

May 16, 2006

The Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission met on the above date at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

	Mr. Jay Yates - *	
Mr. Len Tozer - *		Mr. Bob Ramey - *
Mr. Dave Gordon - X		Mr. Jim Moye - *
Mr. Tim Randall - *		Mr. Don Baker - *
Mr. James Wilson - *		Mr. Bill Lehman - *
Mr. Porter Stokes - *		Mr. Godfrey Bell, Sr. - *

The members present are denoted by an * and the members absent are denoted by a x.

VOTING MEMBERS: Yates, Tozer, Ramey, Moye, Randall, Baker, Wilson, Lehman and Stokes.

PLANNING STAFF: Merrill Flood, Director of Community Development; Harry V. Hamilton, Jr., Chief Planner; Andy Thomas, Planner; Nikki Jones, Planner and Kathy Stanley, Secretary.

OTHERS PRESENT: Ray Craft, Council Member; Dave Holec, City Attorney; David Brown, City Engineer; and Steve Yetman, Traffic Engineer.

MINUTES: Motion was made by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Tozer, to accept the April 18, 2006 minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Yates recognized Council member Ray Craft.

REQUEST BY WILLIAM H. CLARK (REVISED) – CONTINUED TO JUNE

Chairman Yates stated that the Commission has received a request for continuance.

Motion was made by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Tozer, to approve the continuance to the June meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

REQUEST BY T. H. WORTHINGTON – CONTINUED TO JUNE

(This is a verbatim transcript)

Chairman Yates: New Business, Rezoning by T. H. Worthington to rezone 15.282 acres located immediately east of the Rosewood Subdivision, northeast of the Vicksburg Subdivision, 2,156± feet west of County Home Road, and 1,564± feet north of Worthington Road from RR (Rural Residential – County’s Jurisdiction) to R6S (Residential - Single-Family [Medium Density]).

Mr. Harry Hamilton: This is a request to rezone property from Rural Residential which is a County zoning classification to R6S, Residential-Single Family [Medium Density]. This request will come to you as part of an annexation petition. The property is located in the southern part of the city. It is actually beyond the city’s ETJ. This is a copy of the map that is in your packet. You can see here it is fairly square piece of property it is directly at the end of Pine Drive. This would be the location of Rosewood Subdivision, Vicksburg Subdivision down to the south (indicating to map). This aerial photo gives you a little more perspective as to its location. This is Corey Road back to the west, this is the Boyd Lee Park, this is the road to D. H. Conley High School, you can see here Vicksburg Subdivision and Rosewood Subdivision immediately to the west (indicating on map). The existing Land Use Map that we have only shows the land uses within the city’s jurisdiction and within the city limits. A portion of Vicksburg is actually within the city limits and zoned and you can see that area is developing as single family residential. Of course, you have the Boyd Lee Park here, this line, demarcation between color and the white is the city’s ETJ. All the areas that are shown in white are within the county’s jurisdiction and we do not have a land use survey for those areas. This area in here is currently vacant (indicating on map). The property is not impacted by the floodplain. This map shows the major transportation systems. These roads are regarded as residential corridors and you can see the city’s ETJ in the green line back to the north. This map represents the Thoroughfare Plan. There is a minor thoroughfare for Corey Road, the other roads in red are major thoroughfares, County Home Road as well as the road to D. H. Conley (indicating to map). The requested zoning would have an increase in trips, potentially, as many as 260 trips. The majority of those we would expect to go north on Corey Road around 160, with 100 to the south. The Land Use Plan Map of the City extends well beyond the ETJ, it goes out about two miles. The city’s Land Use Plan recommends Medium Density Residential in this entire area. The red represents several neighborhood commercial areas, the green open space. With respect to the medium density

