

**Planning Board Meeting
September 14, 2020
Ragsdale Civic Center
Minutes & General Account**

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

Planning Board Members Absent: Steve Monroe (ETJ)

Council Member Representative: Rebecca Mann Rayborn

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

Visitors Present: Jason Epley, Amanda Hodierne, Zach Tran, Kerry Miller, & Jane Walker Payne

Call to Order- Glanville called the meeting to order.

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- Absent
Sherrie Richmond- Present
Cara Arena- Present

Council Member Rayborn- Present

Public Hearing for Rezoning Request for the following parcels: 2221 Guilford College Road, 5300 Mackay Road, 2207 Guilford College Road, and 5303 Mackay Road from AG (Agricultural) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) - Glanville stated that she would like to read a statement for the record before any further discussion took place about the proposed rezoning. The statement is as follows:

“This is our third meeting in discussion of this particular development, and in that time, we have seen the passion and love that the residents of Jamestown have for this town. Many have reached out to us as a group or on an individual level and voiced concerns, suggestions, and a willingness to be active participants in the discussion. I believe everyone who has spoken up has done so with the best of intentions and the desire to be helpful. The conversations have been overall fruitful. Unfortunately, however, some have been unproductive and distract from the task at hand. I do not want us as a Board to get lost in the noise and be derailed from our mission, which is to recommend to the Town Council a plan that has been thoroughly vetted and thoughtfully considered. I do not want any Board member to feel it necessary to participate in any interactions that you believe are detrimental to that mission. I firmly believe that active citizen participation is the key to a healthy community, and I do not want to do anything that will be construed as hampering that. However, when unfounded allegations and personal

attacks are laid upon members of this Board, I will not allow those to pass. I have known many of you for a long time, and I know you to be people of integrity and conviction. Some of you I am just now getting to know, but have no reason to believe that you do not come to the Planning Board with the same vigor and dedication the rest of us have always had in approaching our duties. I welcome anyone to take us to task whenever there may be a lapse in judgement or procedure. I will, however, defend, on the record, every person on this Board when it comes to malicious slander. I thank every member of this Board for the hard work you have put into this and all projects. Your service has not gone unnoticed. I appreciate all of you.”

Glanville called Jason Epley from Benchmark Planning forward to facilitate the discussion between the Planning Board Members.

Epley came forward and introduced himself to the Board. He gave an overview of the key elements that the Board could use to establish a framework for making a recommendation. He noted that the key elements were as follows: residential form, residential composition, residential architecture, transportation, bike/pedestrian, parks, public space, open space, commercial, community impacts, landscaping, and project phasing. He added that it would be beneficial for the Board to discuss each of the elements, determine what needs to change, and then determine the Board’s highest priorities. He gave a brief overview of each of the different elements and the aspects that the Board should consider.

Epley asked the Board which elements they believed were the highest priority. The Board discussed their biggest concerns. They noted that they would like to focus on the following: location of key areas of the plan, buffers, community impact, density, architectural features, building materials, safety issues that may result from the pipeline location, and the types of businesses that would be included in the commercial area.

The Board decided to discuss the location of specific areas within the development first.

The Planning Board discussed the location of the proposed baseball fields. Several Members voiced concerns about the potential rise in traffic. They also spoke about an increase in noise which may disturb the people living in neighborhoods close to the ballfields. Richmond proposed flipping the location of the baseball field with the proposed age-targeted housing. Planning Board Members were supportive of that idea.

The Board spoke about the possibility of moving the amenities of the development to a more central location for the residents. Council Member Rayborn said that she had heard from current residents that they would prefer not to drive past the swimming pool, club house, etc. There was a general consensus that the amenities needed to be moved to an internal location within the development.

Glanville noted that Benchmark had mentioned a high number of cul-de-sacs within the master site plan within their recommendation summary. She added that cul-de-sacs were bad for the environment. Council Member Rayborn stated that they also decrease the walkability of the neighborhood. The Planning Board directed Epley to add the reduction of the number of cul-de-sacs to their list for the developer.

Richmond stated that she was concerned about the farmers market. Arena proposed that the developer consider moving the farmers market closer to the commercial areas. The Planning Board discussed whether people would want it at all or if it could be a multi-use space.

