PUBLIC HEARING
AGENDA

DECEMBER 14, 2017

ARTivity on the Green - Liberty Street
2016 Community Appearance “AIA Award” Winner

City-County Planning Board
FORSYTH COUNTY & WINSTON-SALEM
NORTH CAROLINA
DATES TO REMEMBER:

December 14, 2017 - 4:30 P.M. Public Hearing
December 22, 2017 - 8:15 A.M. Sign Check
  * Date changed due to Holiday

REMINDER: THERE IS NO REGULARLY SCHEDULED WORK
SESSIONS IN DECEMBER. ENJOY YOUR
HOLIDAY SEASON!

January 11, 2018 - 4:30 P.M. Public Hearing
January 22, 2018 - 8:15 A.M. Sign Check
January 25, 2018 - 4:30 P.M. Work Session
Rules and Procedures

- Persons supporting the zoning request have up to 12 minutes total.
- Persons opposing the rezoning request have up to 12 minutes total.
- There are no rebuttals.
- During the work session, no one is permitted to speak unless the Planning Board asks them a specific question.
- For general use zoning requests, the Planning Board must consider the full range of uses allowed in the zoning district being requested. The petitioner may not refer to a specific intended use of the property.
- For special use district zoning requests, the petitioner must identify the intended use or uses of the site and give specific details on how the site will be developed.
- Most requests listed under agenda item “B” require final action by an elected body (the City Council for cases within the City of Winston-Salem zoning jurisdiction and the Board of Commissioners for cases within Forsyth County zoning jurisdiction). As such, votes taken by the Planning Board concerning these items are recommendations which are considered by the elected bodies during their review of the requests.

**Please Turn Off All Cell Phones and Two-Way Communication Devices.**

This agenda is available in alternative media forms for people with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in programs and activities of the Planning Department are encouraged to contact the Department at least 72 hours in advance so that proper accommodations can be arranged. For information, call 336-747-7069 (727-8319 TTY).
CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

A. ACTION ON MINUTES

- November 9, 2017 Public Hearing
- November 27, 2017 Sign Check

B. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. Zoning petition of Crown Union Cross LLC, Charles Willard, Ina Stevens, and Oneita Tucker from AG to GB-S (Arts and Crafts Studio; Banking and Financial Services; Bed and Breakfast; Building Contractors, General; Building Materials Supply; Child Care, Drop-In; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Club or Lodge; College or University; Combined Use; Food or Drug Store; Funeral Home; Furniture and Home Furnishings Store; Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office; Habilitation Facility A; Habilitation Facility B; Habilitation Facility C; Hotel or Motel; Institutional Vocational Training Facility; Library, Public; Manufacturing A; Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery; Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing; Museum or Art Gallery; Nursery, Lawn and Garden Supply Store, Retail; Nursing Care Institution; Offices; Park and Shuttle Lot; Parking, Commercial; Police or Fire Station; Recreation Facility, Public; Recreation Services, Indoor; Recreation Services, Outdoor; Restaurant (without drive-through service); Retail Store; School, Vocational or Professional; Services A; Shopping Center; Shopping Center, Small; Special Events Center; Storage Services, Retail; Swimming Pool, Private; Theater, Indoor; Utilities; Veterinary Services; Wholesale Trade A; Adult Day Care Center; Child Care Institution; Child Care, Sick Children; Child Day Care Center; Family Group Home B; Family Group Home C; Group Care Facility A; Group Care Facility B; Life Care Community; Residential Building, Multifamily; Residential Building, Townhouse; Residential Building, Twin Home; Residential Building, Duplex; School, Private; School, Public; and Access Easement, Private Off-Site) TWO PHASE and Special Intense Development Allocation (SIDA): property is located on the east side of Union Cross Road across from Glenn Hi Road; (Zoning Docket F-1571).
CONTINUANCE HISTORY: November 9, 2017 to December 14, 2017

a. Zoning Recommendation.
b. Site Plan Recommendation.
c. SIDA Recommendation.

2. Zoning petition of Clarthria Wherry from RM12-S to IP-L (Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Child Day Care Center; Child Care, Drop-In; Child Care Institution; School, Private; and Adult Day Care Center): property is located on the southwest corner of Bethabara Road and Speas Road; (Zoning Docket W-3354).

a. Zoning Recommendation.

3. Zoning petition of YWCA of Winston-Salem & Forsyth County from RS7 to RM18-L (Residential Building, Single Family; Family Group Home A; and Family Group Home B): property is located on the northeast corner of Granville Drive and West Street; (Zoning Docket W-3355).

a. Zoning Recommendation.

4. Zoning petition of Old Salem Inc., Carol Faley, We Buy Houses of the Triad, LLC, and Stephen Foster from LI to PB-L (Arts and Crafts Studio; Banking and Financial Services; Bed and Breakfast; Building Contractors, General; Child Care, Drop in; Child Day Care, Small home; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Club or Lodge; College or University; Combined Use; Food or Drug Store; Furniture and Home Furnishings Store; Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office; Institutional Vocational Training Facility; Library, Public; Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery; Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing; Museum or Art Gallery; Nursing Care Institution; Offices; Park and Shuttle Lot; Police or Fire Station; Recreation Facility, Public; Recreation Services, Indoor; Recreation Services, Outdoor; Residential Building, Duplex; Residential Building, Single Family; Residential Building, Twin Home; Restaurant Without Drive Through Service; Retail Store; School, Vocational or Professional; Services A; Services B; Shopping Center, Small; Swimming Pool, Private; Testing and Research Lab; Theater, Indoor; Urban Agriculture; Utilities; Veterinary Services; Warehousing; Adult Day Care Center; Child Care Institution; Child Care, Sick Children; Child Day Care Center; Group Care Facility A; Life Care Community; Residential Building, Multifamily; Residential Building, Townhouse; School, Public; School, Private; and Access Easement, Private Off-Site): property is located on the east side of Broad Street, the west side of Poplar Street, and the south side of Walnut Street; (Zoning Docket W-3356).

a. Zoning Recommendation.

5. An ordinance amendment proposed by Planning and Development Services staff revising Chapter B of the Unified Development Ordinances to allow Residential Building, Townhouse and Residential Building, Multifamily in the HB and GO
zoning districts, and to remove the uses Residential Building, Duplex and Residential Building, Twin Home from the GB zoning district (UDO-283). Continued from the October 12, 2017 Planning Board meeting.

a. Ordinance Amendment Recommendation.

6. An ordinance amendment proposed by Planning and Development Services staff revising Chapter B of the Unified Development Ordinances to establish building material requirements for the use Retail Store (UDO-284).

This is automatically continued to January 11, 2018 per the applicant's request and as per Planning Board's By-Laws.

C. PLANNING BOARD REVIEWS

1. PBR 2017-13; Villas at Jefferson Ridge; north side of Coravan Drive, west of Norman Road; Planned Residential Development; City; 7.04 acres.

2. PBR 2017-14; Ash Grove; west side of Harper Road, south of Styers Ferry Road; Planned Residential Development; County; 13.11 acres.

D. STAFF REPORT

E. FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER
RESULTS OF CITY COUNCIL AND BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS HEARINGS REGARDING PLANNING MATTERS

The City Council and the Board of Commissioners made the following decisions on Planning Board matters:

WINSTON-SALEM CITY COUNCIL

1. Site Plan Amendment of Jemsite Development, LLC for a Banking and Financial Services use in a GB-S zoning district: property is located on the west side of Silas Creek Parkway, north of Fairlawn Drive; (Zoning Docket W-3343).

   APPROVED with additional conditions.

   Planning Board recommended denial of the amendment and certified that the site plan (including staff recommended conditions) meets all code requirements if the petition is approved.

2. Zoning petition of Marketplace Mall, LLC from HB to GB-L (Residential Building, Duplex; Residential Building, Townhouse; Residential Building, Twin Home; Residential Building, Multifamily; Boarding or Rooming House; Combined Use; Family Group Home B; Family Group Home C; Fraternity or Sorority; Life Care Community; Urban Agriculture; Arts and Crafts Studio; Building Materials Supply; Convenience Store; Food or Drug Store; Furniture and Home Furnishings Store; Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery; Motorcycle Dealer; Nursery, Lawn and Garden Supply Store, Retail; Outdoor Display Retail; Restaurant (without drive-through service); Restaurant (with drive-through service); Retail Store; Shopping Center; Shopping Center, Small; Wholesale Trade A; Banking and Financial Services; Bed and Breakfast; Car Wash; Entertainment Facility, Large; Funeral Home; Hotel or Motel; Kennel, Indoor; Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing; Motor Vehicle, Repair and Maintenance; Motor Vehicle, Body or Paint Shop; Motor Vehicle, Storage Yard; Offices; Services, A; Services, B; Storage Services, Retail; Testing and Research Lab; Veterinary Services; Warehousing; Recreation Services, Indoor; Recreation Services, Outdoor; Recreation Facility, Public; Swimming Pool, Private; Theater, Indoor; Academic Biomedical Research Facility; Academic Medical Center; Adult Day Care Center; Animal Shelter, Public; Cemetery; Child Care, Drop-In; Child Care Institution; Child Care, Sick Children; Child Day Care Center; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Club or Lodge; College or University; Correctional Institution; Dirt Storage; Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office; Group Care Facility A; Group Care Facility B; Habilitation Facility A; Habilitation Facility B; Habilitation Facility C; Hospital or Health Center; Institutional Vocational Training Facility; Library, Public; Museum or Art Gallery; Nursing Care Institution; Police or Fire Station; School, Private; School, Public; School, Vocational or Professional; Special Events Center; Stadium, Coliseum or Exhibition Building; Manufacturing A; Access Easement, Private Off-Site; Helistop; Park and Shuttle Lot; Parking, Commercial; Terminal, Bus or Taxi; Transmission Tower; and Utilities): property is located on the east side of Peters Creek Parkway, north of Salisbury Ridge Road; (Zoning Docket W-3346).
Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment.

3. Zoning petition of William Crouse from RS9 to RM8-S (Life Care Community; Residential Building, Single Family; and Planned Residential Development): property is located on the south side of West Clemmonsville Road, west of Paula Drive; (Zoning Docket W-3348).

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment and certified that the site plan (including staff recommended conditions) meets all code requirements if the petition is approved.

4. Zoning petition of Salem Baptist Church, Inc from RSQ, RM5, and IP to IP-L (Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office; Police or Fire Station; Residential Building, Single Family; Urban Agriculture; Adult Day Care Center; Child Day Care Center; Church or Religious Institution, Community; School, Private; College or University; and Recreation Services, Indoor): property is located along both sides of Spring Street between Academy Street and Wachovia Street; (Zoning Docket W-3349).

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment.

5. Site Plan Amendment of Enclave Land Holdings, LLC for a Residential Building, Multifamily Development in a RM12-S zoning district: property is located on the west side of Bethania Station Road, south of Shattalon Drive (Zoning Docket W-3350).

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment and certified that the site plan (including staff recommended conditions) meets all code requirements if the petition is approved.

6. Zoning petition of Marketplace Mall, LLC from RS9 to GB-L (Residential Building, Duplex; Residential Building, Townhouse; Residential Building, Twin Home; Residential Building, Multifamily; Boarding or Rooming House; Combined Use; Family Group Home B; Family Group Home C; Fraternity or Sorority; Life Care Community; Urban Agriculture; Arts and Crafts Studio; Building Materials Supply; Convenience Store; Food or Drug Store; Furniture and Home Furnishings Store; Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery; Motorcycle Dealer; Nursery, Lawn and Garden Supply Store, Retail; Outdoor Display Retail; Restaurant (without drive-through service); Restaurant (with drive-through service); Retail Store; Shopping Center; Shopping Center, Small; Wholesale Trade A; Banking and Financial Services; Bed and Breakfast; Car Wash; Entertainment Facility, Large; Funeral Home; Hotel or Motel; Kennel, Indoor; Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing; Motor Vehicle, Repair and Maintenance; Motor Vehicle, Body or Paint
WITHDRAWN.

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment.

7. Zoning petition of Kingswood United Methodist Church from LI to GI-S (Borrow Site; and Dirt Storage): property is located on the north side of Ziglar Road, west of U.S. 52; (Zoning Docket W-3352).

APPROVED.

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment and certified that the site plan (including staff recommended conditions) meets all code requirements if the petition is approved.

8. Zoning petition of Forsyth Park Baptist Church from NB-L to NB-L (Retail Store; Offices; Services A; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; and Restaurant Without Drive-Through Service): property is located on the north side of Hawthorne Road, west of Bolton Street; (Zoning Docket W-3353).

APPROVED.

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment.

9. Public Hearing on Zoning Text Amendment proposed by Planning and Development Services to amend Chapter B Articles II and III of the Unified Development Ordinances (UDO) to revise regulations for Bufferyards. (UDO-280).

APPROVED. (Council Committee recommended version, which included the Type II Buffer to 15’.)

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment.
1. Site Plan Amendment of Keen Transport, LLC for a Manufacturing C use in a GI-S zoning district: property is located on the west side of Temple School Road, north of High Point Road; (Zoning Docket F-1569).

APPROVED.

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment and certified that the site plan (including staff recommended conditions) meets all code requirements if the petition is approved.

2. Zoning petition of William Crouse from RS9 to RM8-S (Life Care Community; Residential Building, Single Family; and Planned Residential Development): property is located off the south side of West Clemmonsville Road, west of Paula Drive; (Zoning Docket F-1570).

APPROVED.

Planning Board and staff recommended approval of the amendment
MINUTES
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 9, 2017
4:30 P.M.
FIFTH FLOOR
BRYCE STUART MUNICIPAL BUILDING

MEMBERS PRESENT: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

PRESIDING: Arnold King

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

A. ACTION ON MINUTES

• October 12, 2017 Public Hearing
• October 23, 2017 Sign Check
• October 26, 2017 Work Session

George Bryan asked that we add a statement to case W-3350, Enclave Land minutes to read “George Bryan moved approval of the site plan, certifying that the site plan (including staff and the above noted stormwater pond conditions) meets all code requirements if the petition is approved, and with the following revision to proposed condition a) under Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits: strike the words…“staff change approval at minimum, and may require a …” so that the last phrase after the comma will read, “or close proximity to adjacent residentially zoned land shall require a site plan amendment”.

George Bryan also asked that we add a statement to the special use permit transmission tower to read “Why could the antenna not be placed within the steeple for the church”.

MOTION: George Bryan moved approval of the minutes.
SECOND: Clarence Lambe
VOTE:
    FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
    AGAINST: None
    EXCUSED: None

Melynda Dunigan asked that we add to the Work Session minutes to read “Kelly explained the proposal and Planning Board members discussed issues such as whether the standards should be
different in more outlying rural areas versus more urban areas, as well as a desire for the amendment to include lighting standards for uses such as outdoor recreation and stadiums.

MOTION: Melynda Dunigan moved approval of the minutes.
SECOND: Brenda Smith
VOTE:
    FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
    AGAINST: None
    EXCUSED: None

B. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

The actual order of cases considered by the Planning Board on September 14, 2017 is determined procedurally by taking consent agenda cases first, then cases for which there was a public hearing. Accordingly, the order of cases on November 09, 2017 was: B.1., B.2., B.3., B.4., C.1., C.2., D.1., D.2., and B.5.

1. Zoning petition of Marketplace Mall, LLC from RS9 to GB-L (Residential Building, Duplex; Residential Building, Townhouse; Residential Building, Twin Home; Residential Building, Multifamily; Boarding or Rooming House; Combined Use; Family Group Home B; Family Group Home C; Fraternity or Sorority; Life Care Community; Urban Agriculture; Arts and Crafts Studio; Building Materials Supply; Convenience Store; Food or Drug Store; Furniture and Home Furnishings Store; Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery; Motorcycle Dealer; Nursery, Lawn and Garden Supply Store, Retail; Outdoor Display Retail; Restaurant (without drive-through service); Restaurant (with drive-through service); Retail Store; Shopping Center; Shopping Center, Small; Wholesale Trade A; Banking and Financial Services; Bed and Breakfast; Car Wash; Entertainment Facility, Large; Funeral Home; Hotel or Motel; Kennel, Indoor; Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing; Motor Vehicle, Repair and Maintenance; Motor Vehicle, Body or Paint Shop; Motor Vehicle, Storage Yard; Offices; Services, A; Services, B; Storage Services, Retail; Testing and Research Lab; Veterinary Services; Warehousing; Recreation Services, Indoor; Recreation Services, Outdoor; Recreation Facility, Public; Swimming Pool, Private; Theater, Indoor; Academic Biomedical Research Facility; Academic Medical Center; Adult Day Care Center; Animal Shelter, Public; Cemetery; Child Care, Drop-In; Child Care Institution; Child Care, Sick Children; Child Day Care Center; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Club or Lodge; College or University; Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office; Group Care Facility A; Group Care Facility B; Habilitation Facility A; Habilitation Facility B; Habilitation Facility C; Hospital or Health Center; Institutional Vocational Training Facility; Library, Public; Museum or Art Gallery; Nursing Care Institution; Police or Fire Station; School, Private; School, Public; School, Vocational or Professional; Special Events Center; Stadium, Coliseum or Exhibition Building; Manufacturing A; Access Easement, Private Off-Site; Helistop; Park and Shuttle Lot; Parking, Commercial; Terminal, Bus or Taxi; Transmission Tower; and Utilities): property is located on the north side of Salisbury Ridge Road, west of Park Boulevard (Zoning Docket W-3351).
Aaron King presented the staff report.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

FOR: None

AGAINST: None

**WORK SESSION**

A Board member asked if WSDOT had reviewed the case with respect to tractor trailer turning movements.

