

**Planning Board Meeting
August 10, 2020
6:30 pm in the Civic Center
Minutes & General Account**

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

Council Member Representative: Rebecca Mann Rayborn

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

Visitors Present: Kerry Miller, Jane Walker Payne, Cara Arena, Amanda Hodierne, Zach Tran, Jim Chandler

Call to Order- Johnson called the meeting to order.

Election of Chair of the Planning Board- Johnson stated that the Planning Board was required to elect a member to serve as the Chair of the Board annually. He explained the process of nominating and electing the Chair of the Planning Board. Johnson asked if anyone would like to make a nomination.

Oakley nominated Sarah Glanville to serve as the Chair of the Planning Board.

Johnson made a second and third call for nominations for Chair. There were no other nominations.

Oakley made a motion to appoint Sarah Glanville to serve as the Chair of the Planning Board. Stafford made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Election of Vice Chair of the Planning Board- Glanville asked the Planning Board Members if there were any nominations for Vice Chair.

Glanville nominated Ed Stafford to serve as Vice Chair of the Planning Board.

Oakley made a motion to appoint Ed Stafford to serve as Vice Chair of the Planning Board. Walker made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Roll Call- Johnson took roll call as follows:

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

Council Member Rayborn- Present

Welcome to new Planning Board Member, Dennis Sholl, and Alternate Member, Jane Payne, both of whom were duly sworn by the Town Clerk- Glanville welcomed Dennis Sholl and Jane Payne. She thanked them for being willing to serve. Sholl and Payne introduced themselves to the Planning Board.

Approval of minutes from the November 18, 2019 meeting- Stafford made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 18th meeting as presented. Monroe made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

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) - Johnson presented his staff report to the Planning Board. He said that the parcels in question were also known as the “Johnson Property,” and that they were about 467 acres altogether. He stated that the parcels were once a part of a much larger property that had been owned by the Mackay family. Johnson added that the original property had been about 2,000 acres which had been subdivided and developed for residential housing purposes. He said that the neighborhoods of Cedarwood, Whittington Hall, Woodbine, Quarterpath Trace, portions of Forestdale North, and the surrounding area were all once a part of the Mackay hunting lands.

Johnson stated that the availability of water and sanitary sewer utilities had impacted the density of the residential developments. He noted that the average density of the lots, which were initially developed with water and sewer, was about 4 units per acre. He added that utilities were provided to the Cedarwood neighborhood after it was developed which led to a density that was closer to 1 unit per acre.

He stated that staff had met with the Johnson family during the development of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan. He added that staff had inquired about the proposed future of the property. Johnson stated that the family indicated that it would most likely be developed primarily as a residential community with a light mix of supporting commercial properties. He said that the Future Land Use Map designated the Johnson Property as being located in the “Suburban Residential” district. He noted that the parcel also included a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) overlay district. Johnson said that the idea had been that the property would develop in a mixed-use fashion with commercial as well as residential areas.

Johnson noted that he had listed several policies and goals from the Land Development Plan that staff believed applied to the proposal. He encouraged the Planning Board Members to consider those goals while they were in the process of making a recommendation to Town Council and also during the formulation of the consistency statement. Johnson stated that staff learned about the potential development in February. However, they had been aware that the family may choose to develop the Johnson Property eventually.

He stated that the Town of Jamestown and the City of Greensboro defined areas of future growth for each municipality by signing an annexation agreement in 1991. He noted that the Johnson Property was within the Town of Jamestown’s annexation boundary. He added that the Town’s extra-territorial jurisdictional boundaries were expanded in 2008 which gave the Town planning and zoning authority over the property.

Johnson said that staff understood the contentious nature of rezoning. However, he noted that the Town was fortunate to have the “Planned Unit Development” (PUD) zoning district. He stated that the

PUD district would allow the appointed and elected officials to have greater influence over the design of the development.

He stated that staff could not make a recommendation for denial or acceptance at that time. He added that the plan would change throughout the discussion process. He requested that the Planning Board and Council work diligently to ensure that the development qualities that they desired were included in the site specific master plan. He highlighted that the master plan would become a legally-binding guide for the development of the property if it were approved.

