

Planning Board Meeting
August 10, 2015

6:30 pm

Council Chambers

Minutes & General Account

Planning Board Members Present: Art Wise, Chair; Sarah Glanville, Vice-Chair; Kerry Miller, Eddie Oakley, John Capes

Staff Present: Chuck Smith, Carrie Spencer and Martha Wolfe

Visitors Present: Sterling Kelly, CEO of Burkley Communities; Mike Bullock, Kay Sexton, Sabrina Schumaker, Jim & Julia Rayborn, Pam Harden, Faron Dawson, John & Anne Petty, Mick Laurie, Hugh & Judith Cates, Loretta King, Wes Scott, Tori White, Robert & Sheila Wenzel, Homer & Martha Harden, Brian Babyak, Matt Benner, Rick Benner, Stan Calvarese, Ruth Clark, Janet Gill, Joseph Basile, Keith Hassell Lackey, Donna Turner, Buddy & Joanne Mann, Stephen Smith, Grace Smith and Wes Cashwell.

1. Call to Order – Art Wise, Chair, called the meeting to order. Mr. Wise said the Town Clerk has requested to administer the Oath of Office to a new Planning Board member.
2. Oath of Office – The Town Clerk stated Ms. Dot Perdue’s term on the Planning Board was due to expire August 2015. She asked to step down to the alternate position, due to her health. The current alternate, John Capes, agreed to serve as an active Planning Board Member. At their August 2015 regular meeting, the Town Council voted unanimously to appoint John Capes to serve as an active member to the Planning Board with term expiring August 2020. The Town Council also voted to appoint Dot Perdue to serve as an alternate. The Town Clerk administered the Oath of Office to John Capes.

(Oath)

3. Approval of minutes from the April 13, 2015 meeting – Kerry Miller made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 13, 2015 meeting as presented. John Capes made a second to the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.
4. Public Hearing to consider a rezoning request from MS (Main Street) to CZ-MS (Conditional Zoning-Main Street) – Carrie Spencer, Town Planner, stated the Town has received an application to rezone the property located at 202 R1 Ragsdale Rd. Spencer said the Planning Board members received a staff report giving the conditions of the site. Spencer stated the Technical Review Committee (TRC) has reviewed the application and has approved the site conditional upon the acceptance of a stormwater retention device.

Spencer stated when a property is rezoned and not developed within 24 months it reverts back to its former zoning. This property, therefore, is currently zoned MS.

Spencer stated in the Planning Board packet is the list of permitted uses for this zoning district. Spencer displayed maps showing where the property is located, the street view, and surrounding properties. The parcel consists of approximately 2.28 +/- acres.

The applicant has requested rezoning from MS to CZ-MS with the following conditions:

1. Use limited to multifamily dwellings.
2. Number of dwellings would not exceed sixty (60).
3. Building height limited to 3 stories.
4. Predominant proportion of the building exterior will be brick and fiber cement siding.
5. All dwellings will have individual, privately accessible patios or balconies.
6. Applicant will work to establish Tree Conservation Areas.
7. Applicant will extend brick sidewalks.
8. Buildings will front on Gannaway St. and Ragsdale Rd. with parking situated behind the buildings.

These are the conditions offered by the applicant and in order for the rezoning request to be approved the Town Council would have to approve these conditions offered. Spencer stated the Planning Board is an advisory board. The Planning Board will make a recommendation to the Town Council regarding the rezoning request. The Town Council will be the governing body to make the final decision on the rezoning requested.

Spencer showed the preliminary site plan. She said this site plan could change in minor ways. She said there are 3 buildings; 2 large buildings and 1 small. The 2 larger buildings will have 24 units in each and the 1 small building will have 12 units. The site will include landscape buffers at the northern part of the site that divides it from the adjacent residential property. Brick sidewalk is proposed along the road in front and to the side of the site.

The site proposes 2 different driveways; one on Gannaway and one on Ragsdale Rd. There has been a lot of discussion about traffic movement. There has been talk about changing Gannaway to a one way street. Spencer said the Town is pursuing a study regarding the feasibility of that change. Spencer said the study will include the traffic movement at night and on weekends to get a true picture of the traffic movement.