Staff responded that no site plan has been submitted for review at this point.

MOTION: Clarence Lambe moved approval of the zoning petition.
SECOND: Jason Grubbs
VOTE:

FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
AGAINST: None
EXCUSED: None

2. Zoning petition of Kingswood United Methodist Church from LI to GI-S (Borrow Site and Dirt Storage): property is located on the north side of Ziglar Road, west of U.S. 52 (Zoning Docket W-3352).

Aaron King presented the staff report.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

FOR: None

AGAINST: None

**WORK SESSION**

A Board member asked about the location of the access point onto Ziglar Road.

Staff responded that the access point would have to remain in its current location. The only way for the access to be moved would be through the site plan amendment process.

A Board member asked for further clarification regarding erosion control and stream protection.

Keith Huff from Stormwater responded that perimeter measures will be required for erosion control and to ensure that sediment will be prevented from entering the adjacent stream.

Michael Plummer, 440 S Church Street, Suite 900 & 1000, Charlotte, NC 28202-2075
I am with HDR Engineering and to answer your question, we have shown those as potentials, we have not done the complete design. We would be required to permit through the state land quality department. So we would have to do the full blown calculations, determine the drainage areas and the size the basin appropriate for that. Once we are done with the site, we would have the ability to decommission those basins but the state would be involved in coming in and assessing it and making sure they are ok with us decommissioning the basin.

MOTION: Clarence Lambe moved approval of the zoning petition and certified that the site plan (including staff recommended conditions) meets all code requirements if the petition is approved.
SECOND: Chris Leak
VOTE:
FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
AGAINST: None
EXCUSED: None

3. Zoning petition of Forsyth Park Baptist Church from NB-L to NB-L (Retail Store; Offices; Services A; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; and Restaurant Without Drive-Through Service): property is located on the north side of Hawthorne Road, west of Bolton Street (Zoning Docket W-3353).

Aaron King presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR: None

AGAINST: None

WORK SESSION

A Board Member asked about how parking would be handled.

Staff responded that the site is currently nonconforming to parking because of the rules we have in GMA2. They are allowed to change uses in and out without meeting current parking requirements. When you add the use of restaurant to a site, that triggers the impact of having to meet parking requirements. So, whenever they come in to get a permit for the restaurant use, they are going to have to demonstrate they have enough parking on this NB-L lot to satisfy the parking requirements for all tenants located in the existing building. The UDO also allows consideration of shared parking by uses that have different days and times of use, such as churches.
MOTION: Clarence Lambe moved approval of the zoning petition.
SECOND: Allan Younger
VOTE:
FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
AGAINST: None
EXCUSED: None

4. Zoning petition of Crown Union Cross LLC, Charles Willard, Ina Stevens, and Oneita Tucker from AG to GB-S (Academic Biomedical Research Facility; Academic Medical Center; Animal Shelter; Public Arts and Crafts Studio; Banking and Financial Services; Bed and Breakfast; Boarding or Rooming House; Building Contractors, General; Building Materials Supply; Car Wash; Cemetery; Child Care, Drop-In; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Club or Lodge; College or University; Combined Use; Convenience Store; Food or Drug Store; Fraternity or Sorority; Fuel Dealer; Funeral Home; Furniture and Home Furnishings Store; Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office; Habilitation Facility A; Habilitation Facility B; Habilitation Facility C; Hospital or Health Center; Hotel or Motel; Institutional Vocational Training Facility; Kennel, Indoor; Kennel, Outdoor; Library, Public; Manufacturing A; Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery; Motor Vehicle, Body or Paint Shop; Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing; Motor Vehicle, Repair and Maintenance; Motorcycle Dealer; Museum or Art Gallery; Nursery, Lawn and Garden Supply Store, Retail; Nursing Care Institution; Offices; Outdoor Display Retail; Park and Shuttle Lot; Parking, Commercial; Police or Fire Station; Recreation Facility, Public; Recreation Services, Indoor; Recreation Services, Outdoor; Restaurant (with drive-through service); Restaurant (without drive-through service); Retail Store; School, Vocational or Professional; Services A; Services B; Shopping Center; Shopping Center, Small; Special Events Center; Storage Services, Retail; Swimming Pool, Private; Theater, Indoor; Utilities; Veterinary Services; Warehousing; Wholesale Trade A; Adult Day Care Center; Child Care Institution; Child Care, Sick Children; Child Day Care Center; Family Group Home B; Family Group Home C; Group Care Facility A; Group Care Facility B; Life Care Community; Residential Building, Multifamily; Residential Building, Townhouse; Residential Building, Twin Home; Residential Building, Duplex; School, Private; School, Public; and Access Easement, Private Off-Site) TWO PHASE and Special Intense Development Allocation (SIDA). Property is located on the east side of Union Cross Road across from Glenn Hi Road (Zoning Docket F-1571).

This is automatically continued to December 14, 2017 per the applicant's request and as per Planning Board's By-Laws.

5. An ordinance amendment proposed by Planning and Development Services staff revising Chapter B of the Unified Development Ordinances to further restrict Limited Campus uses in residential zoning districts (UDO-281).
PUBLIC HEARING

FOR: Reid Morgan, 1834 Wake Forest Road, Winston-Salem, NC 27109

- On behalf of Wake Forest, I want to express gratitude for the time and attention this matter has received from the Planning Board, staff, and community representatives. We have listened to what they have said and certainly want to be reasonable in our approach to this and what we are recommending.

- As you know, the limited campus use concept came out of the UDO drafting process when the campus zone was originally created about twenty years ago. It was an important compromise because the zoning ordinance before the UDO permitted colleges and universities to operate fully in residential zones with conditions. The limited campus use was adopted as a way of recognizing that certain low intensity activities that were part of college life were appropriate in nearby residential areas if those activities were conducted in existing buildings or buildings of residential scale, requirements for parking and other matters were set forth, and approval of the site plan was required by the Planning Board to assure all the conditions were met. The limited campus use, as you have heard, has not been much used. One reason for that is that some uses that would have qualified for limited campus use were done before the UDO was adopted, and thus there was no need to transfer to the new classification. The limited campus use has really caused no trouble instead, the issue which brings us together arose from the possibility of expanding the area for which limited campus use would be available as a consequence of rezoning. We believe we have taken care of this problem by proposing to allow limited campus uses only in the general use campus zones, not in campus limited or special zones. Since the great majority of rezoning cases receive the limited or special use classification, this means that the limited campus use would be available adjacent to what could be called the traditional boundary of a campus which would be zoned general use.

- At Wake Forest, we have had some rezoning, under the UDO but the campus zone has not been expanded beyond the recognized borders of Reynolda, Polo, and University Parkway, so it seems that the expansion of the limited campus radius can be managed through the type of rezoning which would be granted by the City Council or the County Commissioners. We have also listened to the neighborhood comments concerning the issues of adjacency and our proposal limits the availability of limited campus use to only the property actually adjoining campus property or directly across the street. Thus, we believe the original logic which permitted campus use is still appropriate for lower intensity uses in residential areas that are adjacent to the traditional, well known boundaries of organizations operating in the campus zone. As such, we believe that it is still appropriate for the Planning Board to confirm that those conditions have been met. I would note that Forsyth Tech and Winston-Salem State University support this proposal and that neither Salem College nor the NC School of the Arts oppose it. Normally, I would guess that a provision of the UDO is not reconsidered unless there is a problem with it. The limited campus use itself has caused no problem, but the expansion of its availability has raised questions. We believe we have a solution that adequately addresses that issue, and as such, further changes in the manner of approval is not necessary. Should the provision cause trouble in the future, the UDO can always be amended to address that.
AGAINST: None

WORK SESSION

A question was asked about the circumstances around the Ronald McDonald House.

Paul Norby responded that the Ronald McDonald House was there before I arrived on the scene so I couldn’t tell you about the details of how that worked. There was one expansion since then but I am not aware that expansion then was an issue. It came through the Planning Board and I do not recall there being a lot of controversy about that. They may have worked out the issues quietly before they even brought it.

Margaret Bessette added that she recalled a text amendment to clarify that Ronald McDonald House was a limited campus use. It’s a little bit of a hybrid use. It specifically serves the hospital but it’s not owned by the hospital. The text amendment changed the definition or at least clarified that it could be a limited campus use. And then there was a later text amendment that established the 500 foot limit so that it could not go on forever.

A board member asked Mr. Morgan, what is his objection to the special use permit approval process, is it the amount of time that would go into it?

Reid Morgan answered that the UDO already has conditions that have been set forth, in terms of the massing, parking and the fact that the Planning Board does review the matter in general that has some discretion around site plan, it seems to me that is sufficient in terms of how the matter stands. It has not caused any problems so I would just ask that it be considered to be a reasonable use.

A board member asked if staff have a preference on which reversion.

Paul Norby responded that originally, we responded to a request that was basically in reaction to neighborhood concerns about the recent Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center rezoning to find a way to restrict the limited campus use from further expanding. Our quick response to that was to suggest all limited campus uses in residential zoning be required to get a special use permit. The Wake Forest proposal came through as a way to focus more closely on the issues involved in those expansive rezonings. Given the origin of the citizens concern that prompted the City Council request, I think the Wake Forest one is responsive to that. Now if the Council wants to go further in having more scrutiny over limited campus uses beyond the existing general campus zone then the staff proposal about the special use permit will be the one to use. But if they were simply concerned about the expansive nature of subsequent rezonings, I believe the Wake Forest one would cover that issue. That is why we said approval of either.

The Chairman asked Paul Norby which one will be presented to City Council.

Paul Norby responded that he will present the Planning Board’s recommendation, although the staff report will also reference the original staff proposal.
MOTION:  Brenda Smith moved approval of the Wake Forest version of UDO-281.
SECOND:  Chris Leak
VOTE:
   FOR:  Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
   AGAINST:  George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan,
   EXCUSED:  None

C.  PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVALS

1.  #2017089; Bartlett Bluff; east side of Lasater Road, south of Center Grove Church Road; Single Family Subdivision in RS20 zoning ; County; 18.94 acres.

   Aaron King presented the staff report.

   PUBLIC HEARING

   FOR:  None

   AGAINST:  None

WORK SESSION

MOTION:  Clarence Lambe moved approval of the zoning.
SECOND:  Allan Younger
VOTE:
   FOR:  George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
   AGAINST:  None
   EXCUSED:  None

2.  #2017100; Ash Grove ; west side of Harper Road, south of Styers Ferry Road; Single Family Subdivision in RS40 zoning district; County; 13.11 acres.

   This is automatically continued to December 14, 2017 per the applicant's request and as per Planning Board's By-Laws.

D.  PLANNING BOARD REVIEWS

1.  PBR 2017-012; Juniper Glen; east side of Peace Haven Road, across from Old Plantation Circle; Planned Residential Development; City; 3.49 acres.

   Aaron King presented the staff report.

   PUBLIC HEARING

   FOR:  None
AGAINST: None

WORK SESSION

A board member asked questions related to:

- Where is the riprap going?
- Is it a natural area or somebody else’s yard?
- Do you have to get permission from your neighbor?
- What standard is this built to?

Keith Huff responded that the riprap is going to the backyard of a neighbor’s property. It’s a riprap energy dissipator and it is common with the outfall of these types of devices. No you do not have to get permission from your neighbor. Typically you release the water hopefully at a velocity that is not harmful for the downstream property owner. This facility here will comply with the two, ten and twenty-five peak and volume control requirements for quantity. And it will also comply with our quality control provisions as well.

MOTION: Clarence Lambe moved approval of the zoning.
SECOND: Jason Grubbs
VOTE:
  FOR: Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
  AGAINST: George Bryan
  EXCUSED: None

2. PBR 2013-06; RJ Reynolds Home Field Advantage/WSFC Board of Education; southeast side of Northwest Boulevard, north of Hawthorne Road; School, Public Stadium Addition in IP zoning; City; 40.76 acres.

Aaron King provided a detailed staff report describing the proposed site plan, how it relates to the applicable UDO requirements, and the process for review and approval by the Planning Board as prescribed in the UDO.

WORK SESSION

Planning Board members asked questions related to:

- How many games are going to be played there and what are the hours of the games?
- Will the practices for football and these different sports occur on the field?
- What surface will the field be?
- Where does Reynolds practice football now?
- How many men’s and women’s basketball games a year are there? How many JV games?
- What will be the latest time that any activity will be occurring on this field?
- Is there a way the school could put a condition on how late that noise would occur?
- Are there any activities that can occur on that field other than these sports activities?
- How many seats do Reagan and Mt. Tabor have in their stadiums?
• What kinds of controls do you have to make sure that crowd capacity will be restricted to 2,040 seats?
• Do you have a plan in place to manage the parking so that you're directing people towards those spaces?
• Is the hillside that's located beside the home bleachers going to be ever used for people sitting on it which would then increase the number of people in there in the stadium?
• How do we look at this development and reassure the neighbors that are in West Highlands, Buena Vista and West End that these folks aren't going to be parking in Hanes Park when other people want to use Hanes Park or in the front of their houses where they don't have off-street parking?
• What's the requirement for number of handicap parking spaces for a 2,040 seat stadium?
• Is there a lighting plan for this? Is there a possibility you could wait until we figure out what we need with stadium lights as an ordinance requirement before seeking approval?
• Is there a noise condition?
• How will stormwater for this project be handled?
• Will the playing fields down below this site be flooded on a regular basis as a result of this? Can we control the stormwater in a way so that we don't have that outcome?

Darrell Walker with the WS/FC School System, 475 Corporate Square Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27102 provided the following information:
• In the fall we have football, boys soccer and field hockey. In the spring boys and girls lacrosse and girls soccer.
• Football is going to start about 7:00pm, should wrap up between 9:30-9:45pm. Soccer typically will start either at 5:00pm or 7:00pm, and those are 80 minute games. If they go into overtime, you can have 100 or 110 minutes. So the length of the game, for the most part, or typically, should be over I would think around 7:30pm-8:00pm, except football. Based upon our current schedules, the games will probably end around 9:45pm. Weather conditions could delay the finish.
• The field surface has not been fully designed at this point. If it's an artificial surface, obviously you could practice more and play on it. What we're looking at now is a site plan approval, not full design yet.
• The field could be a practice location as well as a game location. Teams don't necessarily all practice on their home stadiums, but sometimes soccer, lacrosse and others have to because of the lack of field space. Reynolds currently practices football on the baseball field.
• There are around 35-40 men and women basketball games a year, including JV. The games typically start around five o'clock and end up about 8:30 or 9:00pm. When there are basketball games, the capacity of Bryson Gym is about 2,390, so the gym is actually going to be a larger capacity than the stadium. I haven't really dug into if there's been a problem on basketball nights with people parking up in the neighborhoods.
• I don't think we could put a stipulation on the noise based upon it being a high school. We will work hard to get to that, but I don't think that we can put a stipulation that we could guarantee. We do not have any noise conditions around any of our stadiums at this point.
• There should not be other activities occurring on the field other than these sports activities. We can lease any school property or a piece of property. And if we did that, we could put a stipulation in our agreement related to ending time.
• Reagan and Mount Tabor have around 4,500 seats in their stadiums because they were
4A size schools at the time of their construction.

- We’re still under the guidance of the Fire Marshal. So we would have to count attendance. We know there may be big games. Let's take the Glenn and West game last week. We had 6,000 people there. In this scenario, if it was Reynolds, they’d have to move the game.
- If the requirement is 2,040, under the ordinance of the Fire Marshal, we're going to be limited to that number of attendees.
- We have parking management at all of our athletic events. What we typically do in a lot of our schools is use our JROTC Program, so we have students who help manage that.
- For the Reynolds stadium, signage is going to be important to direct people to the right locations of parking. It may force us at some point to hire some folks to direct traffic.
- Beyond the lighting condition, we’ve already agreed to, the WS/FC Schools would prefer to have an approved site plan so that they could at least start a design process. The School System has not had any issues around that, and typically have had good success. He mentioned that Davie High School has a really neat lighting package that they've done in their stadium. I think it would be unfair not to move forward on a site plan decision to give them an opportunity to get it designed. This is the only stadium that we've agreed to a lighting condition.

Paul Norby told the Board there is a parking permit program that a neighborhood can request to be established for their neighborhood, requiring everyone to have a sticker to park in the neighborhood. The police would then be empowered to enforce parking restrictions in the neighborhood.

