



**Asheboro Planning Board
Asheboro City Hall (146 N. Church Street)
Monday, August 3, 2020
7:00 PM
AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes from July 6, 2020
- III. Review of Cases
- IV. Presentation of video from NC League of Municipalities concerning Conditional Zoning
- V. Items not on the agenda
- VI. Adjournment

MEETING OF THE ASHEBORO PLANNING BOARD
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 146 N. CHURCH ST.
MONDAY, JULY 6, 2020
7:00 p.m.

This being the time and place for the regular meeting of the Asheboro Planning Board, a meeting was held with the following officials and members present:

Van Rich) - Chair
Michael O'Kelley) - Vice Chair

Harold Anderson)
Ritchie Buffkin)
David Henderson) - Members Present
Thomas Rush)
Pamela Vuncannon)

John Evans, Assistant Community Development Division Director
Bradley Morton, Planner/Deputy City Clerk
Jeff Sugg, City Attorney

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rich called the Asheboro Planning Board to order.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

- a) **Approval of Minutes from June 1 Planning Board**
- b) **Approval of Final Decision Document concerning Case No. BOA-20-01: Variance from front yard parking setbacks and minimum pervious coverage requirements at 801 Sunset Avenue**

Mr. Rich inquired if there were any corrections or additions to the consent agenda. Hearing no corrections or additions, the consent agenda, consisting of the June 1 Planning Board meeting minutes as well as the Final Decision Document concerning Case No. BOA-20-01, were approved and adopted as submitted.

REVIEW OF CASES

Mr. Evans reported on the cases which were heard at the regular June City Council meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

RZ-20-08: REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED ON MEADOWBROOK RD. EXTENSION/HONEYSUCKLE RD. (RANDOLPH COUNTY PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS 7762230413 & 7762231577) FROM R15 LOW-DENSITY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND R10 MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO R10 MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

Mr. Evans gave a visual presentation to the board. He stated that the applicant is Darren Hackett and that the location of the property is at Meadowbrook Rd Ext. and Honeysuckle Rd. He stated that the applicant had previously requested that the properties be zoned R7.5 and after the planning board recommended denial, he amended his request. He stated that the current request is to rezone the property from R15 Low-Density Single-family residential and R10 Medium-Density Single-family residential to R10 Medium-Density Residential. He gave the Randolph County Parcel Identification Numbers as 7762230413 and 7762231577. He stated that the total size of the lots are 2.55 acres +/- and that the existing land use is

undeveloped. He showed overview, rezoning, topographic/utilities, and aerial maps of the property as well as photographs from all directions. He then gave the analysis of the case:

1. The property is inside the city limits.
2. Meadowbrook Rd. Ext. connects Honeysuckle Rd., a state-maintained roadway, with Ideal Dr., a city-maintained street with an average road width of less than 20 feet.
3. The majority of the property is zoned R15 (Low-Density Single-Family Residential) and has been since the 1970's. A review of historical records suggests that the current zoning map may be inaccurate and that the R15 district should extend 100 feet further west.
4. The applicant previously requested that this property be rezoned to R7.5 Medium-Density Residential, which the Planning Board considered during its June 1, 2020 meeting. The Planning Board is considering this request due to the applicant modifying the request to ask for an R10 designation of the property instead of the previous R7.5 district request.
5. The R15 district only allows a single-family dwelling on each zoning lot. The R10 district allows a single-family or two-family dwelling on each zoning lot, with reduced lot sizes, frontage, and setback requirements compared to the R15 district. The attached excerpt from the zoning ordinance shows a detailed comparison of both districts, including the statement of intent in the zoning ordinance for each.
6. Adjoining properties consist primarily of low-density single-family dwellings, with many adjoining properties exceeding the minimum lot size by a significant margin. One adjoining property has a legal non-conforming manufactured home park with a density in excess of R10 allowances.
7. There is a stream and city sewer easement on the property. NCDEQ needs to be contacted prior to any land activity that impacts the stream or its banks and the city's easement must be kept clear from encroachment.
8. The neighborhood residential designation of the property is described by the Land Development Plan's Land Category Description as intended "to accommodate existing medium-density, single family residential neighborhoods, while encouraging new neighborhoods of similar density to provide a greater sense of community."

He then gave the Land Development Plan recommendations:

Proposed Land Use Map: Neighborhood Residential

Small Area Plan: Northeast

Growth Strategy Map: Primary Growth

Goals/Policies Supporting Request (3):

- Checklist Item 3: Fits description of intent in zoning ordinance
- Checklist Item 5: Complies with Growth Strategy map
- Checklist Item 13: Property is outside flood area

Goals/Policies Not Supporting Request (4):

- Checklist Item 1: Not compliant with Proposed Land Use Map
- Checklist Item 4: Non compatible with surrounding land uses
- Checklist Item 10: Not consistent with Land Category Description
- Checklist Item 14: Is located on steep slopes

He then gave the consistency statement with adopted plans, reasonableness and public interest:

- Neighborhood residential designation calls for residential uses of similar density to surrounding land uses.
- While higher density uses exist to the west, Meadowbrook Rd. Extension and Honeysuckle Rd. are consistently lower density, single-family residential built to R15 standards.
- Potential for five (5) two-family dwellings (duplexes) are out of character with rest of development along Meadowbrook Rd. Ext. & Honeysuckle Rd.