category that would be between R6A, which allows single family, duplex and very low density multi-family, down to R9S, which is single family only. The requested zoning is for R6S so that is within the medium density range of options for the area that you see here in the pumpkin color, the property is within that area (indicating on map). This map is a composite of the city zoning, Winterville's zoning and the county's jurisdiction. The areas to the north are zoned RA20 and R6, multi-family. There are several single family subdivisions developed in this area within the city's jurisdiction. You have the properties here (indicating on map) which are within the county's jurisdiction, all this area is zoned Rural Residential. The difference between Rural Residential and the city zoning would be that the minimum lot size is 25,000 square feet per lot. Those are very large lots. That is mainly due to the fact that the county doesn't have any sewer and you would have to have on-site environmental systems, septic systems, for sewage disposal in all those areas to the south of the city's ETJ. The requested zoning is for R6S. That would allow a 6,000 square foot lot with public sewer so the lot size is substantially different between the two districts. The R6S district within the city's jurisdiction is more restrictive with respect to land use. A single family development is basically what the area would be restricted to if it were zoned R6S. Under the Rural Residential that category allows a variety of uses. Would allow mobile homes on individual lots, it would allow a mobile home parks and multi-family, limited multi-family with a special use permit, of course, it would allow single family. A greater variety of uses are allowed within the county's jurisdiction so in one sense the city's zoning is more restrictive, in another sense with respect to lot size it is less restrictive. This is a combined view of both the current land use and the existing zoning composite. The estimated number of dwellings that could be built within the county's jurisdiction would be about 24. If it's zoned R6S perhaps as many as 50 dwellings could be built there using the cluster development, something like a Shamrock type of development that is off of Evans Street Extension. In staff's opinion the request is in general compliance with the plan due to the fact that it is within that general category of medium density. The Planning Board would just need to decide whether the particular category that they have chosen within that range is suitable for this location. The Rosewood area and the Vicksburg area mainly by necessity originally of the environmental requirements does have much larger lots than you would see in a R6S area. It is within the range so the real issue is that an appropriate category within that range, but it is in general compliance with the plan.

Mr. Ramey: Harry, since this is in the ETJ and we zone it and the county comes back and says they don't want the zoning, what problems are we in then since we don't have any no authority outside of the ETJ?

Mr. Hamilton: Right, again, this is being submitted in conjunction with an annexation petition that will go to City Council in June. The property will be zoned at the time it is brought into the city limits so it will be within the city's jurisdiction by virtue of being within the city limits.

Mr. Ramey: Has to be annexed before it's zoned.

Mr. Hamilton: It will be annexed and zoned at the same meeting. That's correct. That's the very same thing that happened here in Vicksburg. You can see just to the west, this area in bright yellow, that is within the city limits and was zoned R15S at the time of annexation.

Chairman Yates: Another questions for Mr. Hamilton? Thank you Harry. I now open the public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak in favor please come forward and state your name for the record and you have five minutes.

Mr. Mike Baldwin: Thank you Mr. Chairman and Board members. I'm Mike Baldwin. I represent Tull Worthington. Mr. Worthington has this property under contract with the developer's who developed Vicksburg. We are getting sewer access to the site via Vicksburg. We had stubbed out a manhole on Graves Court and have an easement over to the subdivision. That's the reason that we are requesting annexation so that ya'll can rezone, City Council can rezone the property since it's not within the ETJ right now. Harry's done a great job explaining all the details as far as getting it annexed and then into the ETJ and going through zoning at that point. It is in compliance with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The traffic impact is going to be minimal due to just the size of the land. It's right now used for agricultural purposes. I think Harry pointed out some very good things that zoning it to R6S does give a better control of how the property can be developed. I don't know the county used to have a caveat in their ordinance, their subdivision ordinance, that if property were served by public sewer before they had zoning, that it would be 10,000. Harry, do they have that anymore?

Mr. Hamilton: I'm not sure.

Mr. Baldwin: I think they still might have that in there that if there is public sewer available you can go down to 10,000 square feet unless they've changed that perspective. If they do, what we're doing is not much of a change. It wouldn't be a change on traffic impacts as well either. I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have.

Chairman Yates: Any questions for Mr. Baldwin?

Mr. Ramey: I have one. Mike it seems that the cart is in front of the horse, shouldn't it annexed first and then zoned?

Mr. Baldwin: Well Mr. Ramey you stand a chance you don't want to annex And then this is, it will happen the grand finale will happen at the Council meeting next month. Yes, it will be, Harry does at that public hearing does the annexation take place before the rezoning?

Mr. Hamilton: Actually it takes place at the same time.

Mr. Baldwin: Okay, cause we wouldn't want to get it annexed and not get it rezoned we'd be in a mess.

Mr. Hamilton: It's in a separate ordinance. It would have to be annexed first and then zoned. If it's two separate ordinances which Dave says it is.

Mr. Holec: In reality it's going to be zoning first. We usually do zoning first but the ordinance is going to say that it's zoning and it's conditioned upon and effective with the annexation is effective. If the annexation never becomes effective then the zoning does becomes effective. That's how you cover it. You do need to do them simultaneously because you don't want to have property that's within the corporate limits that's not zoned. You need that so that's why (unclear) prior to them both becoming effective.