Spencer displayed a conceptual drawing showing the proposed exterior of the buildings. The 3 building complex will have open pass through areas between buildings.

Spencer stated the current use of the land is vacant and wooded land. The bordering zoning uses are to the North – MS (Commercial & single family) East – MS (US Post Office) West – SFR (single family residential) South – MS (Multifamily & commercial) this property is located between both SFR use and Main Street use.

The property is adjacent to the Town of Jamestown water & sewer. It was previously zoned B1 (Business Commercial) prior to 2009 LDO. The property was rezoned from MS to CZ-MS in 2011 for senior affordable housing. This project was unable to obtain tax credit financing funding.

Spencer stated the maximum residential density as number of housing units are key components of these zoning districts. Existing zoning districts allow 8 dwelling units per acre or maximum of 18 units

allowed on this property. The rezoning request is for 26 dwelling units per acre of 60 units total in the form of apartment development.

Spencer stated the MS district provides for new development, revitalization, reuse and infill development in Jamestown's traditional downtown. A broad array of uses is permitted. Allowed building and lot types are Urban Workplace, Shop fronts, detached house and civic building. The development pattern seeks to integrate shops, restaurants, services, work places, civic, educational and religious facilities and higher density housing in a compact, pedestrian-oriented environment.

Spencer said the visions of the Town are part of the 2020 LDP. It is a comprehensive look at orderly growth for the Town. Whenever a property is rezoned it is required to adopt a statement that outlines why a proposal is or is not in keeping with this long range plan. Spencer stated the Goals & Policies of the LDP that apply to this proposal are: Growth Management, Community Appearance, Quality of Life.

She further described the Goals to include the adopted policies of the LDP.

Growth Management Goals:

- Carefully manage growth making smart growth decisions that maintain and enhance Jamestown's special characteristics and heritage.
- Strategically locate new land development in the most appropriate places.
- Use infrastructure investments efficiently.
- Attract new business and jobs and a more diverse tax base.
- Preserve our natural, cultural, and historic resources and open space as we grow.

Growth Management Policies:

- Revitalize downtown Jamestown to be the center of community life and provide opportunities for development of new retail, office & community service uses.
- Rejuvenate and beautify Main Street to create inviting and pedestrian friendly atmosphere with variety of services and retail uses.
- Encourage new activity centers to provide wider mixture of uses to serve as pedestrian friendly community destinations and gathering areas.
- Continue to value, preserve and enhance existing residential uses and neighborhoods to maintain unique small town character of Jamestown. Infill development is encouraged to efficiently use existing infrastructure, however, new buildings and renovation of existing buildings should fit the scale and character and add value to existing neighborhoods.
- Encourage new residential land uses and neighborhoods that strike a balance between quality and affordability, add to the livability and character of Jamestown by providing mixed use, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods well connected to community via sidewalks and greenways, provide mixture of appropriate uses and housing types in appropriate location.
- Encourage adequate, affordable, attractive, quality housing through renovation of existing older homes, and the building of a balanced mixture of housing types to match a range of lifestyles and income.
- Encourage open space, parks & squares to be a part of new neighborhoods, encourage these amenities to be connected to greenways, sidewalks and bike lanes, add these amenities to existing neighborhoods where appropriate and feasible.

- Carefully balance individual property rights with the good of the whole community by expecting new development to use the best design features of our favorite existing areas and by providing adequate buffers between incompatible uses.
- Encourage everyone to use these land development plan goals and policies as a guideline to make smart growth decisions, strategically locate land development in most appropriate places, use existing and future infrastructure investment efficiently, reduce costly urban sprawl, help maintain and enhance the community assets that make Jamestown special.

Community Appearance

Goal is to carefully preserve and enhanced Jamestown’s small town character and community appearance as it grows.