- R10 slightly less out of character with surrounding land uses than previous R7.5 request but still without sufficient LDP backing to rezone to R10.

He then stated that staff's recommendation is to deny the request. Mr. Evans stated that staff has received a second communication from an adjoining property owner asking for the board to deny the request. He then asked the board if they had any questions. There were no questions for Mr. Evans at this time.

Mr. Darren Hackett, applicant, had no comments. There was no opposition present at the meeting

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend denial of case RZ-20-08 based on staff's recommendation. Mr. Henderson seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

RZ-20-09: REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 512, 514, AND 516 SOUTH FAYETTEVILLE STREET (RANDOLPH COUNTY PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 7751709933) FROM B2 GENERAL COMMERCIAL TO CU-B3 CONDITIONAL USE CENTRAL COMMERCIAL

Mr. Evans gave a visual presentation to the board. He stated that the applicant is Brandon McKenzie and the location of the proposed request is 512, 514, and 516 South Fayetteville Street. He stated that the request makes up one parcel (Randolph County PIN: 7751709933) and that the size of the parcel is .47 acres+/- . He stated that the request is to rezone from B2 General Commercial to CU-B3 Conditional Use Central Commercial. He stated that the existing land use is commercial with a vacant structure existing on the property. He showed overview, rezoning, Center City Planning Area, topographic/utilities, and aerial maps of the property as well as photographs from all directions. He then gave the analysis of the case:

1. The property is inside the city limits.
2. South Fayetteville Street is a state-maintained major thoroughfare.
3. The property is located within the Center City Planning Area, Tier 2 (Central Business District Fringe Development area). As described by the zoning ordinance: "This planning area encompasses blocks adjacent to Tier 1, the core Central Business Area. Properties in this planning area, unlike those in Tier 1, are not readily accessible to public downtown parking. Coordinated development of a variety of mixed uses is encouraged. "
4. Tier 2 also has heightened requirements for buffering, green space, pedestrian connectivity, and design standards for building and screening of certain features, such as mechanical equipment and solid waste facilities.
5. Along with the rezoning request, the applicant has applied for a conditional use permit proposing a commercial development with multiple uses (and/or structures) plus dwelling(s) within a mixed use structure.
6. The property is currently zoned B2, which is generally considered the broadest commercial district, allowing the widest range of commercial uses. Most uses permitted in the B2 district are also permitted in the B3 district.
7. The underlying B3 district is described by the zoning ordinance statement of intent as "intended to be applied to the traditional commercial, governmental, administrative and service core of Asheboro, commonly known as the Central Business District."
8. Distinctions between the current B2 General Business District and the underlying requested B3 are that the B3 district allows for a mixed use structure with commercial and residential uses, and does not require off-street parking. However, the conditional use permitting process can require off-street parking, along with other site improvements that exceed the minimum requirements for the underlying B3 district.

He then gave the Land Development Plan recommendations:

Proposed Land Use Map: Center City Planning Area

Small Area Plan: Central

Growth Strategy Map: Primary Growth

Goals/Policies Supporting Request (8):

- Checklist Item 1: Complies with LDP proposed land use map
- Checklist Item 5: Complies with Growth Strategy map
- Checklist Item 8: Adaptive reuse of vacant lot
- Checklist Item 10: Consistent with Land Category Descriptions
- Checklist Item 11: Rezoning will promote type of development described in Design Principles
- Checklist Item 12-14: Property is outside area of steep topography, flood area, watershed area

Goals/Policies Not Supporting Request (1):

- Checklist Item 3: The property on which the rezoning district is proposed fits the description of the Zoning Ordinance. (Article 200, Section 210, Schedule of Statements of Intent).

He then gave the consistency statement with adopted plans, reasonableness and public interest:

- Although not directly contiguous to traditional CBD, lies just outside area and shares some characteristics supporting CU-B3 request.
- The Land Development Plan's intent for the City Activity Center is "to create pedestrian-friendly, community focal points containing a mixture of commercial, office and institutional, entertainment, open space, and residential uses & housing types," which should be thoughtfully considered in helping to facilitate an adaptive reuse of the property.
- Property is immediately north of general B3 district approved in 2002 and is closer to city's historic central core.

He then stated that staff's recommendation is to approve the request. He then asked the board if they had any questions. Mr. Henderson asked if the conditional use district was guided by staff or the applicant's choice, to which Mr. Evans stated that the applicant had conversations with staff regarding the request and the applicant ultimately decided on the conditional use district.

Mr. Rich then asked if there was anyone to speak for the request. Mr. Cleve Dunn spoke in favor of the request, stating that his father was the owner of the property and he is the owner of the trust. He stated that there is an agreement with the applicant to purchase contingent on the Planning Board and City Council rezoning decision. He stated that his father has owned the building for more than 20 years and gave a history of the building occupancy, noting that the upstairs has been vacant. He stated that the McKenzie's are good owners and developers and their proposal would help the building to not deteriorate. He hoped the board would recommend approval of the request.

Mr. Rich asked if there was any opposition to the request. There was none.

Mr. Henderson moved to recommend approval of case RZ-20-09 based on staff's recommendation. Ms. Vuncannon seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no items.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the board, Mr. Rich adjourned the meeting.

Bradley Morton, Planning Board Secretary

Van Rich, Planning Board Chair