Paul also noted that for enforcement purposes it is not practical to have zoning enforcement officers standing around at game time enforcing parking regulations or the hours or things like that. We have to operate based on complaints. If the School System wants to state on the public record that they're willing to agree to something, that's one thing. If we start getting into formal conditions that put the burdens on enforcement staff, then that gets to be a concern.

Luke Dickey, 601 North Trade Street, Suite 200, Winston-Salem, NC 27101 provided the following information:

- We will have to meet ordinance requirements and building code requirements for handicap parking spaces. The final engineered plans have not been reviewed by Inspections at this time because this is just a site plan review. We are providing 14-plus handicap spaces. If there needs to be more based on ADA requirements, we can accommodate additional handicap parking spaces in that lot where we have 43 total spaces.
- There will be stormwater devices that will be required per the current ordinance requirements of Chapter 75. And we’ll meet those requirements. What we’re showing conceptually on our site plan is an underground stormwater management system that would be underneath the field. There is a 24-inch drain line that is currently running underneath that field, and it discharges directly into Peters Creek. The intent would be to take that system and the discharge point would tie directly into that 24-inch pipe, which goes underneath Hanes Park and discharges directly into Peters Creek. We will also comply with erosion control and the ordinances that are in place for stormwater on the site for sedimentation and everything else.
Keith Huff from City Stormwater explained the process for stormwater review. There's a term called coinciding peaks, where if we're detaining water at this site when Peters Creek crests, we could be doing more harm than good by detaining the water. And that's why they need to study that as a part of their formal submittal under Chapter 75. Because they are 180 feet approximately from the top of the bank of Peters Creek, if they can get that water out and away from the site before Peters Creek itself crests, then they might want to. I encourage them to investigate that because it's for the betterment of the park and the downstream property owners. We review/approve plans prescriptive to Chapter 75 of the City Code. The City Code allows for a no-adverse impact downstream study. If they can show that via a sealed engineering study that the site yields no adverse impacts, then quantity control can be waived. In this case because of the density of the site, they have to manage for quality. That's a given. But they will have to investigate the situation and those coinciding peaks to see if the quantity control is needed or if it’s in the best interest of the community to waive quantity control because we don't want the water from this site being released when Peters Creek is cresting.

MOTION: Clarence Lambe moved approval of the zoning petition and certified that the site plan (including staff recommended conditions) meets all code requirements.
SECOND: Jason Grubbs

VOTE:
FOR: Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
AGAINST: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan
EXCUSED: None

A. Paul Norby, FAICP
Director of Planning and Development Services

E. STAFF REPORT

Paul Norby presented the staff report.

Staff would like to follow a procedure for when email comments come in from the public about a zoning case or anything else, how the email will be forwarded to Planning Board members. The timing and method of forwarding will depend on when the email comes in. Also, staff will have a standard response to that email that acknowledge that we have received their email and how it will be forwarded to the Planning Board.

Planning Board members will be receiving an invitation to a reception from the Chamber of Commerce. It is for the new President CEO who is starting work in December. The reception date will be Tuesday December 19, 2017.

The City Council adopted UDO-280, having to do with bufferyards. Their action revised the Type II Buffer from 10’ to 15’. Also, Council adopted the revised South Suburban Area Plan which is now going to the County.

F. FOR THE GOOD OF THE ORDER
Members Present: None
PROPOSED ZONING:
GB-S and SIDA

EXISTING ZONING:
AG

PETITIONER:
Crown Union Cross LLC, Charles Willard, Ina Stevens, and Oneita Tucker

SCALE: 1" represents 500'
STAFF: Roberts
GMA: 3
ACRES: 9.15
NEAREST BLDG: 90' north
MAP(S): 6874.01
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
DRAFT STAFF REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket #</th>
<th>F-1571</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Gary Roberts, Jr. AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner(s)</td>
<td>Crown Union Cross LLC, Charles Willard, Ina Stevens, and Oneita Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Property</td>
<td>PIN#s 6874-16-6083, 6874-15-6862, a portion of 6874-15-6221, and a portion of 6874-25-2109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1595 Union Cross Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Request</td>
<td>Special use rezoning from AG to GB-S Two Phase and Special Intense Development Allocation (SIDA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Proposal | The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Maps for the subject property from AG (Agricultural) to GB-S (General Business – special use Two Phase zoning and SIDA). The petitioner is requesting the following uses:  
- Arts and Crafts Studio; Banking and Financial Services; Bed and Breakfast; Building Contractors, General; Building Materials Supply; Child Care, Drop-In; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Club or Lodge; College or University; Combined Use; Food or Drug Store; Funeral Home; Furniture and Home Furnishings Store; Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office; Habilitation Facility A; Habilitation Facility B; Habilitation Facility C; Hotel or Motel; Institutional Vocational Training Facility; Library, Public; Manufacturing A; Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery; Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing; Museum or Art Gallery; Nursery, Lawn and Garden Supply Store, Retail; Nursing Care Institution; Offices; Park and Shuttle Lot; Parking, Commercial; Police or Fire Station; Recreation Facility, Public; Recreation Services, Indoor; Recreation Services, Outdoor; Restaurant (without drive-through service); Retail Store; School, Vocational or Professional; Services A; Shopping Center; Shopping Center, Small; Special Events Center; Storage Services, Retail; Swimming Pool, Private; Theater, Indoor; Utilities; Veterinary Services; Wholesale Trade A; Adult Day Care Center; Child Care Institution; Child Care, Sick Children; Child Day Care Center; Family Group Home B; Family Group Home C; Group Care Facility A; Group Care Facility B; Life Care Community; Residential Building, Multifamily; Residential Building, Townhouse; Residential Building, Twin Home; Residential Building, Duplex; School, Private; School, Public; and Access Easement, Private Off-Site |
| Continuance History | This request was automatically continued from the November 9, 2017 Planning Board meeting to the December 14 meeting. |
| Neighborhood Contact/Met    | See Attachment B for a summary of the petitioner’s neighborhood outreach efforts. |
### Zoning District Purpose Statement
The GB District is primarily intended to accommodate a wide range of retail, service, and office uses located along thoroughfares in areas which have developed with minimal front setbacks. However, the district is not intended to encourage or accommodate strip commercial development. The district would accommodate destination retail and service uses, characterized by either a larger single business use or the consolidation of numerous uses in a building or planned development, with consolidated access. This district is intended for application in GMA1s, 2 and 3 and Metro Activity Centers.

### Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(R)(1) - Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of the requested zoning district(s)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, as the site is located within a designated activity center and fronts on Union Cross Road which is classified as a boulevard. The site is also located within the Suburban Neighborhoods GMA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>East side of Union Cross Road across from Glenn Hi Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Forsyth County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Acreage</td>
<td>± 9.15 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>The site is currently undeveloped.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surrounding Property Zoning and Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>NB-S</td>
<td>Union Cross Animal Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Single family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>HB-S and IP</td>
<td>Sheetz and Glenn High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(R)(2) - Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed mixture of uses is compatible with the uses permitted on the adjacent IP, NB-S, and HB zoned properties. It is less compatible with the low density residential use permitted on the adjacent AG zoned properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical Characteristics
The majority of the subject property has been cleared for farming. The property has a gentle slope downward in all directions from the central portion of the lot.

### Proximity to Water and Sewer
The site has access to public water and sewer service.

### Stormwater/Drainage
Because the petition includes a request for Special Intense Development Allocation (SIDA) future development must utilize stormwater controls based on the Stormwater Quality Management Permit requirements of Section C.3-6 of the Unified Development Ordinances. The site plan shows four conceptual stormwater management devices.

### Watershed and Overlay Districts
The site is located within the balance area of the Abbotts Creek WS III Water Supply Watershed. The built-upon area within the balance area is limited to 24% unless SIDA is granted by the County Commissioners.
The petitioner is requesting SIDA.

**Analysis of General Site Information**

As noted, the subject property is located within the Abbotts Creek watershed. The petitioners have applied for SIDA which would allow for a maximum built-upon area of 70%. See the Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements section below for the evaluation of the subject SIDA request. Otherwise, the site has favorable topography and does not include any designated floodplain areas.

### RELEVANT ZONING HISTORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Date</th>
<th>Direction from Site</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-1434</td>
<td>RS9 to HB-S Two Phase</td>
<td>Approved 9-12-2005</td>
<td>Directly northwest</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>Denial Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1261</td>
<td>NB-S and AG to NB-S</td>
<td>Approved 4-8-1999</td>
<td>Directly north</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>Approval Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SITE ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Average Daily Trip Count</th>
<th>Capacity at Level of Service D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Cross Road</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>1,523’</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>44,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Access Point(s)**

The site plan proposes a full access connection onto Union Cross Road opposite the existing “T” intersection with Glenn Hi Road. A secondary right-in, right-out access onto Union Cross Road is proposed approximately 700’ south of the intersection with Glenn Hi Road.

**Planned Road Improvements**

Union Cross Road has recently been widened to a four lane, median divided facility. The *Comprehensive Transportation Plan* recommends sidewalks along the subject property frontage of Union Cross Road. The 2007 Collector Street Plan recommends an eastern extension of Glenn Hi Road which would extend to Teague Lane and then to NC 66 to align with Bunker Hill/Sandy Ridge Road. The westernmost portion of said proposed road is located on the subject property and the petitioner would be responsible for building the portion of the road located on their site.

**Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed**

Existing Zoning: AG

\[ 9.15 \text{ acre} \times 43,560 \text{ sf} / 40,000 \text{ sf} = 9 \text{ units} \times 9.57 (\text{SFR Trip Rate}) = 86 \text{ Trips per Day} \]

Proposed Zoning: GB-S Phase I only

\[ 12,960 \text{ sf} / 1,000 \times 36.13 (\text{Medical-Dental Office Building Trip Rate}) = 468 \text{ Trips per Day}. \]

No trip generation is available for the proposed Phase II portion of the site as no site plans are available.

**Sidewalks**

A sidewalk is currently located along the opposite side of Union Cross Road. Sidewalks are proposed along the subject property side of Union Cross Road and along the new internal public street.

**Transit**

Not available.

**Connectivity**

The site plan proposes good connectivity in that it accommodates said future eastward extension of Glenn Hi Road and it includes an internal public street which runs parallel to Union Cross Road and extends north.
and south along most of the eastern edge of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA)</th>
<th>A TIA is not required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information | The subject property is located at the intersection of Union Cross Road and Glenn Hi Road. The proposed site plan includes a full access connection onto Union Cross Road at this intersection. The developer has also agreed to dedicate sufficient right-of-way (110’) to accommodate the ultimate cross section of this new road which would eventually connect to Teague Lane and NC 66. The site plan also includes a new public street which would run parallel to Union Cross Road and would provide access to the multiple outparcels as well as future access to the undeveloped properties located directly to the east which are not part of the current request. The petitioners are aware that the internal intersection of this new street (Willard Gate Road) and the Glenn Hi Road extension may need to be realigned when future traffic volumes warrant and/or Glenn Hi Road is extended further east. A secondary right-in, right-out access onto Union Cross Road is also provided further south of the intersection with Glenn Hi Road. 

Due to the recent roadway improvements to Union Cross Road there is ample capacity to accommodate additional traffic associated with the subject request. Staff also notes that the eventual extension of Glenn Hi Road should provide a much needed convenient connection for motorists in this portion of the County and hopefully help to reduce the length of some trips. Sidewalks are proposed along Union Cross Road and said internal public street. These sidewalks would be constructed as the separate outparcels receive final development plan approval. |

<p>| SITE PLAN COMPLIANCE WITH UDO REQUIREMENTS |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Square Footage (Phase I)</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>Placement on Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,960 sf</td>
<td>Pulled up to Union Cross Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (Phase I)</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 spaces</td>
<td>78 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height (Phase I)</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>One story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Coverage (Phase I)</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% with SIDA</td>
<td>51.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Legacy 2030 policies:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Environmental Ord.</td>
<td>See Watershed Protection comments below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article VII, Section 7-5.3</td>
<td>(C) Subdivision Regulations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements | The proposed GB-S Two Phase site plan includes one outparcel developed with a one story 12,960 square foot office building and four phase 2 outparcels which would require Final Development Plan approval by the Planning Board in the future.  

As noted previously, the 9.15 acre site is located within the balance area of the Abbotts Creek watershed. Because the ultimate build-out would result in impervious coverage of greater than 24%, the petitioners have applied for SIDA. Along with the site plan, the *Unified Development Ordinances* requires the request include the following: project timetable; anticipated addition to the property tax base; and, anticipated number of jobs created or retained. Developments for which a SIDA is granted must utilize stormwater controls based on the Stormwater Quality Management Permit requirements of Section C.3-6 of the UDO. The site plan shall include the proposed location of the stormwater control structures. |

Criteria for Approval The Forsyth County Board of Commissioners shall approve the application for a SIDA based upon the request meeting all the following criteria. *Planning staff’s comments are noted below in italics.*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>The proposed project is in conformance with the adopted <em>Legacy 2030</em>. <em>(Yes as the request is consistent with the activity center, mixed-use recommendations of the Southeast Forsyth County Area Plan Update).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The proposed project land use and site design are compatible with the general character of the area and surrounding land uses. <em>(Yes, the land uses and site design are consistent with the development pattern located across Union Cross Road. In light of the recommendations of the area plan, the request is also compatible with the future land uses and development pattern recommended for the AG zoned properties located to the east.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>The proposed project provides a significant economic benefit to the community by creating or retaining jobs, increasing the property tax base, or assisting an existing industry to grow and remain in Forsyth County; or the project meets an identified community need such as the provision of community facilities, retail business or personal services, or affordable housing. <em>(Yes, the petitioner states that the estimated tax base for the improvements associated with Phase 1 will be approximately $5,000,000 with the estimated number of jobs will be between 40 and 50. For the four outparcels associated with Phase 2, the estimated tax base will be between $9,000,000 and $15,000, 000 with the estimated number of jobs being between 60 and 150.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. The proposed project does not pose a threat to the environment, especially water quality, and appropriate measures will be taken to minimize any potential negative environmental impacts. [The subject property will be served with public water and sewer service and the request will comply with the stormwater requirements of the NC Division of the Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)].

e. The proposed project has good transportation access, including proximity to major roads and/or rail lines. (Yes, the site has extensive frontage along a boulevard and provides good external and internal connectivity.)

The UDO allows ten percent (10%) of each designated watershed to be developed with up to seventy (70%) impervious coverage. In July 1, of 1995, 520 acres were assigned to the SIDA “bank” within the Abbotts Creek watershed. To date, 233.21 acres has been allotted for SIDA from the bank leaving a balance of 286.79 acres. Therefore, if the subject request is approved for this 9.15 acre site, the balance within the Abbotts Creek Watershed would be 277.64 acres.

## CONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy 2030 Growth Management Area</th>
<th>Growth Management Area 3 - Suburban Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevant Legacy 2030 Recommendations | • Direct business uses and higher-density residential growth to activity centers and urban boulevards and discourage strip development.  
• Encourage commercial and office uses (along with residential and institutional uses) in activity centers and in carefully planned growth corridors without creating low-density, single-use commercial developments, such as strip malls.  
• Minimize the number of driveways along thoroughfares and arterials to reduce vehicular conflicts, increase pedestrian safety, and improve roadway capacity.  
• Special attention [in Activity Centers] needs to be given to producing an acceptable mix of land uses; designing parking areas for walkability; providing circulation patterns for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access; and providing public amenities including plazas and open space. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Area Plan(s)</th>
<th>Southeast Forsyth County Area Plan Update (2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Plan Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>• Union Cross Road/I-40 Activity Center: The southeast quadrant has 6 acres presently zoned for limited commercial uses. South of the proposed Glenn Hi Road extension (which includes most of the subject property) approximately 35 acres are recommended for mixed-use development. As part of the mixed-use recommendation, low-intensity commercial/office uses are recommended for the northwest portion of the tract closest to the southeast corner of Union Cross Road and Glenn Hi Road extension. Such commercial uses should not extend more than 600 to 700 feet to the east and south from the intersection and should be pedestrian-oriented with well-designed pedestrian connections to existing residential areas. The remainder of the recommended mixed-use area should be developed as a mixture of intermediate-density residential transitioning to moderate-density residential farther east and south of the Union Cross Road/Glenn Hi Road intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Located Along Growth Corridor?</td>
<td>The site is not located along a growth corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Located within Activity Center?</td>
<td>The site is located within the Union Cross Road/I-40 Activity Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments from the Town of Kernersville</td>
<td>Jeff Hatling, AICP, the Planning Director for the Town of Kernersville recommends the following condition: Right-of-way at the intersection of Union Cross Road, across from Glenn Hi Road shall be wide enough to accommodate the construction of a westbound lane approach to Union Cross Road to allow for a separate left-turn lane (350’ storage), a shared through/right turn lane, and dual right-turn lanes (250’ storage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing</td>
<td>The new public street (which will provide access to the outparcels) will be called Willard Gate Road. Building floor plans and elevations must be submitted prior to addresses being issued for the individual buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)</td>
<td>(R)(3) - Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition? Union Cross Road has recently been widened to a four lane, median divided facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues</td>
<td>(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030? Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The request is to rezone 9.15 acres of undeveloped AG zoned land to GB-S Two Phase. The request also includes a request for SIDA as the site is located within the Abbotts Creek watershed. See the previous Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements section. The proposed site plan includes a Phase I outparcel for a one story office along with four additional outparcels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Southeast Forsyth County Area Plan Update identifies the subject property as being within the southeastern quadrant of the Union Cross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road/I-40 Activity Center with mixed-use being the primary land use recommendation.

