



AGENDA
City of Archdale
Planning and Zoning Board Meeting
February 6, 2023 – 7:00 pm
Please note there will be a pre-agenda session at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers – Archdale City Hall

1. Call To Order, Welcome, And Register Of Attendance
2. Approval Of The Minutes For The December 5, 2022 Planning Board Meeting

Documents:

[9 - DECEMBER 5 PZB MINUTES.PDF](#)

3. Additional Items
4. Adjournment

Anyone who needs an accommodation to participate in the meeting should notify the City Clerk's Office at 336-434-7343 at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting or call North Carolina Relay at 1-800-735-8262.

Archdale Planning and Zoning Board
Regular Meeting
Monday, December 5, 2022

Members Present: Larry Thomas, Chairman; Board Members: Brent Kinney, Mitch Miller, Chris Collins, Bob Kollm, Scott Greene, Chris Spillers, and Joy Sparks.

Members Absent: Larry Linthicum, Vice-Chairman.

Others Present: Jason Miller, Planning Director; Matthew Wells, Planning Administrator.

Item 1. Call to Order, Welcome, and Register of Attendance

Chairman Thomas welcomed everyone and explained the procedures for the Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Item 2. Approval of the Minutes

Chairman Thomas stated the next order of business was the approval of the minutes from the November 7th, 2022 meeting.

Mr. Kinney made a motion to approve the November 7th, 2022 minutes with a correction to remove his name from the “Members Present” as he was not in attendance. Mr. Spillers seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously by the Board.

Item 3. Public Hearing: Request by City of Archdale to amend the text of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Miller gave the staff report for this item:

The proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is intended to establish the basis for the City’s request to the High Point MPO and NCDOT to modify the functional classification of a broad range of roads in and around the City. The functional classifications of the City’s Road network have not been updated in many years and are not reflective of the current or intended future use or traffic volume of the roadways by the traveling public in many cases. The proposed map will also help to implement the update to the City’s Subdivision Ordinance by ensuring that high volume roads are correctly identified and regulated for the purpose of limiting direct access from larger scale residential and commercial development through requirements for consolidated access points and driveway access from internal streets vs. direct driveway access. Over the longer term, the reclassification of the designated roads on the City’s Functional Classification map will also help to ensure that NCDOT roads can be improved and maintained with Federal primary aid funds – increasing their quality and function – especially

in areas that are expected to see significant growth in coming years. Staff recommends approval of the text amendment.

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark Planning in Charlotte and the City's consultant with the *Plan Archdale* comprehensive plan and updates to the City subdivision and zoning ordinances expounded further on the purpose of this amendment and how this classification plan would replace the NCDOT classification map in the *Plan Archdale* document.

Chairman Thomas thanked Mr. Miller and Mr. Hansen and then opened the public hearing. He asked if there was anyone present in support of the request.

There was no one present for the request.

Chairman Thomas then asked if anyone present was against the request.

There was no one present that was against the request.

Chairman Thomas then closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Board for discussion and a possible action.

Chairman Thomas what the difference was between a major and a minor collector road. Mr. Hansen responded that the difference was due to a few factors, including: traffic volume, being an urban or rural road, and what kind of roads are the collectors being connected to.

With no further discussion, Mr. Kollm made a motion to recommend approval of the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Greene seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

Item 4. Public Hearing: Request by City of Archdale to repeal and replace the text of the Subdivision Ordinance in its entirety.

Mr. Miller gave the staff report for this item:

Plan Archdale, prepared by Benchmark Planning, was adopted in December 2020 and recommended the City undertake a revision of its Zoning and Subdivision ordinances. The proposed subdivision ordinance is meant to improve the performance of the City's land use and development regulations and better align regulations with Comprehensive Plan recommendations. The process was guided by the City's staff, planning consultant, and the Planning Board. Staff recommends approval of the text amendment.

Mr. Hansen came up again and provided a summary of the changes being presented, including administrative and design changes to promote more effective subdivision of land in the City of Archdale.

Chairman Thomas thanked Mr. Miller and Mr. Hansen and then opened the public hearing. He asked if there was anyone present in support of the request.

There was no one present for the request.

Chairman Thomas then asked if anyone present was against the request.

There was no one present that was against the request.

Chairman Thomas then closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Board for discussion and a possible action.

With no further discussion, Mr. Spillers made a motion to recommend approval to repeal and replace the Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. Kollm seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Item 5. Public Hearing: Request by Travelcamp, LLC to rezone property from HB (Highway Business) to CD M2 (Light Manufacturing), for property located at 1661 Kersey Valley Road, being Guilford County Parcel #'s 7729323853, 7729433412, and 7729333881.