Mr. Ramey: Things must have a changed over the past 7 or 8 years Mr. Holec.

Mr. Baker: Mike, is access off Corey Road that will be coming into this?

Mr. Baldwin: Coming straight into Pine Drive.

Mr. Baker: Pine Drive and that's Rosewood?

Mr. Baldwin: That's Rosewood. I've done a layout on it already and I've got a street stubs to

Mr. Baker: So you won't go through Vicksburg? There won't be a road...

Mr. Baldwin: Vicksburg, if I'm not mistaken is a terminal subdivision.

Lady in Audience: My I interject. Vicksburg is the only subdivision that is contiguous to Rosewood that has sewer. Rosewood does not have sewer.

Chairman Yates: Yes madam we'll give you a chance to speak in just one second.

Mr. Baldwin: We will be (unclear), the access will be Pine Drive.

Mr. Baker: So it will be in and out Pine Drive.

Mr. Baldwin: Yes sir. Then we'll have stubs to the adjoining property for future development.

Mr. Moyer: Are you talking about stubs on the other side going over to County Home Road eventually?

Mr. Baldwin: Yes sir.

Mr. Moyer: Mike what about the compatibility size wise for the proposed rezoning lot versus Rosewood and Vicksburg? It seems to me like it's going to be a little bit smaller development.

Mr. Baldwin: If you look on Vicksburg, Vicksburg was developed R15S. If you look at Rosewood the lots are 15,000 square feet but they were developed under the county guidelines. The house sizes out there I would probably estimate and somebody in the audience might be, but I'd probably estimate 1400 to 1500 square feet on the house sizes. I see from what my developer said that they are going to be in excess of that. I think, when you bring sewer in you have, or annex into the city, we have you defray those costs by the need for smaller lots. I haven't, what I've done, Dave will get onto me so I won't even say what I was going to say.

Chairman Yates: Any other questions for Mr. Baldwin? Thank you Mike. Anybody else wishing to speak in favor please come forward and state your name for the record and you have three minutes. Anybody wishing to speak in opposition please come forward and state your name for the record and you have five minutes. Just state your name for the record into the microphone madam.

Ms. Janet Holley: Thank you. My name is Janet Holley. I'm a resident of Rosewood. I want to thank you. Niki Jones who since us a letter telling us, alerting us about what was going to happen. I'm only one of twenty-five residents of Rosewood Subdivision who have signed a petition opposing this rezoning request. This partial list of signatures represents the opposition to R6S by all but two property owners on Tucker Drive contiguous to the proposed development plus several property owners on Pine Drive. The list is partial because not all residents were home at the time this petition was circulated. Since this rezoning and the ensuing development would affect everyone who uses Corey Road and Pine Drive, especially the property owners, additional time will be needed to inform these individuals of the long range implications and get their input. A copy of this petition which is attached will be provided to the Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission for consideration and filing at this meeting. If permitted, I will read the contents of the petition.

“Quote

“ Dear Sir:

We the undersigned property owners of Rosewood Subdivision oppose the rezoning from Rural Residential-County's Jurisdiction to R6S (Residential-Single Family [Medium Density]) for the property located immediately east of Rosewood Subdivision, 2156 feet west of County Home Road, and 1546 feet north of Worthington Road. Our reasons for opposing the rezoning are as follows:

1. It is incompatible with current surrounding zoning patterns. Vicksburg Phase II is zoned R15S. All of the lots in Vicksburg, Phase I and Rosewood Subdivision are zoned Rural Residential but are large enough to fall under R15S or R16S if they were in the Greenville City limits. The same can be said about the lots in Windsor Subdivision which currently fall under Rural Residential. Furthermore, Corey Ridge, Farrington, and Windsor Downs

Subdivisions are zoned R15S or R16S. These are subdivisions off Corey Road.

2. The impact on Pine Drive which we assume will be extended of medium density housing would increase traffic to a dangerous level through a neighborhood where children routinely play in and around the street.
3. The impact of medium density zoning on current drainage would be undesirable. The proposed development would eventually drain into Fork Swamp Creek. Fork Swamp Creek routinely overflows its banks over the bridge on Worthington Road preventing access to Winterville during heavy rains. Medium density housing would only make this flooding worse.
4. We feel that a more appropriate rezoning would be R15S or R16S, Residential Single Family [Low density].