The list of requested uses are consistent with the low-intensity commercial, office, and residential uses which are recommended within this proposed mixed-use activity center. Because the site is located within an activity center, staff recommends conditions pertaining to signage, lighting, and building appearance. Staff recommends approval of the subject request.

**CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Aspects of Proposal</th>
<th>Negative Aspects of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is located within the Union Cross Road/I-40 Activity Center as per the <em>Southeast Forsyth County Area Plan Update</em> and the list of requested uses and proposed conditions are consistent with the intent of an activity center.</td>
<td>The request would increase the amount of impervious surfaces within the Abbotts Creek watershed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request serves as the first piece in development of the Glenn Hi Road extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request meets the required findings for SIDA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request is consistent with the GB purpose statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

The following proposed conditions are from interdepartmental review comments and are proposed in order to meet codes or established standards, or to reduce negative off-site impacts.

- **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:**
  a. Developer shall obtain a Watershed Permit from the Erosion Control Officer.
  b. Developer shall obtain all necessary permits (including stormwater) from the NC Division of the Environment and Natural Resources (DENR).
  c. Developer shall obtain a driveway permit from NCDOT; additional improvements may be required prior to issuance of driveway permit. Required improvements include:
     - Dedication of 110 feet of right-of-way as shown on site plan for the extension of Glenn Hi Road
     - Dedication of the right-of-way for the entire length of Willard Gate Road.
     - Install sidewalk along Union Cross Road for the Phase I frontage.
     - Right turn lane as shown on the plan.
     - Construction of the Glenn Hi Road extension as shown on the site plan.

- **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS:**
  a. Developer shall record a final plat in the Office of the Register of Deeds. Final plat shall show street right-of-ways, outparcel property lines, and all access and utility easements.
  b. The proposed building plans shall be in substantial conformance with the submitted elevations as shown on “Elevation A” as verified by Planning staff.
Future buildings within Phase II shall be constructed of similar materials as the submitted elevations.

c. An engineered lighting plan shall be submitted to the Inspections Division which complies with the following: (1) maximum pole height of twenty-five (25) feet; (2) full cut-off fixtures; (3) any wallpacks or attached lighting shall be angled downward and away from all public streets; and (4) no more than 0.5 ft/candle at the right-of-way line.

• PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF OCCUPANCY PERMITS:
  a. All NCDENR requirements shall be completed.
  b. Developer shall complete all requirements of the driveway permit.
  c. Buildings shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the approved building elevations as approved by Planning staff.
  d. Willard Gate Road will need to be constructed through the Phase I frontage in Phase I.
  e. Lighting shall be installed per approved lighting plan and certified by an engineer.

• OTHER REQUIREMENTS:
  a. Freestanding signage for each outparcel shall be limited to one sign with a maximum height of six (6) feet and a maximum copy area of thirty-six (36) square feet along the frontage of Union Cross Road and one such sign along the frontage of Willard Gate Road.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Zoning: Approval
SIDA: Approval

NOTE: These are staff comments only; final recommendations on projects are made by the City-County Planning Board, with final decisions being made by the appropriate Elected Body, who may approve, deny, table or request modification for any project. THE APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC HEARINGS WHERE THE CASE WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING BOARD AND THE ELECTED BODY.
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING
MINUTES FOR F-1571
NOVEMBER 9, 2017

This item was continued to the December 14, 2017 meeting.
### Preliminary Comments and/or Recommended Conditions

Note: City-County Planning staff is responsible for coordinating the Interdepartmental Review of Special Use Rezoning Requests, Subdivisions, and Planning Board Review items; please contact the appropriate Department at the phone # indicated below if you have any questions about the comments or recommendations lists. A list of recommended conditions from this Interdepartmental Review will be sent to you via e-mail generally by the end of the business day on Friday the week prior to the Planning Board Public Hearing.

### Project Case Number: F-1571  Project Title: Crown Union Cross LLC  Date: November 29, 2017

**Project Description:** East side of Union Cross Road across from Glenn Hi Road

**NCDOT (Wright Archer)- Phone #: 336.747.7900 Email:** warcher@ncdot.gov

NCDOT driveway permit is required. Driveway package should include: two original signed driveway permit applications, a $50 check made payable to NCDOT, and five sets of plans. NCDOT Encroachment Agreement is required for widening improvements or any utility ties within NCDOT right-of-way. Right turn lane will be required on Phase 1 with 150’ of storage, along with additional right-of-way dedicated for road improvements if needed. A traffic agreement will need to be entered with our Division Nine Traffic Engineering Department at 336-747-7800 for a signalized intersection. Right-of-way at the intersection of Union Cross Road, across from Glen Hi Road shall be wide enough to accommodate the construction of a westbound lane approach to Union Cross Road to allow for a separate left-turn lane (350’ storage), a shared through/right turn lane, and dual right-turn lanes (250’ storage).

**WSDOT (Jeff Fansler)- Phone #: 336.747.6883 Email:** jeffreygf@cityofws.org

All work on Union Cross should be coordinated with NCDOT. Crosswalks may need to be realigned and extended with new signal design. Provide ADA ramps with dome mats on both sides of new public road. Existing traffic signal poles may need to be relocated. Show them on the plan. Dedicate 110’ of R/W from Union Cross to easternmost property line for future connection and aligned with Glenn Hi Rd. The Caleb Creek TIA recommended a right turn lane with 150’ of storage. Lengthen Northbound Rt turn lane into site to accommodate future needs for the Glen Hi Rd Extension.

**Engineering (Al Gaskill)- Phone #: 336.747.6846 Email:** albertcg@cityofws.org

1. Union Cross Rd is within the City limits at this area. Both NCDOT and City driveway permits are required. An 8’ wide concrete strip will also be required at the ROW line to designate this as a private road.

**Inspections - Phone #: Aaron King - 336.747.7068 Email:** aaronk@cityofws.org

See Planning Comments

**Erosion Control (Matt Osborne)- Phone #: 336.747.7453 Email:** matthewo@cityofws.org

An Environmental Grading and Erosion Control Permit will be required if more than 10,000 square feet is to be disturbed during any potential construction. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control plan must be
submitted and approved before the permit can be issued. Please submit this plan at least 30 days prior to the intended start date of construction.

This project resides within the Lower Abbotts Creek Watershed Protection Area. As a result, a Watershed Protection Permit shall be required prior to the start of work. Permit application may be submitted concurrently with an Erosion Control Permit. Watershed Protection Permit Application form can be found at http://www.cityofws.org/Departments/Stormwater-Erosion-Control/Erosion-Control. A site plan showing all existing Built Upon Area (BUA), all newly proposed BUA, and the associated calculations noting both square footage of impervious cover, as well as percent of total parcel coverage must accompany the Watershed Protection Permit Application form. Furthermore, additional special provisions require that 50 foot undeveloped buffers (inner 30 feet undisturbed) must be shown and established on-site for all existing perennial and intermittent streams. Please direct any questions about these requirements to Matthew Osborne at (336) 747-7453 or at matthewo@cityofws.org.

Stormwater Division (Joe Fogarty)- Phone # - 336.747.6961 Email: josephf@cityofws.org

No Comment

City Fire- (Doug Coble) - Phone # - 336.734.1290 Email: douglasc@cityofwfire.org
County Fire- (Tony Stewart)- Phone # - 336.703.2562 Email: stewartaj@forsythe.cc

No Comments

Utilities (Todd Lewis)- Phone # - 336.747.6842 Email: toddl@cityofws.org

Submit water/sewer extension plans to Utilities Plan Review for Permitting/Approval. Extend water to end of phase. Backflow Preventer require on all water connections.

Sanitation (Johnnie Taylor)- Phone # - 336.748.3080 Email: johnniet@cityofws.org

No Comments

Planning (Aaron King)- Phone # - 336.747.7068 Email: aaronk@cityofws.org

Staff recommends removing the following uses: Academic Biomedical Research Facility; Academic Medical Center; Animal Shelter, Public; Boarding or Rooming House; Car Wash; Cemetery; Convenience Store; Fraternity or Sorority; Fuel Dealer; Hospital or Health Center; Kennel, Indoor; Kennel, Outdoor; Motor Vehicle, Body or Paint Shop; Motor Vehicle, Repair and Maintenance; Motorcycle Dealer; Outdoor Display Retail; Restaurant (with drive-through service); Services B; Warehousing; Staff will recommend a sign condition limiting each parcel to one 6’/36sf sign; Staff recommends a condition requiring future buildings to be constructed of similar materials as the submitted elevations; Staff recommends a lighting condition; Clarify/further explain the information submitted for SIDA; Willard Gate Road needs to be built through the Phase I frontage in Phase I; Is the stub extension feasible? Staff recommends the dedication of 60’ of ROW for the Glenn Hi Road extension and reserving the remainder of the future ROW; Staff also recommends street trees along the UC Road frontage.
"Willard Gate Rd" is approved for use. Floor plans and elevations must be submitted prior to addresses being issued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Names/Addresses (Matt Hamby)</td>
<td>- 336.747.7074 Email: <a href="mailto:hambyme@mapforsyth.org">hambyme@mapforsyth.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Names/Addresses (Stacy Tolbert)</td>
<td>- 336.747.7497 Email: <a href="mailto:tolbersy@mapforsyth.org">tolbersy@mapforsyth.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth County Health Department</td>
<td>- 336.703-3110 Email: <a href="mailto:rakescd@forsyth.cc">rakescd@forsyth.cc</a></td>
<td>No Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Management</td>
<td>- 336.748.3020 Email: <a href="mailto:keithfl@cityofws.org">keithfl@cityofws.org</a></td>
<td>No Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USES ALLOWED WITH A PERMIT FROM THE ZONING OFFICER (Z)
Adult Day Care Home  
Agricultural Production, Crops  
Agricultural Production, Livestock  
Agricultural Tourism  
Animal Feeding Operation  
Child Day Care, Small Home  
Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood  
Family Group Home A  
Fish Hatchery  
Kennel, Outdoor  
Police or Fire Station  
Recreation Facility, Public  
Residential Building, Single Family  
Swimming Pool, Private  
Transmission Tower (see UDO)

USES ALLOWED WITH REVIEW BY THE PLANNING BOARD (P)
Cemetery  
Church or Religious Institution, Community  
Golf Course  
Landfill, Land Clearing/Inert Debris, 2 acres or less  
Library, Public  
Planned Residential Development  
School, Private  
School, Public  
Utilities

USES ALLOWED WITH SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (A)
Borrow Site  
Campground  
Child Day Care, Large Home  
Dirt Storage  
Fishing, Fee Charged  
Habilitation Facility A  
Manufactured Home, Class A  
Manufactured Home, Class B  
Manufactured Home, Class C  
Nursing Care Institution
EXISTING USES ALLOWED IN THE AG ZONING DISTRICT
Forsyth County Jurisdiction Only

Park and Shuttle Lot
Recreational Vehicle Park
Riding Stable
Shooting Range, Outdoor
Special Events Center
Transmission Tower

USES ALLOWED WITH SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ELECTED BODY (E)
Access Easement, Private Off-Site
Landfill, Land Clearing/Inert Debris, greater than 2 acres

\(^5\text{SUP not required if requirements of Section B.2-5.2(A) are met}\)
Neighborhood Meeting Summary
Crown Companies – Union Cross

Held November 15, 2017 from 5:30 pm to 7:00 pm

The neighborhood meeting was held in the cafeteria of R.B. Glenn High School, 1600 Union Cross Rd, Kernersville, NC, which is near the site. On November 1, 2017, 47 invitations were sent to the surrounding property owners located within the nearby vicinity. 3 property owners (5 individuals) and a Glenn High staff member attended the meeting, for a total of 6 individuals. (3 of the individuals did not sign the attendance sheet).

The neighborhood meeting was facilitated by representatives from Stimmel Associates, project land planners, and the petitioners and their representatives.

Two (2) identical stations were set-up with the following plans displayed on 24" x 36" boards:

1. Aerial Exhibit showing project location and adjacent property owners identified on the plan based on the neighborhood meeting invitations.
2. Site plan and color rendered area of detail.

The meeting was conducted as a "drop-in session" where neighbors could arrive any time between 5:30 pm and 7:00 pm. Upon arrival and sign-in, neighbors were directed to one of the available stations manned by representatives of Stimmel Associates. Each neighbor was identified on the Aerial Exhibit to provide a reference to the location/proximity to the proposed development. Then, each neighbor was given a general overview of the rezoning process and proposed development based on the site plan and rendering. Neighbors were free to ask questions or voice concerns at any point. Representatives from the petitioner were available to answer questions and floated between stations as needed.

The overall experience of the meeting indicated a positive response. Most simply came with a desire to see the plans and what was intended for the property, and indicated satisfaction that they had answers to their questions. One of the property owners indicated their support for the project on the comment sheet. No concerns were expressed, but one owner did mention a desire to see more restaurants in the area.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Owen
Stimmel Associates, P.A.
Gary,
As requested, below is summary of anticipated tax and job benefits for the Union Cross project.

Phase 1
It is anticipated that the proposed office / medical office building will provide approximately 5 million in tax base and approximately 40 – 45 new jobs.

Phase 2
While phase 2 development is speculative at this time, it is anticipated that development will likely consist of low intensity commercial and office uses, with an estimated average of 10,000 sf per outparcel. It is anticipated that this will provide an approximate tax base between $9,000,000 to $15,000,000, and 60 to 150 new jobs.

Stephen Owen, Land Planning Designer
336.723.1067 x1120 | cell: 336.486.0151
601 N. Trade St. Suite 200 | Winston-Salem, NC 27101
www.stimmelpa.com

Serving the Southeast for over 30 years,
with offices in Winston-Salem & Charlotte!
Stimmel Associates, P.A. E-mail Disclaimer
DOCKET #: W3354

PROPOSED ZONING:
IP-L

EXISTING ZONING:
RM12-S

PETITIONER:
Clarthria Wherry

SCALE: 1" represents 300'

STAFF: Wilson

GMA: 3

ACRES: 4.43

NEAREST BLDG: 17' south

MAP(S): 6818.03
North Suburban Area Plan Update, 2014
(Proposed land uses shown are generalized. See area plan for specific recommendations.)

Proposed Land Use
- Single-Family Residential
- Low-Density Attached Residential
- Intermediate-Density Residential
- High-Density Residential
- Manufactured Housing Park
- Office
- Office / Low-Intensity Commercial
- Commercial
- Mixed-Use Development
- Industrial
- Institutional
- Park
- Open Space
- Commercial Recreation
- Utilities
- Activity Centers
- Special Land Use Condition Area
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
DRAFT STAFF REPORT

PETITION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket #</th>
<th>W-3354</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Bryan D. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner(s)</td>
<td>Clarthria Wherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Property</td>
<td>PIN # 6818-30-1563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>2400 Bethabara Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Request</td>
<td>Special Use Limited Rezoning from RM12-S to IP-L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal

The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Maps for the subject property from RM12-S (Residential Multifamily twelve (12) units per acre) to IP-L (Institutional and Public – special use limited zoning). The petitioner is requesting the following uses: Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Child Day Care Center; Child Care, Drop-In; Child Care Institution; School, Private; and Adult Day Care Center.

Neighborhood Contact/Meeting

Per a letter received on November 21st, 2017:

On November 12, 2017 we contacted a total of 18 property owners in the general area of the property located at 2400 Bethabara Road and Speas Road. We went door to door placing the announcement concerning the rezoning. The letter asked each property owner to meet with us concerning the rezoning of the property.

On November 19, 2017, at 2 PM we held a meeting on the foresaid site with 4 of the property owners present. All of those present were excited about the property being rezoned back to a church. Two stated they would do whatever was needed to get the rezoning done. One of the concerns was the property needed a stop sign upon exiting the property. They stated while it was a day care center drivers would not stop before entering Speas Road.

Roy A. Swann- Pastor

Zoning District Purpose Statement

The IP District is intended to accommodate public and institutional uses which have a limited land use impact or traffic generation potential upon surrounding uses. The district is intended to accommodate smaller, less intensive public and institutional uses which have concentrated service areas and are located in or near residential areas, or larger, less intensive recreational or institutional facilities in rural areas.

Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, (R)(1) - Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of the requested zoning district(s)?

