



AGENDA
City of Archdale
Planning and Zoning Board Meeting
August 2, 2021 – 7:00 pm
Please note there will be a pre-agenda session at 6:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers – Archdale City Hall

1. Call To Order, Welcome, And Register Of Attendance
2. Approval Of The Minutes For The July 12, 2021 Planning Board Meeting

Documents:

[6 - JULY 12 PZB MINUTES.PDF](#)

3. Additional Items
4. Adjournment

Anyone who needs an accommodation to participate in the meeting should notify the City Clerk's Office at 336-434-7343 at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting or call North Carolina Relay at 1-800-735-8262.

Archdale Planning and Zoning Board
Regular Meeting
Monday, July 12, 2021

Members Present: Larry Thomas, Chairman; Larry Linthicum, Vice-Chairman; Board Members: Brent Kinney; Chris Collins, Mitch Miller, Bob Kollm, Scott Greene, Chris Spillers, and Joy Sparks.

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Jason Miller, Planning Director; Matthew Wells, Planning Administrator; Duncan Walser, Planning Technician.

Item 1. Call to Order, Welcome, and Register of Attendance

Chairman Thomas welcomed everyone and explained the procedures for the Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Item 2. Approval of the Minutes

Chairman Thomas stated the next order of business was the approval of the minutes from the June 7th, 2021 meeting.

Mr. Kinney asked for two items to be corrected on the minutes:

- 1) On Page 3, changing the word “matter” to “manner”.
- 2) On Page 6, changing the honorific “Mr.” to “Ms.” for Ms. Hodierne’s name.

Mr. Kinney made a motion to approve the June 7th, 2021 minutes with the corrections stated above. Mr. Kollm seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously by the Board.

Item 3. Public Hearing: Request by Bernice Ingram Earnhardt to rezone property from R-15 (Single Family Residential) to R-AH (Residential Attached Housing), for property located at 4602 Archdale Road, being Randolph County Parcel # 7718422000.

Matthew Wells gave the staff report for this rezoning request.

The applicant, Bernice Ingram Earnhardt, is looking to rezone this from R-15 (Single-Family Residential) to R-AH (Residential Attached Housing) for a future development. The property is about 6.64 acres and has road frontage along Archdale Road and Elaine Street. The property has access to both City water and sanitary sewer services. Additionally, the property is designated on the City’s Future Land Use Plan for Suburban Neighborhoods and the rezoning request is consistent with that designation.

Mr. Wells also stated the neighboring properties were single family residential to the west and vacant industrial land to the south and east. Lastly, he explained that this request was just considering a change in the use of land. Any future R-AH development would require a TRC and would have to come back to Planning Board and City Council for consideration of a Special Use Permit.

Chairman Thomas thanked Mr. Wells. Chairman Thomas then opened the public hearing. He asked if anyone was in support of the request.

Randy Ingram, 1104 Dogwood Lane, introduced himself as one of the developers. Mr. Ingram said he believed that this development would be an upgrade to the surrounding community and that he proposed to create a loop of Elaine Street to increase traffic flow and enable fire trucks to turn around.

Chairman Thomas then asked if anyone was against the request.

Vickie Guinn, 115 Elaine Street, came forward and said she was a 25-year resident of the Elaine Street neighborhood. Her biggest concern was about the impact on the school system and how it would become overcrowded with new residents. She also stated that she believed single family was a better fit than attached housing as this kind of development attracts crime and high speeds, especially to vulnerable populations.

Gary Jensen, 591 Robin Lane, was next and explained that his daughters lived at 119 and 211 Elaine Street and that he had concerns because Elaine Street was not designed for increased traffic.

Jeff Johnson, 113 Elaine Street, said he liked that Elaine Street was a dead-end street with a low amount of traffic. He believed that a new development would open the street to lots of traffic, which would be unsafe as kids, including his grandchildren, often play in the road. Mr. Johnson also said that fire trucks already had good access to Elaine Street, and they did not need other connections to Archdale Road. He echoed Ms. Guinn's concerns about the impact on the schools. Lastly, Mr. Johnson said that it was already difficult to turn onto Archdale Road and that new development would create more issues.

Chairman Thomas then closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Planning Board for discussion and possible action.

Mr. Greene asked what the density would be for an R-AH development. Mr. Wells said that it allowed for up to 8 units an acre.

Mr. Jensen spoke from the crowd and asked how many units would be allowed under this density. Chairman Thomas answered that 46 to 50 units was the maximum.

Mr. Jensen again spoke from the crowd and asked if this development would be apartments or condos. Chairman Thomas replied that this was not being considered tonight in the rezoning.

Mr. Greene asked for clarification of the Suburban Neighborhood designation and how it stated townhomes would be appropriate. Mr. Miller responded that apartments could mean multiple things, but that the traditional apartment would not be allowed in R-AH. He explained that the definition of townhomes stated they "have separate units that are attached by a party all to one or more of the dwelling units."

Mr. Greene asked if they had to be owned or if they could renter occupied. Mr. Miller said that the City cannot regulate this.

Mr. Kinney said he had concerns if the future development did not have an entrance on Archdale Road. He said if it had this access, it may be seen as a future improvement as it would provide better access to the main arterial road, being Archdale Road.

With no further discussion, Mr. Greene made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning with the associated Consistency Statement. Mr. Kinney seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

Item 4. Additional Items

Mr. Wells clarified an issue that arose in the June meeting where a Planning Board member abstained from voting on an item. He said that before 160-D was passed, it was only permissible to recuse or abstain from a vote due to a familial relationship or financial benefit. However, there is a clause that for rezoning items, a member is not required to provide a reason for recusing or abstaining themselves from a vote. Mr. Wells said that while this was legal, it was not considered a best practice and could be challenged. He encouraged any member to vote against an item instead of abstaining.

Mr. Miller explained that the August 2nd meeting would likely be just a workshop to discuss several items coming up in September.

Item 5. Adjournment

With no further discussion, Chairman Thomas adjourned the Monday, July 12th, 2021 meeting.