Asheboro Planning Board
Asheboro City Hall (146 N. Church Street)
Monday, May 6, 2024
7:00 PM
AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Consent Agenda Items:

(a) Approval of Minutes from April 1, 2024.

(b) Approval of Final Decision Document for Case No. BOA-24-03: Request for variances from Table 4-1 and Section 3.02(D) of the Asheboro Zoning Ordinance which regulates required yards (setbacks) and front yard averaging for property located at 508 Clegg Avenue (Randolph County Parcel Identification Numbers 7752891361).

III. Review of Cases and Monthly Report on Major Subdivisions Administratively Approved.

IV. Old Business continued from March 4, 2024

RZ-24-05: Request to rezone property currently addressed as 801 and 817 Sunset Avenue (Randolph County Parcel Identification Number 7751426889) from M (CZ) Mercantile Conditional Zoning and OA6 Office-Apartment to OA6 (CZ) Office-Apartment Conditional Zoning for a development with multiple family dwellings. *The applicant has withdrawn this request.*

V. New Business

Annual Report concerning Planning Board activities, expenditures, and budget estimates and discussion of other items of interest related to planning & zoning.

VI. Items not on the agenda

VII. Adjournment

# # # # # # # # #

MEETING OF THE ASHEBORO PLANNING BOARD
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 146 N. CHURCH ST.
MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2024
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:

Michael O'Kelley) – Chair
Pamela Vuncannon) – Vice Chair

Harold Anderson)
Ritchie Buffkin)
David Henderson) - Members Present
Van Rich)
Thomas Rush)

John Evans, Assistant Community Development Division Director
Justin Luck, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Bradley Morton, Planner/Deputy City Clerk
Jeffrey Sugg, City Attorney

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. O'Kelley called the Asheboro Planning Board to order.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

a. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 4, 2024**

b. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF BOARD'S PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CONTINUANCE REQUEST FOR RZ-24-05: REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 801 AND 817 SUNSET AVENUE (RANDOLPH COUNTY PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 7751426889) FROM M (CZ) MERCANTILE CONDITIONAL ZONING AND OA6 OFFICE-APARTMENT TO OA6 (CZ) OFIFICE-APARTMENT CONDITIONAL ZONING FOR A DEVELOPMENT WITH MULTIPLE FAMILY DWELLINGS**

Mr. Rich moved to approve all consent agenda items. Ms. Vuncannon seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

REVIEW OF CASES AND MONTHLY REPORT ON MAJOR SUBDIVISIONS ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED

Mr. Evans went over the land use cases that the City Council heard at the March, 2024 Regular Meeting. He stated that there currently have been no major subdivisions approved since March 4, 2024. Mr. Luck provided the Certificate of Service for BOA-24-02, stating that the Final Decision Document has been served in accordance with state law and city ordinance and noted that the appeal period has started.

OLD BUSINESS CONTINUED FROM MARCH 4, 2024

PLANNING BOARD FUNCTIONING AS BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT: BOA-24-03: REQUEST FOR VARIANCES FROM TABLE 4-1 AND SECTION 3.02 (D) OF THE ASHEBORO ZONING ORDINANCE WITH REGULATES REQUIRED YARDS (SETBACKS) AND FRONT YARD AVERAGING FOR

PROPERTY LOCATED AT 508 CLEGG AVENUE (RANDOLPH COUNTY PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 7752891361)

At this time, Mr. Luck and the applicant, Ms. Beverly Needham Garner, were placed under oath to offer the staff report and their testimony, respectively. Mr. Luck gave a visual presentation on the above-referenced case. Mr. Luck presented the following analysis:

Variance Request: Variances from Table 4-1 and Section 3.02(D) of the Asheboro Zoning Ordinance which regulates required yards (setbacks) and front yard averaging.

