

**Planning Board Meeting  
September 28, 2020  
6:00 pm in the Civic Center  
Minutes & General Account**

**Planning Board Members Present:** Sarah Glanville, Chair; Ed Stafford, Vice Chair; Dennis Sholl, Eddie Oakley, Jane Walker Payne (Alternate Member), Richard Newbill (ETJ), Steve Monroe (ETJ), Cara Arena (ETJ), and Sherrie Richmond (ETJ).

**Planning Board Members Absent:** Russ Walker

**Council Member Representative:** Rebecca Mann Rayborn

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

**Visitors Present:** Jason Epley, Amanda Hodierne, Zach Tran, & Kerry Miller

**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- Absent  
Jane Walker Payne- Present  
Richard Newbill- Present  
Steve Monroe- Present  
Cara Arena- Present  
Sherrie Richmond- Present

Council Member Rayborn- Present

**Consideration of approval of minutes from the August 10, 2020 Regular Planning Board Meeting-** Stafford made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 10<sup>th</sup> Regular Planning Board meeting. Newbill 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, and 5303 Mackay Road from AG (Agricultural) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) -** Glanville stated that she hoped that the Planning Board Members could finalize their recommendations for Diamondback. She added that this would allow the developer to begin incorporating their feedback into the updated Castleton Village plan.

Glanville called Jason Epley, Benchmark Consulting Representative, forward to continue the facilitation of the discussion regarding the rezoning request.

Epley gave an overview of specific aspects of single family residential and townhome residential architecture that the Board could consider when making their recommendations.

Richmond stated that offering a variety of homes that were constructed with high-quality materials was very important to her. She added that a portion of the homes should be made with stone, wood, or brick. Richmond also noted that the height of the homes should blend in with the existing structures in the surrounding neighborhoods. She stated that the mechanical utilities should also be buffered.

Stafford and Rayborn agreed that it would be beneficial for a percentage of the homes to be made with high-quality materials like brick and stone. Monroe added that the use of those construction materials would make the homes less affordable. Rayborn stated that some use of vinyl siding would be acceptable as long as it was not covering the entire house.

Planning Board Members discussed different types of foundations for homes. There was a general consensus that the Members preferred crawl spaces for the single-family homes, but that a slab foundation would be acceptable for townhomes. Stafford, Monroe, and Oakley agreed that slab foundations would be fine for the single-family homes as well because of the threshold of the building code requirements. There was also a brief discussion about potentially incorporating basements into the plan.

The Planning Board Members agreed that mechanical utility equipment should be buffered between houses and the road.

Epley asked the Planning Board if they would like to discuss porches. Payne stated that she believed porches could add a lot of character to homes. Stafford said that the renderings that the developer provided included a variety of porches within the illustrations for the single-family homes. The Planning Board Members agreed that they would like to strongly encourage the developer to incorporate porches or a portico as one of the architectural aspects of the single-family homes.

The Planning Board began to discuss the lot sizes of the proposed development. Arena stated that it was important to offer a variety of lot sizes neighborhood to neighborhood. Richmond said that the lots within the current plan were too small. She noted that density would be reduced if there were some larger lot sizes included. Glanville stated that the front yard and side yard setbacks for the single-family homes should also be increased. Arena agreed that there should be variation in the setbacks.

Epley asked the Planning Board Members to share their opinions on garages. Payne said that her personal opinion was that garages should be distinguishable from the rest of the house. Glanville stated that she would like to see a larger variety of garages including side-loading and back-loading options. The Planning Board agreed that the garages should not be the focal point of the homes. The Board members recommended that the developer include a variety of location options for garages.

The Board Members briefly spoke about driveways within the development. They were not in favor of shared driveways. There was a consensus amongst the Planning Board that the developer should incorporate separate driveways for the single-family residential homes within the proposed plan.

Epley encouraged the Planning Board Members to share their opinions about the townhomes that were included in the plan. Oakley stated that the townhomes should include two car garages instead of the one car garages that were in the current plan. Sholl said that he did not think that a two car garage

should be a requirement, but he did think that the driveway should be large enough to park an additional car. Glanville added that there should be different options that could meet the needs of potential buyers. The Planning Board agreed that the driveways needed to be long enough that parked cars would not block the sidewalk. There was also a consensus that the townhomes should feature designs with a variety of one and two car garages that also provided space for storage. The Board also recommended that the developer incorporate recessed garages for the plans so that they were not the focal point of the townhomes.

There was a brief discussion about shared driveways for the townhomes within the plan. Oakley stated that he had seen some examples of shared driveways that were really well done. Planning Board Members were open to the idea of shared driveways for some of the townhome units.

Several Planning Board Members expressed concern about the number of attached townhomes within the plan. There was discussion about the maximum number of attached units that would be acceptable. Sholl stated that it may be appropriate to allow for more units to be attached if the tradeoff would be larger lot sizes for the single-family homes. He noted that the townhomes would not be visible as long as there was appropriate buffering. The Planning Board determined that there should be a maximum of six attached units, but they would prefer four attached units. They also noted that they would like to see a variety of one story and two story options.

Glanville called for a five minute recess at 7:50 pm.

Glanville called the meeting back to order at 7:55 pm.

Epley asked the Planning Board to express any opinions they had about building materials for the townhomes. Stafford said that he would like to see the developer incorporate the use of Hardie board in the designs. He noted that it would be nice for brick and stone to be used as architectural accents. Rayborn stated that she was concerned about an overuse of vinyl siding. Monroe said that high quality building materials would drastically drive up the cost of the townhomes. The Planning Board Members recommended that the developer use higher quality materials for architectural accents, and they noted that the variation may depend on location and buffering.

Epley asked if the Planning Board had any other concerns regarding the architecture of the townhomes. Stafford noted that windows would be an important feature to include. Payne added that patios should also be included within the designs. Rayborn stated that the developer should also consider adding privacy fences for the outdoor areas.

Planning Board Members discussed the next steps of the recommendation process with Epley. Glanville requested that Epley compile a summary of the recommendations which could be distributed to the Board prior to their next meeting. Epley agreed to write a summary.

Planning Board Members spoke about the impact of the development on the Guilford County School system. Glanville presented some information that she had researched that provided a rough projection of potential students that would be generated. Several Planning Board Members expressed concern that there would be a burden placed on the already overcrowded schools.

The Board briefly discussed the types of businesses that could potentially be included in the commercial section. The Members agreed that they wanted to prevent drive-thrus. They agreed that the following

types of businesses would be acceptable: restaurants, small businesses, professional offices, daycare facility, fitness center, brewery/wine bar, and an ice cream shop.

Glanville gave an overview of expectations for the next meeting. She noted that Epley would provide a summary of their conversation and that the Board could finalize their recommendations for the developer at their next meeting. She added that she was hopeful that the developer would also have a better understanding of when the updated Castleton Village Plan would be presented by the end of that meeting.

**Discuss possible change of time and venue for next meeting-** Glanville spoke with Planning Board Members about the best time and date for their next meeting. She noted that their next regular meeting was scheduled for October 12<sup>th</sup>. The Board decided that they would like to continue meeting on a two week basis.

Stafford made a motion to continue the public hearing to October 12<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 pm in the Council Chambers without further advertisement. Richmond made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

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

The meeting ended at 8:54 pm.