In closing, please remember that this petition does not oppose the right of the owner to develop his property. The petition serves to document the opposition to an R6S rezoning and to implore reconsideration. We respectfully request a rezoning such that the property is divided into lots that are equivalent in size to the contiguous and neighboring subdivisions for single family dwellings which is R15S or R16S. Thank you. (see attached original at end of minutes)

“Quote

Mr. Baker: How many homeowners are there in Rosewood?

Ms. Holley: There are 36 houses. I don't know how many, I guess 36 homes in Rosewood Subdivision.

Mr. Ramey: How many people signed this petition?

Ms. Holley: Twenty-five. We have a couple that just got married, bought a home and just got married, they just bought a house on Tucker Drive. We have another couple that are out of town on business. She works for a pharmaceutical firm so she

does a lot of traveling. She lives on Pine Drive. I'm trying to think of all of the owners on Tucker that we, I think we did get just about everybody on Tucker that would really bare the blunt of having this neighborhood right behind them. In speaking of the sewer I know our property does not have sewer easement. In order for them to, I guess, I mean we just found out about this May 2nd with the little sign at the end of the road. Nobody contacted us to tell us their plans.

Mr. Moyer: Can we view the petition?

Chairman Yates: Yes, Mr. Wilson do you mind grabbing that petition from Ms. Holley?

Mr. Baker: How many trips a day do the existing 35 homes create? Does anyone know that? In Rosewood.

Mr. Hamilton: Our traffic estimate is just for the area under consideration.

Mr. Baker: So you don't have a number for the existing homes?

Mr. Hamilton: No sir.

Chairman Yates: Any other questions for Ms. Holley? Thank you very much. Anybody else wishing to speak in opposition please come forward and state your name for the record and you have three minutes. Anybody wishing to speak in favor with rebuttal please come forward, state your name for the record and you have three minutes.

Mr. Baldwin: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I respect Ms. Holley's comments but I think she did state numerous times medium density. The Comprehensive Plan even though we're outside the ETJ, the portion that carries it outside the ETJ does recommend medium density. We fall right in that middle ground of medium density. The city has a stormwater plan in place now I've allocated room on my layout for stormwater no more will leave the site than leaves the site now. There won't be any additional flooding caused by this subdivision. Yes, Fork Swamp floods, it has always flooded since I've lived in Greenville. On your comment about the traffic if there's 35 lots you want to use about 8.3 trips per day per lot so maybe around 280 trips a day.

Mr. Baker: So it would be roughly doubling the trips through there?

Mr. Baldwin: Yea. Again, I don't know what the issue about sewer to Rosewood is but when Vicksburg was laid out the developers did have in mind in purchasing this property so they have allowed themselves a sewer easement over to the property. I'm sure that the sewer is probably deep enough to serve some lots in Rosewood.

Mr. Baker: Is there any possibility of there being another entrance or exit to the property?

Mr. Baldwin: Oh sure. That's your general policy of having street stubs. Not right now. You can see it is one way end and one way out. We do on the layout that I've done do have

Mr. Baker: How long before that is to be in effect would you say? That would be a developer's decision, right?

Mr. Baldwin: Well it would be an adjoiner's decision. The developer is going to put the street stub in as part of the subdivision. How quick the adjoiner develops is another thing. Pine Drive, well if you take around 280 trips per day then add what this is going to be it's not going to be anywhere near capacity for a residential road of this type.

Chairman Yates: Any other questions for Mr. Baldwin? Thank you Mike. Anybody with rebuttal with opposition to the request please come forward and state your name for the record and you have three minutes. Yes madam. Please state your name again madam and you have three minutes.

Ms. Holley: My name is Janet Holley. I don't think that R15S or R16S is considered medium density. I think it's considered low density if I'm reading the paperwork carefully.

Chairman Yates: Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Hamilton: That would be correct but the only available zoning option is R15S at this location or RA20 which would require 20,000 without sewer and could be reduced to 10,000 with sewer.

Mr. Baker: That can be changed in the rezoning?

Mr. Hamilton: Excuse me.

Mr. Baker: Would that be changed in the rezoning when it is annexed?

Mr. Hamilton: The applicant has asked for R6S so you have to vote that up or down unless they amend their request and you accept that amendment.

Mr. Randall: Under the R15S, what is the lot size?

Mr. Hamilton: 15,000.

Ms. Holley: Our lot is 16,000 square feet.

Mr. Randall: R6S?