Analysis:

Location: 508 Clegg Ave.
Parcel Identification Number: 7752891361
Property Size: 0.44 Acres (19,254 sq.ft.)
Zoning: R10 Residential
Overlay Zone: None

Surrounding Land Use:

North: Industrial
South: SF Residential
East: SF Residential
West: SF Residential

LDP Recommendations:

Growth Strategy: Primary Growth
Proposed Land Use Map: Neighborhood Residential

He then showed aerial, overview, zoning, topographic/utilities, and oblique maps of the subject property as well as photographs from all directions. He then continued the analysis:

508 Clegg Ave. ("The Lot") is a conforming R10 lot with an existing single family dwelling use. Required yards for the R10 zoning district are regulated through Table 4-1 as follows:

Table 4-1
Table of Area, Height, Bulk and Placement Regulations

District	Minimum Lot Size in Sq. Ft.	Lot Width (Frontage) In Feet*	Front Required Yard in Feet*	Side Required Yard In Feet*	Rear Required Yard in Feet*	Maximum Height in Feet*	Maximum Floor Area Ratio*	Open Space Ratio*	Recreation Ratio*
R10	10,000 SF	75	30	10	25	35	22%		

The 10-foot required side yard is applicable to both principal and accessory structures (Table 4-1; 5.04(31)).
The required 30-foot front yard setback is modified by Section 3.02(D), Averaging a Front Setback Line, as follows:

3.02(D)(2) Increase to Front Yard Setback

In a residential district, where the average of the front setbacks for all adjacent lots, which are located within two hundred feet of either side of a lot is greater than the required front setback specified in this Ordinance, a required setback line shall be provided on the lot equal to this greater average depth but not to exceed sixty feet. For the purpose of computing such average, an adjacent vacant lot shall be considered as having the minimum required front setback specified for the zoning district.

There are a total of four adjacent lots within two hundred feet of either side of The Lot. Utilizing Section 3.02(D), the required front yard becomes 45.5', calculated as follows:

Address	Apparent Existing Setback
516 Clegg Ave.	39'
514 Clegg Ave.	49'
504 Clegg Ave.	48'
500 Clegg Ave.	46'
Average	**45.5'**

Mr. Henderson inquired if this was the required setback or if the district setbacks still applied. Mr. Luck confirmed that 45.5' is the required front yard setback for this property.

The existing single-family dwelling conforms with all required yards; however, the existing open carport, constructed prior to current permitting records, is legal, nonconforming with respect to the required side yard and the averaged front yard. The existing carport is located 5 feet from the side property line and 35 feet from the front property line.

The applicant proposes to remove the existing carport, replacing it with a new open, metal carport. This proposed carport would come no closer than 6 feet from the side property line, and 23 feet from the front property line, thus a required side yard variance of four feet and a front yard variance of 22.5 feet are requested.

He then showed a site plan of proposed improvements to the property. He then went over the findings of fact:

1) Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance. It shall not be necessary to demonstrate that, in the absence of the variance, no reasonable use can be made of the property.
2) The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography. Hardships resulting from personal circumstances, as well as hardships resulting from conditions that are common to the neighborhood or the general public, may not be the basis for granting a variance.
3) The hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner. The act of purchasing property with knowledge that circumstances exist that may justify the granting of a variance shall not be regarded as a self-created hardship.
4) The requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved.

He then asked the board if there were any questions at this time. Mr. O'Kelley inquired if the existing carport is on the owner's property. Mr. Luck confirmed that the existing carport is on the owner's property and is considered legal nonconforming with respect to the setbacks. He stated that the proposed structure will be 12' closer to the front property line than the existing legal nonconforming carport. He showed the site plan of the proposal to clarify this. Mr. Rich inquired about the adjoining property owner and if there was any obstruction to the view of the adjoining owners. Mr. Luck showed images of the properties to the board. He stated that there has been no contact made to city staff from adjoining property owners. Mr. O'Kelley inquired on what the max height can be for detached accessory structures. Mr. Luck stated that 25 feet is the max height for detached accessory structures and that the proposed height of the new structure will be 11'. There were no further questions from the board for Mr. Luck at this time.

Ms. Garner addressed the board and offered her testimony to meet all findings of fact tests. She provided the board with a handout showing different houses in the immediate vicinity which all had existing double carports. To address the hardship tests she stated the following:

1. There is nowhere else on the lot to place the proposed structure other than the front. There is no access to the rear of the lot. She has spoken with the neighboring property owners, and they have no problems with the proposal. The home was purchased in 1976 and it included the existing carport at that time.
2. There are peculiarities with the property in that at the time constructed it was built only with a single car garage that was minimum height. The height of the proposed structure will accommodate her vehicle.
3. She has sought the variance prior to construction and has seen other properties that are not permitted and not meeting setbacks.
4. This proposal will not block anyone's visibility at the right of way.