Policies:

- Value and preserve Jamestown’s small town feel.
- Create a downtown “village” feel along Main St. that enhances our community character and uses as a selling point to attract entrepreneurs (shops, restaurants, services) and visitors., Use a market analysis study to determine types of businesses and development that would “work” in downtown and include historic district.
- Maintain a strong sense of place and community pride as each new land use fits into our future vision, adding quality and value and enhancing our community character and quality of life.
- Carefully consider appearance and design of new buildings and site development to insure a good fit, maintain and improve the community appearance, create a greater sense of harmony and compatibility among various uses in the community.
- Beautify existing streetscapes, and encourage creation of new streetscapes that provide pedestrian friendly environment with adequate sidewalk and street trees, attractive landscaping, signage and building facades.

Quality of Life

Goals – Carefully preserve Jamestown’s natural, cultural and historic resources as we grow.

Policies:

- Maintain and improve air quality by recruiting environmentally friendly industry, encourage pedestrian friendly, mixed use land use patterns, more sidewalks, bike lanes and greenways, interconnected street patterns, open space development.

Spencer stated the key issue to consider for the rezoning request is balancing the various goals and policies of the LDP. Does it provide a mix of housing that we need, does it also satisfy our community character and quality of life for the Town.

The applicant, Sterling Kelly, Burkley Communities, gave his presentation. Kelly introduced Jerry Robinson, President of Burkey Communities, Kathleen Leary, Community Manager of Courtyard Commons, Mike Fox, legal Counsel for rezoning case.

Kelly said it has been a great experience working in Jamestown through their involvement with Courtyard Commons. It is a great community. Their singular purpose as a company is to build the area's best apartments. They feel there are 2 ways to do this:

1. The physical environment that they create. Give residents a reason to take pride in a community in which they live.
2. People are more important than the physical environment. We have a proven model and would apply that model to this proposed apartment complex.

While not pertinent to the rezoning request, Kelly reported that the Courtyard Commons project is in mid-stream. They have renovated the 7 buildings that will remain on site. They are about to demolish the 2 buildings that will be removed. They will build 3 new buildings changing the number of dwellings units from 72 to 86.

What they learned from the most recent residents of Courtyard Commons as to why they choose to live there is because foremost it is in Jamestown. It is the small town characteristics. These characteristics described as friendliness, convenience, genuineness, relaxing, inviting, refreshing. People feel great when they are a part of the community. That is what we are trying to capitalize at this project. This project is different in its location and characteristics. It is in a unique way precisely located between the property of the Post Office that fronts Main Street and fronts on single family residential. We spent a lot of time looking at the LDP adopted by the Town of Jamestown and working with the Town Planner. Sterling said in his view, given the LDP goals and policies, he sees the development fits very well with the LDP for that location:

- To rejuvenate & beautify Main St.
- Add activity centers
- Encourage residential land uses in neighborhoods
- Appropriate infill development is encouraged when adding value and preserving historic integrity and unique character of downtown area
- Uses should be comparable in scale & design
- Create village concept for visitors to easily walk
- Encourage a pedestrian oriented mix of predominately 2 & 3 story buildings close to the street and containing an attractive mix of storefronts, office, residential uses.
- Ample sidewalk & trees

They are trying to shape this development to these goals and policies. This property is currently zoned MS. The development they envision will market rent housing; a high quality residential apartment complex. The ideal mix for this development would be a broad mix of ages, young professionals to empty nesters to retirees. People that are drawn to small town living. They are requesting to build 3 buildings with a total of 60 units.

They see a range of ages find living downtown attractive. They will have sufficient on-site parking. The parking lot will have 84 spaces; 1 space per bedroom. (36 – 1 BR and 24 – 2BR) The entrance to the property is located on Gannaway.

In closing, they are providing sufficient on-site parking. They do not want to add to the Town's parking problem. Beyond that, they would like to be part of helping with a solution for the parking problem. While not a condition of the rezoning request, it would probably work well to make Gannaway a one way street. He would be interested and willing to do this if in the Town's interest. He would dedicate

an easement along the frontage of the property on Gannaway that would allow for a sufficiently wide one way street with angled parking. (20 spaces now) if angled parking would add 10 – 12 additional on street parking spaces.

