allow GTCC to do something with the parcel or to set it aside for a different civic use.

Walker discussed the proposed townhomes located on Guilford College Road and Mackay Road. He noted that he lived in Jordan Creek which was adjacent to that parcel. He suggested placing a medical office there instead. Arena stated that the Cedarwood community seemed to be happier to see townhomes in that location than an alternative.

Richmond was concerned about the farmers market being located across from the Cedarwood area. She noted that there was already a farmers market that was held by the Baptist Church. She added that she was concerned about the sustainability of the market during the off season. Hodiernie stated that the developer included the farmers market within the plan as a result of the feedback that they had received from the community in February. She encouraged the Planning Board to be specific about their priorities in order for their concerns to be addressed in the updated plan. Hodiernie highlighted that the developer wanted to provide something for the community that they would enjoy.

Glanville stated that the Planning Board needed to be clear about their changes so that Hodiernie and the rest of the team could begin implementing changes to their plan. She added that there were a lot of topics to cover, and that she did not expect to get through everything in one night.

Hodiernie agreed that there would be several changes made to the plan. Therefore, she added that they did not need to discuss all of the details that night.

Glanville called for a five minute recess at 8:11 pm.

Glanville called the meeting back to order at 8:16 pm.

Glanville called Jeff Hochanadel forward to present an overview of the traffic study that was conducted for the proposed development.

Hochanadel stated that he worked for Timmons Group and his office was located at 5410 Trinity Road Suite 102, Raleigh, NC 27607 for the record. He said that Timmons Group had determined the scope of the project area in 2019. He added that counts were conducted around January 2020 before the Coronavirus pandemic. Hochanadel highlighted that school had still been in session and that the study had taken place during a time with a normal traffic pattern. He added that the study followed all NCDOT guidelines and procedures. They had examined existing year traffic and had also taken into consideration the three phases of growth that were proposed for the Castleton Village Development. He stated that their recommendations had been submitted for NCDOT review and approval. He said he would be happy to answer any questions that the Board may have about the study.

Glanville reiterated that she was concerned about the traffic that would be generated by any use that was placed at the corner of Guilford College Road and Guilford Road. Hochanadel stated that NCDOT would not allow for anything to be constructed on that corner that would create major traffic concerns. He explained the NCDOT approval process to the Planning Board.

The Planning Board discussed the details of the traffic study with Hochanadel.

Monroe asked if there would be sidewalks constructed along Guilford College Road. Hoderne stated that sidewalks would be constructed along that road.

Oakley asked if curb and gutter would be included along Mackay Road. Hoderne stated that she was unsure about the Town's curb and gutter requirements. Oakley requested that staff provide the curb and gutter requirements to the Planning Board.

Planning Board Members discussed potential traffic that would be generated for the Cedarwood community with Hochanadel and Hoderne.

Hoderne thanked the Planning Board Members for their feedback.

Glanville requested that the arborist come forward and give the Planning Board a brief introduction on his role within the development team.

Neal Beasley introduced himself to the Board. He stated that he worked for Timmons Group. He noted that his office was located at 1001 Boulders Parkway #300, Richmond, Virginia 23225 for the record. He added that he went to NC State and had earned a landscape horticulture degree. He noted that he was a registered landscape architect, a certified horticulturist, and a certified arborist.

Beasley stated that he was introduced to the project a few days ago. He added that he had driven the perimeter of the site and had taken a brief list of existing species on the property. He noted that it was very evident in the Town's ordinance that there was a lot of value placed on trees within the community. Beasley gave a brief overview of the protections that were required for trees within the ordinance. He stated that it would take some effort to document the existing species, but he had begun that process.

**Discuss possible change of time and venue for September 14, 2020 Regular Meetings-** Glanville stated that staff had proposed to continue the hearing to September 14<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm.

Walker made a motion to continue the public hearing to September 14<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm in the Civic Center without further advertisement. Monroe made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**Adjournment-** Newbill made a motion to adjourn. Monroe made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

The meeting ended at 9:11 pm.