She then asked the board if there were any questions. Mr. O'Kelley inquired if the granting of this variance would set a precedent for other properties in the future. Mr. Luck stated that a variance is specific to the property applying for relief and that this would not set a precedent for future variances.

Mr. Rich inquired on access to the rear of the lot and if this was a possibility. Ms. Garner stated that with a normal vehicle, she could likely access the rear of the lot, but with the camper she has, it will not fit in the rear of the lot without entering someone else's property. Ms. Vuncannon had concerns with not meeting the side setback. Mr. Rich inquired if this would be on a concrete slab. Ms. Garner stated that it will only be anchored into the ground and not on a concrete slab. There were no further questions at this time for Ms. Garner. Mr. Henderson noted that he would like to see at least one of the setbacks met, but if this is the case it may block the entrance into her existing garage.

Mr. Buffkin moved to approve Board Action 1 (Variance from Table 4-1 of the Asheboro Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required side yard setback to 6 feet. Provided, however, the variance is limited by any conditions stated in the Final Decision Document) and Board Action 2 (Variance from Section 3.02 (D) of the Asheboro Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required front yard setback to 23 feet. Provided, however, the variance is limited by any conditions stated in the Final Decision Document) of BOA-24-03. Ms. Vuncannon again stated concern with not meeting the side setback and blocking visibility due to the proposed walls of the structure as depicted in the building quote submitted as part of the variance application. Mr. Sugg stated that a condition can be crafted to the motion to address approving the variance per the site plan and building quote submitted. Mr. Buffkin amended the motion to include a condition that the structure would be consistent with the site plan and building quote, showing a 6' side panel and the front and back remaining open. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. When the question was called, Board Members Anderson, Buffkin, O'Kelley, Rich, and Rush voted aye. Board Members Henderson and Vuncannon voted no. Since state law requires a four-fifths majority of the decision-making board to issue a variance, this vote did not result in the issuance of any variance.

Ms. Garner inquired if there was anything else that she could propose at this time. Mr. Sugg stated that the Board of Adjustment was still in session for the purpose of considering the variance case. If another board member had a different motion, the board could entertain it at this time. Mr. Henderson moved to deny Board Action 1 and have the structure meet the zoning district side setback and to grant Board Action 2, adding a condition to both actions that the structure is consistent with the site plan and building quote, showing a 6' side panel and the front and back remaining open. Ms. Vuncannon seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. The final decision document will be presented to the board at the May regular meeting for adoption.

NEW BUSINESS

a) RZ-24-07: REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 919 DRAPER STREET (RANDOLPH COUNTY PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 7762573909) FROM B2

GENERAL COMMERCIAL, I1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL, AND R10 MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO R15 LOW-DENSITY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

Mr. Evans provided a visual presentation for the above-referenced case. He gave an overview of the case:

Applicant: Pablo Beltran Martinez
Location: 919 Draper Street
Request: Rezone from B2 General Commercial, I1 Light Industrial, and R10 Medium-Density Residential to R15 Single-Family Residential
Randolph County Parcel ID: 7762573909
Size: 3.5 acres +/-
Existing Land Use: Undeveloped

He showed overview, rezoning, topographic/utilities, aerial and oblique maps as well as photographs of the subject property from all directions. He then went over the analysis:

1. The property is inside the city limits.
2. Central Falls Road and Draper Street are both state-maintained minor thoroughfares.
3. The property has multiple zoning designations including B2 General Commercial, I1 Light Industrial, and a small amount R10 Medium-Density Residential. The B2 district is the most permissive commercial district in terms of allowable commercial uses; I1 zoning, in addition to allowing several industrial uses, also allows limited commercial development. The small area of R10 zoning could allow single and two-family development if certain criteria were met.
4. The requested R15 zoning district generally permits only single-family dwellings; one principal dwelling per property is allowed. Developable lots must possess at least 15,000 square feet of land area and 100 feet of lot width. Descriptions from the zoning ordinance for these districts are attached to this report (Attachment 1).

B2 General Commercial District **(existing zoning):** The B2 General Commercial District is intended to serve the convenience goods, shoppers' goods retail and service needs of the motoring public, both local and transient. This district should always be located with access directly to minor thoroughfares or higher classification streets, but never local residential streets.