Mr. Hamilton: 6,000.

Ms. Holley: So you're taking 6,000 versus 16,000. Our house also has 2,000 square feet of heated space. Yes, most of the homes in Rosewood are 14,000 square feet with some that are larger.

Mr. Tozer: Madam your homes are septic tank service, is that correct?

Ms. Holley: Yes sir they are.

Mr. Tozer: That's one of the reasons the larger lot size is a necessity is to have room to supply the septic service so when we move the infrastructure that provides city water and sewer you need that amount of square footage to provide the water and sewer for each lot.

Ms. Holley: To do in R6S would provide a very small lot which is a very large number of homes. I would decrease our property values. What they could put on an R6S is just about anything. If they zone this plot R6S there's a field to the west that could be zoned by contiguous annexation R6S and the field in back of Vicksburg could be zoned R6S by virtue of the fact that the property right behind Rosewood will if indeed this allowed is R6S. What we're asking is that it commensurate with

what the subdivision sizes are around us that's all.

Mr. Tozer: See one of the problems that happens in this era of construction is that the state requirements for the stormwater retainage, the city's requirements for street construction, infrastructures, inspection elevates the cost so high that's not possible to develop lot sizes similar to what the size you have back in that era when those homes were constructed. We have a lot of pressures in developing the lots so that's why there is a less size lot available because of those pressures.

Mr. Holley: I would accept that except that Vicksburg is right behind us and they are R15S. Just down the road there is Farrington who is R16S and right across the street there's Corey Ridge which is R15S. The logic of that escapes me.

Chairman Yates: Any other questions for Ms. Holley? Thank you very much. I'll now close the public hearing.

Mr. Ramey: Mr. Chairman in going over this I don't really have any problem with the zoning of this piece of land. Twenty-five people signed the petition and I do have, that live adjacent, I do have a problem with that. I think maybe we should continue this and I make a motion that we continue until June and get a little better handle on it.

Mr. Baker: Second.

Chairman Yates: We've got a motion on table, on the floor that it be continued by Mr. Ramey and seconded by Mr. Baker. Any more discussion?

Mr. Lehman: Mr. Ramey what information do you think we would gain by this?

Mr. Ramey: Well, maybe Planning and Zoning will gain a little information from these people who have signed this petition against it. They could present it to us and give us a little clearly picture. As I said this piece of property I don't have any problem with zoning it. I do have a problem with 25 people objecting right next door to it.

Mr. Baker: And all the other subdivisions and the footage that's around it.

Chairman Yates: This is in the Comprehensive Plan though correct?

Mr. Tozer: Yes.

Chairman Yates: Medium density.

Mr. Tozer: I would think one thing that we need to take into consideration is that this development as proposed meets all the criteria from both the Land Use Plan and the Horizons. As directed the traffic flow has been done and it all meets and is in compliance and Harry's agreed that this project is in compliance so we have to look at the facts as the situation has been presented to us that it meets all the criteria. I'm trying to figure out what more information we could put on the table to make a decision.

Mr. Ramey: Len what you're saying is true. The commodity that runs the City of Greenville and the County of Pitt are its people. Without its people you would have neither. What I'm saying is we should continue a month and give these people who are objecting a little more input to Harry. Harry can then explain it a little clearer to us. I don't want to do anything to hurt the people. I think Mike has done a good job with it. I have no problem with zoning it other than the people who live adjacent to it, 25 out of the 36 are complaining.

Chairman Yates: I certainly don't think that anybody on this Board wants to hurt anybody either. We've got a motion on the table to continue this. All in favor. Let's see a show of hands. Those voting to continue: Ramey, Lehman, Stokes, Moyer, Baker and Wilson. Motion is continued to the June meeting. I'm sorry.

Mr. Holec: You need to ask for those who are opposed to it.

Chairman Yates: Those in opposition please raise your hands: Tozer and Randall.