Yes. The petition is requesting low-intensity institutional uses that serve the general area. Child Day Care Center is already allowed on this site.
**GENERAL SITE INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Southwest corner of Bethabara Road and Speas Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Winston-Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s)</td>
<td>North Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Acreage</td>
<td>± 4.43 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>The subject property contains three unoccupied structures. The approved use is for a child day care center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Property Zoning and Use</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
<td>RM18 &amp; RS9</td>
<td>Apartments (Towergate) and single family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS12</td>
<td>Single family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS9</td>
<td>Single family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS9</td>
<td>Single family homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)**

(R)(2) - Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity?

Yes. The subject property is located within a mixture of single family and multi-family districts. The addition of the proposed institutional uses are compatible within this residential development pattern.

**Physical Characteristics**

The developed site is largely flat with a gentle downward grade to the southwest. A mixture of trees border the site to the north, west, and south.

**Proximity to Water and Sewer**

Public water and sewer are available to the subject property.

**Stormwater/Drainage**

No known issues.

**Watershed and Overlay Districts**

The subject property is not located within a watershed.

**Analysis of General Site Information**

The site is currently developed with three separate buildings located on the eastern portion of the site. The site contains two separated parking areas and driveways.

**RELEVANT ZONING HISTORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Date</th>
<th>Direction from Site</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-2328</td>
<td>RM12-S to Site Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Approved 5/17/1999</td>
<td>Current Site</td>
<td>± 4.43 acres</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-1966</td>
<td>RM12-S to Site Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Approved 6/8/1995</td>
<td>Current Site</td>
<td>± 4.43 acres</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-1213</td>
<td>RM12-S to Site Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Approved 12/13/1984</td>
<td>Current Site</td>
<td>± 4.43 acres</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SITE ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Average Daily Trip Count</th>
<th>Capacity at Level of Service D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethabara Road</td>
<td>Minor Thoroughfare</td>
<td>177’</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speas Road</td>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td>435’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed

- **Existing Zoning:** RM12-S
- **10,286 sf/1000 x 79.26 (day care center trip rate) = 815 trips per day**

Staff is unable to provide a detailed trip generation for the proposed special use limited zoning because there are no site plans.

#### Sidewalks

There are no sidewalks located in the general area.

#### Transit

WSTA Route 109 stops approximately 0.5 miles to the south at the intersection of Bethabara Road and Bethabara Park Boulevard.

#### Connectivity

The subject property currently has two separated parking areas. Both parking areas are served by drives onto Speas Road.

#### Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information

The site has extensive frontage along two public streets, one of which is a minor thoroughfare. Staff does not envision any transportation issues pertaining to this request.

### CONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES

#### Legacy 2030 Growth Management Area

- Growth Management Area 3 (Suburban Neighborhoods)

#### Relevant Legacy 2030 Recommendations

- Encourage convenient services at designated areas to support neighborhoods consistent with the Growth Management Plan.
- Encourage the development of a range of childcare facilities.
- Encourage redevelopment and reuse of existing site and buildings that are compatible and complimentary with the surrounding area.

#### Relevant Area Plan(s)

- **North Suburban Area Plan Update (2014)**

#### Area Plan Recommendations

- The 2014 Proposed Land Use Map recommends institutional land use for the subject property.

#### Site Located Along Growth Corridor?

- No

#### Site Located within Activity Center?

- No

#### Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, (R)(3) - Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition?

- No

#### (R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?

- Yes
### Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed request is to rezone an existing RM12-S zoned lot to IP-L in order to add additional institutional uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subject property was originally constructed as a church in 1965. The property was rezoned to allow for a daycare center in 1984. There were three site plan amendments to the site to expand the daycare center operations to additional facilities. The current site contains the original repurposed sanctuary and two additional buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North Suburban Area Plan Update recommends institutional land use for the subject property. Legacy 2030 recommends the location of public amenities at key, easy-to-access locations within neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore, the request is consistent with both Legacy 2030 and the area plan. As the subject property is located within a residential neighborhood setting, staff recommends a condition to prohibit electronic message board signs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Aspects of Proposal</th>
<th>Negative Aspects of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The request would allow for a greater range of institutional uses that are compatible with the residential character of the neighborhood.</td>
<td>The proposed IP-L District would allow a slightly larger sign than the existing RM12-S district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request is consistent with the recommendations of the North Suburban Area Plan Update and Legacy 2030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request would facilitate the use of a vacant property that was formerly used for institutional uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SITE-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The following proposed conditions are from interdepartmental review comments and are proposed in order to meet codes or established standards, or to reduce negative off-site impacts.

**OTHER REQUIREMENTS:**

- No electronic message board signs shall be allowed on the subject property.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** **Approval**

**NOTE:** These are staff comments only; final recommendations on projects are made by the City-County Planning Board, with final decisions being made by the appropriate Elected Body, who may approve, deny, table or request modification for any project. **THE APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC HEARINGS WHERE THE CASE WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING BOARD AND THE ELECTED BODY.**
DOCKET #: W3355

PROPOSED ZONING: RM18-L

EXISTING ZONING: RS7

PETITIONER: YWCA of Winston-Salem and Forsyth County

SCALE: 1" represents 200'
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(Proposed land uses shown are generalized. See area plan for specific recommendations.)

Proposed Land Use
- Single-Family Residential
- Urban Residential/Infill
- Low-Density Attached Residential (0-8 DU/Ac)
- Intermediate-Density Residential (8.1-18 DU/Ac)
- High-Density Residential (over 18 DU/Ac)
- Office/Low-Intensity Commercial
- Commercial
- Mixed Use
- Institutional
- Industrial
- Park
- Open Space
- Commercial Recreation
- Utilities

Activity Center
Special Land Use Condition Areas
- Residential Opportunity Area
- Low-Density Attached (up to 8 du/ac)
- Growth Corridor: Commercial/Office/Multifamily with Urban Form

South Central Area Plan
Southwest Area Plan
West Salem
Brookstown / Marshall
Southeast Gateway
Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center
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### CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
### DRAFT STAFF REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PETITION INFORMATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Docket #</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petitioner(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Property</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Request</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Proposal** | The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Maps for the subject property from RS7 (Residential, Single Family – 7,000 sf minimum lot size) to RM18-L (Residential, Multifamily – 18 units per acre maximum density – special use limited zoning). The petitioner is requesting the following uses:  
  • Residential Building, Single Family; Family Group Home A; and Family Group Home B  
  NOTE: General, special use limited, and special use district zoning were discussed with the petitioner(s) who decided to pursue the rezoning as presented. |

| **Neighborhood Contact/Meeting** | See Attachment B for a summary of the petitioner’s neighborhood outreach efforts. |
| **Zoning District Purpose Statement** | The RM18 District is primarily intended to accommodate multifamily uses at a maximum overall density of eighteen (18) units per acre. This district is appropriate for GMAs 1 and 2 and may be suitable for GMA 3 and Metro Activity Centers where public facilities, including public water and sewer, public roads, parks, and other governmental support services, are available and the site has direct access to a minor or major thoroughfare. |

| **Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)** | (R)(1) - Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of the requested zoning district(s)?  
  Yes, as the request would allow for a higher density residential living arrangement (Family Group Home B) on a site which is located in the Urban Neighborhoods GMA and has access onto a collector street. The site is also across the street from Granville Park. |

### GENERAL SITE INFORMATION

| **Location** | Northeast corner of Granville Drive and West Street |
| **Jurisdiction** | City of Winston-Salem |
| **Ward(s)** | South |
| **Site Acreage** | ± .21 acre |

| **Current Land Use** | The site is currently developed with a two story house which is used as a Family Group Home A. Family Group Home A’s are limited to a maximum of six residents. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Surrounding Property Zoning</strong></th>
<th><strong>Direction</strong></th>
<th><strong>Zoning District</strong></th>
<th><strong>Use</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS7</td>
<td>Single family homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Use</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family homes</td>
<td>RS7</td>
<td>RS7</td>
<td>RS7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R)(2) - Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The uses of Residential Building, Single Family and Family Group Home A are compatible with the uses permitted on the adjacent RS7 zoned properties. The use of Family Group Home B could allow up to twelve residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The developed site has a gentle slope downward toward the southwest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to Water and Sewer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is served with public water and sewer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stormwater/ Drainage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No known issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed and Overlay Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is not located within a water supply watershed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic, Natural Heritage and/or Farmland Inventories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The subject property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a contributing building in the West Salem National Historic District. The district is not a locally zoned historic district and therefore is not subject to the certificate of appropriateness design review process by the Historic Resources Commission and their staff. However, properties in this district will be subject to the Section 106 review process if there is a federal undertaking (federally related grant, loan, permit, license, funding etc.) proposed on the premises.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of General Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is currently developed with a two story structure which was originally used as a single family home but has been used more recently as a Family Group Home A. The site appears to have no development constraints; however, if the subject request is approved, a Type II bufferyard will have to be installed prior to the certificate of occupancy for a Family Group Home B use. Due to the location of the existing structures on site, it appears that the property owner may need to apply for a bufferyard width variance from the City of Winston-Salem Zoning Board of Adjustment (see condition below).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RELEVANT ZONING HISTORIES |
|---|---|---|---|
| Case | Request | Decision & Date | Direction from Site | Acreage |
|---|---|---|---|
| W-3121 | RSQ to NB-L | Approved 1-3-2012 | 500’ northwest | .34 |
| | | | | Approval |
| | | | | Approval |
### SITE ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Average Daily Trip Count</th>
<th>Capacity at Level of Service D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Granville Drive</td>
<td>Collector Street</td>
<td>101’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Street</td>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td>89’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Access Point(s)**

Because this is a special use limited request with no site plan or access conditions, the exact location of access points (other than the existing driveway onto Granville Drive) is unknown.

**Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed**

There is no trip generation available for the either the existing use of Family Group Home A which allows up to 6 residents or for the use of Family Group Home B which allows up to 12 residents. Staff does note that residents within these facilities typically do not have individual cars and staff does not anticipate a noticeable increase in traffic if the residency is allowed to increase by 6 additional residents.

**Sidewalks**

Sidewalks are located on both sides of the abutting streets.

**Transit**

Route 80 serves the intersection of Academy Street and Granville Street located approximately 400 feet to the northwest.

**Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information**

The site is a corner lot with access onto a collector street (Granville Drive) and the area is well served with sidewalks. Transit is also located two blocks to the north. Staff does not anticipate any transportation related issues associated with the subject request.

### CONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES

**Legacy 2030 Growth Management Area**

Growth Management Area 2 - Urban Neighborhoods

**Relevant Legacy 2030 Recommendations**

- Encourage the production of a range of housing types in neighborhoods for the elderly and people with disabilities, including independent living, assisted living, and skilled nursing care facilities.
- Support the maintenance, revitalization, and rehabilitation of existing housing stock contributing to neighborhood character.
- Ensure the design and placement of gentle density buildings respect neighborhood identity and sense of place and have minimal impact on the streetscapes of single-family residential areas.

**Relevant Area Plan(s)**

South Central Area Plan Update (2014)

**Area Plan Recommendations**

- The subject property is shown on Map 6-Proposed Land Use (p. 31) for institutional use.
- Encourage institutions owning single-family homes adjacent to their properties to maintain existing structures in good condition.

**Site Located Along Growth Corridor?**

The site is not located along a growth corridor.
### Site Located within Activity Center?

The site is not located within an activity center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)</th>
<th>(R)(3) - Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030? |
| Yes |

### Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues

The proposed request is to rezone an existing RS7 zoned lot to RM18-L. The purpose of the request is to add the use of Family Group Home B. Currently, a Family Group Home A (which houses up to six residents) is located on the site.

Family Group Home A and Family Group Home B are both defined as “A transitional housing facility with support and supervisory personnel licensed by the State of North Carolina or operated by a nonprofit corporation chartered pursuant to Chapter 55A, North Carolina General Statutes, which provides room and board, personal care and rehabilitation services in a supportive family environment for ..... handicapped persons, older adults, foster children, abused individuals, homeless persons, and those recovering from drug or alcohol abuse....”

The difference between these two types of housing arrangements is in regard to the number of permitted residents. In a Family Group Home A, up to six (6) residents are permitted whereas up to twelve (12) residents may reside in a Family Group Home B. Also, the use of Family Group Home A is allowed in all residential districts provided there is a spacing of at least 1,200’ between such homes.

The subject property has housed a Family Group Home A for many years. The request would allow the property owner to increase the number of residents at this location.

The South Central Area Plan Update recommends institutional land use for the subject property. The use of Family Group Home B has both residential and institutional characteristics. Legacy 2030 recommends a range of housing types in neighborhoods for the elderly and people with special needs, including independent living, assisted living, and skilled nursing care facilities.

The subject property is modest in size and it is a corner lot rather than a mid-block location. The site is also located along a collector street, across the street from a park, and it is within a neighborhood which is well served with sidewalks. These are favorable characteristics in staff’s consideration of the request to increase the intensity of the residential zoning designation. Staff believes the request would allow for a special population to receive needed services within a residential setting.
Planning staff supports the request and is of the opinion that it is consistent with the recommendations of both Legacy 2030 and the area plan.

### CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Aspects of Proposal</th>
<th>Negative Aspects of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The request is consistent with the recommendation of the <em>South Central Area Plan Update.</em></td>
<td>The site is surrounded by properties which are zoned RS7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request is consistent with the <em>Legacy 2030</em> recommendation which encourages housing types that serve people with special needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request includes only three uses and excludes the use of Residential Building, Multifamily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subject property is a corner lot with is modest in size and has frontage along a collector street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is served with sidewalks and it is located across the street from a neighborhood park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has a history of being used as a Family Group Home A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SITE-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The following proposed conditions are from interdepartmental review comments and are proposed in order to meet codes or established standards, or to reduce negative off-site impacts.

- **PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF ANY PERMITS:**
  - Developer shall apply for a bufferyard width variance request from the City of Winston-Salem Zoning Board of Adjustment.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

**NOTE:** These are staff comments only; final recommendations on projects are made by the City-County Planning Board, with final decisions being made by the appropriate Elected Body, who may approve, deny, table or request modification for any project. **THE APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC HEARINGS WHERE THE CASE WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING BOARD AND THE ELECTED BODY.**
USES ALLOWED WITH A PERMIT FROM THE ZONING OFFICER (Z)
Adult Day Care Home
Child Day Care, Small Home
Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood
Family Group Home A
Police or Fire Station
Recreation Facility, Public
Residential Building, Single Family
Swimming Pool, Private

USES ALLOWED WITH REVIEW BY THE PLANNING BOARD (P)
Church or Religious Institution, Community
Golf Course
Library, Public
Limited Campus Uses
Planned Residential Development
School, Private
School, Public
Utilities

USES ALLOWED WITH SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (A)
Bed and Breakfast
Child Day Care, Large Home
Habilitation Facility A
Manufactured Home, Class A
Park and Shuttle Lot
Urban Agriculture

USES ALLOWED WITH SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ELECTED BODY (E)
Access Easement, Private Off-Site
Parking, Off-Site, for Multifamily or Institutional Uses
Transmission Tower

^SUP not required if requirements of Section B.2-5.2(A) are met
Background Information

- At the request of the City of Winston Salem and the United Way, The Hawley House became a program of the YWCA in 1998 and is the only state licensed residential recovery facility for women diagnosed with Substance Use Disorder in Forsyth County.
- We are licensed by the State of N.C. Department of Health and Human Services Division of Health Service Regulation as a Mental Health Facility with 6 beds. Our license number is MHL-034-066. Our Facility ID# is 955648.
- Our Licensed Service Categories are: 10A NCAC 27G .5600E Supervised Living SA Adult and 10A NCAC 27G .4300 Supervised Therapeutic Community
- In 2012, The City of Winston-Salem provided financing to the YWCA in the amount of $110,000 in the form of a 0%, non-amortizing, deferred loan for rehabilitation to the Hawley House. This allowed us to increase our capacity to serve an additional 2 women, however we were unaware that this increase would require us to re-zone from single family to a group home and in doing so would require us to have a sprinkler system installed.

Steps Taken Regarding Rezoning Approval Process

Background meeting held June 9, 2017 with Council Member John Larson

- Attendees: City Councilman John Larson, YWCA Board Chair the Honorable Molly Leight, Kristin O’Leary Vice President of Supportive Services for Women, and Christy Respass YWCA CEO
- Topics discussed include: The YWCA requested advice regarding the opportunity to expand capacity of the Hawley House from 6 to 8-10 beds. John Larson was supportive but stressed the need to meet with the West Salem neighborhood association for their support. Once a funding opportunity was identified this would be a key next step.

Background meeting held October 6, 2017 - Information re Grant Potential

- Attendees: Tim West City Planning, Kristin O’Leary Vice President of Supportive Services for Women, Marty Edwards Development YWCA and Christy Respass YWCA CEO
- Topics: Tim West provided information on the City of Winston Salem’s upcoming request for proposals. The YWCA wanted to understand if there was an option to apply for funding related to rezoning of the Hawley House. Referred to Aaron King in Planning for Rezoning Information.