I1 Light Industrial District **(existing zoning):** The intent of the I1 Industrial Development District is to produce areas for manufacturing, processing and assembly uses, commercial uses, distribution and servicing enterprises, controlled by performance standards to limit the effect of such uses on uses within the district and on adjacent districts.

R10 Medium-Density Residential District **(existing zoning):** The R10 Residential District is intended to provide regulations which will produce a moderate intensity of residential uses, usually single family or two family in character and served by central water supply and sewage disposal systems, plus the necessary governmental and other support facilities to service such urban intensity living.

Proposed zoning designations (R15 district)
R15 Low-Density Single-Family Residential District **(proposed zoning):** The Rl5 Residential District is intended to provide regulations which will produce a low intensity of single-family residential use with the necessary governmental and other support facilities to service such suburban intensity living.

Table 4-1
Table of Area, Height, Bulk and Placement Regulations

District	Minimum Lot Size in Sq. Ft.	Lot Width (Frontage) In Feet*	Front Required Yard in Feet*	Side Required Yard In Feet*	Rear Required Yard in Feet*	Maximum Height in Feet*	Maximum Floor Area Ratio*	Open Space Ratio*	Recreation Ratio*

R15	15,000	100	30	15	25	35	22%		
		1 Single Family Only							
R10	10,000 SF	75	30	10	25	35	22%		
	15,000 Duplex	1 Single Family or 1 Duplex Only					22%		
	10,000 NonRes						22%		
B2	10,000	75	25	0 or 5	0 or 5	35	100%		
I1	10,000	75	10	10	10	45	N/A		
*Except as specifically modified by this Ordinance Revised 07/2021									

5. There was formerly a non-residential use on the property according to tax assessment information. The use, a "Storage-Shop", was noted as previously burned.
6. The area consists primarily of single-family residential uses, with scattered two-family dwellings and manufactured housing. Non-residential uses include an adjoining parking lot serving a place of assembly (church) and a solar farm.
7. The request is for a general district rezoning. No specific use or site plan can be considered with this application. There are property constraints, such as regulated floodplain, areas of steeper slopes, and an existing city-maintained utility easement that will affect the property's development potential.

He then went over the Land Development Plan (LDP) Recommendations:

Proposed Land Use Map:
Suburban Residential
Small Area Plan: Northeast
Growth Strategy Map: Primary Growth

Goals/Policies Supporting Request (6):
- Checklist Item 1: Complies with LDP Plan proposed land use map
- Checklist Item 3: Fits zoning ordinance district description
- Checklist Item 4: Compatible with surrounding land uses
- Checklist Item 5: Complies with Growth Strategy Map
- Checklist Item 7: Complies with small area plan
- Checklist Item 12: Located outside of watershed area

Goals/Policies Not Supporting Request (2):
- Checklist Items 12-13: Property is located within flood zone and area with steep slopes

He provided staff's consistency statement:

"The requested R15 residential zoning district promotes single-family residential development and is consistent complies [sic] with the Land Development Plan map's Suburban Residential designation for the property. The Northeast Small Area Plan, which advocates protection of existing residential neighborhoods from incompatible non-residential development, also lends support to the application. Development under the current commercial and industrial zoning could result in land use conflicts; amending the property's zoning and applying an R15 designation is advisable."

He then provided staff's recommendation:

"Considering the aforementioned analysis, staff believes that the proposed zoning map amendment is reasonable and in the public interest and recommends approval of the request."

He stated that the City Council will consider the rezoning request on Thursday, May 9. He then asked the board if there were any questions. There were no questions for Mr. Evans at this time.

Mr. O'Kelley inquired if there was anyone to speak in favor of the request. The applicant was present and spoke in favor of the request. A question was asked of the applicant if the adjoining property owners were notified. It was confirmed that letters were sent to all adjoining property owners.

Mr. O'Kelley inquired if there was anyone in opposition to the request. There was no one in opposition to the request.

