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for Kennel Enclosure
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June 23, 2010

John Lusk
Lusk Commercial Properties LLC
1920 Angelo Court, Apt A
Winston-Salem, NC  27104

RE:  SPECIAL USE PERMIT W-3068

Dear Mr. Lusk:

The attached report of the Planning Board to the City Council is sent to you at the request of the Council Members. You will be notified by the City Secretary’s Office of the date on which the Council will hear this petition.

Sincerely,

A. Paul Norby, FAICP
Director of Planning

pc:  City Secretary’s Office, P.O. Box 2511, Winston-Salem, NC  27102
     Chris Dunn, 1049 Kenleigh Circle, Winston-Salem, NC  27106
     Gray Stout, 206 East Fisher Street, Salisbury, NC  28144
     Sanders Mosley, 1855 Runnymede Road, Winston-Salem, NC  27104
     Lonnie Clark, 1212 Watson Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC  27103
**ACTION REQUEST FORM**

**DATE:**  June 23, 2010  
**TO:**  The Honorable Mayor and City Council  
**FROM:**  A. Paul Norby, FAICP, Director of Planning

**BOARD ACTION REQUEST:**

Request for Public Hearing on Special Use Permit of Lusk Commercial Properties, LLC

**SUMMARY OF INFORMATION:**

Special Use Permit of Lusk Commercial Properties, LLC for an outdoor enclosure of a Kennel, Indoor use and setback reductions: property is located on the west side of Chatham Road, south of Northwest Boulevard (Zoning Docket W-3068).

**PLANNING BOARD ACTION:**

**MOTION ON PETITION:**  APPROVAL  
**FOR:**  ARNOLD KING, ARTHUR KING, CLARENCE LAMBE, DARRYL LITTLE, LYNNE MITCHELL, PAUL MULLICAN  
**AGAINST:**  WESLEY CURTIS, BARRY LYONS  
**SITE PLAN ACTION:**  CONFORMS TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE UDO
BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Winston-Salem as follows:

Section 1. The City Council hereby makes an affirmative finding as follows, based upon the material and competent evidence presented at the public hearing:

1. That the use will not materially endanger the public health or safety if located where proposed and developed according to the application and plan as submitted and approved;
2. That the use meets all required conditions and specifications;
3. That the use will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property, or that the use is a public necessity; and,
4. That the location and character of the use, if developed according to the application and plan submitted and approved, will be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located and in general conformity with Legacy.

Section 2. The Winston-Salem City Council hereby issues a special use permit for an outdoor enclosure of a Kennel, Indoor use and setback reductions in accordance with Section 6-1.5 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Unified Development Ordinances to Lusk Commercial Properties, LLC to be established on the following described property:

Section 3. This Ordinance is adopted after approval of the site plan entitled Winston-Salem Kennel and identified as Attachment "A" of the Special Use Permit issued by the City Council the ______ day of __________________, to Lusk Commercial Properties, LLC.

Section 4. The City Council hereby directs the issuance of a Special Use Permit pursuant to Section 6-1.5 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Unified Development Ordinances for a development to be known as Winston-Salem Kennel. Said Special Use Permit and site plan with associated documents are attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 5. This Ordinance shall be effective from and after its adoption.
SPECIAL USE PERMIT

Issued by the City Council
of the City of Winston-Salem

The City Council of the City of Winston-Salem issues a Special Use Permit for the site shown on the site plan map included in this zoning petition of Lusk Commercial Properties, LLC, (Zoning Docket W-3068). The site shall be developed in accordance with the plan approved by the Council and bearing the inscription: "Attachment A, Special Use Permit for an outdoor enclosure of a Kennel, Indoor use and setback reductions, approved by the Winston-Salem City Council the _____ day of _____________________, 20____" and signed, provided the property is developed in accordance with requirements of Section 6-1.5 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Unified Development Ordinances, and other applicable laws, and the following additional conditions be met:

- **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:**
  a. Developer shall obtain a driveway permit from City of Winston-Salem Public Works Department.

