



**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
SEDALIA TOWN HALL
6121 Burlington Road
May 15, 2025
7PM**

Minutes

- **CALL TO ORDER:** The regular scheduled meeting for the Town of Sedalia was called to order at 7:03 pm at the Sedalia Town Hall by Chair Riehle.
- **PRAYER & MEDITATION:** Time was allotted for silent prayer and meditation.
- **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Time was allotted for pledge to the U.S. flag.
- **ROLL CALL:** Jay Riehle (Chair), Marian Jeffries (Vice Chair) and Tyler Thomas.
- **ABSENT:** Alfred Walker and Brenda Walker

A. MOTION to approve the agenda was made by Vice Chair Jeffries and seconded by Planning Board member Thomas. Motion carried.

B. MOTION to approve the minutes from the April 17, 2025 Planning Board meeting was made by Vice Chair Jeffries and seconded by Planning Board member Thomas. Motion carried.

C. REPORTS/DISCUSSIONS

I. Sedalia Thoroughfare & Collector Street Plan

Lydia McIntire with the Greensboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Greensboro Department of Transportation provided an update on the Thoroughfare & Collector Street Plan (Plan). The Plan is used to support land development and ordinances and exact road locations are determined during site development and project processes. The MPO reviewed the Town's recommendations but some were not viable. The MPO is presenting their proposed recommendations.

Vice Chair Jeffries commented when the Town was first presented with the plan, it had never seen it and the MPO was asking for approval. Many of the proposed roads went through residents' yards. Chair Riehle added there is trepidation from the Town because the process did not go as expected. Ms. McIntire responded some of the roads are development driven and would be constructed only if the property is sold. Developers would build these roads, not the N.C. Department of Transportation. The Plan simply puts a line on the map so developers see that the Town wants a connection.

Ms. McIntire reviewed the MPO proposal and discussed the Town's recommendations. The MPO's proposed changes for the Town of Sedalia Plan include:

- Reclassified Gateway Drive from existing Local to existing Collector;
- Add proposed Collector from Gateway Drive to Knox Road;
- Add proposed Collector from end of Rockhurst Drive to Blue Lantern Road;

- Reclassify Sharonwood Drive from Local to Collector;
- Add proposed Collector from Sharonwood Drive to Stewart Bend Road;
- Add proposed Collector from Simmons Lake Drive, Jennie Drive and Martingale Dr.
- Reclassify existing JL Martin Drive from Local to Collector;
- Realign Rock Creek Road Extension; and
- Add proposed Collector from Sedalia Road at Gateway Drive to Peeden Drive.

Chair Riehle commented the Town's recommendations as presented incorrect. He did not remember a discussion about Gateway Drive connecting to Knox Road. There was discussion regarding Blue Lantern Road connecting to Knox Road, but this would impact a resident's home and property. Also, the Town wanted some of the roads to go around the town rather than through it. Ms. McIntire responded since the Blue Lantern extension would impact a resident, the compromise was Gateway Drive to Knox Road. Chair Riehle added the Town did not support Simmons Lake Road connecting to JL Martingale Drive, or the Creek Lane extension due to all the new homes in that area. The Town recommended Gateway Drive and Lookout Place go around the town. He added Rockhurst Drive to Blue Lantern Road is listed as 'maybe' because it went through several properties. Administrator Dungee noted Rockhurst Drive is the only road into the subdivision. If it is connected to Blue Lantern Road there would be another entrance and exit.

Ms. McIntire reiterated these roads are development driven only and will create connectivity. Chair Riehle asked what happens to existing houses if a developer comes in. Ms. McIntire responded the developer would buy existing homes and demolish them, then redevelop the land. Chair Riehle felt that was not explained well early in the process of the review of this Plan. Ms. McIntire responded the Plan is designed to support the Town's development ordinance. If the Town wants a connection between two areas, then this plan is used to achieve it. However, the connection will occur only if the developer is the property owner. The road will be built with private funds (e.g., the developer). The State will not build it and the City of Greensboro does not have the funds. Chair Riehle asked for clarification that roads would be constructed only if the current home or property owners sell their property to a developer for redevelopment. He added it was misleading because some of the properties already are developed where the proposed roads are listed. Ms. McIntire responded it would require a developer to own the property for the road to be constructed. A meeting attendee asked what if an owner does not sell their property. Ms. McIntire responded the developer must acquire all of the land.

Planning Board member Thomas commented a DCC is submitted and is forwarded to Guilford County. The County would not provide recommendations on transportation infrastructure, but would be aware of it and enforce it. Ms. McIntire stated this Plan is guidance on where collector roads should be constructed if development occurs. Chair Riehle asked for clarification that this is a guideline map, but not a definitive 'this is where the road will go' map. He added some are concerned about eminent domain. Ms. McIntire responded eminent domain is a concern with freeways or major thoroughfares, but not for collector roads. She added if there is a proposed collector road on the map, there is a need for that road and a need to seek funding.