REQUEST BY MAXINE A. SPEIGHT – APPROVED AS AMENDED

Chairman Yates stated that the next item is a request by Maxine A. Speight to rezone 0.8927 acres located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Reedy Branch Road and Tice Road from OR (Office-Residential [High Density Multi-Family]) to CH (Heavy Commercial)

Mr. Hamilton stated this is a request to rezone property Office Residential to Heavy Commercial. The property is just a little less than an acre. The property is located west of US Highway 11, the southern quadrant of the city. This property is basically square as noted on the map. The property is located at the intersection of Reedy Branch Road and Tice Road. Mr. Hamilton indicated the locations of Pitt Community College, the athletic fields and Community Square Shopping Center on the map. The subject site is located between the community college properties and Community Square Shopping Center. To the north of Tice Road is a parking lot that is owned and operated by Pitt Community College. The subject property is not impacted by the floodplain. The area is surrounded by portions of the major transportation system. The change in zoning would increase traffic by 250 trips with the majority of trips to the north, 80 trips to the south and 65 trips to the east along Tice Road. Mr. Hamilton presented a map indicating the site is recommended for commercial uses. Mr. Hamilton stated that the map represents some type of transition between the commercial and Community College. The existing Office zoning was designated at the time the original Tice Drive-In property was rezoned to General Commercial. Mr. Hamilton stated that the request is in general compliance with the Horizons Plan provided that the commercial zoning protects the interest of the Community College. Another issue, is the applicant has requested Heavy Commercial zoning, which would be considered spot zoning which is not recommended. Mr. Hamilton stated that staff would recommend denial of the request if recommended for rezoning to Heavy Commercial in lieu of General Commercial.

Mr. Ramey asked if the closing of Reedy Branch Road hadn't been discussed and going across to Fire Tower Road to the south of Pitt Community College.

Mr. Hamilton indicated on the Thoroughfare Plan map that Fire Tower Road is proposed to be extended west crossing N.C. Highway 11 and connecting with Reedy Branch Road.

Mr. Baker asked what type of uses are allowed for Heavy Commercial versus General Commercial.

Mr. Hamilton explained that Heavy Commercial zoning would allow a mobile home sales lot, various uses that are permitted with a special use permit under the General Commercial zoning as a matter of right, automobile sales are a permitted

use for that location along with a variety of uses not compatible with the community college.

Ms. Alicia Speight Hawk, representing Maxine Speight, apologized for the proposed request for Heavy Commercial and stated that the request should have been made for General Commercial. Ms. Hawk asked that the request be amended to reflect General Commercial zoning for this site.

Motion was made by Mr. Randall and seconded by Mr. Ramey, to amend the request from Heavy Commercial to General Commercial. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Hawk stated that they are the developers and owners of Community Square Shopping Center and contacted the Community College and adjacent tenants to inform them of their proposal. Ms. Hawk stated that are looking at integrating the subject property, which is vacant, with Community Square in order to provide mixed office/retail services.

No one spoke in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Randall, seconded by Mr. Lehman to recommend approval of the proposed amendment, to advise that it is consistent with the comprehensive plan and other applicable plans, and to adopt the staff report which addresses plan consistency and other matters.

REQUEST BY BY-PASS PROPERTIES, III, LLC – APPROVED

Chairman Yates stated that the next item is request by By-pass Properties, III, LLC for a preliminary plat entitled “ Pitt Commerce Center”. The property is located on Radio Station Road and south of US 264. The preliminary plat consists of 11 lots on 25.8084 acres.

Mr. Andy Thomas stated this is a request by Pitt Commerce Center and the developer is By-pass Properties, III, LLC. The property is located on Radio Station Road and south of US 264. The property is not impacted by the floodplain. The property is currently zoned Medical Office and the anticipated use is Medical Offices on 11 lots. A portion of Radio Station Road was withdrawn from dedication from the NCDOT for this development. NCDOT planned for and

approved the access to US 264. There is a riparian buffer along North Fork Green Mill Run. The detention ponds will feed into this branch. There are two common detention ponds that will serve this development that will be maintained by the property owner's association. There is also a riparian buffer along the rear of Lot 4 and the central common area. There is a family cemetery on Lot 5 adjacent to Commerce Center Road. The plat indicates a road that abuts the cemetery to provide adequate access for visitors. Streets are being extended to the vacant property to the east. Sidewalks will be provided.

Mr. Andy Munday, Stroud Engineering, stated he would answer any questions that the Commission had.

No one spoke in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Tozer, seconded by Mr. Moye, to approve the request. Motion carried unanimously.

REQUEST BY JON DAY AND ASSOCIATES – APPROVED

Chairman Yates stated that the next item is a request by Jon Day and Associates for a preliminary plat entitled “Melrose Place-Phase 1”. The property is located north of NC HWY 43 between Brighton Park and Treybrooke Condominiums. The preliminary plat consists of 3 lots on 135.43 acres.

