



**AGENDA**  
**City of Archdale**  
**Planning and Zoning Board Meeting**  
**October 3, 2022 – 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 September 12, 2022 Planning Board Meeting

Documents:

[6 - SEPTEMBER 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, September 12, 2022

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

**Members Absent:** Bob Kollm.

**Others Present:** Jason Miller, Planning Director; Matthew Wells, Planning Administrator.

**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 July 11th, 2022 meeting.

Mr. Kinney asked for a correction on Page 2 on the minutes, in the staff report for Item 3, that the notation of “feet” will be added in reference to sidewalk length in two sentences.

**Mr. Greene made a motion to approve the July 11th, 2022 minutes with the correction noted. Mr. Mitch Miller seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously by the Board.**

**Item 3.** N. Main St. Feasibility Study Presentation

Mr. Miller introduced Kristina King Whitfield, transportation planner for Kimley-Horn, who worked as the City’s consultant on a feasibility study for N. Main Street traffic improvements. Ms. Whitfield gave a short presentation on the proposed plan, which emphasized a goal from the comprehensive plan to make N. Main Street in hopes of developing a downtown corridor.

Chairman Thomas asked if there would be grant opportunities available. Ms. Whitfield responded that most grant opportunities had only been available along the coast.

Mr. Greene asked about an option to not go through and build all the physical infrastructure. Ms. Whitfield responded that N. Main Street is scheduled to be repaved within the next year and there might be opportunities to restripe the roadway, which would allow for traffic patterns to observe any future physical changes that could be later installed.

Mr. Kinney brought up concerns about traffic flow in dealing with unexpected congestion – such as during the Furniture Market and during traffic accidents. He referenced a project in High Point along Centennial Street that had been a road diet. Ms. Whitfield said this was a common practice across North Carolina and referenced a similar plan in Edenton. Mr. Kinney asked for a copy of this plan.

Chairman Thomas asked about the project that was supposed to occur along Main Street in High Point and how it faced a lot of opposition. Ms. Whitfield replied that it was passed in 2013 and was very controversial. She said that her firm had actually recently been rehired to update the plan due to new interest from the current City Council.

Chairman Thomas asked if the slides would be available and if any action would need to be taken. Mr. Miller responded that no action was required and that the slides would be provided.

**Item 4.** Public Hearing: Request By 5 Henry LLC For A Special Use Permit For Property Located at 10405 and 10407 S. Main Street.

Mr. Wells gave the staff report for this item:

The applicant, 5 Henry LLC, is seeking a Special Use Permit to construct a car wash on a 1.78 acre site along S. Main Street. The property was formerly two residential homes owned in common ownership and was rezoned from R-15 to Highway Business in 2021 in anticipation of a future commercial development. The property is surrounded by commercial uses to the south, southwest, and northwest. Residential and vacant residential uses surround the property to the north, east, and southeast and are zoned R-15, R-40, and GRD (Bush Hill Apartments).

In working with the applicant, they have asked for leniency on the front yard setback (50 feet in Roadway Overlay District to 20 feet), not constructing cross access, and for alternative screening methods (constructing a 6' opaque fence in addition to 15 feet of landscaping instead of the traditional 25-foot landscaped buffer). Staff is generally in favor of those requested modifications.

The submitted site plan meets all City standards.

Mr. Wells also noted the stormwater statement, which is required for the High Density Development Permit, as well as the Findings of Fact that are required to be referenced in the motion for the Special Use Permit.

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

Jason Burkhart (543 Becks Church Road, Lexington, NC) introduced himself as the Director of Operations for Jimmy Clean's and said he would be willing to answer any questions.

Chairman Thomas then asked if anyone present was against the request.

There was no one present that was against the request.

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

Chairman Thomas asked about the expected daily traffic using the car wash. Mr. Burkhart answered that 5000 cars a month was an average number and, on peak days, could reach up to 800 cars. Chairman Thomas then asked where their location was in High Point. Mr. Burkhart said it was in North High Point, near the Sheetz and the interchange with Interstate 74. Chairman Thomas then asked about the reclaimed water process. Mr. Burkhart explained how the water travels through a set of filtration systems and about 50-75% is reused in the car wash.

Mr. Greene asked for a clarification on the site plan and how it would look when constructed. Mr. Wells handed out elevations that were provided by the developer.

Mr. Spillers asked how many locations the company had and Mr. Mitch Miller asked for those locations. Mr. Burkhart answered there were currently 3 car washes and they were located in High Point, Salisbury, and Monroe (all in North Carolina).

Mr. Collins inquired about the need of the tower on the car wash. Mr. Burkhart responded that it was mostly monumental and used for aesthetic purposes, but also houses offices and storage.