Mr. Wells gave the staff report for this item:

The applicant, TravelCamp LLC, is looking to conditionally rezone +/- 27 acres along Kersey Valley Road. The three parcels are currently zoned Highway Business and have approximately 834 feet of road frontage (in 2 locations) along Kersey Valley Road as well as access from Cecil Farm Road. On the Future Land Use Plan, the property is designated both Commercial Corridor and Commerce Park. The applicant is looking to conditionally rezone to M-2 (Light Industrial) to operate a recreational vehicle (RV) sales and service dealership as well as a small campground as an accessory use. RV sales & service dealerships are an allowed use-by-right in the M-2 zoning district. RV campgrounds and parks are not an allowed use in this zoning district, but it is considered a secondary use to the sales and service dealership.

A site plan was submitted to staff for a TRC review meeting on October 6th. Most items have been corrected, but there are still few outstanding issues on the site plan:

Public Works

- There needs to be a 2” gate valve at the 8” water main where the 2” water line is tapped on the 8” main.
- A fire hydrant is located in the middle of a driveway on sheet C-3.1
- All hydrants need to have a 5” Storz nozzle on them.

Planning

- The application references submitted building elevations that are inconsistent with SR 17. A deviation has not been asked for to consider allowing these elevations.
- The site plan incorrectly lists the applicant as the owner on several pages.
- There is some discrepancy between the application and pages of the site plan in reference to the number of tent sites being asked for (either 15 or 16)
- Road frontage presented on the site plan is erroneously labelled.

The applicant has specifically asked to a deviation from SR 19 to reduce aisle widths within the campground from the required 34 feet to 24 feet. Guil-Rand Fire Department commented that they need a minimum of 24 feet for a drive aisle.

Jamestown Engineering also submitted the following notation: “The zoning site plan is conditionally approved pending modifications required to meet City and State standards for utility service, watershed, and erosion control.”

Although the site meets most requirements of a TRC approval, staff is not in favor of the rezoning as the use is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Plan designations of Commerce Park and Commercial Corridor. Vagn Hansen of Benchmark Planning, who worked on *Plan Archdale* and the City’s current ordinance updates, gave the following statement concerning the inconsistency and its potential impacts:

“The proposed rezoning of the site from HB to M-2 (inclusive of the specific use proposed) is not consistent with the intent of the Future Land Use Map, which designates this quadrant of the I-85 / NC 62 interchange with the “Commercial Corridor” place type. The Commercial Corridor place type is intended to provide opportunities for the establishment of businesses that are primarily engaged in the provision of goods and services to the local community and travelling public. While the establishment of an RV campground may be nominally viewed as partially fitting within this intent, the tendency of such establishments to evolve over time from transient lodging to permanent / semi-permanent housing (without regard to any official rules or regulations on tenancy which are generally ignored in favor of the economic well-being of the owner) reduces the degree of conformance that might otherwise exist absent real world observations of such establishments.

The companion use of RV sales / service might be seen as a generally better fit for a high-profile location at an evolving major interstate interchange if viewed in isolation but looking more closely at the intent of the designation of the Commercial Corridor place type in this location reveals that its primary purpose is to provide a supporting commercial component to the proposed Commerce Park that is designated to occupy the surrounding area. Specifically, the I-85 / NC-62

interchange Commercial Corridor is intended to provide a location for the establishment of a range of retail, dining, entertainment, and similar supporting uses that will serve the needs of employees in the Commerce Park.

The establishment, and ultimate success, of the proposed Commerce Park, which is action ED-2 under the overall plan goal of “Building a Strong, Diverse, and Resilient Economy,” is dependent on the allocation of sufficient land for the establishment of both major employment generators within the Commerce Park as well as sufficient commercially designated land to ensure that the employees and businesses in the park have ready access to goods and services to meet their daily needs. Removing land from the supply for a use that will not directly support the Commerce Park could be a limiting factor in its establishment.”

Stormwater Statement

The applicant is also requesting a High-Density Development Permit, the acquisition of which is required prior to the initiation of any construction. The project has been reviewed based on the requirements of the High-Density Development Permit as well as the provisions of the ACE Integrated Stormwater Management Program. The requirements of Chapter 15 of the City Code of Ordinances are more stringent therefore govern in this case.

Chairman Thomas thanked Mr. Wells and then opened the public hearing. He asked if there was anyone present in support of the request.

John Jones, realtor for Gibson Smith Realty Company (1100 Kenilworth Ave., Suite 200, Charlotte, NC 28204) and representing the applicant explained that Travelcamp has 10 locations and were previously bought out but are now back and have a primary focus of selling recreational vehicles (RVs). He said there would be 50 employees with an average salary of \$60,000 and projected sales of \$15 million annually. He continued that it would be an employment generator of a greater magnitude than warehouse-type uses. Mr. Jones said the intent was to have transient lodging with a maximum of a 30 day stay in the RV campground, but it could be extended an additional 30 days if the client is waiting for a part. He explained the amenities that would be provided and stated that the topography was not conducive to a warehouse use but would be feasible to work with for this applicant. Mr. Jones also mentioned that they had been working with NCDOT and had gotten preliminary approvals. Lastly, he introduced Mack Summey, engineer for the project.

