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January 26, 2011

Allerton Place Association, Inc and CB Development Co. Inc.
c/o David Murray, President
3141 Allerton Lake drive
Winston-Salem, NC 27106

RE: SITE PLAN AMENDMENT W-3081

Dear Mr. Murray:

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
Ashley Webb, Gupton & Associates, 2200 Silas Creek Parkway, Suite 2B, Winston-Salem, NC 27103
David Murray, 3141 Allerton Lake Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
Brandt Deal, 2990 Bethesda Place, Winston-Salem, NC 27103
Betsy Baldwin, 220 Forest Brook Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
Gene Metcalf, 235 Forest Brook Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
Page West, 3109 Allerton Lake Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
Mallory Oldham, Suite 600, 100 N. Cherry Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101
Wenford Hood, 3100 Allerton Lake Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
**ACTION REQUEST FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>January 26, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO:</td>
<td>The Honorable Mayor and City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td>A. Paul Norby, FAICP, Director of Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COUNCIL ACTION REQUEST:**

Request for Public Hearing on Site Plan Amendment of Allerton Place Association, Inc and CB Development Co. Inc.

**SUMMARY OF INFORMATION:**

Site Plan Amendment of Allerton Place Association, Inc and CB Development Co. Inc. for a RM-5-S (Planned Residential Development) zoned site: property is located along both sides of Allerton Lake Drive between Gatehouse Road and Lakeshore Drive (Zoning Docket W-3081).

**PLANNING BOARD ACTION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION ON PETITION:</th>
<th>APPROVAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR:</td>
<td>UNANIMOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST:</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE PLAN ACTION:</td>
<td>CONFORMS TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE UDO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY ORDINANCE - SPECIAL USE

Site Plan Amendment of Allerton Place Association, Inc and CB Development Co. Inc.,
Docket W-3081

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE
WINSTON-SALEM CITY
ZONING ORDINANCE AND THE
OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF
THE CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM, N.C.

____________________________________

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Winston-Salem as follows:

Section 1. The Winston-Salem City Zoning Ordinance and the Official Zoning Map of
the City of Winston-Salem, N.C. are hereby amended by granting a Site Plan Amendment for
property zoned RM-5-S (Planned Residential Development) and described as follows:

PIN #s 6816-38-2143 and 6745

Section 2. This Ordinance is adopted after approval of the site plan entitled Allerton
Place and identified as Attachment "A" of the Special Use District Permit issued by the City
Council the ______ day of _______________, to Allerton Place Association, Inc and CB
Development Co. Inc.

Section 3. The City Council hereby directs the issuance of a Special Use District Permit
pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance of the Unified Development Ordinances for a development to
be known as Allerton Place. Said Special Use District Permit and site plan with associated
documents are attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Section 4. This Ordinance shall be effective from and after its adoption.
CITY - SPECIAL USE DISTRICT PERMIT

SPECIAL USE DISTRICT 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 District Permit for the site shown on the site plan map included in this zoning petition of Allerton Place Association, Inc and CB Development Co. Inc., (Zoning Docket W-3081). The site shall be developed in accordance with the plan approved by the Board and bearing the inscription:

"Attachment A, Special Use District Permit for RM-5-S (Planned Residential Development - Site Plan Amendment), approved by the Winston-Salem City Council the _____ day of ______________, 20____" and signed, provided the property is developed in accordance with requirements of the RM-5-S zoning district of the Zoning Ordinance of the Unified Development Ordinances, the Erosion Control Ordinance, and other applicable laws, and the following additional conditions be met:

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

- **OTHER REQUIREMENTS:**
  a. If a grading plan is required a tree save plan will be required.
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
STAFF REPORT