Mr. Kinney had some questions about the layout being closer to the road, queueing patterns, and how the exit of the car wash and vacuum stations seemed to be tight for traffic to flow through. Mr. Burkhart responded that the development was granted leniency on the front setback by the TRC so that their site plan could allow for more queueing going into the car wash as well as hide the vacuums from the roadway.

Mr. Spillers asked staff what the setback was for the recent Starbucks development. Mr. Wells responded that it was approved at 25 feet and that staff, as part of expected future ordinance changes would be promoting developments to be built closer to the roadway.

**With no further discussion, Mr. Greene made a motion to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit and referenced the Findings of Fact. Mr. Linthicum seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

**Item 5.** Public Hearing: Request By Bernice Ingram Earnhardt For A Special Use Permit For Property Located at 4602 Archdale Road.

Mr. Miller read the staff report for this item:

## **Overview**

The applicant, Bernice Ingram Earnhardt, is seeking a Special Use Permit to construct 27 townhomes on property located at 4602 Archdale Road. The property is designated on the City's Future Land Use Plan for Suburban Neighborhoods and was successfully rezoned from R-15 (Single-Family Residential) to R-AH (Residential-Attached Housing) in July of 2021. Single-family attached housing developments require a Special Use Permit and must conform to Special Requirement 40 (SR 40) in Section 6.5 of the Zoning Ordinance.

## **Proposed Site Details & Amenities**

A site plan and building elevations are submitted as conditions of this Special Use Permit (*See Building Elevations*) illustrating the architectural standards for the townhomes shown on the site plan. The applicant is proposing 27 townhomes: 14 three-bedroom units (1,363 – 1,410 heated square feet of space) and 13 four-bedroom units (1,530 heated square feet of space). The proposed site contains approximately 6.64 acres of property, resulting in a density of 4.07 units per acre, which is below the City's maximum of 8 units per acre.

The internal public streets will be 26' back-to-back valley curb and have a 5-foot sidewalk on one side of the street. The proposed development will be served by approximately 1,100 linear feet of new roadway that will be dedicated and publicly maintained when complete. Creating a loop, the proposed new street (Southern Magnolia Lane) will connect with Elaine Street approximately 170' southwest of its intersection with Archdale Road and terminate in a hammerhead at the southern boundary of the property. The current terminus of Elaine Street will be extended to connect with Southern Magnolia Lane, providing two points of access for the proposed townhomes (*See Site Plan*).

City parking standards have been met. All units will have a garage, with most units having a two-car garage. Additional parking is provided in front of each unit. The development will be properly screened from adjoining residential property by a 20' vegetated buffer. The frontage along Archdale Road will have a berm and meet the City's thoroughfare planting yard requirements. All open space and sidewalk not within a public ROW will be dedicated and maintained by the HOA.

## **TRC Review**

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) reviewed and conditionally approved the site plan on April 6<sup>th</sup> (*See TRC Minutes*) and the applicant has revised the plan to reflect TRC comments. Water and Sewer service will be available from extensions of existing City utility lines. The submitted utility plan shows the proposed water lines, sewer lines, and storm drainage and stormwater management devices to indicate that the project is feasible for utility service and providing stormwater management. If the Special Use Permit request is approved, the applicant can begin the process of preparing the site for final plat approval.

The submitted site plan is in conformance with Special Requirement 40 (SR 40) in Section 6.5 of the Zoning Ordinance and meets all applicable City development standards.

**Requested Fee in-Lieu:**

The applicant is requesting City Council consider a fee in-lieu of installation for sidewalk along Archdale Road (approximately 388 feet) due to difficult topography and the NCDOT U-3400 Road Widening Project.

Mr. Miller also noted the stormwater statement, which is required for the High-Density Development Permit, as well as the Findings of Fact that are required to be referenced in the motion for the Special Use Permit.

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

Josh Beck (5537 Harvest Forest Drive, Kernersville, NC) introduced himself as the site engineer for the project and said that he was there to answer questions. He also noted that the developer was going with a small development that was less dense than what is allowed in the R-AH zoning district.

Chairman Thomas then asked if anyone present was against the request.

Louis Boone, 114 Elaine Street, introduced himself as a 38-year resident of the adjoining neighborhood. He said that the existing neighborhood was all single family residential with mainly senior citizens, but with a recent increase in younger families moving into the neighborhood. He said there would be three times the amount of traffic and it would be more difficult to turn onto Archdale Road with the new neighborhood being built. Mr. Boone also asked if an additional entrance off of Archdale Road could service the proposed neighborhood.

Vickie Guinn, 115 Elaine Street, came forward next and asked why the new neighborhood couldn't have an entrance just off of Archdale Road and not onto Elaine Street. She also commented that she felt the 20-foot buffer between the proposed development and the existing neighborhood was insufficient and should include a 6-foot privacy fence. Ms. Guinn asked if on-street parking would be allowed, and Mr. Miller responded that parking would only be allowed on driveways and in garages. She also questioned why sidewalk was only on one side of the development. Ms. Guinn continued and expressed a desire that the community be only for residents 55 and older. She concluded by saying that the 3- and 4-bedroom units would have at least four cars per unit (54 additional vehicles).