Johnson briefly went over the suggested timeline for the public hearing. He added that the meeting that night would mostly be a discussion between the Planning Board Members and the applicant. He noted that the public would be allowed to give commentary on the potential rezoning at a later meeting date. He said he would be happy to answer any questions that the Board may have.

Glanville asked if the property had already been annexed by the Town. Johnson stated that it had not been annexed, and he explained the annexation process. Glanville asked Johnson if the City of Greensboro could annex the area if the Town Council did not vote in favor of annexation. Johnson stated that the City of Greensboro could not annex the property.

Johnson said that Rebecca Mann Rayborn was in attendance as the Town Council liaison to the Planning Board. He added that she was going to give the Board a brief overview of Council's expectations.

Council Member Rayborn thanked the Planning Board for all the work they had done and would be doing for the consideration of the rezoning. She noted that Council was concerned about overall density and lot sizes in relation to existing neighborhoods. She added that they also wanted to focus on the quality of construction materials, architectural details, the development layout, and buffers between the development and surrounding areas. Council Member Rayborn encouraged the Planning Board Members to take their time while they considered the request. She stated that there was no rush from Council and that they essentially wanted the Planning Board to be thorough.

Glanville stated that the public should contact the Planning Board Members and provide any constructive feedback that they believed would be helpful throughout the process. Johnson added that there would be ample opportunity for the public to participate in the discussion about the development plan. He noted that staff was also available to answer any questions that the public may have about the rezoning request.

Glanville called the applicant forward to speak.

Amanda Hodiern from Issacson Sheridan came forward. She noted that her office was located at 804 Green Valley Road in Greensboro for the record. She stated that she was there to represent her client, Diamondback Investment Group. She introduced Zach Tran and Jim Chandler from Diamondback to the Planning Board. She added that Diamondback had the subject property under contract to purchase.

Hodiern stated that she knew that the Planning Board had heard a lot about the potential development since February. She said that she was looking forward to getting some feedback from the Planning Board about the project. She added that the development plan was created by utilizing the vision for the property that was outlined in the Town's Comprehensive Plan. She stated that the plan had also evolved to address some of the concerns that people had voiced after the earlier community meetings.

Hodierne gave an overview of the site specific master plan for the Castleton Village development. She noted that the conceptual development plan described the land use for different sections of the development. She stated that the majority of the development would be comprised of single-family residential homes and townhomes. She added that the schematic site layout provided a more detailed view of the road network and neighborhood layout. Hodierne stated that it provided a visual representation of how the developer had interpreted the suburban residential and traditional neighborhood overlay.

She noted that the development did include areas for civic and recreational use. She said that the developer had proposed to build a baseball field within the recreational area for the citizens of the Town. She highlighted the location for the potential farmers market and noted that the commercial component had been scaled back due to the feedback they had received. Hodierne gave a brief overview of the conceptual mixed-use layout of the commercial area. She noted that the façade of the commercial area was inspired by the hunting lodge that was formerly on the Johnson property.

Hodierne spoke about the internal circulation system and the impact that it had on placemaking. She stated that it gave the development its own feel. She said that the interior residential roads would have a fifty foot right-of-way along with five foot sidewalks on each side. Hodierne described the horseshoe shaped road that would be the internal road within the development that would be the major circulation street within the project. She added that there would be a seventy foot right-of-way, a median, a five foot sidewalk on one side, and a ten foot multi-use path on the other. She stated that the entry points of the development would have a ninety foot right-of-way, a larger median, and five foot sidewalks on each side.

Hodierne stated that there was a plethora of interconnected options for recreation and open space. She added that people throughout the community would be able to utilize the recreational areas included in the Castleton Village development. She highlighted the public nature trail that could be connected to the Town of Jamestown's current greenway in the future. She added that there were eight pocket parks that were interspersed throughout the development. She said that there was also an age-targeted recreation area which included pickle ball courts. Hodierne noted that there was a large amenity center that would be available to everyone which included a junior Olympic pool.

Hodierne noted that the master site specific plan also included a fifty foot scenic corridor overlay buffer along Guilford College Road. She added that she was open to suggestions from the Board about what they would like to see included in the buffer. She stated that it would protect the views of those that currently live across the road from the potential development.

