

**HIGH POINT CITY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING  
OCTOBER 5, 2020 – 2:30 P.M.  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**MINUTES**

*Note: In order to maintain the health, safety, and well-being of our residents, staff, and the City Council, this meeting was conducted electronically. As part of the City of High Point's COVID-19 mitigation efforts, in-person public attendance was not allowed at this meeting. Instead, the open session portion of the meeting was live-streamed and the public was provided a link to listen to the open session portion of the meeting as it was being live-streamed.*

[www.HighPointNC.gov/VirtualPublicMeeting](http://www.HighPointNC.gov/VirtualPublicMeeting)

**CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL**

Mayor Wagner called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m. and called the roll for attendance. The following council members were present (9):

Mayor Jay W. Wagner (physically present)  
Mayor Pro Tem Christopher Williams- Ward 2 (physically present)  
Council Member Tyrone E. Johnson- At Large (remote participation)  
Council Member Britt W. Moore- At large (physically present)  
Council Member Cyril A. Jefferson- Ward 1 (physically present)  
Council Member Monica L. Peters- Ward 3 (physically present)  
Council Member S. Wesley Hudson- Ward 4 (physically present)  
Council Member Victor A. Jones- Ward 5 (physically present)  
Council Member Michael A. Holmes- Ward 4 (remote participation)

The following staff members were physically present:

Randy McCaslin, Interim City Manager; Greg Ferguson, Assistant City Manager; Eric Olmedo, Assistant City Manager; JoAnne Carlyle, City Attorney; Meghan Maguire, Assistant City Attorney; Lee Burnette, Director of Planning & Development; Heidi Galanti, Planning & Development; Chris Andrews, Planning & Development; Jeron Hollis, Director of Communications & Public Engagement; Mary Brooks, Deputy City Clerk; and Lisa Vierling, City Clerk

The following staff members participated remotely:

Terry Houk, Director of Public Services

Others Present:

Hayes Finley, Attorney with Fox Rothschild (remote participation)  
Ellis Hankins, The Mercer Group (physically present)  
Steve Strauss, Developmental Associates (remote participation)  
Joe Durham, Developmental Associates (remote participation)

PRESENTATION OF ITEMS

**2020-394**     **Closed Session pursuant to N.C. General Statute §143-318.11(a)(6) for personnel**  
Staff is requested to go into closed session pursuant to N.C. General Statute §143-318.11(a)(6) for personnel.

**At 2:36 p.m. Council Member Moore moved to enter Closed Session pursuant to N.C. General Statute 143-318.11(a)(6) for personnel. Council Member Peters made a second to the motion. Following a roll call vote by the Mayor, the motion carried by the following 6-0 unanimous vote:**

Aye (6): Mayor Wagner; Council Member Britt Moore; Council Member Cyril Jefferson; Council Member Monica Peters; Council Member Wesley Hudson; and Council Member Victor Jones

Absent (3): Mayor Pro Tem Chris Williams, Council Member Michael Holmes, and Council Member Tyrone Johnson

**[Council Members Holmes, Johnson, and Williams had not yet joined the meeting when the vote to go into Closed Session was taken.]**

Upon reconvening into Open Session at 3:50 p.m., Mayor Wagner announced there would be no action taken at this time as a result of the Closed Session.

**2020-429**     **Update- Seaboard Chemical**  
Hayes Finley, Attorney with Fox Rothschild LLP, will provide an update on the Seaboard Chemical litigation.

*Hayes Finley, outside legal counsel with Fox Rothschild LLC, provided a brief update on the Seaboard Chemical litigation. She explained this was a contaminated landfill site that has since been closed by the city in the early 2000s. Since that time, remediation efforts have been shared with The Seaboard Group being responsible for 75% of the cost and the City of High Point being responsible for 25% of the cost. She advised that there have been concerns recently expressed by The Seaboard Group and due to the increased effluent in the treatment system, they felt the 75/25 cost allocation was unfair; they felt the city's portion should be increased, largely due to the landfill's activities.*

*As a result, an independent outside consultant was engaged to perform some evaluations of the site. They conducted several site visits over the summer, looked at historical data, collected samples, etc... She shared that the consultants determined that the main cause of*