PETITION INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docket #</th>
<th>W-3081</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Gary Roberts, Jr., AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner(s)</td>
<td>Allerton Place Association, Inc and CB Development Co. Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner(s)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Property</td>
<td>PIN # s 6816-38-2143 and 6745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>No address has been assigned to the subject properties which have no buildings located on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Request</td>
<td>Site Plan Amendment regarding traffic circulation for a RM-5-S zoned site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>The petitioner is requesting a Site Plan Amendment to the existing RM-5-S zoned property to convert a portion of Allerton Lake Drive from a one way to a two way private street and to terminate the connection between Allerton Lake Drive and Lakeshore Drive. The permitted use established for this site in 1981 (W-845) and 1992 (W-1794) is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planned Residential Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance History</td>
<td>The request was continued from the November 11, 2010 Planning Board meeting to the December 9th meeting. Because the revised site plan was not received until after the December 2nd Site Plan Resubmittal/Issue Resolution Deadline, the request was continued to the January 13, 2011 meeting. The revised site plan meets UDO requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Contact/Meeting</td>
<td>A meeting with representatives from both Robinwood and Allerton was held on Monday, November 29th in an effort to resolve the outstanding issues. Attached is a letter dated 12-1-10, from the petitioners’ attorney, summarizing the results of that meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Both sides of Allerton Lake Drive between Gatehouse Road and Lakeshore Drive</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>± 1.6 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>This site consists of a portion of Allerton Lake Drive (private) and its adjacent landscaping.</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>RM5-S</td>
<td>Single family homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>RM5-S</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>Southwest</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Mount Tabor High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>RM5-S</td>
<td>Undeveloped property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Characteristics</td>
<td>Brenner Lake Branch runs near the eastern edge of the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater/Drainage</td>
<td>No known issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed and Overlay Districts</td>
<td>The site is not within a water supply watershed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of General Site Information</td>
<td>The site has no apparent constraints and appears to be suitable for the proposed improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Allerton Lake Drive</td>
<td>Local street (private)</td>
<td>441’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatehouse Road</td>
<td>Local street</td>
<td>127’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeshore Drive</td>
<td>Local street (private)</td>
<td>119’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Proposed Access Point(s):** See comments below in the Analysis section.
- **Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed:** The proposed street circulation changes will not result in a change in overall trip generation which is based upon the number of homes in the area.
- **Sidewalks:** There are no sidewalks located in the general area.
- **Transit:** Route 21 along Petree Road directly southwest of the site.
- **Connectivity:** See comments below in the Analysis section.

**Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information**

The proposed Site Plan Amendment relates to the circulation pattern of two private streets within the Robinwood and Allerton Place neighborhoods.

Currently, the subject portion of Allerton Lake Drive serves as the only entrance into the Allerton Place neighborhood which consists of 38 houses. It is a one way entrance. Traffic exiting Allerton Place goes through Lakeshore Drive which is within the adjacent Robinwood neighborhood. Both streets connect into Gatehouse Road which is a short public street that connects to Petree Road.

According to a representative from the Robinwood neighborhood, approximately six years ago three speed bumps were installed on Lakeshore Drive which the Allerton Place residents must drive over to leave their neighborhood. By widening the subject portion of Allerton Lake Drive and converting it to a two way street, the Allerton Place residents (the petitioners) will be able to exit their neighborhood without circulating through Robinwood and going over said speed bumps.
Planning staff is supportive of the request to convert Allerton Lake Drive from a one way street to a two way street.

It should also be noted that the possibility of connecting the adjacent public stub street of Millerwood Drive was studied by City Engineering staff and determined to be unfeasible due to topography.

### CONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy GMA</th>
<th>Growth Management Area 3 – Suburban Neighborhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Legacy Recommendations</td>
<td>• New streets in residential areas must be designed to accommodate all users. Greater connectivity between residential streets would distribute the total traffic, ease congestion and make movement easier for all modes of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant Area Plan(s)</td>
<td>Polo-Reynolda Area Plan, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Plan Recommendations</td>
<td>The Polo-Reynolda Area Plan recommends the subject property for low-density residential development (0-5 units per acre).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing</td>
<td>There are no address numbering or street naming concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(R)(3) - Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition?