Mack Summey, principal for Summey Engineering Associates (150 S. Fayetteville St., Asheboro, NC 27203) and site engineer, introduced himself and said he had similar experience working on the Jellystone Resort in Asheboro and that RV parks were in higher demand. He explained that the applicant had been working with the city to provide a sewer easement across the property. He reiterated Mr. Jones’ comments about the quality of the development and the 30-day maximum stay at the campground. Lastly, he mentioned that they would work to meet SR 17 requirements with the building elevations.

Chairman Thomas then asked if anyone present was against the request.

Darrell Smith, 1550 Kersey Valley Road, said he was against the development due to traffic concerns already existing due to the landfill and Kersey Valley Adventures.

Kim Brown, 5991 Weant Road, said she was against the request as she believes the City has been waiting for a higher level of development. She said she was not opposed to the sales portion of the request but felt the campground does not fit the City's plans.

Chairman Thomas then closed the public hearing and turned it over to the Board for discussion and a possible action.

Mr. Greene asked if there was an ordinance concerning the 30-day maximum stay. Mr. Wells responded that it was required in SR 19. Mr. Kollm asked if the extension would not be allowed per the ordinance to which Mr. Wells confirmed. Mr. Jones said the applicant would be willing to consider the maximum 30 day stay as a condition.

Chairman Thomas addressed a discrepancy in the amount of tent sites represented on the plans and applications. Mr. Jones confirmed there were 15 tent sites. Chairman Thomas then asked if the notes from Public Works in the staff report were addressed. Mr. Wells confirmed they had not been addressed.

Mr. Spillers asked about the elevations and what the concern was with what was presented. Mr. Wells responded that they were inconsistent with SR 17 as they were a metal building faced with EIFS siding.

Mr. Kinney asked what districts RV sales and service dealerships are allowed in and why the M-2 zoning was being asked for. Mr. Jones responded that it was recommended by staff and that in other cities it was usually allowed in commercial districts. Mr. Wells said they were allowed use-by-right in M-1 and M-2 zoning districts and M-2 was closer to the Commerce Park land use designation. Mr. Miller continued and said that automobile dealerships are not allowed in the B-1 and B-2 zoning districts and needed a Special Use Permit in Highway Business.

Mr. Kollm asked for some clarifications on making a motion and how the item could be passed as presented if conditions were being considered. Mr. Miller said it could be recommended to be passed as presented, passed with conditions, denied, and denied with conditions. Chairman Thomas suggested that some of the inconsistencies noted on the staff report could become conditions for a recommendation of approval.

Chairman Thomas asked about a notation on the site plan and in the application referring to private utility lines. Mr. Wells answered that because the roads were not being turned over, the lines serving the individual campgrounds would remain private.

Mr. Greene asked if a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was required. Mr. Wells said the City does not require one for commercial developments unless the City or NCDOT believes it is warranted. NCDOT Division 7 had provided comment that a TIA was not required, but that a driveway permit would need to be approved prior to construction.

Chairman Thomas reminded the board of having to read the consistency statement despite the site plan and request being inconsistent.

With no further discussion, Mr. Spillers made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional district rezoning with the following conditions:

- 1. All requirements of SR 17 will need to be met and, if an elevation is submitted, it will meet these requirements of SR 17.**
- 2. As stated in SR 19, there will be no stays in the campground past 30 days.**
- 3. All comments made by Public Works will need to be addressed.**

Mr. Kinney seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-2.

Yay: Kinney, Collins, Greene, Spillers, and Miller.

Nay: Kollm and Sparks.

Item 6. Request by Crescent Communities for a High-Density Development Permit (HDDP) for property located at 300 Roelee Street being Randolph County parcels # 7718217803, 7718203484, 7718204365, and 7718205266.

Mr. Wells gave the staff report for this item:

Crescent Communities is seeking a HDDP to construct a new 120,000 square foot building at 300 Roelee St. The project would also include the extension of Roelee Street to service the site. The project will control the first 1-inch of stormwater runoff as required by high density development. The built upon area of the property will be 393960.79 square feet (15.77%) of the parcel's 57.35 acres. The project has an estimated timetable of January 2023 to January 2024.

Mr. Wells also read the seven requirements of the High-Density Development Permit and that this item was not a public hearing.

Mr. Greene asked where Roelee Street was in relationship to the property to which Mr. Wells showed on the map.

Chairman Thomas asked if this was the project that had gotten approval for incentives by City Council a couple months prior to which Mr. Wells confirmed.

Mr. Greene asked if this request involved a rezoning. Mr. Wells said the property was already zoned M-1 and M-2 and the request was use-by-right, which negated the need to rezone a property.

Item 7. Additional Items

Mr. Wells presented the Planning Board meeting schedule for 2023 to the Board and said the next meeting would be on January 9th due to the New Year's holiday on January 2nd. Chairman Thomas asked about updates for the Zoning Ordinance and Mr. Miller said it would likely be coming back for a workshop and approval by February 2023.

Item 8. Adjournment

With no further discussion, Chairman Thomas adjourned the Monday, December 5th, 2022 meeting.