Mr. Thomas stated this is a preliminary plat for Melrose Place, Phase 1. The property is located north of NC Highway 43 between Brighton Park and Treybrooke Condominiums. The property is currently zoned MO, Medical Office on Lots 1 and 2 and MR, Medical Residential on Lot 3. The anticipated use is medical offices for Lots 1 and 2 and the remainder multi-family residential on three lots. This is a large tract of land that extends from NC Highway 43 to the Tar River. It encompasses more than 135 acres of land. Most of his property has severe environmental challenges including the Tar River floodway and associated wetlands. The portion of property that would be suitable for development is illustrated on this submission with the northern boundary of Lot 3 representing the edge of developable property. The balance of the property is to be used for conservation and stormwater purposes. There is a greenway easement and riparian buffer along Schoolhouse Branch. The 100-year flood plain impacts Lots 2 and 3. Arlington Boulevard will be extended to intersect with Melrose Drive. The

developer has worked with NCDOT regarding the placement of a traffic light and they will participate in the costs. A coordinated street system is being extended to the north and west. Sidewalks are provided

Mr. Jon Day spoke on behalf of the request. Mr. Day stated they will financially participate in the fourth part of the traffic signal to be placed at NC Highway 43 and Arlington Boulevard. Mr. Day stated he would answer any questions.

No one spoke in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Ramey, seconded by Mr. Tozer, to approve the plat. Motion carried unanimously.

REQUEST BY VICTOR T. COREY – APPROVED

Chairman Yates stated that the next item is a request by Victor T. Corey for a preliminary plat entitled “Corey Ridge, Section Two, Phase Two”. The property is located west of Corey Road at the end of Van-Gert Drive. The preliminary plat consists of 32 lots on 22.4404 acres.

Mr. Thomas stated this is a preliminary plat for Corey Ridge, Section Two, Phase Two. The property is located west of Corey Road at the end of Van-Gert Drive. The property is currently zoned RA20, Residential and the anticipated use is single family residential on 32 lots. The Planning and Zoning Commission approved a preliminary plat for the development on March 16, 2004. This submittal represents an addition of 2 lots to the previous submittal. An increase in the number of approved lots is required to be returned to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval. There is a fifty-foot riparian buffer along the northern boundary. The 100 year flood plain impacts Lots 20-31. Single-family dwellings on lots containing less than 20,000 square feet of area shall have the first floor elevated to the base flood elevation (100 year flood line) plus one foot or to the 500 year flood line whichever is greater. The Greenville Utilities Commission operates a pump station on Lots 20 and 21. Access is provided via an easement between Lots 22, 23 and 24. A coordinated street system is being extended to the north and south. Sidewalks are provided.

Mr. Steve Spruill, Spruill & Associates, spoke on behalf of the request. Mr. Spruill stated he would answer any questions the Commission may have.

No one spoke in opposition.

Motion was made by Mr. Baker, seconded by Mr. Ramey, to approve the plat.
Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Yates stated that he has enjoyed serving on the Planning and Zoning Commission for the past six years.

Mr. Hamilton stated that this was the last meeting in the Municipal Building and future meetings will be held in the new City Hall.

There being no further business, motion was by Mr. Tozer to adjourn at 7:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Merrill Flood
Secretary

William Keith and Janet Myers Holley

1116 Pine Drive
Winterville, NC 28590-9118
252.756.7658

Dear Niki S. Jones
Planner I
City of Greenville, NC
P.O. Box 7207
Greenville, NC 28590-9118

Re: Petition to Oppose R6S Rezoning Request by T.H. Worthington for property contiguous and immediately east of Rosewood Subdivision (off of Corey Road).

Thank you so much for alerting the residents of Rosewood Subdivision (Pine Drive, Tucker Drive, and Forest Place) of this rezoning request made by the property owner. I am only one of the 25 residents of Rosewood Subdivision who have signed a petition to oppose this rezoning request. This partial list of signatures represents the opposition to R6S by all but two property owners on Tucker Drive (contiguous to the proposed development) plus several property owners on Pine Drive. The list is partial because not all residents were home at the time this petition was circulated. Since this rezoning (and the ensuent development) would affect everyone who uses Corey Road and Pine Drive (especially the property owners), additional time will be needed to inform these individuals of the long-range implications and get their input.

A copy of this petition (attached) with the partial list of signatures will be provided to the Greenville Planning and Zoning Commission for consideration and filing at the 6:30 pm meeting in Council Chambers of the Municipal Building on Tuesday, 16May06. If permitted, I will read the contents of the petition.