Isaac Gains, 207 Elaine Street, spoke next and said that as a father of two young children who play outside that he was concerned about increased traffic in the existing neighborhood.

Cathy Short, 117 Elaine Street, said that she had lived in the neighborhood for 50 years and that she was worried about increasing traffic. She echoed others in saying that the existing driveway along Archdale Road needed to be utilized.

John Bowman, 205 Elaine Street, also brought up concerns about traffic at the entrance of Elaine Street and Archdale Road and said that the existing driveway on Archdale Road should be utilized.

Joe Barnes, 107 Elaine Street, said he walks along the street at night and felt concerns about safety as it is supposed to remain a dead-end street. Mr. Barnes mentioned that many of the residents on Elaine Street are elderly. He also expressed support for the driveway on Archdale Road to be used as an entrance.

Mr. Boone came forward again and said emergency access to the development would be difficult. A short discussion between him, Mr. Kinney, and Mr. Beck ensued concerning how emergency vehicles could enter and exit if the proposed development is built. He also expressed concern about water runoff along Archdale Road.

Peggy Boone, 114 Elaine Street, expressed concerns about increased traffic and echoed others' desire to see an entrance off of Archdale Road instead.

Chairman Thomas then closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Board for discussion and a possible action. He invited Mr. Beck to come back forward in a rebuttal.

Mr. Beck answered several of the concerns that were raised during the public hearing:

- The developer is not utilizing the existing driveway on Archdale Road as it was only built to service one home and upgrades to a new roadway would be difficult due to terrain and the presence of wetlands.
- Archdale Police and Guil-Rand Fire Department have approved the site configuration for emergency access management.
- 2 stormwater control devices will be installed, and that the runoff post-development will be less than before as the site is required to mitigate stormwater issues up to the first inch. Mr. Beck said he had been working with the City's stormwater manager as well as the state EPA.
- No on-street parking would be allowed.
- The roadway was increased to 26 feet (existing Elaine Street is only about 20 feet) to allow for a better traffic flow.
- The 3- or 4-bedroom units are just a maximum calculation to determine parking standards. Mr. Beck said the developer had looked at plans that could potentially turn those additional bedrooms into offices or sunrooms.
- The allowed density, based on acreage and the R-AH zoning district, was 53 units. He reiterated that only 27 units were being planned. He also explained that the existing Elaine Street could hold a much larger traffic amount than what was being proposed in changes with the new development (estimated 20 new trips in the

morning, 35 new trips in the evening) through the Elaine Street and Archdale Road intersections.

Mr. Collins asked about how the elevation of the proposed development would appear compared to the existing neighborhood. Mr. Beck responded that there was a significant 6% grade from top to bottom, but that through grading, the units would be about 2 feet higher than the one below and 2 feet lower than the one above it. Mr. Beck also noted that there would be a berm along the top of the property to help redirect water into the pond.

Chairman Thomas asked about the runoff into the ponds near units 3 and 9. Mr. Beck responded that they should be dry after 24 hours if functioning properly. Chairman Thomas asked if there would be a homeowners' association to which Mr. Beck said there would be in order to maintain the landscaping and stormwater devices. A short discussion that also involved some members of the audience began concerning water runoff and increasing culvert sizes. Mr. Beck said he would be installing twin 48' pipes to meet the 100-year stormwater requirements, which was required to be met on the 401/404 permits from the EPA.

Mr. Bowman spoke and brought up concerns about perceived water runoff from PCA, an industrial site to the south of the development. Mr. Beck said the stormwater would just be controlled on site and could not make other areas worse. Mr. Bowman then asked about traffic capacity on Elaine Street. Mr. Beck said that the existing Elaine Street was narrow, only about 20 feet wide, but that the low projected density of the development could be handled by the existing infrastructure.

Mr. Boone stepped forward with concerns about the high-density nature of the development as well as mosquitoes in the stormwater devices. Mr. Miller said the stormwater was approved and passed at the TRC level.

Mr. Kinney commented that the Planning Board had a few recent developments come up where the developer was extending onto an existing neighborhood and that the developer had an additional challenge of dealing with a property that is developing in front of an existing neighborhood.

**With no further discussion, Mr. Kinney made a motion to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit and referenced the Findings of Fact. Mr. Greene seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.**

#### **Item 5. Additional Items**

Mr. Miller relayed that there might be a work session to review the Zoning Ordinance proposed updates in October and a potential conditional district rezoning in November.

#### **Item 6. Adjournment**

With no further discussion, Chairman Thomas adjourned the Monday, September 12th, 2022 meeting.