Mr. Rush moved to recommend approval of RZ-24-07 as presented with staff's consistency statement and recommendation. Ms. Vuncannon seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

b) RZ-24-08: REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 947 EAST SALISBURY STREET (RANDOLPH COUNTY PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 7761324663) FROM R7.5 MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO B2 GENERAL COMMERCIAL

Mr. Evans provided a visual presentation of the above-referenced case. He gave an overview of the case:

Applicant: Robert Small (Jenna McKenzie, Agent)
Location: 947 East Salisbury Street
Request: Rezone from R7.5 Medium-Density Residential to B2 General Commercial
Randolph County Parcel ID: 7761324663
Size: 0.78 acres +/-
Existing Land Use: Retail shoppers' goods and repair services

He showed overview, rezoning, topographic/utilities, aerial and oblique maps as well as photographs of the subject property from all directions. Mr. Henderson inquired if the use was legal nonconforming. Mr. Evans confirmed that the use is legal nonconforming. He then went over the analysis:

1. The property is inside the city limits.
2. East Salisbury Street (SR 2237) is a state-maintained minor thoroughfare at this location.
3. The existing R7.5 zoning district is described as to provide regulations which will produce a moderate intensity of residential uses, usually single family and no more than two family in character and served by central water supply and sewage disposal systems, plus the necessary governmental and other support facilities to service such urban intensity living. The proposed B2 district is described as Intended to serve the convenience goods, shoppers' goods retail and service needs of the motoring public, both local and transient. This district should always be located with access directly to minor thoroughfares or higher classification streets, but never local residential streets.
4. The request is for a B2 General Commercial district. No specific use or site plan can be reviewed with this request.
5. There is currently a commercial use existing on the property (repair services and retail shoppers' goods). It is considered a legal nonconforming land use. Tax records indicate that the two structures on the property were constructed in 1972 and 1980. City zoning regulations limit the extent of changes that can be made to legal non-conforming uses.
6. As is common with many long-standing legal non-conforming land uses, the property is not developed in a manner that complies with all respects of current city codes. The application filed seeks to make the land use legal and conforming; any present non-conforming situations would be permitted to remain unless a new use is proposed for the property.

He then went over the LDP Recommendations:

Proposed Land Use Map:
Commercial

Small Area Plan: Central
Growth Strategy Map: Primary Growth

Goals/Policies Supporting Request (6):

- Checklist Item 1: Property is compliant with Proposed Land Use Map
- Checklist Item 3: Fits zoning ordinance description
- Checklist Item 5: Complies with Growth Strategy map.
- Checklist Item 7: The proposed rezoning is compatible with the applicable Small Area Plan.
- Checklist Item 12-14: Outside of watershed, flood area, area of steep slopes

Goals/Policies Not Supporting Request (1):
Policy 2.1.5: The City will ensure development regulations provide appropriate transitional uses.

He provided staff's consistency statement:

"The Land Development Plan designates the subject property and several adjoining properties for commercial use. Approval of the rezoning would recognize the property's lengthy commercial history and be consistent with surrounding zoning; much of the East Salisbury Street corridor in the immediate vicinity already is zoned B2 General Commercial. The Central Small Area plan identifies "accommodating existing, and some future commercial development" as an objective in appropriately designated locations along minor thoroughfares or higher classification streets. Staff believes changing the property's zoning to B2 could help facilitate investment into the property by eliminating its non-conforming status."

He then provided staff's recommendation:

"Considering the aforementioned analysis, staff believes that the proposed zoning map amendment is reasonable and in the public interest and recommends approval of the request."

He stated that the City Council will consider the rezoning request on Thursday, May 9. He then asked the board if there were any questions. There were no questions for Mr. Evans at this time.

Mr. O'Kelley inquired if there was anyone to speak in favor of the request. Ms. Jenna McKenzie, the applicant's agent, spoke in favor of the request. She stated that Mr. Small has operated Asheboro Outdoor Equipment and has been in business for 28 years. She stated that the intent of the request is to bring the property into a conforming zoning district for the legal nonconforming use. She stated that Mr. Small mailed letters to all adjoining properties on March 19th, 2024. She stated that if the board had any questions, she would answer them at this time. The board had no questions for Ms. McKenzie.

Mr. O'Kelley inquired if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the request. There was no one in opposition to the request.

Mr. Rush moved to recommend approval of RZ-24-08 as presented with the staff's consistency statement and recommendation. Mr. Henderson seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no items at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the board, Mr. O'Kelley adjourned the meeting.