Outreach with the West Salem Association – October 10 – 18, 2017 – Approval Secured

- Kristin O’Leary Vice President of Supportive Services emailed Carol Foley (neighborhood advocate of the Hawley House) on 10/10/17 for contact information for the President of the West Salem Association
- Carol Foley connected Kristin with Salvador Patino via email on 10/10/17 to request a meeting to discuss the rezoning.
- Salvador Patino requested a meeting to discuss the project background on 10/10/17.
- Meeting held 10/12/17 with Salvador Patino, Kristin O’Leary, and Carol Foley. The discussion covered the history of the Hawley House and previous support of the West Salem neighborhood, the opportunity to apply for funds to expand capacity from 6 tp 8-10 beds, and the required re-zoning and support needed from The West Salem Association. Salvador recommended calling a meeting of the association to discuss.
- Special meeting of the association was held October 18, 2017. The minutes of the meeting are attached. This provides the details of the conversation and the approval received after the vote.

W-3355 Attachment B
West Salem Neighborhood Association

Meeting Notes for Zoning Change Meeting
Thursday October 18th, 2017

A special meeting was called to present to zoning change request within West Salem. The meeting was held at the Christ Moravian Fellowship Hall on the corner of Academy and Granville from 7:00PM to 8:00PM.

David Bergstone from Old Salem Inc. presented a proposal to change the zoning of various properties in the area around Poplar St. and Walnut St. The proposed zoning would change the Light Industrial zoning of multiple properties to Pedestrian Business. David provided paperwork which demarcated a special zoning request, which would eliminate some of the uses allowed in the zoning, primarily car mechanic shops. David explained that the main intent for the zoning change would be to allow for educational and museum programs to take place in the Old Salem Inc. properties, while formalizing the residential lots which are currently violating zoning regulations.

Questions were asked to clarify the zoning change, and the properties in question. David explained that there are no immediate plans to develop any of the lots in question, but rather tidying up the many properties in question. Additionally, he clarified that not all properties in the zoning change are owned by Old Salem Inc. and that other property owners have been included to clean up the zoning confusion in the area. Salvador Patiño stated that he would like to see surface parking crossed out of the potential uses, due to the fact that said conditions tend to create dead zones in the urban fabric, but is in favor of the proposed change.

The neighbors present in the meeting unanimously voted in favor of Old Salem’s proposed zoning change.

Kristin O’Leary from the Hawley House, presented a proposal to change the zoning of 941 West St. from single family to allow for two more residents to live in the property. The Rehabilitation Program currently is able to house 6 women under current zoning. The footprint of the house would not increase if the zoning change was approved by the city, since the work of adding the required bedrooms had already been completed prior to the zoning proposal. Additionally, the Hawley House would be required to add a sprinkler system to the house to meet building codes, a process which they are already working on obtaining the necessary funding.

There were no questions on the zoning change, however there were some questions about the program itself. Carol Faley and other members of neighborhood commented on how the fact that many neighbors don’t know that the rehabilitation program is housed on that corner is a testament to the success of the program. Jeff Fallin asked about the success rate of the Hawley House, which Kristin explained that the current success rate is about 80%, far above national average.

The neighbors present in the meeting unanimously voted in favor of the Hawley House’s proposed zoning change.

Salvador Patiño
West Salem Neighborhood Association President
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## DRAFT STAFF REPORT

### PETITION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket #</th>
<th>W-3356</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Gary Roberts, Jr. AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner(s)</td>
<td>Old Salem Inc., Carol Faley, We Buy Houses of the Triad, LLC, and Stephen Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Property</td>
<td>PIN#s 6835-20-2928, 6835-20-2953, 6835-21-1095, 6835-21-1269, 6835-21-2268, 6835-21-2301, 6835-21-2345, and 6835-21-3104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>927 South Broad Street; 500 and 510 Walnut Street; and 908 and 920 South Poplar Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Request</td>
<td>Special use limited rezoning from LI to PB-L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Proposal | The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Maps for the subject property from LI (Limited Industrial) to PB-L (Pedestrian Business – special use limited zoning). The petitioner is requesting the following uses:

- Arts and Crafts Studio; Banking and Financial Services; Bed and Breakfast; Building Contractors, General; Child Care, Drop in; Child Day Care, Small home; Church or Religious Institution, Community; Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood; Club or Lodge; College or University; Combined Use; Food or Drug Store; Furniture and Home Furnishings Store; Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office; Institutional Vocational Training Facility; Library, Public; Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery; Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing; Museum or Art Gallery; Nursing Care Institution; Offices; Park and Shuttle Lot; Police or Fire Station; Recreation Facility, Public; Recreation Services, Indoor; Recreation Services, Outdoor; Residential Building, Duplex; Residential Building, Single Family; Residential Building, Twin Home; Restaurant Without Drive Through Service; Retail Store; School, Vocational or Professional; Services A; Services B; Shopping Center, Small; Swimming Pool, Private; Testing and Research Lab; Theater, Indoor; Urban Agriculture; Utilities; Veterinary Services; Warehousing; Adult Day Care Center; Child Care Institution; Child Care, Sick Children; Child Day Care Center; Group Care Facility A; Life Care Community; Residential Building, Multifamily; Residential Building, Townhouse; School, Public; School, Private; and Access Easement, Private Off-Site |

**NOTE:** General, special use limited, and special use district zoning were discussed with the petitioner(s) who decided to pursue the rezoning as presented. |
| Neighborhood Contact/Meeting | See Attachment B for a summary of the petitioner’s neighborhood outreach efforts. |
**Zoning District Purpose Statement**

The PB District is primarily intended to accommodate office, retail, service, institutional, and high density residential uses which customarily serve community and convenience business needs of smaller communities and urban nodes in the city and county. The district is intended to encourage the development of attractive, identifiable small towns, and to accommodate the pattern of building in the business concentrations surrounding the central core of Winston-Salem, and the central core of other municipalities in the County. The district should demonstrate pedestrian oriented design through elements such as buildings pulled up to the street, on-street parking, street trees, covered arcades, awnings, storefront display windows, public/private outdoor spaces, wide sidewalks, and building entrances facing the street. This district is intended for application in Growth Management Areas 1, 2 and 3.

**Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)**

(R)(1) - *Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of the requested zoning district(s)?*

Yes, the site is located within a pedestrian oriented neighborhood and the site is adjacent to properties which are zoned PB. The area is also well served with sidewalks and it is located within the Urban Neighborhoods GMA.

**GENERAL SITE INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>East side of Broad Street, the west side of Poplar Street, and the south side of Walnut Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>City of Winston-Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s)</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Acreage</td>
<td>+/- 1.3 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Currently there are five principal buildings on the subject property. Three are in residential use, one is used as meeting space for Old Salem, and one is unoccupied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surrounding Property Zoning and Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Direction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(R)(2) - *Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity?*

Yes, the proposed mixture of uses is compatible with the mixture of uses permitted on the adjacent properties which are zoned commercial/industrial.

**Physical Characteristics**

The site has a gentle slope downward toward the southwest. The southwestern portion of the site is located within the regulatory floodplain of Salem Creek.
Proximity to Water and Sewer
The subject property is served with public water and sewer.

Stormwater/Drainage
No known issues.

Watershed and Overlay Districts
The site is not located within a water supply watershed.

Historic, Natural Heritage and/or Farmland Inventories
The subject properties are listed on the National Register of Historic Places in the West Salem Historic District. These properties are also within the Old Salem Historic District National Historic Landmark. The buildings on the site are listed as contributing buildings within this national district. The district is not a locally zoned historic district and therefore it is not subject to the certificate of appropriateness design review process by the Historic Resources Commission and their staff. However, properties in this district will be subject to the Section 106 review process if there is a federal undertaking (federally related grant, loan, permit, license, funding etc.) proposed on the premises.

Analysis of General Site Information
The site is located in the West Salem National Register Historic District. The site includes several buildings which were originally constructed for residential purposes. Some of these buildings are now used for residential purposes and some are currently in transition in regard to their use. The southwestern portion of the site is impacted by the floodplain of Salem Creek.

RELEVANT ZONING HISTORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Decision &amp; Date</th>
<th>Direction from Site</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W-3053</td>
<td>LI to PB</td>
<td>Approved 2-15-2010</td>
<td>70’ southeast</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-2819</td>
<td>LI, LB, HB, and GB to PB</td>
<td>Approved 1-3-2006</td>
<td>Directly north and east of current site</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-2331</td>
<td>LI and HB to PB</td>
<td>Approved 8-16-1999</td>
<td>Directly south</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITE ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Average Daily Trip Count</th>
<th>Capacity at Level of Service D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Minor Thoroughfare</td>
<td>201’</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street</td>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td>161’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Street</td>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td>185’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Access Point(s)
Because this is a special use limited request with no site plan or access conditions, the exact location of access points (other than the existing points of access on the above mentioned streets) is unknown.

Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed
No trip generation is available for the existing general use or the proposed special use limited zoning as neither includes a site plan.
### Sidewalks
Sidewalks are located along all street frontages.

### Transit
Route 85 runs along Broad Street.

### Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information
Part of the site has frontage on a minor thoroughfare which has excess capacity and is served with transit. The subject property is also located in a pedestrian oriented area which is served with sidewalks. With respect to the relationship between zoning and transportation, staff believes the proposed PB-L zoning is much more appropriate than the existing LI zoning. Staff does not anticipate any negative transportation related impacts from this request.

## CONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES

### Legacy 2030 Growth Management Area
Growth Management Area 2 - Urban Neighborhoods

### Relevant Legacy 2030 Recommendations
- Develop compact, pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods that contain a mixture of residential and commercial buildings, public spaces and amenities, and offer a variety of transportation options.
- Support land use policies, decisions and regulations that promote mixed-use development and transit/pedestrian-oriented design. Require new mixed-use/large-scale developments, employment centers, and major institutions to integrate transit and provide pedestrian and bicycle networks within their projects and connect to pedestrian and bicycle networks.
- Value and preserve the unique elements of our community, including its natural features and built environment.

### Relevant Area Plan(s)
*South Central Area Plan Update (2014)*

### Area Plan Recommendations
- The subject property is recommended for institutional use and is within the Special Land Use Condition Area (k):
  - The block bounded by Broad Street, Salem Avenue, Poplar Street, and Walnut Street has multiple zoning districts including LI, LB, and PB. The block contains a number of residential structures, businesses, some of them vacant and for sale, and undeveloped land. This general area was part of a sixty-eight acre farm established by Salem Diacony and Brother Johannes George Stockburger. The original farmhouse and later additions are located on the site (northwest corner of the subject property, 510 Walnut Street, PIN 6835-21-1269). Old Salem has acquired properties in the area since adoption of the *South Central Area Plan* in 2003 with the intent to recreate the farmhouse and its environment. This plan supports the long term efforts of Old Salem, but also recognizes that the entire block is zoned for nonresidential uses and property owners could redevelop individual lots for nonresidential uses. The plan recommends the following:
  - Encourage Old Salem to acquire additional needed properties and move ahead with implementation of their plan for the area.
For the southernmost portion of this block, this plan recommends a mix of uses including single-family residential, small-scale office, and low-intensity commercial. Retain existing historic structures and ensure new structures are compatible in character and scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Located Along Growth Corridor?</th>
<th>The site is not located along a growth corridor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Located within Activity Center?</td>
<td>The site is not located within an activity center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)</td>
<td>(R)(3) - Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues</td>
<td>The subject request is to rezone a 1.3 acre assemblage of parcels from LI to PB-L. The petitioners have worked with Planning staff on paring down the list of requested uses to exclude some of the potentially more impactful uses allowed within the PB district such as Car Wash, Convenience Store, and Family Group Home, C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The site is located in an established, mixed use setting in the southeastern portion of the West Salem neighborhood and the western periphery of Old Salem. The general area includes a mixture of zonings including PB, HB, LB, and LI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The South Central Area Plan Update recommends institutional land use for the subject property which is also within a Special Land Use Condition Area (SLUCA). The institutional land use recommendation is consistent with the recommendation for the formal portion of Old Salem and is in acknowledgment that Old Salem owns most of the subject property. The SLUCA recommends a mix of uses including single-family residential, small-scale office, and low-intensity commercial. The proposed PB-L zoning allows for a wide array of residential, institutional, office, and commercial uses and is therefore significantly more compatible with the recommendations of the area plan than is the existing LI zoning. The subject request is also consistent with previous PB rezoning requests in the area that were approved between 1999 and 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The general area is well served with sidewalks and transit which further contribute to the site’s suitability for PB-L zoning. Planning staff recommends approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Aspects of Proposal</th>
<th>Negative Aspects of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The request is consistent with the recommendations of both <em>Legacy 2030</em> and the <em>South Central Area Plan Update</em>.</td>
<td>The proposed zoning does not include the lot which is located between the two sections of the subject property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed PB-L zoning is more compatible with the existing zoning and development pattern in the general area than is the existing LI district.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is located in a pedestrian oriented neighborhood which is served with sidewalks and transit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request is consistent with the PB district purpose statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** **Approval**

**NOTE:** These are staff comments only; final recommendations on projects are made by the City-County Planning Board, with final decisions being made by the appropriate Elected Body, who may approve, deny, table or request modification for any project. **THE APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC HEARINGS WHERE THE CASE WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING BOARD AND THE ELECTED BODY.**
EXISTING USES ALLOWED IN THE LI ZONING DISTRICT
City of Winston-Salem Jurisdiction Only

USES ALLOWED WITH A PERMIT FROM THE ZONING OFFICER (Z)

Academic Biomedical Research Facility
Academic Medical Center
Animal Shelter, Public
Arts and Crafts Studio
Banking and Financial Services
Building Contractors, General
Building Contractors, Heavy
Building Materials Supply
Child Care, Drop-In
Church or Religious Institution, Community
Church or Religious Institution, Neighborhood
College or University
Fish Hatchery
Fuel Dealer
Government Offices, Neighborhood Organization, or Post Office
Hospital or Health Center
Kennel, Indoor
Manufacturing A
Manufacturing B
Micro-Brewery or Micro-Distillery
Motor Vehicle, Body or Paint Shop
Motor Vehicle, Rental and Leasing
Motor Vehicle, Repair and Maintenance
Motor Vehicle, Storage Yard
Offices
Park and Shuttle Lot
Parking, Commercial
Police or Fire Station
Postal Processing Facility
Recreation Facility, Public
Recreation Services, Indoor
Recycling Center
School, Vocational or Professional
Services A
Services B
Signs, Off-Premises
Special Events Center
Storage Services, Retail
Terminal, Bus or Taxi
EXISTING USES ALLOWED IN THE LI ZONING DISTRICT
City of Winston-Salem Jurisdiction Only

Testing and Research Lab
Transmission Tower
Urban Agriculture
Utilities
Warehousing
Wholesale Trade A
Wholesale Trade B

USES ALLOWED WITH REVIEW BY THE PLANNING BOARD (P)
Adult Day Care Center
Child Care, Sick Children
Child Day Care Center
Landfill, Construction and Demolition
Landfill, Land Clearing/Inert Debris

USES ALLOWED WITH SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (A)
Borrow Site
Dirt Storage
Helistop
Solid Waste Transfer Station

USES ALLOWED WITH SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ELECTED BODY (E)
Access Easement, Private Off-Site
Shelter for Homeless

\textsuperscript{5}SUP not required if requirements of Section B.2-5.2(A) are met
West Salem Neighborhood Association

Meeting Notes for Zoning Change Meeting
Thursday October 18th, 2017

A special meeting was called to present to zoning change request within West Salem. The meeting was held at the Christ Moravian Fellowship Hall on the corner of Academy and Granville from 7:00PM to 8:00PM.

David Bergstone from Old Salem Inc. presented a proposal to change the zoning of various properties in the area around Poplar St. and Walnut St. The proposed zoning would change the Light Industrial zoning of multiple properties to Pedestrian Business. David provided paperwork which demarcated a special zoning request, which would eliminate some of the uses allowed in the zoning, primarily car mechanic shops. David explained that the main intent for the zoning change would be to allow for educational and museum programs to take place in the Old Salem Inc. properties, while formalizing the residential lots which are currently violating zoning regulations.

Questions were asked to clarify the zoning change, and the properties in question. David explained that there are no immediate plans to develop any of the lots in question, but rather tidying up the many properties in question. Additionally, he clarified that not all properties in the zoning change are owned by Old Salem Inc. and that other property owners have been included to clean up the zoning confusion in the area. Salvador Patiño stated that he would like to see surface parking crossed out of the potential uses, due to the fact that said conditions tend to create dead zones in the urban fabric, but is in favor of the proposed change.

The neighbors present in the meeting unanimously voted in favor of Old Salem’s proposed zoning change.

Kristin O’Leary from the Hawley House, presented a proposal to change the zoning of 941 West St. from single family to allow for two more residents to live in the property. The Rehabilitation Program currently is able to house 6 women under current zoning. The footprint of the house would not increase if the zoning change was approved by the city, since the work of adding the required bedrooms had already been completed prior to the zoning proposal. Additionally, the Hawley House would be required to add a sprinkler system to the house to meet building codes, a process which they are already working on obtaining the necessary funding.