Planning Board member Thomas asked about the Rock Creek Dairy Extension. Ms. McIntire responded the MPO will seek funding for it. It indicates there is a need, but just because a road is on the map does not mean they will seek funding. She added roads that have congestion and safety issues get funded.

Vice Chair Jeffries commented if development occurs outside of the town boundaries the proposed collector roads would increase traffic coming through town. Chair Riehle asked if the goal is to take traffic off of Bethel Church Road why is there a need for three collector roads; the Town proposed two. Also, the Town does not want the Creek Lane connector since there are new homes on Bogues Way and more being developed. Ms. McIntire noted the Creek Lane connector was removed. Planning Board member Thomas asked if the intent was to remove dead end roads. Ms. McIntire responded the intent is to create connectivity to Bethel Church Road. Vice Chair Jeffries expressed concerns that increased traffic on Blue Lantern Road would affect the Town's Park. Ms. McIntire responded most people would probably take higher speed roads. Chair Riehle commented it is not the Town's vision to be a thoroughfare or shortcut. He thought there may have been a road that connected to Burlington Road outside of Sedalia. Ms. McIntire responded she will see if it is possible to have access roads to U.S. 70/Burlington Road without going through the town. Vice Chair Jeffries expressed concerns that all these collector roads will create more congestion and safety issues and the Town wants to have a safe community for children and the elderly. Ms. McIntire will review the Town's proposed alternatives. She added the Rock Creek Extension was shifted to more align with that proposed by the town. They will look for funding, but this road will be more of a thoroughfare. Administrator Dungee commented there are homes being built along Sedalia Road so the road was proposed in the vacant areas outside of the town boundaries.

Ms. McIntire stated the proposed changes discussed at the meeting will be reviewed by the MPO and she will send another version of the map for the Town to review and approve. Chair Riehle stated he appreciated Ms. McIntire attending the meeting and explaining the process.

II. Sedalia Rezoning Procedures.

Administrator Dungee recently received information that the rezoning may not happen, or it may not be considered at this point. Chair Riehle suggested each member review the rezoning procedures and it will be discussed at a future meeting. This will be a refresher to some or new material to others who are not familiar with the regulations.

III. Resolution on Planning and Zoning Bill

Planning Board member Thomas presented the *Resolution Opposing Changes to Local Planning and Zoning*. He reported several bills have been introduced in the 2025 session of the North Carolina General Assembly that make significant changes to how local governments do zoning and planning. Generally, the changes may allow developers to move forward with development projects without the Town's input and it will remove

Town's ability to shape how development looks within its boundaries. He understands that developers want to reduce paperwork and costs but these bills remove the Town's ability to provide input. There should be some middle ground. Some parts of the bills make sense. For example, changes to the accessory development unit (ADU) requirements. In some areas, a property owner cannot add an ADU behind their house because of zoning; whereas, in some areas an ADU can be added. ADUs make financial sense for some people to be used as rentals, etc.

Chair Riehle commented the proposed bills basically allow developers to construct developments without input from towns or the community. Vice Chair Jeffries commented developers have presented development plans within the town. If the Town does not want what is proposed, it has input, but if these bills pass, then the Town would not have input. Planning Board member Thomas agreed that if the bills pass, a developer would be able to build a development on the 100-acre tract with no regard to how the Town wants development to look and the Town would have no input. Chair Riehle commented is not right for a developer to be able to construct a development without town or community involvement. Planning Board member Thomas added that developers construct developments, but they do not live there. Administrator Dungee commented the bills were proposed because there is a housing shortage. The bills are a means for the State to address this shortage. Communities all want to have input on how their communities look, but this is the state's way of increasing development.

MOTION to approve the *Resolution Opposing Changes to Local Planning and Zoning* was made by Planning Board member Thomas and seconded by Vice Chair Jeffries. Motion carried.

IV. Development Ordinance Review

Chair Riehle proposed the Planning Board continue the review of the Town's Development Ordinance at the next meeting.

D. CITIZENS COMMENTS

No comments.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS

All regular scheduled meetings are held at the Sedalia Town Hall at 7:00 pm.

- The next Town Council Agenda meeting will be held on May 19th
- The Town Hall will be closed on May 26th for Memorial Day
- The next Town Council meeting will be held on June 2nd
- The Charlotte Hawkins Brown Museum – Black Heritage Day event will be held on June 14th
- The next Planning Board meeting will be held on June 19th

Meeting adjourned at 8:14pm

Submitted By:

Cam Dungee
Cam Dungee, Town Administrator

Aug. 21, 2025
Date

Approved By:

Jay Riehle
Chair Riehle

(SEAL)