- **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF OCCUPANCY PERMITS:**
  a. Any damage to City maintained streets, sidewalk, or curb shall be replaced or repaired to the requirements of the Public Works Department.
  b. All requirements of the City of Winston-Salem driveway permit shall be completed.
## PETITION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket #</th>
<th>W-3068</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Gary Roberts, Jr. AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner(s)</td>
<td>Lusk Commercial Properties, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Property</td>
<td>PIN # 6825-98-6919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>744 Chatham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Request</td>
<td>Special Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>The petitioner is requesting a Special Use Permit for an outdoor enclosure and setback reductions for a Kennel, Indoor use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## GENERAL SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>West side of Chatham Road, south of Northwest Boulevard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>City of Winston-Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s)</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Acreage</td>
<td>± 0.78 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>An 8,500 sf, unoccupied industrial/commercial building is currently located on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Property Zoning and Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>GI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>LI &amp; RS-Q HO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>The site slopes down gently from south to north. No streams or wetlands are located on the site. Staff also notes that the subject property had a chemical fire in 2002 that destroyed the previous building and its contents. The site is listed on the EPA Superfund CERCLIS website with information that the site was “cleaned up” between 7/31/02 and 10/16/02.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to Water and Sewer</td>
<td>Public water and sanitary sewer are available to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater/Drainage</td>
<td>No known issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed and Overlay Districts</td>
<td>The subject property is not located within a water supply watershed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of General Site Information</td>
<td>The site appears to have no development constraints. Staff does not anticipate any significant changes to the site from this request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SITE ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>ADT Count</th>
<th>Capacity/LOS D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chatham Road</td>
<td>Collector Street</td>
<td>122’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Access Point(s)**
The site plan reflects one driveway onto Chatham Street, which will be relocated from its present location.

**Planned Road Improvements**
All three proposed alternative Martin Luther King Drive Extensions run through the subject property.

**Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed**
- **Existing Zoning: GI**
  - No trip rate is available for the existing zoning which has no site plan.
- **Proposed Use: Kennel, Indoor**
  - No trip rate is available for this use

**Sidewalks**
No sidewalks are located along this portion of Chatham Road.

**Transit**
Route 4 along Broad Street, +/- 1,100’ to the west.

**Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information**
Staff does not anticipate any negative transportation impacts from this request.

### CONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES

**Legacy GMA**
Growth Management Area 2, Urban Neighborhoods

**Relevant Legacy Recommendations**
- *Legacy* encourages convenient commercial services to support neighborhood needs.
- *Infill and Redevelopment*: Manage growth by making more efficient use of land that has already been developed, encouraging reuse and infill and capitalizing on other development opportunities.
- *Infill and Redevelopment*: Increased infill development could bring new opportunity and improved quality of life for residents within the MSA, especially for neighborhoods within the city.

**Relevant Area Plan(s)**
South Central Area Plan (2003)

**Area Plan Recommendations**
Though zoned General Industrial, the property’s existing land use is shown as commercial. No change is recommended on the proposed land use map.

**Other Applicable Plans and Planning Issues**
For Special Use Permits (SUP) requiring approval by the Elected Body, certain findings have to be met. Findings of the Planning Board accompanying a favorable recommendation shall include:

**Planning Board Findings:**
- a. The development is in conformity with *Legacy*. *(Yes)*
- b. Water and sewer service are available in adequate capacity. *(Yes)*
- c. Where buildings greater than thirty-five (35) feet in height are proposed within the City of Winston-Salem limits, there is adequate access for aerial fire-fighting equipment. *(No new buildings are proposed; existing building height is 20’)*
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d. Streets and highways, both within and in the vicinity of the
development, are of such design and traffic-carrying capacity that the
development will not create a traffic hazard. (Yes)

e. General layout and design of the development meet all requirements
of this Ordinance. (Yes)

f. Adequate, safe and convenient provision is made for vehicular and
pedestrian movement on the site with particular attention paid to the
needs of public safety equipment and personnel (fire, police, etc) and
service vehicles and personnel (sanitation, postal delivery, etc). (Yes)

g. The Planning Board may recommend to the Elected Body conditions
as identified in Section 6-1.3(A)(1) for the issuance of the special use
permit to reduce impacts associated with the project. (See “SITE-
SPECIFIC RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL”
section below)

