



Steering Committee Meeting #8 Summary

December 17, 2019

▼ Members Present

Michael Faucette
Craig Fleming
Mark Gatehouse (via conference call)
Jay Matey (via conference call)
Jimmy Morgan
Kim Rayle
Betty Smith
Judy Stalder
Vincent Townsend

▼ Staff Present

J. Leslie Bell, AICP, Planning Director
Kaye Graybeal, Deputy Planning Director
Oliver Bass, Senior Planner
Matt Talbott, Planner II
Teresa Andrews, Stormwater Program Administer
Bobby Carmon, Fire Plans Examiner

▼ Consultants Present

Chad Sary, AICP

▼ Meeting Overview

→ Old Business / Previous Items / Project Updates

- **Historic Preservation Commission.** GC Staff noted that no substantive changes were made from the state's model ordinance – only changes were to some of the text and sections to make the language and section references consistent with that used in the UDO.
- **Accessory Structures.** GC Staff mentioned there would be more modifications (less restrictive) to the accessory structures requirements to potentially match up with High Point and Greensboro.
- **Residential Zoning District Comparison.** The proposed zoning districts of RS-3, RS-5, RS-7, RM-8, RM-18 & RM-26 now are comparable to the similar districts in High Point and Greensboro.
- **Rock Creek Consent Area.** GC Staff discussed the Rock Creek Consent Area noting that it is already included in the UDO however they wish to include more information on it (more than a reference).
- **Open Space Standards.** The committee agreed that the open space requirements for subdivisions should be similar to Greensboro and High Point in that the lower density developments (AG, RS-40, RS-30, RS-20) should not be required to provide open space and the higher density zones should be similar to Greensboro and High Point.

→ New Business

- **Article 9 – Environmental Regulation**
 - GC Staff mentioned this is largely a reorganization and clarification of the existing regulations.
 - A new “how to use” section has been provided.
 - Commentary will be added to clarify certain sections.
 - Questions, concerns, or thoughts about the proposed article –
 - Concerns over farmland and buffer requirements, new development puts water quality burden on farmers.
 - Would be good to see regulations that account for future growth (infrastructure that can handle increased water capacity from storms/flooding).
 - Should look to Future Land Use Map to determine where additional infrastructure may be needed.



Guilford County Unified Development Ordinance Update

- Flood Damage Prevention section from state model (required).
- **Article 10 – Enforcement**
 - Article ensures compliance with UDO and provides processes for enforcement.
 - Provides certain violation types, remedies and penalties.
 - GC staff's goal on violations is compliance vs. fines.
 - Questions, concerns, or thoughts about the proposed article –
 - Need to re-word or delete 10.02.B regarding imminent hazard determination, it puts a lot of responsibility on Enforcement Officer.
- **Article 11 – Nonconformities**
 - Article addresses nonconforming situations that may be created or exists prior to the adoption the UDO.
 - Questions, concerns, or thoughts about the proposed article –
 - Need to add replacement standards for nonconforming mobile homes.
 - Should be consistent with Greensboro's standards for increasing a nonconforming situations (percentage).
 - Remove dates no longer applicable in sign section.
- **Article 12 – Definitions**
 - Matches new UDO terminology
 - Definitions consistent with I60D definitions
 - Organized by type (alphabetically)
 - Overall user-friendliness.
 - Questions, concerns, or thoughts about the proposed article –
 - Be sure to re-word with commas on definitions with multiple words (i.e. water, private & sewer, off-site).
 - Be clear with diameter of tree measurement.

→ General Discussion/Comments

- Steering Committee agreed to move forward with UDO update workshop for County Commissioners in mid-January.
- Should have pubic meetings with stakeholders in one place rather than in separate parts of county.
- Steering Committee will see a revised complete draft in near future.
- Adoption planned for late spring or early summer with a “grace period” prior to effectiveness.

→ Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:58 am.