There were no questions on the zoning change, however there were some questions about the program itself. Carol Faley and other members of neighborhood commented on how the fact that many neighbors don’t know that the rehabilitation program is housed on that corner is a testament to the success of the program. Jeff Failing asked about the success rate of the Hawley House, which Kristin explained that the current success rate is about 80%, far above national average.

The neighbors present in the meeting unanimously voted in favor of the Hawley House’s proposed zoning change.

Salvador Patiño
West Salem Neighborhood Association President

W-3356 Attachment B
STAFF REPORT

DOCKET #  UDO-283
STAFF:      Kelly Bennett

REQUEST

UDO-283 is a zoning text amendment proposed by Planning and Development Services staff to amend Chapter B of the *Unified Development Ordinances* (UDO) to allow Residential Building, Townhouse and Residential Building, Multifamily in the HB (Highway Business) and GO (General Office) zoning districts, and to remove the uses Residential Building, Duplex and Residential Building, Twin Home from the GB (General Business) district. This text amendment was proposed in a report staff presented to the Planning Board in April 2017 concerning strategies for promoting mixed-use development.

BACKGROUND

*Legacy 2030* highlights the advantages of mixed-use development to advance the themes of fiscal responsibility, livable design, and sustainable growth. Benefits of mixed-use development include an urban environment that is active throughout the day and evening, makes optimum use of infrastructure, reduces automobile trips, and increases walkability and pedestrian activity. Several *Legacy 2030* policies and action agenda items specifically encourage mixed-use development in activity centers and along growth corridors.

To further these goals, a report that staff presented to the Board in April 2017 recommended amending the UDO to allow multifamily development (with review by the Planning Board) as one of the other uses allowed in HB (Highway Business), GO (General Office), and Corporate Park Office (CPO) districts to help provide more opportunities for creating mixed-use development. Removing the lower density uses Residential Building, Duplex and Residential Building, Twin Home from the GB district would ensure that only more intense land uses are reserved for this district, which is also largely located in activity centers and along growth corridors. The Board asked staff to prepare this text amendment as part of its 2017-18 work program.

ANALYSIS

In Winston-Salem and Forsyth County, a mix of multifamily residential and commercial/office uses are already allowed with review by the Planning Board in several business and office zoning districts: MU-S (Mixed-Use - Special), GB (General Business), PB (Pedestrian Business), NO (Neighborhood Office), and LO (Limited Office. However, residential multifamily uses are not currently permitted in HB, GO, or CPO districts. Uses allowed with review by the Planning Board do not require rezoning, which takes two months on average and adds time and expense to a project, ultimately discouraging developers from taking such risks. Since the HB district in particular is already one of the most intense zoning districts and is mostly located in activity centers and along growth corridors rather than in neighborhoods, there appears to be little
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downside to adding multifamily uses here. GO, while not as common as HB, is similarly intense and located mostly near growth corridors, also making it an appropriate location for multifamily development. After further review, staff believes that the CPO district is not as logical of an environment for multifamily development because existing CPO districts are not located in or near growth corridors or activity centers. And, removing the uses Residential Building, Duplex and Residential Building, Twin Home from the GB district would further the goals of encouraging more intense mixed-use development.

Both the HB and GO districts have reasonable setback requirements, which could benefit the walkability of new development. HB allows a building height of 60 feet (compared to a 40-foot maximum height for single-family residential districts) and a maximum impervious surface allowance of 85 percent. GO also allows a building height of 60 feet if adjacent to property zoned RS, RM (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H; it has no height limit otherwise. The GO district has a maximum impervious surface allowance of 80 percent.

The number of residential units possible on a tract of land is currently limited by dimensional requirements in the PB, GB, and MU-S districts, and by density in NO and LO. Given each district’s dimensional requirements, Planning staff believes that multifamily development of up to 18 units per acre is appropriate in GO districts and multifamily development of unlimited density is appropriate in HB districts.

The original Planning Board public hearing on this text amendment was held on October 12, 2017. At the hearing, a number of neighborhood representatives spoke in opposition or requested a continuance for further discussion. The Planning Board continued the hearing until December 14 so that Planning staff could meet and discuss the proposed amendment with concerned citizens. That meeting was held on November 2 and the background of the proposal was discussed along with concerns that focused on where the HB and GO districts are located as well as a desire by neighborhoods for a full rezoning process to occur when a change of use from commercial to multifamily development occurs. There was also a concern that for some small lots with HB zoning, multifamily development might be incompatible.

To address these neighborhood concerns and to protect single-family neighborhoods from multifamily development on smaller HB-zoned lots, Planning staff believes that limiting multifamily development to parcels greater than one acre in size is appropriate in HB districts. Multifamily in GO and HB is further limited with 40-foot setbacks from single- or multifamily zoning districts. All multifamily uses in these districts would also require review by the Planning Board. The proposed text amendment has been revised to reflect these changes.

Although Planning staff’s original memo recommended adding the use Residential Building, Multifamily to these zoning districts, staff also believes that adding the use Residential Building, Townhouse could make sites more flexible to develop and encourage developers to mix housing types and even offer more affordable housing products. Because HB and GO districts both allow land uses that generate more traffic than typical multifamily residential development, allowing multifamily uses is not likely to increase traffic in these areas.

Staff continues to believe, however, that the basic premise of allowing multifamily uses in HB and GO, similar to the other commercial and office districts, has a sound planning basis and has
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many possible benefits. Besides the possibility of creating more mixed-use development along growth corridors and in activity centers, such a change could encourage more incremental mixed-use development in commercial outparcels or other infill locations. Additionally, the relocation of some large tenants to Downtown Winston-Salem has left several office properties vacant in suburban locations. Also, many previously developed commercial properties have become vacant or underused. Allowing multifamily in these areas could help redevelopment efforts here while promoting residential units near employment areas. Also, removing the uses Residential Building, Duplex and Residential Building, Twin Home from the GB district would further these goals.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL
Kelly Bennett presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR: None

AGAINST:

Diane Fitzhugh, 830 W 14th Street, Apt E, Winston-Salem, NC 27103
- I’m here to request the opposition of UDO-283 because it does not support the interests of my community. From my understanding, this development ordinance seeks to implement a process by which developers would be able to avoid the cost of a rezoning case. Which takes on an average two months resulting for them an additional time and expense to their project.
- So in effect, to make it faster and more convenient for property seeking developers, this ordinance will eliminate the democratic check and balance system that allows for a public hearing to review and question the consequences of such development. It eliminates the resident and other stake-holders opportunity to voice their concerns about the projects impact when the lives of those living in the community, such as how will the development affect traffic, public safety, schools and/or the environment.
- I was told this ordinance will support walkability in new multifamily developments. My question is, walkability to what?
- Under the UDO-283, the investors will be given the authority to make their own decision about what they can do to increase their profits and not what’s best for the Winston-Salem community.
- I’m not asking you to oppose this ordinance because I don’t want growth or revitalization in my community. There is nothing wrong with quality, affordable housing or luxury lofts. But tonight, I am asking you for a continuance or denial because UDO-283 intentionally or unintentionally fails to respect my right as a tax paying registered voter to voice my concerns and support for future affordable multifamily housing developments in my community.

Bonnie Crouse, 2001 Boone Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC 27103
- Change is inevitable and change is also good. But it’s best when residents have some say in how that change arrives. We don’t want it to just drop down on us overnight and then UDO-283 December 2017
have lost our chance to speak up about that.

- I like to say I’m not a NIBY.
- The change under consideration is going to do great damage. It is a streamline for investors to select a piece of property and make significant changes to a neighborhood without an opportunity for input from them. We want to make certain that no one can come in and make changes without specific presentations of exact impact and some research.

Carolyn Highsmith, 3335 Anderson Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27127

- I’m here today in opposition of UDO-283 on behalf of the New South Community Coalition representing the neighborhood areas of south Winston-Salem.
- Why should developers have the automatic right to bypass the entire zoning process for creating mixed use development without permitting any citizens or neighborhood input for the public hearing process? Without citizens input in any new mixed-use development proposal, there can be unforeseen and destructive consequences to nearby single family homes neighborhoods.
- In conclusion the New South Community Coalition asserts the following:
  1. UDO-283 is way too broad and sweeping basically giving any developer who is interested in horizontal mixed use development carte blanche to build or do whatever they desire while bypassing the entire zoning process.
  2. That all horizontal mixed use development should be required to go through the entire zoning process when requesting a change in a current zoning district or horizontal mixed used zoning.
  3. That any new planning department recommendation or facilitating horizontal mixed use development should be written as, and under and in particular to the existing mixed use zoning classification.
  4. That UDO-283 either be rewritten as a mixed used horizontal zoning classification taking out the by right language and keeping the zoning public process. And that this new version be presented community wide to all stakeholders where the planning board will need to request a continuance. Otherwise, the New South Community Coalition is requesting that the planning board deny UDO-283 as currently written.

Nathyl Snipes, 940 Manly Street, Apt 54, Winston-Salem, NC 27105

- I’m the director of the housing summit and we agree with everyone who is in opposition.
- What are the equal housing opportunity that will be in place if the current residents are displaced?

**WORK SESSION**

During discussion by the Planning Board, the following points were made:

Paul Norby pointed out that hardly any of our zoning districts are single use zoning districts. Single family zoning districts allow a variety of uses including nonresidential uses. Right now by right, a piece of land zoned HB allows dozens of non-residential uses, many of which are much more intense than multi-family. You do not have to ask permission and you do not have to go to a public hearing; they are assigned by right. Changing a use for a property zoned HB, someone UDO-283 December 2017
has the legal right under our zoning ordinance that has been around for decades, to make those changes, as long as they meet those requirements of the zoning. So what we are talking about here is adding to that long list of uses the use of multi-family residential. The one thing multi-family requires in the ordinance that none of these other uses is that it requires a site plan to come to the Planning Board for review and approval. I think some of the opposition expressed here is built on an assumption that every change of use should also be a public hearing process and that is not the way zoning is structured or has been structured. I think what has been learned in communities that are becoming healthier is that it is good to allow for more mixture of uses and that it is probably better to think about intensity of uses than the strict separation of uses one from another. So that is why for the sake of avoiding sprawl and for the sake of building up walkability and transit, the Legacy plan that’s adopted and the report that we put together for the Planning Board last year suggest that we should be moving towards this.

Arnold King: How many parcels in Boston Thurmond are already zoned HB or GB?

Paul Norby responded that in reviewing the map of that area between Coliseum and Northwest Boulevard, I do not see any HB zoning or GB zoning within the neighborhood. The vast majority of Boston Thurmond is zoned RS9, RSQ or RS7. The only HB zoning is on property on Coliseum Drive already developed for commercial, and at the Bojangles at University and Northwest Blvd.

MOTION: George Bryan moved continuance of the zoning petition to December 14, 2017.  
SECOND: Allan Younger  
VOTE:  
FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Arnold King, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger  
AGAINST: None  
EXCUSED: None

____________________________
A. Paul Norby, FAICP
Director of Planning and Development Services
UDO-283
AN ORDINANCE REVISING
CHAPTER B OF THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCES
TO ALLOW RESIDENTIAL BUILDING, TOWNHOUSE AND RESIDENTIAL BUILDING, MULTIFAMILY IN HIGHWAY BUSINESS AND GENERAL OFFICE DISTRICTS WITH PLANNING BOARD REVIEW AND REMOVE THE USES RESIDENTIAL BUILDING, DUPLEX AND RESIDENTIAL BUILDING, TWIN HOME FROM THE GENERAL BUSINESS DISTRICT

Be it ordained by the _____________________________________________, that the Unified Development Ordinances is hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Chapter B, Article II of the UDO is amended as follows:

Chapter B – Zoning Ordinance
Article II - Zoning Districts, Official Zoning Maps, and Uses

2-1 ZONING DISTRICTS

2-1.3 COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICTS – PURPOSE STATEMENTS AND REGULATIONS
(D) GO General Office District

(1) Purpose. ..... The GO District is primarily intended to accommodate high intensity office uses and supporting services, as well as intermediate-density residential uses. The district is established to provide locations for employment within GMAs 1 and 2, Metro Activity Centers, and GMA 3 with access to thoroughfares.

(2) General Dimensional Requirements - GO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Zoning Lot</th>
<th>Minimum Contiguous Site Area (ac)</th>
<th>Minimum Setbacks ¹, ²</th>
<th>Maximum Impervious Surface Cover (%)</th>
<th>Maximum Height (ft)³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area (sf)</td>
<td>Width (ft)</td>
<td>Front (ft)</td>
<td>Rear (ft)</td>
<td>Street (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items to be deleted are indicated with a strikeout; items to be added are indicated with an underscore.
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- 1 -
1. Whenever a lot in a nonresidential district other than the NB or NO Districts shares a common boundary line with a lot in a residential district (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H District with no intervening street or highway, the lot in the nonresidential district shall have a required setback along the shared boundary line of not less than forty (40) feet or shall have the required setback for the nonresidential district, whichever is greater.

2. The eighty percent (80%) limit applies only to GMA 3.

3. There is no height limit unless adjacent to property zoned RS, RM (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H. Height of structure above sixty (60) feet may be increased one foot for each foot of additional setback beyond the forty (40) foot minimum required if adjacent to property zoned RS, RM (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H.

4. Minimum nonresidential setbacks in GMA 2 shall be waived in accordance with Section B.3-14.1(B)(1). (W)

(3) Supplementary District Requirements. ..... Multifamily residential development is permitted at a maximum density of eighteen (18) units per acre and must meet the requirements of Table B.3.4.

(I) HB Highway Business District

(1) Purpose. ..... The HB District is primarily intended to accommodate retail service, and distributive uses, and high-density residential. The district is established to provide locations for establishments which require high visibility and good road access, or which cater primarily to passing motorists. However, the district is not intended to encourage or accommodate strip commercial development. Developments in this district generally have substantial front setbacks. This district is intended for application in GMAs 2, 3 and 4.

(2) General Dimensional Requirements - HB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Zoning Lot</th>
<th>Minimum Contiguous Site Area (ac)</th>
<th>Minimum Setbacks 1,2</th>
<th>Maximum Impervious Surface Cover (%)</th>
<th>Maximum Height (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area (sf)</td>
<td>Width (ft)</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Front (ft) Rear (ft) Interior Side (ft) Street (ft)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—                     —               —               —               —               85</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Whenever a lot in a nonresidential district other than the NB or NO Districts shares a common boundary line with a lot in a residential district (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H District with no intervening street or highway, the lot in the nonresidential district shall have a required setback along the shared boundary line of not less than forty (40) feet or shall have the required setback for the nonresidential district, whichever is greater.

2. Minimum nonresidential setbacks in GMA 2 shall be waived in accordance with Section B.3-14.1(B)(1). (W)
(3) Supplementary District Requirements. ..... Minimum lot sizes for multifamily development must meet the requirements of Table B.3.4.

(J) GB General Business District

(1) Purpose. ..... The GB District is primarily intended to accommodate a wide range of retail, service, and office, and high-density residential uses located along thoroughfares in areas which have developed with minimal front setbacks. However, the district is not intended to encourage or accommodate strip commercial development. The district would accommodate destination retail and service uses, characterized by either a larger single business use or the consolidation of numerous uses in a building or planned development, with consolidated access. This district is intended for application in GMAs 1, 2 and 3 and Metro Activity Centers.

(2) General Dimensional Requirements - GB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Zoning Lot</th>
<th>Minimum Contiguous Site Area (ac)</th>
<th>Minimum Setbacks ¹</th>
<th>Maximum Impervious Surface Cover (%)</th>
<th>Maximum Height (ft) ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>60/ unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Whenever a lot in a nonresidential district other than the NB or NO Districts shares a common boundary line with a lot in a residential district (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H District with no intervening street or highway, the lot in the nonresidential district shall have a required setback along the shared boundary line of not less than forty (40) feet or shall have the required setback for the nonresidential district, whichever is greater.

2. There is no height limit unless adjacent to property zoned RS, RM (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H. Height of structure above sixty (60) feet may be increased by one foot for each foot of additional setback beyond the forty (40) foot minimum required, if adjacent to property zoned RS, RM (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H.

3. Residential structures in GMA 2 shall meet the requirements of Section B.3-8. (W)

(3) Supplementary District Requirements. ..... Minimum lots sizes for multifamily developments must meet the requirements of Table B.3.4.
Table B.3.4
OTHER DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS ¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Minimum Zoning Lot</th>
<th>Minimum Setbacks</th>
<th>Maximum Impervious Surface Cover (%)</th>
<th>Maximum Height (ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area (sf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Width (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rear (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One Side (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combined (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residences in NO, NB, PB and MU-S Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB², NB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU-S</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes in MU-S, PB, NB and NO Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU-S</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB², NB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Homes in MU-S, PB, NB and NO Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU-S</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items to be deleted are indicated with a strikeout; items to be added are indicated with an underscore.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>HB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>PB, NB</th>
<th>MU-S</th>
<th>NO, LO</th>
<th>GO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>43,560</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setb</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dens</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>80^3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elev</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multifamily Developments in GB, HB, CB, PB, NB, MU-S, NO, and LO, and GO Districts

1. These dimensional requirements are subject to additional provisions in Section B.3-1.2; Section B.2-5; Section B.2-1; Section B.3-4; Section B.3-5; and Section B.3-8.