*the increased cost to the treatment system and effluent was not actually attributable to the landfill leachate, but mostly coming from the groundwater contamination that had occurred over the years and they determined that the groundwater is infiltrating the intermittent stream which runs underneath the landfill.*

*Ms. Finley relayed this is good news for the city because the independent party hired to evaluate the site determined that it is not due to the city's operation of a landfill. She stated she would be happy to answer any questions and pointed out they basically looked at the historical data, the analysis, and were able to trace contaminants.*

*In summary, City Attorney JoAnne Carlyle explained this is an EPA Super Fund Site with monumental issues that the city has been dealing with for many years. She advised that the city entered into an agreement with The Seaboard Group, which consists of about 20-25 participants, for a 75/25 cost split with the city being responsible for 25% of the remediation costs and The Seaboard Group being responsible for 75%. She reported that last year, The Seaboard Group came to the city and asked the city to consider changing the 75/25 split and claimed that the city should be responsible for more than 25% because the landfill leachate cost was attributable to additional costs for treatment of the environmental issues. At that time, all parties involved agreed to conduct a review, which resulted in great news for the city because they determined that it is not anything that the city should be responsible for.*

*Ms. Finley pointed out the consultant's findings are preliminary and there are some things that they need to follow up on and confirm.*

**2020-395****Review-Telecommunications Ordinance Revisions**

Staff is requested to review the Telecommunications ordinance revisions.

*Chris Andrews with the Planning & Development Department, advised that staff has been working with CityScape consultants in the past year to revise the city's wireless telecommunications standards primarily due to federal and state laws that have recently passed.*

*He then introduced Susan Rabold, consultant with CityScape, who joined the meeting remotely. Ms. Rabold stated they work exclusively with local government; they do not do consulting work for tower companies; do not sell products/services outside of their consulting services; do not sell a wireless service. She clarified that when she uses certain terms, she would be talking about the infrastructure that helps wireless devices work.*

*Due to technical difficulties, Ms. Rabold was unable to finish her presentation and Chris Andrews with the Planning Department stepped up and completed it.*

*Mr. Andrews explained that Macro Cell Tower infrastructure is larger and noted there could also be macro cells located on other structures throughout the city; he shared some illustrations. He also shared some pictures of small cell wireless facilities in the city and noted some are not concealed, but are connected to utility poles throughout the city. He advised there are parameters and definitions in the ordinance about what the infrastructure*

*is like, and noted that the equipment is primarily in the ground and they try to blend it with some kind of infrastructure. He spoke to how the current trends indicate continued growth in these small cell facilities in order to deliver the amount of bandwidth that is required to power devices; that 5G is the next generation of data delivery; and mentioned some federal regulations passed in 2018-2019 that necessitated these amendments.*

*Council Member Moore asked if staff could provide some examples of barriers. Interim City Manager Randy McCaslin explained that Councils and other agencies making governmental decisions were the barriers and the authority for municipalities to regulate it was taken away. Lee Burnette, Director of Planning and Development, explained that cities have different standards, so the intent at the federal and state levels was to create a uniform standard.*

*Mr. Andrews spoke to the terms that have been defined at the federal and state level which are reflected in the proposed ordinance to bring it in alignment; the requirements for co-locations. He explained one of the substantive changes that Council hears is special use permits to allow certain types or a certain size within a certain area of the wireless facility. He stated that these proposed changes to the ordinance would eliminate special use permits and make it an administrative function, so there would be type differences and differences where these facilities are allowed in terms of zoning, zoning districts that would change, etc....*

*Mr. Burnette added that in the special use permit process and what Council has seen over the last several years in federal and state regulations, that the city's discretionary ability to make the decisions relative to a special use permit is very limited in the sense of a quasi-judicial hearing where evidence would be heard; presented by expert testimony; and there are certain aspects that could not be considered such as frequency wave and citizens who are opposed to the tall towers going up in their neighborhoods, etc.... He explained that these proposed changes could be considered a trade-off to eliminate the special use permit process and make it an administrative process instead.*