Walker asked Hodierne if a buffer could be included along Mackay Road. She stated that a buffer could be included along that road as well.

Hodierne stated that the only residential homes that were included were single-family residential and townhomes. She added that the apartments that had been included at the very beginning stages of the plan had been removed. However, she noted that the developer would like to make one of the townhome pods available to people that would prefer to rent as opposed to own the property. Hodierne stated that they would like to provide viable options to a diverse population of people while also ensuring cohesiveness throughout the development.

She stated that the Castleton Village development included smaller lot sizes which was consistent with traditional neighborhood development. She noted that smaller lot sizes provided more open space for amenities within the community. She added that it also allowed for more walkability within the development. Hodierna said that the frontyard setbacks that were proposed for the single family homes ranged from eighteen to twenty-two feet. She noted that this would prevent the homes from being seen as a continuous straight line.

Richmond asked Hodierna if they had a plan to save valuable, heritage trees. Hodierna said that the developer was working with a certified arborist to identify large, heritage trees. She added that there was a section within the site specific master plan for tree conservation.

Richmond discussed the proposed signage for the development with Hodierna. She believed that the signs for the Castleton Village development may be too large. She added that it may increase the feeling of separation between the new development and existing neighborhoods.

Glanville stated that she was very concerned about the density and the increased school population. She said that she understood that it was the school board's responsibility to build schools. However, she believed that there should be collaboration between the Town, the developer, and the school board in order to address the issue of overcrowding. Hodierna said that they were willing to be a part of the discussion about the issues with the school population.

Planning Board Members discussed the issue of school overcrowding.

Zach Tran, Diamondback representative, came forward. He stated that the plan had been modified considerably to factor in student generation rates. He added that townhomes did not typically generate as many school aged children. He also noted the age-targeted housing would be much less likely to contribute to overcrowding. He said that a large portion of the tax generated from the development would go towards Guilford County schools.

Glanville thanked Tran for the information. She requested that he provide the Planning Board with the statistics that he had generated. Tran said that he would provide the Board with that data. Glanville said that she was still concerned about how the Jamestown area would get a new school or expand the schools so that the students could be accommodated. Richmond agreed with Glanville's concerns. Sholl requested that the development team provide the number of students that would be generated by phase of development.

Glanville asked if there would be sidewalks along Guilford College Road. Hodierna said that there would be.

Glanville said that she was concerned about increased traffic that would be generated at the proposed "Civic" site. She noted that the intersection of Guilford College Road and Guilford Road was already busy. Hodierna said that any "Civic" use that would be located on the corner would be one that did not generate a heavy amount of traffic.

Glanville requested that Paul Blanchard, Public Services Director, provide the Planning Board with information on water/wastewater capacity. Johnson stated that he would speak with Blanchard about distributing that information.

Walker asked how the Board Members should submit feedback from concerned citizens to the development team. Hoderne encouraged the Board Members to email her about issues raised or constructive feedback that they received.

Glanville asked Hoderne if there was any market research that they had acquired that showed there was a need for the amount of housing that would be provided by the development. Hoderne stated that they had research that showed there was a housing need. She said that she would provide that information to the Planning Board.

Oakley was concerned about the location of the proposed baseball field. He thought that it may generate a large amount of traffic. Hoderne said that interior roads within the development would be used to access the field in order to absorb some of the traffic.

Stafford said that he was very impressed with the proposed road layout. He added that it was similar to what currently existed in Cedarwood. He stated that he loved that the developer was using the historic hunting lodge as inspiration for the amenity center and commercial buildings. He added that he appreciated the small park areas and the diversity of the home options being proposed. Stafford thanked the development team for responding to some of the concerns that citizens had with the initial plan.

Richmond stated that she was concerned that the plan included townhomes that would be located across from the single-family residential homes in Cedarwood. She highlighted the importance of buffers and cohesiveness with existing neighborhoods.

Glanville asked if the Planning Board Members had any further questions at that time. There were none.

Walker made a motion to continue the public hearing to the August 24th Special Planning Board meeting at 6:00 pm in the Civic Center without further advertisement. Monroe made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Public Comment Period- Nobody signed up.

Adjournment- Walker made a motion to adjourn. Stafford made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

The meeting ended at 8:27 pm.