Kelly displayed a site plan showing the 60 units. The site has some challenging topography. There might be need for a low retaining wall in a section along Gannaway. We think the architectural style breaks up the buildings and is less institutional with private balconies and patios. In closing, Kelly stated he considers it a privilege to be doing business in Jamestown.

Spencer stated the issue with the street parking and easement, while I believe in good faith Mr. Kelly would do this should this rezoning pass and be allowed to develop, it is not however a condition of the rezoning. The idea of the additional on street parking is not of consideration at this time.

Mike Fox, attorney for Burkley Communities, stated part of the problem making the parking easement a condition is it goes with the zoning. If this parking easement is a condition and for some reason DOT denies it, we are stuck with a site plan that does not work. The parking as a condition of the zoning is impractical for everybody.

Sarah Glanville asked for comparison of parcel size of Courtyard Commons and the proposed project. Spencer stated the Courtyard Commons is approximately 5.37 acres. Courtyard Commons has approximately 150 parking spaces. There will be approximately 86 units at Courtyard Commons when completed.

Capes asked regarding the height of the proposed structure in relationship to the Townhomes across the street, is there any type of observational study as to how they measure up. Mr. Kelly said no study has been done at this time. Capes said as for the town, we need to consider the look and feel of the structure and how the footprint measures up. In general, it is hard to see how the proposed structures look compared to the existing structures. Miller asked regarding the proposed foot print, if that 3rd story is an issue. Is it at all feasible to cut back to be more consistent with that local area. To him, the footprint is very important. He does not want to see a “castle on a hill”. His concern is that the 3 story building is really imposing in that area. He sees that 3rd story as significant to that area. Capes asked if possible to have an artist rendering showing the building at street level in relation to buildings across the street for perspective.

Sterling said the Planning Board is asking a question of scale. One of the ways to address that is aesthetic design. If you eliminate the 3rd floor, he feels you have an economically unfeasible project.

Oakley said everything is speculative. He would prefer to see the actual elevations. Does the brick type match existing structures? He feels that is important. Kelly said the sketch shows the areas that will be brick. The breezeway provides private entrances to the apartments. Steps are of steel construction. The stairs and doors are located on the interior of the breezeways.

Art Wise opened the public comment portion of the public hearing. Wise asked if there was anyone that wished to speak in favor of the project to please come forward. There was no one that wished to speak.

Wise asked if there was anyone that wished to speak against the project to please come forward.

Steve Smith, 506 Mendenhall – Stated he has 2 concerns. 1. The apartments are 3 stories high. If these are to be targeted for empty nesters and retirees, these people will not be able to walk upstairs to the

2nd and 3rd floors. Are there elevators in the buildings? 2. People need parking spaces, it is unreasonable to allow less than 2 parking spaces per apartment. That is not enough parking and parking is already a problem. The buildings are too high.

Buddy Mann, 100 Ragsdale Ct. – He asked for clarification of where the brick would be on the buildings. The description of the project says predominately brick. Mr. Kelly showed the areas of brick construction on the sketches.

Mr. Mann said the density is too many units for the approximately 2.2 acres. He understands the parking was increased to 84 spaces. Did you move the buildings to get the extra spaces? Mr. Kelly said they did.

Mr. Mann said the main thing is at night. There is a major problem at night. To try to put that many people in that small of space is not good planning. That is the purpose of planning to try to relieve problems we have. The only plus is that the Town might get some tax money. But I think that is offset by all the problems created.

Mr. Mann said regarding the parking, the developers said they are trying to market the apartments to young professionals. Most young people starting out are both working. You will need at least 120 parking spaces. People come in from work at night and fill up the interior parking. Then if you have friends and family come over there is no place to park. He sees more negative than positive.

Rick Benner, 107 Mendenhall – aside from the parking, it is just not going to work. If you look at Gannaway going east you cannot make a left turn back toward Town. All the 120 cars are going to come out of the apartment complex turn and flood the neighborhoods. We already have a problem in Forestdale subdivision being a cut through. Nobody uses the stop light. A one-way street is not going to matter.