_____ _____

Bradley Morton, Planning Board Secretary Michael O'Kelley, Planning Board Chair

146 N. Church Street
Asheboro, NC 27203

City of Asheboro
Community Development Division

336-626-1201
www.asheboronc.gov

2024 ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED SUBDIVISIONS (Since January 1, 2024)

Name of Subdivision	Case No.	Location	Number of lots	Type of Approval	Notes
Windcrest Acres, Section 4	SUB-22-01	Bennett Street (off Old Liberty Rd.)	15	Final Plat - April 2024	Subdivision is approved by-right in an R10 Medium-Density Residential zoning district.

RZ-24-05: Request to rezone property currently addressed as 801 and 817 Sunset Avenue (Randolph County Parcel Identification Number 7751426889) from M (CZ) Mercantile Conditional Zoning and OA6 (Office-Apartment) to OA6 (CZ) Office-Apartment Conditional Zoning for a development with multiple family dwellings.

Staff Report

The applicant has withdrawn this request.

From: Davis Ray - WynnefieldForward
To: Trevor Nuttall
Cc: John Evans
Subject: RE: [External Sender] Zoning Application
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 12:05:13 PM

Due to some unfortunate circumstances, we would like to withdraw this rezoning request.

Davis Ray
336.625.7641
davis@wynnefieldforward.com

From: Trevor Nuttall <tnuttall@ci.asheboro.nc.us>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 1:09 PM
To: Davis Ray - WynnefieldForward <davis@wynnefieldforward.com>
Cc: Trevor Nuttall <tnuttall@ci.asheboro.nc.us>; John Evans <jevans@ci.asheboro.nc.us>
Subject: Re: [External Sender] Zoning Application

Received - we will report this request to both boards. Planning Board can deal with this tonight. Council will do so at at its April meeting.

On Mar 4, 2024 1:05 PM, Davis Ray - WynnefieldForward <davis@wynnefieldforward.com> wrote:

> We would like to respectfully request to continue our rezoning request to the May 6th, 2024 Planning Board and May 9th, 2024 City Council. The reason for this request is to allow more time to adequately prepare our site plan and design to meet the existing neighborhood as well as the Sunset Drive corridor aesthetics. We are still working to finalize our driveway entrances, parking spaces and stormwater design to be more specific.
>
> Thank you for your understanding and consideration!
>
> Davis Ray
> 336.625.7641
>
> davis@wynnefieldforward.com

Annual Report concerning Planning Board activities, expenditures, and budget estimates and discussion of other items of interest related to planning & zoning.

To: Asheboro City Council

From: Michael O'Kelley, Planning Board Chairman

Date: May 6, 2024

RE: Annual Report- Asheboro Planning Board

This memorandum provides a summary of the Planning Board's activities since July 1, 2023, an analysis of the expenditures to date for the current fiscal year and the anticipated funds needed for operation during the ensuing fiscal year. The Planning Board is comprised of seven (7) members, five (5) of whom reside in the corporate limits and two (2) who reside within the city's extraterritorial planning jurisdiction. A current Board roster is attached to this memo for your reference.

Summary of Activities

Through May 6, 2024 (not including continued and withdrawn cases), the Planning Board has reviewed a total of 20 cases. These 20 cases consisted of eleven (11) conditional rezoning requests, six (6) general district rezoning requests, and three (3) Board of Adjustment variance requests. This is an increase in the number of cases the Planning Board reviewed when compared to a similar period during the previous fiscal year when 16 cases were reviewed.

Expenditures and Budget

The Board's only expenditure this fiscal year has been related to members' stipends, which are $150 a month. $12,600 was budgeted for board stipends in FY 23-24. The same amount is being requested for FY 24-25. To date, current year expenditures are below the budgeted amount.

On behalf of the Planning Board, I thank you for your support. It is an honor to serve the Asheboro community.

City of Asheboro
Planning Board/Board of Adjustment

Name/City or ETJ	Appointed/Expires
Van Rich / City	2-3-86 / 1-1-26
Ritchie Buffkin / City	2-7-13 / 1-1-25
Harold Anderson / City	3-5-20 / 1-1-27
David Henderson / ETJ	2-4-13 / 2-1-28
Pamela Vuncannon, Vice Chair	08-9-18 / 1-1-29
Mike O'Kelley, Chair / City	2-8-18 / 1-1-28
Thomas Rush / ETJ	2-3-14 / 2-1-29