# BENCHMARK

400 CLARICE AVE STE 130  
CHARLOTTE, NC 28204

## MEMORANDUM

To: Sarah Glanville, Chair  
Town of Jamestown Planning Board  
From: Jason Epley, President  
Date: October 2, 2020  
RE: Planning Board Planned Unit Development Input Summary

---

On September 14 and September 28, Benchmark staff facilitated discussion with the Planning Board regarding the continued review of the proposed rezoning of four properties along Mackay and Guildford College Roads to a Planned Unit Development. The summary of the input gathered from the Planning Board is presented on the following pages.

At the beginning of these discussions, Benchmark provided an overview of key elements related to the review of the proposed rezoning. These elements included:

- Residential Form
- Residential Composition
- Residential Architecture
- Transportation
- Bike & Pedestrian
- Parks
- Public Space
- Open Space
- Commercial
- Community Impacts
- Landscaping
- Project Phasing

After reviewing these elements, the Planning Board provided their input on the issues that are most important to them.

### **Residential Elements**

In regard to the residential elements of the review, the Planning Board considered a comprehensive list of items related to the development form, composition, and architecture proposed in the planned unit development for both single family and townhome units. The following summary represents the main topics of discussion and the most important elements identified by the Planning Board.

#### ***Single Family Residential Design Concerns***

- The quality of cladding materials is important; however, the use of a variety of materials is acceptable. Specifically, the Planning Board would like to see a higher percentage of the primary materials include brick or stone cladding, with a preference for brick to match the character of Jamestown.

- The Planning Board does not desire the use of vinyl siding as the primary material. Although, a mixture of materials, with vinyl or hardy board as a secondary cladding material is acceptable to help create some more affordable homes in the proposed development.
- Windows and architectural details are important, including the use of transom windows, arches, unique features, and other interesting details.
- The use of slabs, crawlspace, or basements should be based on the topography and types of residential structures within the proposed development.
- The buffering/screening of mechanical equipment is desired.
- The Planning Board agreed that a usable porch or covered entrance should be provided along the front of the house.
- The Planning Board had a range of comments concerning lot sizes. These are summarized as follows:
  - A variation in lot size is encouraged from within the development.
  - All of the single family residential lot sizes currently proposed are too small.
  - The overall density of the proposed development is too high.
  - All setbacks (front, side, and rear) are too small.
  - Front yard setbacks should provide for more variation in depth. The proposed range of 18' to 22' (6' change) front yard is too small of a range. Consider a range with 8' to 10' of change.
- The Board would like to see a variety of garage locations (front, side, and rear), with the house as the focal point and less prominent garages.
- The Board desires separate driveways for single family residential lots.
- Driveways should be long enough to allow for a vehicle to be parked without blocking the sidewalk or extending into the roadway.
- The Board would like to see a variety of housing plans / custom designs to avoid a monotonous, "cookie cutter" feel.

### ***Townhome Residential Design Concerns***

- The Planning Board discussed a variety of concerns related to garage size and parking for residential townhomes. These include:
  - Allow for a variety of garage sizes and placement.
  - Ensure garages are at least 12' wide for single loaded and 24' wide for double loaded.
  - One option discussed by the Board was to place larger townhome units with double loaded garages on the end units with single loaded garages located in the middle of the townhome building.
- Driveways should be long enough to allow for a vehicle to be parked without blocking the sidewalk or extending into the roadway.
- Garages should not be focal point of the structure and should be set back.
- The Board would like to explore other options considering garage access for residential townhome buildings.
- The Board would like to see no more than six attached units per townhome building with a preference for four or fewer. A variety is acceptable.
- The Board would like to encourage a variety of one and two story townhome options.

- The Board desires the use of high quality primary cladding materials, such as stone or brick; however not as high of a percentage as would be required for single family residential.
- The use of vinyl, hardy board, and other materials are acceptable as secondary cladding materials.
- A variety of cladding materials and combinations is acceptable.
- The location of townhome units may impact overall design and desires for buffering.
- Windows and architectural details are important, including the use of transom windows, arches, other interesting features, and unique details.
- Outdoor living areas and entertainment space such, as courtyards or decks, are desired to include privacy / buffering of those areas.