*He advised they are under "shock clock" requirements in many aspects of getting things done in a short period of time, so they are doing things a little differently than other jurisdictions in order for it to be done quickly. He reiterated the intent is to improve standards and height standards in regards to what is allowed and what the law allows regarding standards, but in the same term and tradeoff, it would be administrative and more streamlined. He provided an example that the tradeoff could be instead of allowing 200-foot tall towers in residential districts, they would have to lower it to 100 feet and conceal it.*

*Interim City Manager Randy McCaslin stated this is a proposal and would go before the Planning & Zoning Commission before coming to the City Council for adoption.*

*Council Member Peters asked if this would improve broadband access, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, so that students and people working from home offices would have more access to broadband. Mr. Burnette explained it would be up to the industry to deliver those services, but the amendments would streamline the process to erect those facilities.*

*From a processing and timeline perspective, he explained that the proposed amendment would require a telecommunications permit, which would provide clarity to as to specific information/records that need to be submitted as part of the process.*

*Mr. Andrews advised that after the ordinance is adopted, it will run through the city's Accela permitting software, and the application would be available online. He noted that these proposed changes are currently out for public comment and it has been sent to subscribers of the Planning Department and Build High Point, and has also been sent to other constituents related to development and wireless telecommunications; and has been reviewed by the TRC within city staff. He advised that staff is looking at presenting this to the Planning & Zoning Commission on November 10th and to the City Council after that time. Mr. Burnette clarified that the goal is to condense these requests into one approval; staff will create a webpage to provide instructions on submitting applications; staff would then determine who reviews it; and stakeholders in the industry like it because it streamlines the approval process.*

*City Attorney Carlyle asked if this has been legally vetted. Mr. Burnette replied in the affirmative and noted that CityScape has an attorney that practices in North Carolina and they write ordinances in North Carolina and in other jurisdictions as well. Ms. Carlyle asked if it might be possible for the Legal Department to get a copy so it could be reviewed. Mr. Andrews advised that a copy was sent on Friday. Assistant City Attorney Meghan Maguire confirmed that she did have a draft, but did not have a copy of the engagement letter, and noted they do not have a copy of the contract. Mr. Andrews agreed to send it to the Legal Department.*

*The consultant, Susan Rabold with CityScape, advised that she was able to re-join the meeting and did hear the discussion from the last 10 minutes. She stated she would gladly entertain any questions, and reiterated that CityScape does have an attorney that has been involved in the drafting of the revisions to the ordinance since the onset, so they feel confident about what they drafted and noted it is consistent with the federal and state standards.*

*Mayor Wagner thanked staff for the presentation/information, and asked that staff proceed with the next agenda item. Mr. Burnette took advantage of the opportunity and mentioned one other text amendment that is going forward regarding a Watershed text amendment. He explained this was also as a result of some tweaks in watershed rules that the State has required in an effort to make the regulations as unified as possible, and these amendments would also be going to the Planning & Zoning Commission in November, then to the City Council.*

## **2020-396      Review-Small area land use plans**

Staff is requested to give a review on small area land use plans

*Heidi Galanti, Planning Administrator with the Planning & Development Department, advised this is a presentation of land use assessments for the Eastchester Drive/I-74*

*interchange and the Jamestown Bypass. Staff has conducted these assessments simultaneously due to their adjacency/similar timing, and together, they offer a more complete set of opportunities. She reported that staff briefed the Planning & Zoning Commission regarding this at a meeting held on September 22nd.*

*The purpose for the Land Use Assessments is to evaluate the impacts of roadway changes to adjacent land uses and to provide policy guidance for potential future development opportunities. The Eastchester Drive/I-74 assessment is a 153-acre study area of an approximate one-mile section of Eastchester Drive from Festival Park to Lassiter Drive. There are four main goals for assessment of this are:*

- 1. To protect the city's water supply (Oak Hollow Lake); and*
- 2. To maintain a safe and sufficient transportation functionality of the corridor; and*
- 3. To protect adjacent neighborhoods from incompatible development; and*
- 4. To protect the gateway corridor entrance into the city.*

*The policy recommendations of this assessment will be used in conjunction with the policy recommendations of the Land Use Plan and the Eastchester Corridor Plan and in the case of a conflict, staff would defer to this assessment.*