The Elected Body shall issue a Special Use Permit only when the Elected
Body makes an affirmative finding as follows:

**Elected Body Findings:**

a. That the use will not materially endanger the public health or safety if
located where proposed and developed according to the application
and plan as submitted and approved. (Yes)

b. That the use meets all required conditions and specifications. (Yes)

c. That the use will not substantially injure the value of adjoining or
abutting property, or that the use is a public necessity; and, (Yes)

d. That the location and character of the use, if developed according to
the application and plan submitted and approved, will be in harmony
with the area in which it is to be located and in general conformity
with Legacy. (Yes)

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

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

**Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues**

The petitioner is requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) for: (1) an
outdoor enclosure, and (2) setback reductions for a Kennel, Indoor use.
The use conditions for Kennel, Indoor require a 40’ rear yard and 20’ side
yard setback for both the building and any outdoor enclosed area. Any
reduction of those setbacks must be reviewed through the elected body
Special Use Permit process. The UDO also requires that any outdoor
enclosure for a Kennel, Indoor use be reviewed and approved through the
elected body SUP process.

The existing building is located +/-15 feet from the southern lot line, +/-
20 feet from the western lot line, and 0 feet from the northern lot line.
Approval of this request would provide relief from the required 20’
setback on these three sides of the building. The proposed outdoor enclosure wraps around the building’s southern and western sides and extends to those respective property lines. Staff believes that the outdoor enclosure and setback reductions are reasonable requests, given the existing site layout and surrounding land uses.

RELEVANT ZONING HISTORIES

There are no relevant histories in the vicinity of the subject property.

SITE PLAN COMPLIANCE WITH UDO REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Square Footage</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>Placement on Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,500 SF</td>
<td>Western ½ of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 spaces</td>
<td>21 spaces</td>
<td>90° head-in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 feet</td>
<td>I-story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impervious Coverage</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request</th>
<th>(A) Legacy policies:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Environmental Ord.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Subdivision Regulations</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements

The revised site plan meets the requirements of the UDO.

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>Request is consistent with Legacy.</td>
<td>The proposed outdoor enclosure will be approximately 100’ from a residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request is consistent with the South Central Area Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed use is compatible with the surrounding land uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SUP would encourage the re-use of an existing commercial building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The request meets the required SUP findings.</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 driveway permit from City of Winston-Salem Public Works Department.
• PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF OCCUPANCY PERMITS:
  a. Any damage to City maintained streets, sidewalk, or curb shall be replaced or repaired to the requirements of the Public Works Department.
  b. All requirements of the City of Winston-Salem driveway permit shall be completed.

STAFF SPECIAL USE PERMIT 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.
Aaron King presented the staff report.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**FOR:**

Chris Dunn, 1049 Kenleigh Circle, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
- I will be the developer of the property.
- This will be a dramatic improvement to what is there now.
- We have sent letters and the site plan to eight property owners in Historic West End whose properties look down on this site. We have had no response from them.
- We also communicated with the West End Association and posted our letter on their neighborhood web site. They had a concern regarding noise and we responded with another letter.
- Please understand that these dogs will be internally housed. Their time outside the building will be limited to exercise when they will be escorted by an employee.
- The hours of that happening would be Monday through Friday from 8 AM to 6 PM and Saturdays probably from 8 AM to Noon with outdoor walks Saturday afternoon and Sunday afternoon.

Gray Stout, 206 East Fisher Street, Salisbury, NC 28144
- I am the site plan preparer.
- I feel that the outdoor enclosure area is in the best spot possible.
- We feel that the proposed layout will enhance the visual aspect of this portion of Chatham Road.
- Our proposal also includes alterations to the building’s façade which will help it look less like a metal building.