Brian Babyak, 107 Mendenhall – When he first moved here he lived in an apartment just like the one being proposed. It was in Adams Farm. Same elevations, finishes and similar drawings. The concern is the traffic coming out of the complex. The 3 stories is a big concern. The existing townhomes are 3 stories, but the garage is below the dwelling. Putting a 3 story albatross overlooking everybody's back yard is not good. There are no houses in the neighborhood comparable to that.

Stan Calvarese, 103 Forestdale Drive – I like to approach this with an open mind to see if it is logical and feasible. He took notes during the meeting and they were all negative. I don't think the Planning Board should go ahead with this rezoning. It just doesn't seem feasible. If you are going from a 3 story to 2 story and it is not economically feasible to building it, then it just does not fit. Seems like too much of a problem.

John Petty, 203 Ragsdale Rd. – He lives right across the street from the site. His driveway is right across from the proposed driveway for the apartment complex. The traffic is bad enough as it is. He almost had a wreck coming here tonight. Ragsdale Rd. has a dip in the road and it is hard to see cars traveling on the road. If parking is not sufficient in the apartment parking lot, he is scared people will park on the street in front of his house, further reducing his visibility. Other problem is crime. He has lived crime free for over 50 years. He would hate to have a 3 story complex where someone could watch his house and know when he is not at home.

Pam Harden, 204 Ragsdale Rd. – She lives beside the property. If looking at 86 units and if they are all married that is 172 people. If they have families, children that is more people. How much do we want Jamestown to grow and in what amount of time do we want it to grow. Her other concern is the type of people. The type people that have been renting at Jamestown Commons are not the type people that Jamestown wants right in the middle of downtown. Her sister lives beside Courtyard Commons apartments. The police are called to the apartment every weekend. She has not had a crime problem, but she is sure that is something she can look forward to with just the sheer number of people this apartment complex will add to the area.

Sheila Wenzel, 515 Forestdale Drive – She moved here because it's a small town. She is a proud resident of Jamestown. She would like to keep it small. She has enjoyed the improvements she has seen over the last few years. (Southern Roots, Potent Potables, businesses downtown, Soap Lady, etc.) As far as apartment complex, she is worried about that. I know people that live in Adams Farm. Some of those units get rented and they are very nice. However, sometimes they reduce the prices in order to rent them. Then we get the problem the previous lady was taking about. The type of people that move into our neighborhood and the value of our homes. We have a lot to think about. The community supports the growth of Jamestown but how far do we go to support that. The 3 story buildings are really something to think about as well. I appreciate the Planning Board considering how this will look. We don't want the building to over shadow the neighborhoods.

Robert Wenzel, 515 Forestdale Dr. – He posed several questions:

- How expensive will the units be?
- If we are going to increase our resident count by 8-10% how is that going to affect our utility – Is there enough water supply.
- What about rain water runoff. Taking a forest and turning it into a parking lot. The water will flood neighboring properties. Where will water go?
- Are apartments for rent or sale? If owner occupied, owner will take care of the property. Renters will not.
- How long will construction take? It is going to be a mess trying to get through downtown day or night.
- How can you control multi families living in a single unit? He knows this is happening now at the Courtyard Commons.
- Has anybody done a feasibility study to see if we need apartments? He questioned if there are empty apartments now at the Commons. Are you totally full? Is there really a need for more apartments?

Mike Bullock, 206 Ragsdale Rd. – This proposed unit would be right up to his back yard. He loves Jamestown, it is so nice in the evening. You build 60 units apartments here, Jamestown will not be a place you want to live. Not what we need. It just won't work.

Kay Sexton, 206 Ragsdale Rd. - she agrees with everything said tonight. She lives 2 doors down from the proposed site. They have a big stake in this. It will not work.

Wes Scott, 104 Ragsdale Ct. - His property is located away from the proposed project. He is concerned about the traffic. A lot of people cut through original Forestdale subdivision to miss the stop light. If there are multiple people in the apartments will have more problems. Also concerned about the 3

stories. Everything has been objections. Only positive mentioned was additional income for the Town. Would it be worth it?