2. Whenever a residential use in the PB Zoning District shares a side yard boundary line with a lot in a residential district, the requirements of Section B.3-1.2(J)(2) shall apply.

3. The eighty percent (80%) limit applies only to GMA 3.

4. There is no height limit unless adjacent to property zoned RS, RM (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H. Height of structure above sixty (60) feet may be increased one foot for each foot of additional setback beyond the forty (40) foot minimum required if adjacent to property zoned RS, RM (except RM-U), YR, AG, or H.
## 2-4 - PERMITTED USES

### 2-4.1 TABLE B.2.6

Table 2.6 displays the principal uses allowed in each zoning district and references uses conditions. Table B.2.6 should be read in conjunction with the definitions of principal uses and other terms in Section A.2. Land, buildings, and structures shall only be used in accordance with the districts shown on the Official Zoning Maps, and subject to all requirements and conditions specified in this Ordinance.

| Use Type                              | YR | AG | RS40 | RS30 | RS20 | RS15 | RS9 | RS7 | RSQ | RMS | RM8 | RM12 | RM18 | RMU | MH | LO | CPO | GO | NB | LB | NSB | HB | GB | CB | MRB-$S^4$ (W) | E | LI | GI | CI | IP | C | MU-5 | CONDS |
|---------------------------------------|----|----|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| **RESIDENTIAL USES**                  |    |    |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |
| Residential Building, Duplex (Lo)     |    |    |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |
| Residential Building, Townhouse (Lo)  |    |    |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |
| Residential Building, Twin Home (Lo)  |    |    |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |
| Residential Building, Multifamily (Hi)|    |    |      |      |      |      |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |

Section 2. This ordinance shall be effective upon adoption.

NOTE: Items to be deleted are indicated with a strikeout; items to be added are indicated with an underscore.
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Kelly, and Planning Board members,

Recently, neighborhood representatives have expressed to the Winston-Salem Neighborhood Alliance their concerns about UDO-283. Although we understand this amendment may be intended to encourage affordable housing, neighborhood representatives do not see sufficient safeguards to assure that new housing in commercial zones would be beneficial to or consistent with existing, surrounding neighborhoods. Some see potential for new development to be disruptive, and ultimately, detrimental.

It is our understanding that the Boston-Thurmond neighborhood, and perhaps other neighborhoods, are likely to request a continuance for this UDO amendment, if not denial. WSNA supports Boston-Thurmond and other neighborhoods that seek greater assurance that future housing policy will be beneficial rather than disruptive.

Thanks for your attention and consideration.

–
Eric Bushnell
on behalf of the Winston-Salem Neighborhood Alliance
Board of Directors of the
Winston Salem Regional Association of REALTORS®

We, the undersigned, agree that the following corporate resolution was made on this 20th day of November Two Thousand Seventeen, by the Board of Directors of the Winston Salem Regional Association of REALTORS®.

We do hereby consent to the adoption of the following at a regularly called meeting of the board of directors of this corporation. In accordance with state law and the bylaws of this corporation, by unanimous vote, the board of directors decided to lend its support to the proposed UDO-283 zoning text amendment proposed by Planning and Development Services.

Therefore, it is resolved, that the corporation shall support the proposed zoning text amendments of the Planning and Development Services amending Chapter B of the Unified Development Ordinances (UDO) to allow Residential Building, Townhouse and Residential Building, Multifamily in the IIB (I Highway Business) and GO (General Office) zoning districts for the purpose of promoting mixed-use development.

The officers of this corporation are authorized to perform the acts to carry out this corporate resolution.

Lou Baldwin
2017 President
Winston Salem Regional Association of REALTORS®

Paul McGill
2017 RCA President
ZONING STAFF REPORT

DOCKET:  UDO-284
STAFF:    Aaron King

Petitioner(s):  Planning staff

REQUEST

An ordinance amendment proposed by Planning and Development Services staff revising Chapter B of the *Unified Development Ordinances* to establish building material requirements for the use Retail Store (UDO-284).

AUTOMATIC CONTINUANCE:

Staff requests a one month continuance to further refine the proposed ordinance language. This item is automatically continued to the January 11, 2018 meeting since the continuance request was received by December 11, 2017.
PLANNING BOARD REVIEW

13-lot Planned Residential Development in RS9 Zoning

CASE: PBR 2017-13

PIN: 6806-74-3779
6806-75-5195

SCALE: 1" represents 400'

STAFF: Reed

GMA: 3

ACRES: 7.04

MAP(S): 6806.02, 6806.04
1) SITE PLAN TITLE AND NUMBER: Villas at Jefferson Ridge  PBR 2017-13

2) TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: Single Family Planned Residential Development (PRD)

3) ACREAGE: 7.04

4) ZONING: Existing: RS-9

5) # UNITS/LOTS: 13 lots  DENSITY: 1.85 lots/acre

6) SITE PLAN PREPARER: Stoltzfus Engineering Inc., Aden R. Stoltzfus, PE
747 Park Lawn Ct
Kernersville, NC 27284
PHONE: 336-904-0207
E-MAIL: aden@seiengineering.com

7) OWNER AND/OR AGENT: Nova Jefferson LLC
206 North Spruce Street, Suite 2A
Winston-Salem, NC 27101
PHONE: 336-291-8592
E-MAIL: adreyfuss@piedmont-metro.com

8) CONDITIONS: (These conditions are additional requirements for development. All other city or county code regulations still apply.)

- PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:
  a. Developer shall obtain a driveway permit from the City of Winston-Salem.
  b. An Environmental Grading and Erosion Control Permit will be required if more than 10,000 square feet is to be disturbed during any potential construction. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control plan must be submitted and approved before the permit can be issued. A Watershed Protection Permit shall be required prior to the start of work. Permit application may be submitted concurrently with Erosion Control plan review. Relocation or installation of any stormwater treatment device into any buffer areas, vegetation designated to remain, or close proximity to adjacent residentially zoned land shall require a Staff Change approval at minimum, and may require a Site Plan Amendment.

- PRIOR TO THE SIGNING OF FINAL PLATS:
  a. All documents including covenants, restrictions, and homeowners association agreements shall be recorded in the office of the Register of Deeds. Final plats must show common open space declarations.
  b. Developer shall build streets to UDO street standards. Final plat shall include a negative access easement along Coravan Drive.
  c. Final Plat shall show lots, common areas, streets, and utilities.
  d. Developer shall obtain an encroachment agreement from Duke Energy for the pedestrian walking path inside the Duke Energy Transmission right-of-way.
INTERDEPARTMENTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Project Case Number: PBR 2017-13

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

Note: City-County Planning staff is responsible for coordinating the Interdepartmental Review of Special Use Rezoning Requests, Subdivisions, and Planning Board Review items; please contact the appropriate Department at the phone # indicated below if you have any questions about the comments or recommendations lists. A list of recommended conditions from this Interdepartmental Review will be sent to you via e-mail generally by the end of the business day on Friday the week prior to the Planning Board Public Hearing.


PROJECT DESCRIPTION: North side of Coravan Drive, west of Norman Road

NCDOT (Wright Archer)- Phone # - 336.747.7900 Email: warcher@ncdot.gov

No Comments / Not a state maintained road.

WSDOT (Jeff Fansler)- Phone # - 336.747.6883 Email: jeffreygf@cityofws.org

Widen Coravan 13’ from center with curb and gutter and sidewalk. Connect sidewalk with interior sidewalk on Albemarle Ct. Provide a NAE along your frontage except for main entrance and existing access easement. Verify that DUKE power will allow pedestrian access in their utility easement. Locate parking space and mail kiosk as far away from intersection as possible.

Engineering (Al Gaskill)- Phone # - 336.747.6846 Email: albertcg@cityofws.org

1. Engineering to review/approve all roadway design.
2. Need min 20’ storm drain easements and ditch to the creek.
3. C&G and sidewalk required along Coravan Dr from PL to PL.
4. Recommend mail kiosk be placed further for entrance and provide for 2 spaces.
5. NAE along Coravan Dr at lot 1 and common area.
6. Transmission Access to have concrete apron and be at 90 degrees to roadway.

Inspections - Phone # - Aaron King - 336.747.7068 Email: aaronk@cityofws.org

No Comments

Erosion Control (Matt Osborne)- Phone # - 336.747.7453 Email: matthewo@cityofws.org

An Environmental Grading and Erosion Control Permit will be required if more than 10,000 square feet is to be disturbed during any potential construction. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control plan must be submitted and approved before the permit can be issued. Please submit this plan at least 30 days prior to the intended start date of construction.
### Stormwater Division (Joe Fogarty) - Phone # - 336.747.6961 Email: josephp@cityofws.org

Stormwater Study Required. In addition to meeting Stormwater ordinance provisions staff recommends either management for the 50 year peak rate and volume increases or in lieu of management providing a no adverse impact downstream study that includes analysis up to this 50 year design event.

### City Fire - (Doug Coble) - Phone # - 336.734.1290 Email: douglasc@cityofwsfire.org

County Fire - (Tony Stewart) - Phone # - 336.703.2562 Email: stewartaj@forsyth.cc

No Comments

### Utilities (Todd Lewis) - Phone # - 336.747.6842 Email: todl@cityofws.org

Submit water/sewer extension plans to Utilities Plan Review for Permitting/Approval.

### Sanitation (Johnnie Taylor) - Phone # - 336.748.3080 Email: JohnnieT@cityofws.org

No Comments

### Planning (Aaron King) - Phone # - 336.747.7068 Email: aaronk@cityofws.org

No Comments

### Street Names/Addresses (Matt Hamby) -336. 747.7074 Email: hambyme@mapforsyth.org

Street Names/Addresses (Stacy Tolbert) -336. 747.7497 Email: tolbersy@mapforsyth.org

“Albemarle Ct” is approved for use. Need clarification of access for existing dwelling at 4000 Leland Dr. Addresses will be issued during planning process.

### Forsyth County Health Department - 336.703-3110 Email: rakescd@forsyth.cc

No Comments

### Vegetation Management -336.748.3020 Email: keithf@cityofws.org

No Comments
PLANNING BOARD REVIEW
9-lot Planned Residential Development in RS40 Zoning

CASE: PBR 2017-14
PIN: 5884-46-3126

SCALE: 1" represents 500'
STAFF: Reed
GMA: 3
ACRES: 13.11
MAP(S): 5884.01
1) SITE PLAN TITLE AND NUMBER: Ash Grove PBR 2017-14

2) TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: Single Family Planned Residential Development (PRD)

3) ACREAGE: 13.11

4) ZONING: Existing: RS-40

5) # UNITS/LOTS: 9 lots DENSITY: 0.69 lots/acre

6) SITE PLAN PREPARER: Allied Design, Inc
   4720 Kester Mill Road
   Winston-Salem, NC 27103
   PHONE: 336-765-2377
   FAX: 336-760-8886
   E-MAIL: scausey@allied-ensurv.com

7) OWNER AND/OR AGENT: Arden Group, LLC (Justin Mendenhall)
   111 Brookstown Avenue
   Winston-Salem, NC 27101
   PHONE: 336-659-9503
   E-MAIL: justin@theardengroup.com

8) CONDITIONS: (These conditions are additional requirements for development. All other city or county code regulations still apply.)

   • PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:
     a. Developer shall obtain a driveway permit from NCDOT.
     b. Petitioner shall obtain a Watershed Permit from the Inspections Division.

   • PRIOR TO THE SIGNING OF FINAL PLATS:
     a. All documents including covenants, restrictions, and homeowners association agreements shall be recorded in the office of the Register of Deeds. Final plats must show common open space declarations.
     b. Developer shall build private streets to UDO street standards.
     c. Final Plat shall show lots, common areas, streets, and utilities.

   • PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS:
**PRELIMINARY COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS**

*Note: City-County Planning staff is responsible for coordinating the Interdepartmental Review of Special Use Rezoning Requests, Subdivisions, and Planning Board Review items; please contact the appropriate Department at the phone # indicated below if you have any questions about the comments or recommendations lists. A list of recommended conditions from this Interdepartmental Review will be sent to you via e-mail generally by the end of the business day on Friday the week prior to the Planning Board Public Hearing.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT CASE NUMBER:</th>
<th>PBR 2017-14</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE:</th>
<th>Ash Grove</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>November 29, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** West side of Harper Road, south of Styers Ferry Road

**NCDOT (Wright Archer)- Phone # - 336.747.7900 Email:** warcher@ncdot.gov

NCDOT driveway permit is required. Driveway package should include: two original signed driveway permit applications, a $50 check made payable to NCDOT, and five sets of plans. NCDOT Encroachment Agreement is required for any utility ties within NCDOT right-of-way.

**WSDOT (Jeff Fansler)- Phone # - 336.747.6883 Email:** jeffreygf@cityofws.org

Dedicate 40’ of R/W from center on Harper Rd along your frontage.

**Engineering (Al Gaskill)- Phone # - 336.747.6846 Email:** albertcg@cityofws.org

No Comments

**Inspections - Phone # - Aaron King - 336.747.7068 Email:** aaronk@cityofws.org

See Planning comments

**Erosion Control (Matt Osborne)- Phone # - 336.747.7453 Email:** matthewo@cityofws.org

An Environmental Grading and Erosion Control Permit will be required if more than 10,000 square feet is to be disturbed during any potential construction. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control plan must be submitted and approved before the permit can be issued. Please submit this plan at least 30 days prior to the intended start date of construction.

This project resides within the Yadkin River Watershed Protection Area per Chapter C, Article 4 of the WS/Forsyth Co. UDO. As a result, a Watershed Protection Permit shall be required prior to the start of work. Permit application may be submitted concurrently with Erosion Control plan review. A site plan showing all existing Built Upon Area (BUA), all newly proposed BUA, and the associated calculations noting both square footage of impervious cover, as well as percent of total parcel coverage must accompany the Watershed Protection Permit Application form. Watershed Protection Permit Application form can be found at http://www.cityofws.org/Departments/Stormwater-Erosion-Control/Erosion-Control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact Info</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Division</td>
<td>Joe Fogarty - Phone # 336.747.6961 Email: <a href="mailto:josephf@cityofws.org">josephf@cityofws.org</a></td>
<td>No Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Fire</td>
<td>Tony Stewart - Phone # 336.703.2562 Email: <a href="mailto:stewaraj@forsyth.cc">stewaraj@forsyth.cc</a></td>
<td>Must comply with gate standard (Two means/methods of fire department access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Todd Lewis - Phone # 336.747.6842 Email: <a href="mailto:todl@cityofws.org">todl@cityofws.org</a></td>
<td>Submit water/sewer extension plans to Utilities Plan Review for Permitting/Approval. You may need to extend the 6” water line one lot farther.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>Johnnie Taylor - Phone # 336.748.3080 Email: <a href="mailto:johnniet@cityofws.org">johnniet@cityofws.org</a></td>
<td>No Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Aaron King - Phone # 336.747.7068 Email: <a href="mailto:aaronk@cityofws.org">aaronk@cityofws.org</a></td>
<td>PBR 2017-14 Show grade in active open space area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Names/Addresses</td>
<td>Matt Hamby - Phone # 336.747.7074 Email: <a href="mailto:hambyme@mapforsyth.org">hambyme@mapforsyth.org</a></td>
<td>“Ash Grove Ln” is approved for use. Addresses will be issued during planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stacy Tolbert - Phone # 336.747.7497 Email: <a href="mailto:tolersy@mapforsyth.org">tolersy@mapforsyth.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth County Health Department</td>
<td>Phone # 336.703-3110 Email: <a href="mailto:rakescd@forsyth.cc">rakescd@forsyth.cc</a></td>
<td>The Infrastructure on this one says private, but under general comments it has information about sewer. If this is sewer, then we have no comments. If this involves septic systems and drain lines then we would like to see those applications prior to grading and erosion control permits so we can determine if the lots will pass for approval, then to grading and erosion control so they can see our work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Management</td>
<td>Phone # 336.748.3020 Email: <a href="mailto:keithf@cityofws.org">keithf@cityofws.org</a></td>
<td>No Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Board Members:

Arnold G. King, Chairman
Allan Younger, Vice Chair

George Bryan
Melynda Dunigan
Jason T. Grubbs
Tommy Hicks
Clarence Lambe, Jr.
Chris Leak
Brenda Smith

The mission of the City-County Planning Board of Forsyth County and Winston-Salem is to assert visionary leadership in the comprehensive, creative planning for our urban and rural community and responsible stewardship of the natural environment.

We value a beautiful, livable, harmonious, and economically successful community.