*There are four main factors that will be considered.*

- 1. Watershed Restrictions; and*
- 2. New Road Alignments; and*
- 3. Existing Land Use; and*
- 4. Property Ownership.*

*Ms. Galanti advised that the general conclusions for the Eastchester corridor is that it is a very narrow corridor and has limited area for new development. Lot consolidation will be needed for any new development to occur, and there is a need to continue limiting access points to Eastchester Drive to maintain its transportation functionality. There will also be some street name changes associated with this are that will be considered at a later date. Staff is recommending some minor amendments to the Land Use Plan, and this corridor has a lot of office-institutional zoning in the area. The new Development Ordinance provides for a wider variety of uses that are allowed within the Office Institutional District.*

*Regarding the street name changes, there are areas of restricted access to Eastchester. Hilton Court no longer connects to Eastchester, and the realignment of Cypress Court now connects to Eastchester where Hilton Court used to intersect with Eastchester. Gordon Road has been realigned and a traffic circle has been constructed to come in directly across to where Cypress Court is. Staff is recommending the cul-de-sac where Gordon Road used to intersect with Highway 68 be named Gordon Court. Ms. Galanti explained that the Planning & Zoning Commission makes the final determination regarding any street name changes and these recommended changes have been provided to them for consideration.*

*Regarding the Land Use Recommendations, staff took an in-depth look at seven areas along the corridor and ultimately concluded that only two areas should be amended at this time.*

**Area 1:** *Located along the new Cypress Court, has multiple constraints as it is in Watershed Critical Tiers 2 and 3. Staff is recommending that Area 1A, which is in the back, remain as Low-Density Residential and Area 1B remain designated as office.*

**Area 2:** *Located along the edge of Oak Hollow Lake is more constrained than Area 1; is in the Watershed Critical Tier 1; and does not allow for any development. Staff is recommending that as these properties around the lake in Tier 1 become available, that the city should consider purchasing them to protect the city's drinking water supply. This is one of the two areas that is recommended for amendment from Low-Density Residential to Recreation/Open Space. It is currently zoned Residential Single Family-3.*

**Area 3:** *Located on the northwest corner of Cypress Court and Eastchester Drive; consists of six acres and is split between Oak Hollow Tiers 2 and 3 and City Lake General Watershed which allows development not to exceed 70% of built upon area. The watershed restrictions, topographic constraints, and controlled access make it infeasible for commercial development to occur. In order to remain consistent in character of the corridor in this section, staff is recommending Area 3 remain in the Office land use category.*

*The Office Institutional zoning district, with the adoption of any ordinance, now supports a wide variety of moderate and high intensity office-institutional uses, residential uses including townhomes/multi-family, minor personal services, retail uses up to a maximum of 4,000 sq. ft., and a restaurant without a drive-thru. High intensity commercial uses are not supported in this area due to continued policy concerns for protecting the aesthetics of the corridor and the need for continued efficiency of this transportation corridor.*

**Area 4:** *Located along the eastern side of Eastchester Drive, north of Gordon Road, is approximately 22 acres; is in the City Lake Watershed; backs up to an existing residential neighborhood; and is impacted by steep slopes and classified streams. Current uses are office and single-family homes with some undeveloped parcels. Potential land use for the undeveloped parcels and single-family parcels are office and higher density residential use; however, the topography and streams make development difficult. Staff is recommending the Office land use designation remain to support those options; the area is currently zoned Office Institutional and Residential-3.*

**Area 5:** *Located on the eastern side of Eastchester is between the I-74 exit ramp and the new cul-de-sac on Gordon Road; contains four lots which add up to about 4 acres, some of which have frontage on Eastchester, but can only be accessed off the new cul-de-sac. Most of this area is within the City Lake General Watershed. It is mostly within Tier 3 of the Oak Hollow Watershed with a small area in the City Lake Watershed. It's current use is single family residential; however due to the lack of direct access, possible land uses for this area are office and higher density residential such as townhomes, condominiums, or apartments. Staff is recommending the Office land use designation be expanded to include all properties within Area 5. The current zoning is Residential Single Family-3.*