Ruth Clark, 212 Knollwood - Every month she reads in the Jamestown News about businesses needing more parking. The subject is always what we are going to do about the parking. Everyone knows that is a major problem. She does not think that an interior parking lot and little additional street parking is going to solve that.

Homer Harden, 200 Guilford Rd. – He has property in lots of places. In Greensboro has property and nothing is empty. He rents to everybody. He has property in Jamestown and all is empty because he tries to put someone in there that Jamestown citizens would appreciate.

Kay Kavanaugh, I have worked and volunteered in Jamestown. I have worked at a lot of the little shops. I can tell you parking is a major problem. Also, wonder how an emergency vehicle would service the property. If an apartment catches on fire how would you get a fire engine or ambulance in there? Can you address an emergency situation with the vehicles and access?

Wes Cashwell, 101 & 103 Gannaway St. – His property is located across the street. This proposed site would be his view. He thanked Mr. Kelly for the rehabilitation at Courtyard Commons. It was much needed and appreciated as you attempt to make that area much more appealing. He looks forward to seeing the finished product. Traffic seems to be a major issue. Traffic is going to be a major issue whether these apartments are built or not. He would suggest that the Board if so inclined, to make the zoning requirement for this particular project more of a solution to the problem rather than an impediment to additional traffic flow. Mr. Kelly stated he would be amicable to adding an easement that would allow diagonal parking on Gannaway St. That coupled with a one way street, which in his opinion, should flow toward Ragsdale Rd.

Cashwell continued, Mr. Kelly mentioned also he was amicable to installing sidewalks, it might be a good idea to extend the sidewalks all the way up to Main Street cross to the Post Office egress and continue. If you want your particular tenants to be able to have access to the Food Lion Shopping Center, take the sidewalk down Ragsdale Rd. If one of the most appealing aspects of the proposed apartment complex is walkability then put those sidewalks in place.

From the aesthetic aspect, the buildings are pretty much a “cookie cutter” architecture design. If you want to make an architectural mark on the Town, consider doing the project all in brick. He thinks an elevation plan would be good to see how the building looks in relation to the Townhomes across the street. He sees traffic & aesthetics as a problem.

Art Wise closed the public comment portion of the hearing. Carrie Spencer said there were some things asked of the applicant that cannot be part of consideration. Those include; rent, type of people, interior finishes, number of families living in one apartment.

Mr. Kelly said despite what he has heard tonight, he is still in favor of the apartment project. He appreciates the interest and concern. He respectfully disagrees. He alone cannot solve the parking problems, that problem currently exists and will continue regardless how that property is developed. He is interested in being part of the solution. In his experience, the amount of parking that they are proposing on the site plan is inadequate. It is sufficient for the number of apartments on the site. The parking is almost twice the number that Jamestown requires.

He hears what you are saying about brick. There is a substantial amount of brick on these buildings. In his view, the project fits the goals & policies. He thinks it reflects very nicely for the Main Street district. He thinks the 3 story is fair and reasonable.

He has seen many good mixes of 2 & 3 story buildings. He thinks 3 story is a very workable arrangement. He disagrees with the insinuation that with apartment comes crime. The trend in the country is for rental units. They have sufficient demand at Courtyard Commons. They have a very high caliber of renters over last 18 months that they have been in operation. He feels there is a need for this type development in Jamestown. Their market research shows continued growth in population in Guilford County and Jamestown. He feels this project fits nicely with LDP.

Spencer said this board is looking at the use of the land. A site plan will be reviewed by first responders to ensure the driveways provide adequate access to all the apartments. Stormwater runoff will be reviewed during site plan phase. Spencer said there is adequate water & sewer to provide for this proposed project.

A traffic impact study is not a requirement of our ordinance. It is something the Planning Board could request as information needed before making a decision. It is the Planning Board's job to consider whether a request meets the goals of the LDP. Spencer stated if the Planning Board decides they need more information from applicant or staff, they may do so. It would require continuing the Public Hearing to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Capes felt it would be logical to make a motion to request the applicant conduct a traffic study.

Spencer stated before we make that motion, let us discuss if there are other types of issues and concerns. We want to ask the applicant for all information needed. The Planning Board discussed also if a 3 story rendition should be requested.