### **Proposed Location of Uses**

- The Board does not see a need for a ballfield as presented in the plan and would like to see it removed or relocated so that it is not across from established residential areas.
- The Board would like to see the age targeted housing relocated to a more appropriate (accessible) area, such as the currently proposed location of the ballfield.
- The Board would like to see single family residential uses across from the entrance at Cedarwood instead of the proposed townhomes.
- The Board would like the amenities for the planned unit development to be centrally located within the interior of the development to encourage greater accessibility of the residents within the development, while screening larger play structures and similar facilities from the view of the public from Mackay and Guilford College Roads.
- A strong desire was expressed to reduce the number of cul-de-sacs, while increasing opportunities for connectivity and walkability.
- The Board would like to see a significant buffer area around the entire perimeter of the development.
- The Board would like to examine more options concerning the Civic corner at Guilford College Road and Guildford Road. Is there a demand / need for that type of use? Can this land use be considered open space?
- The Board would like to see the farmer's market moved to the commercial area. The Board questioned if a farmer's market was needed at all and/or if it could become a multi-use area.
- The Board would like to receive more information regarding the pipeline to better assess potential safety concerns related to the pipeline's location within the development and access.

### **Buffering / Screening**

- The Board desires several improvements along Mackay Road. These include:
  - 50' buffer area along Mackay; similar to what is proposed along Guilford College Road.
  - Provide curb, gutter, and sidewalks.
  - Provide a turn lane.
  - Include Greensboro's plans for Mackay Road in the review.
- The Board desires a perimeter buffer to block / screen views. Buffers are to include:
  - Entire perimeter of the proposed development.

- Use of berms to help increase height of vegetation.
- Utilize dense planting patterns of native vegetation.
- Incorporate existing forested/natural vegetative areas as screening where feasible.
- Along areas proposed for development adjacent to the Jordan Creek development.
- The Board also expressed concerns about street lighting and dark skies, specifically:
  - Downward facing lighting.
  - Light color / illumination / bulbs.
  - Scale of street lights / match character of Jamestown.

## **Density**

- The Board is very concerned about the overall density of the development.
- The Board wants to know the overall impact of the development on school capacity.
- The Board suggests smaller townhome buildings, limiting the number of attached units to help reduce overall development density.
- The Board would like more information on how the overall density compares with the minimum dwelling units per acre allowed within the current zoning districts.
- The Board would like to know the number of units per acre for the developable land versus the number of units per acre based on the gross acreage (to better evaluate the overall density).
- The Board would like to know how the overall density compares to Whittington Hall.
- The Board is interested in how the proposed development will impact wastewater treatment capacity.

## **Community Impact**

- The Board is concerned about traffic and would like to have more information from the firm that prepared the traffic impact study.
- The Board wants to know NCDOT's comments concerning accessibility and turn lanes for the development.
- The Board would like to hear from the PSFD concerning any issues with fire protection.
- The Board would like to hear from the Guilford County Sheriff concerning law enforcement impacts.
- The Board would like more information from the Guilford County Schools regarding capacity, land donation, school construction, and the overall potential impacts of the proposed development on the School System.
- The Board wants to know if there will be any challenges presented with trash pickup and recycling.
- The Board would like to see utility lines placed underground.
- The Board would like to see greenways connected to Town greenways, sidewalks, and trails.
- Commercial development comments by the Board included the following:
  - Commercial development is needed to avoid overcrowding of existing commercial areas.
  - No drive-thru businesses should be allowed.
  - The Board would like to see the following uses:
    - Restaurants, Small shops, Professional offices, medical uses, day care facilities, fitness centers, breweries/wine shops, or bicycle shops

## **Other Concerns / Questions**

- The overall density of the development remains an open question and concern.
- The Board would like more information about the age targeted housing and what is proposed.
- The Board would like to see more elevations, views (including rear views), and other renderings.
- The Board would like more information on the pipeline location and accessibility.
- More information is desired on impact to Town services / service levels.
- Planning Board would like to have more information from the arborist, fire department, transportation consultant, and law enforcement.
- The Board expressed concerns about communications. How do you improve communications and flow of information about the process?