**Area 6:** *Located on the east side of Eastchester between the I-74 entrance ramp and Ambassador Court; consists of 7 lots (a total of about 8 acres); is mostly within Tier 3 of the Oak Hollow Watershed with a small area in the City Lake Watershed; current uses are a mix of office, residential, and religious institution. The realignment of Ambassador Court with York Avenue on the other side of Eastchester could allow opportunity to add a small area of local convenience service uses in this area to accommodate some moderate intensity, retail, and personal service uses. Feasibility would require land assembly to manage the impacts, coordinated access, and maximized development potential under the Watershed Development restrictions. Conditional Use zoning would be needed to ensure the Land Use policies are supported. Staff is recommending the land use for this area remain as Office and Medium Density Residential. It is currently zoned Office Institutional and Residential Single Family-3.*

**Area 7:** *Located on the west side of Eastchester Drive north of York Avenue and the I-74 exit ramp; contains 13 lots which are approximately seven acres; and is in Tier 3 of the Oak Hollow Watershed. The current uses are single family residential and offices. Protection of the Timberlake neighborhood is needed to maintain its stability; it has limited lot depth and potential future uses continue to be single family residential and small scale offices that are typically allowed in the Transitional Office District. Staff is recommending the Office land use designation remain in this area. It is currently zoned Transitional Office and Residential-3.*

*Ms. Galanti asked if there were any questions regarding the Land Use Assessment for Eastchester Drive & I-74. There being none, she proceeded with an overview of the **Jamestown Bypass Assessment.***

*Ms. Galanti advised that the Jamestown Bypass is a much larger assessment area. It is a 1.4 square mile study area that covers an approximate two-mile section of the Jamestown Bypass from I-74 to the Jamestown limits and also includes the Five Points commercial area between I-74 and Montlieu Avenue.*

*The four main goals for this area are:*

- 1. To evaluate impacts of the new roadway; and*
- 2. To examine existing land uses; and*
- 3. To assess water and sewer availability; and*
- 4. To provide policy guidance for potential future development.*

*Existing policy documents that will be considered for this area are the Land Use Plan, the US 311 Bypass Study, and the Core City Plan. Ms. Galanti reiterated that in the case of a conflict, staff would defer to this assessment.*

*The main factors considered for this area were:*

- *New Road Alignments*
- *Existing Land Uses*
- *Property Ownership*



- *Water and Sewer Availability*
- *Watershed Restrictions*

*Staff's general conclusions for this assessment is that it is a new front door into the city; the Jamestown Bypass is scheduled to open in 2022; there are more opportunities for development; there are some new roadway intersections that will offer opportunities; there are less restrictive watershed regulations; there are access points to undeveloped parcels; there are new opportunities for some underutilized properties in the area; and there is an Opportunity Zone on the west side of I-74.*

*Ms. Galanti noted there is potential change in character to the existing Greensboro Road because it is no longer going to carry the amount of traffic that it currently carries. There are also some street name considerations and staff is recommending quite a few Land Use Plan amendments in this area.*

*Regarding the street name changes, the Jamestown Bypass connects to I-73/I-74 and it has already been named the Jamestown Parkway for the opened segment in the Jamestown limits. Greensboro Road, east of I-74, no longer connects High Point to Greensboro and it becomes Main Street in Jamestown. Staff feels a new name could be considered for this segment. Segment B would be a new alignment that forms a "T" intersection with the Jamestown Bypass and it should be considered in conjunction with Greensboro Road. Segment A, the dead-end that used to be Greensboro Road, will no longer connect to the bypass; it will intersect with Hampton Road and staff feels it should be evaluated to determine a new name. Greensboro Road, west of I-74, there is a 1/3-mile section that becomes Lexington Avenue at Five Points Place. Staff is recommending this section be renamed as well. Ms. Galanti reiterated that the final determination for any road/street name changes would be made by the Planning & Zoning Commission after holding a public hearing.*

*Regarding the Land Use recommendations in this area, staff took an in-depth look at eight areas within the study area and is recommending seven areas for amendment at this time. Other recommended changes will be based on assembling land and the submittal of a specific development proposal.*