Miller asked if the traffic study would be conducted for current conditions or would it include the potential impact of the apartment project. Spencer said a traffic study would count how many trips are taken and if the roads were designed to handle that. Oakley said for those that live in this neighborhood that are connected to the streets not only is Ragsdale Rd. and Gannaway used as cut through but also Potter Drive and Forestdale Dr. are used as a cut through. It is a severe problem. After 9:00 pm no one stops at a 4 way stop. Spencer said it may be that the Planning Board does not need a traffic study. That the Planning Board is well aware of what the traffic is and can anticipate what the apartment project would do to the traffic. Oakley said for those residents that live there it would be a real problem. Spencer stated the Planning Board has every right to say that there is a traffic problem and that the proposed apartment project would contribute to it. So a traffic study is not a requirement. The Planning Board also has the right to ask for proof and data.

Oakley said he is consistent in that projects bordering neighborhoods of single family residential is not conducive to apartments. You put apartments in the SFR neighborhoods you destroy the life of those that have property adjoining/bordering or overlooking it. He will be consistent saying Jamestown needs to turn this project down because of the residents that made this their home.

Spencer said it will be important to base the Planning Board decision on the LDP goals & policies. Oakley stated the things he has outlined are from the LDP.

- Revitalize downtown Jamestown to be the center of community life and to provide opportunity for development of new retail, office & community service. This does not say anything about apartments. Oakley felt a nice Townhome development would be compatible with residential living and not 3 story apartments.
- Adamant about the traffic problem

Capes made a motion that the Planning Board request of Burkley Communities a traffic study. Kerry Miller made a second to the motion. Other Planning Board members were interested in continuing the discussion as they had more questions. Capes withdrew his motion.

Glanville said the current zoning is Main Street which includes restaurants. So, in some ways she sees that apartments are a better use than some of the other things that could go there. Glanville stated from the LDP a policy is that: New buildings and the renovations of existing buildings should fit the scale and character and add value to the existing neighborhoods. She is worried about the scale. She would like to see included in information requested a drawing of the elevation. She thinks the developer is committed to Jamestown. She thinks he in good faith is presenting something he thinks fits well. Glanville stated one extra story (3rd) can add a lot of visual distraction. She agrees this is a “cookie cutter” architecture style.

The architecture of the existing Townhomes is all brick. The proposed apartment complex is not. Glanville said she is not sure that style really fits with the aesthetics of what is already there. She would like to see elevation and drawings that aesthetically fit the neighborhood better. She questioned if apartments add value to the existing neighborhoods, which is part of the LDP policies.

Spencer asked the Town Attorney if the Planning Board has a right to ask applicant to supply architectural renditions. Koonce stated the Planning Board can ask this of the applicant. The applicant has a choice to accept or not. Koonce stated though any kind of schematic is illustrative only and the applicant is not bound by it unless it is entered as a condition of the rezoning.

The Planning Board discussed again the elevation of the apartment building and the architecture of the building. The Planning Board was concerned with the 3 story height and how it would look compared to the existing properties.

Spencer stated as we talk about things we would like more information about, she asked if these items were supplied and Planning Board is happy with the traffic study, etc., are you otherwise satisfied with the request as far as the housing type and the density. Glanville stated the request for 60 units is way more than what the current zoning allows and there is a reason for why the current zoning is allowed; 18 units allowed and 60 requested. That is a concern. There is a reason for the current density and what would be the reason to go against what it is currently allowed.

The Planning Board discussed the growth management policy; “to strategically locate new land development in the most appropriate place. Enhance Jamestown’s special community character and heritage. We need to also consider the community appearance policy – “enhance our downtown village feel”. The presented plan is a “cookie cutter” plan. A 3 story building does not fit into our community appearance. If we address the issues as the LDP deem appropriate, then it answers a lot of the questions. The density is definitely of concern and the appearance is of concern.