In closing, please remember that this petition does not oppose the right of the owner to develop his property. The petition serves to document the opposition to an R6S rezoning and to implore reconsideration. We respectfully request a rezoning such that the property is divided into lots that are equivalent in size to the contiguous and neighboring subdivisions for single family dwellings (R15S or R16S).

Sincerely,

Jan Holley

Concerned Property Owners of Rosewood Subdivision

1116 Pine Drive
Winterville, NC 28590
Pitt County

Re: Rezoning Request by T. H. Worthington

Dear Sir:

We the undersigned property owners of Rosewood Subdivision (see attached) **oppose** the rezoning from RR (Rural Residential-County's Jurisdiction) to R6S (Residential-Single Family [Medium Density]) for the property located immediately east of Rosewood Subdivision, 2156± feet west of County Home Road, and 1,546± feet north of Worthington Road. Our reasons for opposing the rezoning are as follows:

1. It is incompatible with current surrounding zoning patterns. Vicksburg Phase II is zoned R15S. All of the lots in Vicksburg Phase I and Rosewood Subdivision are zoned RR but are large enough to fall under R15S or R16S if they were in the Greenville City Limits; the same can be said about the lots in Windsor Subdivision which currently fall under RR. Furthermore, Corey Ridge, Farrington, and Windsor Downs Subdivisions are zoned R15S or R16S.
2. The impact on Pine Drive, which we assume will be extended, of medium density housing, would increase traffic to a dangerous level through a neighborhood where children routinely play in and around the street.
3. The impact of Medium Density zoning on current drainage would be undesirable. The proposed development would eventually drain into Fork Swamp Creek. Fork Swamp Creek routinely overflows its banks over the bridge on Worthington Road preventing access to Winterville during heavy rain. Medium Density housing would only make this flooding worse.
4. We feel that a more appropriate rezoning would be R15S or R16S (Residential -Single Family [Low density]).

Thank you for your consideration of our Petition.

Concerned Property Owners of Rosewood and Vicksburg Subdivisions

Re: Rezoning Request by T. H. Worthington

Printed Name	Address	Signature
1. William K Holley	1116 Pine Drive	William K. Holley
2. Janet M. Holley	1116 Pine Drive	Janet M. Holley
3. ROBERT MULLEN	2125 TUCKER RD	Robert Mullen
4. Brenda Mullen	2123 Tucker Rd.	Brenda Mullen
5. Andrew Brown	2115 Tucker Rd	Andrew Brown
6. Earl C. Lewis	2126 Tucker Rd.	Earl C. Lewis
7. Terry R. Lewis	2126 Tucker Rd.	Terry R. Lewis
8. William Chesman	1103 Pine Drive	William Chesman
9. JAMES E. HOLLY	1119 PINE DRIVE	James E. Holly
10. DAVID RYHANYET	1102 PINE DR	David Ryhanyet
11. Glenda Brookshire	1053 Pine Drive	Glenda Brookshire
12. William Brookshire		William R. Brookshire
13. Jim Lyn	1054 PINE DR	Jim Lyn
14. Georgette Debevoise	1036 Pine DR.	Georgette Debevoise
15. Steve ^{STEVENS} Debevoise	1036 Pine DR.	Steve Debevoise
16. Michael Wilkins	2110 Tucker Rd.	Michael Wilkins
17. Lisa Wilkins	2110 Tucker Rd.	Lisa Wilkins
18. Lisa D. Atkinson	2105 Tucker Rd	Lisa D. Atkinson
19. Sheryl Jones	1094 Pine Dr	Sheryl Jones
20. Ryan Spruce	2104 Tucker Rd	Ryan Spruce

Concerned Property Owners of Rosewood and Vicksburg Subdivisions

Re: Rezoning Request by T. H. Worthington

Printed Name	Address	Signature
21. Crystal Spruill	2104 Tucker Rd.	Crystal Spruill
22. Frankie Wilson	2105 Tucker Rd	Frankie Wilson
23. Jeanne Tipton Jeanne Tipton	1065 Pine Dr	Jeanne Tipton
24. Joseph L. Choate	1086 Pine Dr.	Joseph Choate
25. Valerie L. Choate	1086 Pine Dr.	Valerie L. Choate
26.		
27.		
28.		
29.		
30.		
31.		
32.		
33.		
34.		
35.		
36.		
37.		
38.		
39.		
40.		