**Area 1:** *Known as the Five Points commercial area along Greensboro Road between I-74 and Montlieu Avenue; consists of approximately 20 acres; and will be a new front door into the city. The south side of Greensboro Road is within an Opportunity Zone which could be an incentive for development. There is a mix of convenience, service uses including the Eastgate Shopping Center. The US 311 Bypass Study and Core City Plan show this area as mixed-use and is currently designated as Local Convenience Commercial. Staff is recommending it be changed to Mixed Use Development in support of the Core City Plan and the US 311 Bypass Study. Because the area is already developed and has some underutilized properties, staff is recommending that the city initiate a Mixed Use Area Plan for the Five Points area to create a detailed vision for what this new entrance into the city could look like. The area is currently zoned General Business and Limited Business.*

**Area 2:** *A narrow area between I-74 and Deep River Road and Wayside Street, consists of approximately 46 acres which includes the site of the old Presbyterian Nursing Home and the*

*old Evergreen Nursing Facility. The northern portion of the Presbyterian property is currently being used for housing restricted to people aged 55+; however, the multi-story building is vacant. The Evergreen site is vacant; most of the buildings have been demolished; has very limited road frontage on Greensboro Road, so the property on the corner of Greensboro Road and Wayside Street has been included in this area to provide an opportunity for better access into this area. Staff feels this area could support higher density housing or commercial uses such as a hotel and/or restaurant. It's current land use designation is Mixed Use Development and staff feels that should be retained in support of a possible mix of uses.*

*Staff suggests that this area could be incorporated into the Area Plan that is recommended for Area 1, or it could stand alone and act as a transition to the interstate. It is currently zoned Institutional and staff is recommending this zoning district serve as a holding zone until a plan for this area is created or a development proposal is submitted.*

**Area 3:** *Located along the dead-end portion of Greensboro Road between Hampton Drive and Spencer Street; contains approximately 20 acres; and is divided into Area 3A and 3B. Area 3A includes the lots along Greensboro Road that have a mix of commercial and service uses with some undeveloped lots, a religious institution on the corner of Greensboro Road, and the new road leading to the bypass. Area 3b, located directly behind, has a single-family neighborhood; an unopened right-of-way; and some undeveloped lots. Spencer Road on the western end will have access to the bypass via a right-in and a right-out only.*

*There will be no direct access to the bypass or the new realigned road from Area 3A. Area 3A is currently designated as Community Regional Commercial, and Area 3B is Low Density Residential. Staff feels that Area 3A would be better represented with a land use designation with less intensity due to the reduced access and feels that Area 3B, with some land assembly and access to the dead-end portion of the Greensboro Road, could support some infill housing with a variety of detached or attached dwellings. Staff is recommending the land use designation be changed from Community Regional Commercial to Local Convenience Commercial for Area 3A and from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential for Area 3B. The current zoning for Area 3A is General Business; the current zoning for Area 3B is Residential Single Family-5.*

**Area 4:** *Located on the south side of Greensboro Road and north of the bypass, between the newly aligned road and Ring Street; consists of approximately 14 acres. This northern section of Ring Street will not connect to the bypass and will not have direct access to the newly aligned road on the western end or to the bypass and includes a mix of commercial and office uses, some of which appear to be vacant. The US 311 Bypass Study recommends this area, as well as the remainder of Greensboro Road to Wrenn Farm Drive and Penny Road, could act as a traditional Main Street with local commercial uses serving the surrounding neighborhoods, as it is anticipated that Greensboro Road will be less traveled. It is currently designated on the Land Use Plan as Local Convenience Commercial with a small portion of Community Regional Commercial on the western edge and Low Density Residential to the south along Ring Street. Staff is recommending an expansion of the Local Convenience Commercial designation to cover this entire area. The current zoning is General Business and Residential Single Family-5. As the residential uses in this area no*

*longer exist, so if a development proposal is submitted for neighborhood serving uses, a change in zoning would be supported.*