Kerry Miller stated he doesn't know if the Planning Board requests additional data, is that going to change the appearance factor or the density. Miller stated it is not fair to ask the applicant to provide extra information if in fact the land use and density requested is the real reason for concern. Miller feels this project would be a wonderful addition, but the 3 stories is not in the appearance and it does not fit the scale. It does not fit the aesthetics. He keeps coming back to "the castle on the hill." It will dominate the landscape. We can do study after study, but still comes back to the 3 story building.

Eddie Oakley made a motion that we deny the rezoning request from MS (Main Street) to CZ-MS (Conditional Zoning Main Street) due to the density of the project, it does not preserve the unique small-town character of our residential neighborhood that borders Main Street. Oakley stated the rezoning request is not consistent with the Town's adopted comprehensive plan because it does not meet the goals of the 2020 LDP of growth management, planning coordination, community appearance, quality of life and it is not in the public interest because:

- The density of the project is too high – currently the allowed units are 18 units and the request is for 60 units.
- The parking is insufficient
- The 3 story building does not fit the scale and character of the existing neighborhood

Capes again asked if the applicant provided a traffic study and reduced the height of the building from 3 story to 2 story would that make a difference. The Town Attorney advised that the Planning Board could request additional information from the applicant or staff. However, the Planning Board is to consider the facts presented to them. This is the applicant's request as presented here tonight, not another possible version of the plan.

Oakley said the prior planners put the number of units per acre allowed. If the number was too high then, why is the same not true now? Density is an issue.

Spencer asked the applicant if he was interested in changing or adding any conditions to the application. Mr. Kelly said his objection has not changed. If there is fundamental opposition to the project no changes will resolve it. He does not see the point in trying to make a more effective case. Mr. Kelly said it would be problematic to change the density.

Oakley's original motion died for lack of a second to the motion.

Sarah Glanville stated she was in support of Mr. Oakley's original motion without the insufficient parking reason.

Oakley made a motion to deny this rezoning request from MS (Main St) to CZ-MS (Conditional Zoning Main Street) due to the high density which is not allowed in the Town's LDO and the 3 story building does not fit the scale & character of the existing neighborhood per the Town's LDP. Sarah Glanville made a second to the motion. On a roll call vote:

Glanville voted aye

Oakley voted aye

Capes voted aye

Miller voted aye

Spencer stated this recommendation will go to the Town Council. The Council will set a Public Hearing date at the August meeting, probably set a public hearing date for the September meeting. The

property owners within 500' will receive a letter as they did for this Planning Board Public Hearing, advising them of the date, time and place for the Public Hearing.

5. Public Comment Period – There was no one that registered to speak.
6. Other business:

Sarah Glanville asked about the “neighborhood” meeting requirement in the Town’s LDO. She was informed about the neighborhood meeting held by Burkley Communities by a citizen. She felt it was helpful. She questioned if there was any law that would require the Planning Board members get notice of this meeting. The Town Attorney said it is required that the Planning Board members get their information at the Public Hearing and from the applicant. The Town Attorney stated she felt it best for the Planning Board members to get their information in this way. The neighborhood meeting is an informational meeting and it is open to the public. The “neighborhood” meeting is not a town sponsored meeting, it is sponsored by the applicant. The applicant sends out the notices. The Town just allows for the use of the Town Hall for the meeting.

Still under other business – Art Wise would like for the Planning Board to look at the current sign ordinance. Glanville agreed, she would like to revisit the sandwich board signs.

The Planning Board asked the Town Planner to follow up on the sign request that was granted for the Forestdale Plaza Shopping Center project.

Capes added we talked about parking some tonight. He feels the Planning Board needs to talk about the parking issues and traffic issues at future meetings.

Spencer said the Town Council has agreed that the Town needs a Corridor study. Staff is working on looking at funding sources and talking with HPMPO about the study.

Capes asked about the safety standpoint on E. Fork Rd. Wolfe reported the Council has on several occasions requested staff speak with NCDOT about installing safety devices on E. Fork Rd. E. Fork Rd. is a state maintained road. To date, we have not had any success except to have “No parking” signs erected by DOT. Spencer will follow up.

Kerry Miller moved to adjourn. John Capes seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. The meeting ended at 9:15 pm.