The Planning Board discussed moving the townhomes to a more internal location within the development. Several Members stated that there should be single-family residential homes facing the existing neighborhoods on Guilford College Road. Glanville said that a really good buffer may prevent the existing residents from seeing the new homes built by the developer. There was consensus amongst the Planning Board that the area across from Cedarwood should be single-family residential instead of townhomes.

Glanville spoke about the proposed civic area that would be located on the corner of Guilford Road and Guilford College Road. She stated that she was concerned about an increase in traffic. She also did not think that it would be a good idea to have a civic area so close to existing residential neighborhoods. Glanville said that there would not be any property tax revenue generated from a civic use, and she did not believe that it would add value to the Town. She noted that it may be best to leave that area as green space. The Planning Board Members discussed the proposed civic corner, and they decided that they needed to think about the issue before they added it to their recommendation list.

Council Member Rayborn said that she was unsure about the location of the mixed use and commercial areas. She stated that she had heard from several residents that they would prefer for those businesses to be moved to a more central location within the development. Richmond said that she had heard similar things. She added that she was also worried about the increase in competition for the current businesses in Jamestown. Stafford stated that he was more concerned that the current businesses in Jamestown would be overwhelmed if there were not some new commercial areas for a development of that size. Glanville said that walkability would be increased for residents that do not live in Castleton Village if the mixed use area remained on the exterior of the development. The Planning Board came to a consensus to leave the mixed use area where it had been originally located in the proposed plan.

Glanville briefly spoke about the pipeline that was located on the east side of the development. She was concerned that it may be a safety hazard. Glanville requested more information about the pipeline

The Planning Board decided to discuss buffers for the development next.

The Planning Board Members discussed the need for a sidewalk along Mackay Road and Guilford College Road. Oakley added that curb and gutter also needed to be included on Mackay Road. Everyone agreed that the inclusion of curb and gutter was important.

The Planning Board spoke about the proposed buffers for the development. Glanville stated that twenty-four inch shrubs would not be sufficient for the buffer. The Planning Board Members discussed the need for a buffer along Mackay Road. They also spoke about the necessity of the development to be hidden from the streets and existing neighborhoods. Richmond highlighted the need to keep the large, heritage trees which could be utilized as a buffer. Sholl stated that berms could be used along with other vegetation to reduce the visibility of the development.

The Planning Board briefly spoke about street lighting along Guilford College and Mackay Road.

Glanville called for a recess at 7:55 pm.

Glanville called the meeting back to order at 8:00 pm.

Jane Walker Payne, Planning Board Alternate, briefly spoke about the importance of keeping historical structures that were currently on the Johnson property. She encouraged the developer to keep the history of Jamestown in mind when updating the plan.

The Planning Board began their discussion about density.

Planning Board Members spoke about their concern of the quality of the development. Walker stated that the number of units that were connected within the proposed townhome section should be reduced. Planning Board Members agreed that they did not like the overall look of the townhomes.

Arena said that that the lot sizes for the single-family homes were too small. She added that the density could be lowered if the sizes of the lots were increased.

Planning Board Members requested that the overall density of the proposed development be reduced. They discussed the number of units per developable acre that was within the Castleton Village Plan. Glanville added that she did not think that the density should be less restrictive than what had been outlined in the Town's current zoning ordinances.

The Planning Board Members raised concerns about how a high-density development could impact the services that the Town currently provided to residents.

The Board discussed multiple areas of potential community impact. They requested more information on the traffic generation, fire/sheriff protection, and solid waste pickup.

They also requested that the developer consider donating a portion of land to Guilford County for the construction of a new school.

The Planning Board Members encouraged the developer to begin a public relations campaign in order to increase communication with the general public and current citizens.

Members briefly discussed regulating certain types of businesses in the commercial area.

Discuss possible change of time and venue for next meeting- Glanville discussed potential times and dates for the next meeting with the Board.

Walker made a motion to continue the public hearing to the next Planning Board meeting on September 28th at 6:00 pm in the Civic Center without further advertisement. Stafford made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Public Comment- Nobody signed up.

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

The meeting ended at 8:59 pm.