**Area 5:** *Located on the south side of the bypass between Enterprise Drive and east of Green Street; contains approximately 35 acres; there is a traffic signal at Enterprise Drive and there will be a new signal at the new "T" intersection; there is an 80-foot access from the bypass to the land south of the "T" intersection; the Ring Street intersection with the bypass will have a median on the bypass, so it will be right-in, right-out access only without a signal light. There are some undeveloped parcels in this area; however, the perennial stream that runs through it on the southern two parcels will impact the ability to develop it. Staff feels there could be opportunity for development of a shopping center with a cohesive mix of commercial uses, possibly a hotel and higher density housing. It is currently split between Community Regional Commercial and Low Density Residential. Staff is recommending to change the Mixed-Use development to support uses for the community and the traveling motorists along I-74. It is currently zoned Residential Single Family-5.*

**Area 6A:** *Located south of the bypass between Scientific Street and the railroad tracks; contains approximately 25 acres; it is currently a mix of single family residential and an industrial use; and has some potential for redevelopment of residential due to the new signalized intersection with the bypass and proximity to the new Wrenn Farm development located across the intersection. It is currently designated as Light Industrial on the Land Use Plan and has a mix of zoning of Residential-5, Heavy Industrial, and Light Industrial. Staff is recommending the Land Use designation be changed to Medium Density Residential to support a mix of higher density housing in the area. Additionally, staff is recommending that the city initiate a rezoning for this area to protect it for future residential use.*

**Area 6B:** *Located east of the railroad tracks, south of the bypass; consists of approximately 45 acres; is currently undeveloped with the exception of one small parcel on S. Scientific Street next to the railroad tracks; is constrained by the lack of access, rough topography, and a classified stream. Half of this area is owned by the city for the future Dillon Road Park. It is currently designated as Low Density Residential, Recreation/Open Space, and Light Industrial. Staff is recommending to change the Light Industrial designation to a Low Density Residential due to the previously mentioned constraints. Staff is also recommending that the city initiate a rezoning for this area due to its constraints and adjacency to existing residential to the south and east. This area has been. Ms. Galanti pointed out the small cul-de-sac appearing on the map is an unopened right-of-way that does not exist.*

**Area 7:** *Located on the southwest corner of the bypass and Dillon Road; will be a signalized intersection at the bypass; consists of about 30 acres; is located outside of the city limits; and is adjacent to the future Dillon Road Park. Potentially it could be redeveloped with a mix of housing styles and densities such as townhomes, townhomes, or multi-family, but the need for public water and sewer extensions will require the property to be annexed into the city. Staff is recommending a change in the Land Use designation from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential and noted that a change in zoning should be developer driven to ensure that Land Use policies are met and that adjacent neighborhoods are protected. It is currently zoned Residential Single Family-3 with the city's extra-territorial zoning jurisdiction.*

**Area 8:** Located on the southwest corner of the bypass and Dillon Road; consists of approximately 82 acres; and is located outside the city limits. About 1/3 of the area is within the Oakdale Reservoir General Watershed while 2/3 of it is in the Oakdale Reservoir Critical Tier 3 which limits development to two dwelling units per acre or 35% built upon area. The perennial stream in the area may impact development; and the area is mostly undeveloped with some rural residential uses. The area may have potential for some increased residential development; however, the need to extend public water and sewer will require it to be annexed into the city. Staff feels it could support a mix of residential uses, especially on Dillon Road near the intersection with the bypass. Staff is recommending to change the Land Use designation from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential; however due to the watershed restrictions and impacts of the stream, land assembly will be needed to achieve higher densities. It currently has Guilford County zoning of Agricultural and Residential Single Family-40 which limits development to one dwelling unit per acre.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Ms. Galanti reviewed the **Next Steps** in the process.

- ✓ Complete public review drafts of the assessments
- ✓ Solicit Public input (project website, mailed notice, Zoom meetings, online comment form)
- ✓ Finalize assessments based on feedback
- ✓ Schedule a public hearing before the Planning & Zoning Commission and make a recommendation to the City Council
- ✓ Schedule a public hearing before the City Council and consideration of adoption

## ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m. upon motion by Council Member Moore and second by Mayor Pro Tem Williams.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Jay W. Wagner, Mayor

Attest:

---

Lisa B. Vierling, City Clerk