**AGAINST:**

Sanders Mosley, 1855 Runnymede Road, Winston-Salem, NC 27104
- We own the building directly south of this property.
- The proposed kennel will be almost on our property line.
- I am opposed to this because my building is leased to a church and I’m concerned that the noise from this will interfere with them.
• It will also echo the noise up to the Historic West End neighborhood.
• I urge you to vote against this proposal because of the disruption of the peace and quiet of the area at this time.

Lonnie Clark, 1212 Watson Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC 27103
• I’m here representing the Neighborhood Alliance of which I’m a member because I’m president of the Ardmore Neighborhood Association.
• In both this case and the next one we are concerned that they set a precedent regarding the setback requirements for kennels.
• While many of us on both boards are serious dog-lovers, we think this many dogs does create a noise problem and can reduce the property values of adjacent properties.

**WORK SESSION**

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

1. The extension of Martin Luther King, Jr Drive is unscheduled at this time. Mention of the proposed extension is provided for a “heads-up”.

2. This building was built in 2002 and has never had a tenant.

3. The Board discussed potential uses in the GI District. Paul Mullican: There are a lot of things that could go on this property as it’s zoned right now which would be detrimental to the area. This could be much better than many of those uses. This does have economic value to the area. There are manufacturing plants nearby.

   *NOTE: A list of uses currently allowed in the GI District is attached.*

4. Barry Lyons: A dog kennel can be an intense use with regards to the noise factor. I hesitate to set a precedent of reducing setback requirements when there is residential property on the hill just above this property. It appears to me that too often the Special Use Permit is used to circumvent what is reasonable zoning. This particular situation may be very well run, but we could be setting a precedent for businesses which will not be well run.

5. The petitioner read the letter he wrote to the neighbors in which he addressed the noise concern. It was noted that the statements were not binding unless the petitioner agreed to include them as conditions in this Special Use Permit. Staff read the existing restrictions in the UDO pertaining to kennels. They restrict hours of operation from 8 AM - 6 PM, limit use of outdoor space to dogs on leashes, and require adult supervision and meeting the appropriate sanitary restrictions.

6. In response to a question from Arthur King, the petitioner noted that there would be outdoor activity on Sunday for the purpose of walking the dogs. The dogs would be on leashes during this activity.
7. Lynne Mitchell clarified that the dog run would abut the adjoining property on the southern sides as it will be placed within the bufferyard area, and that there was a railroad tract on the northern side. On the western side, the play area will meet the normal setbacks but there will not be a buffer since the adjoining property on that side is zoned LI. We look at cases individually. Given that the houses are significantly higher than the site, I don’t think the buffer would be a help anyway.

8. Wesley Curtis: Since this is a request which gives the property owner a right which the surrounding neighbors do not have, to me the key thing is the surrounding neighbors. If the adjacent property owners don’t support that, I don’t know if I can support it.

9. Arthur King: This is a difficult decision. I appreciate the possibility of setting precedent. On the other hand it seems the economic benefit of using property for business purposes is a reasonable objective in and of itself. If there were more valuable uses they probably would have shown up by now. We have an industrial building which ought to be used for something.

10. Lynne Mitchell: I’m struggling also. I think there’s a perception of what it can do, but it’s beneficial to do something with the site. I’m always supportive of keeping something in the community which is in a good location, convenient to people instead of way out. I do think we would have to have the conditions.

11. The petitioner’s letters were sent to the HOA and not the property owner of the church next door.

12. The petitioner stated that he doesn’t want to agree to conditions beyond the requirements of the UDO.

MOTION: Paul Mullican moved approval of the Special Use Permit, certified that the site plan meets all code requirements and recommends staff conditions.
SECOND: Clarence Lambe
VOTE:
   FOR: Arnold King, Arthur King, Clarence Lambe, Darryl Little, Lynne Mitchell, Paul Mullican
   AGAINST: Wesley Curtis, Barry Lyons

A. Paul Norby, FAICP
Director of Planning