Yes, the Robinwood Association installed three speed bumps along Lakeshore Drive approximately 6 years ago.

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

See comments below.

### Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues

The current situation, as discussed in the Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information section above, is an unfortunate by-product of private streets. Legacy recommends greater connectivity between residential streets. Please see Appendix A from The Legacy Toolkit regarding the benefits of street connectivity.

As noted above, staff recommends approval of the request to two-way Allerton Place Drive.

### 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>W-845</td>
<td>R4 &amp; R3 to R3-S (PRD)</td>
<td>Approved 5-4-81</td>
<td>Includes portion of current site</td>
<td>91.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R4 to R3-S (PRD)</td>
<td>Approved 11-2-92</td>
<td>Includes portion of current site</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE PLAN COMPLIANCE WITH UDO REQUIREMENTS

| UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request | • Chapter B, Article II, Section 2-5.60 Planned Residential Developments |
| Complies with Chapter B, Article VII, Section 7-5.3 | (A) Legacy policies: See comments above |
| | (B) Environmental Ord. NA |
| | (C) Subdivision Regulations NA |

| Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements | The site plan meets UDO requirements. |

CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION

| Positive Aspects of Proposal | Negative Aspects of Proposal |
| Request would result in the conversion of a one way street into a two way street. | Mature vegetation in landscaped median within Gatehouse Road will be replaced with younger vegetation. |
| According to WSDOT, the proposed intersection changes at Gatehouse Road and Petree Road will make the proposed two-way access at Gatehouse Road and Allerton Lake Drive safer. | |

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 ANY PERMITS:**
  a. Developer shall obtain a driveway permit from the City of Winston-Salem Public Works Department.

• **OTHER REQUIREMENTS:**
  a. If a grading plan is required a tree save plan will be required.

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.**
Gary Roberts presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR:

Ashley Webb, Gupton & Associates, 2200 Silas Creek Parkway, Suite 2B, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- The main intent of the petitioner is to widen Allerton Place from the one-way to a two-way access.
- In doing that they also want to limit traffic going through the Lakeshore Drive access. One reason for that is there is an existing access easement from Robinwood to Allerton and as a condition of that agreement Allerton is required to pay a portion of the maintenance expenses on Lakeshore Drive.
- Of course if they could completely restrict their vehicular traffic along Lakeshore and allow their traffic to go along this two-way Allerton Drive, they would be able to remove that access easement and save themselves some maintenance costs as they are no longer travelling on Lakeshore.
- One last proposal on the site plan is in widening Allerton Lake Drive to two-way they are being required by Engineering and by Transportation departments to reconfigure that gatehouse intersection which will improve the safety.
- The next thing I'd like to speak to is a letter I believe you should have received from the Robinwood Association dated October 11th. As I was reading this letter it occurred to me that several issues they pointed out in this letter seemed to stem from some misunderstanding between the two associations so I'd like to try to clear up some of those from a technical aspect.
- The first issue raised was questioning any public right-of-way on Gatehouse Road which Gary spoke to in his report. Gatehouse Road is in fact a public street so any of those landscaped islands you saw within that right-of-way, although it is currently maintained by Robinwood, it is actually owned as a public right-of-way.
- I had a conversation a while back with Connie Curtis from the Department of Transportation and she informed me that Robinwood has in fact been irrigating, lighting, and maintaining for a good while but as she goes back and looks through her records come to find out they are "illegally" maintaining this if there is such a thing in that they have not filed any encroachment agreements or maintenance agreements for these areas.
• As this has been brought up, that may need to be done by Robinwood but there is certainly nothing to stop them from continuing to maintain it.

• The next point that they brought up in their letter deals with this landscaping. We just want to point out that the proposed changes we’re making to this intersection at Gatehouse Road, while we are going to do away with some of the current landscaping islands, any of these islands that we are doing away with will be paved over and then we will be removing some different pavement to ultimately provide more natural areas within the right-of-way than currently exist which I think is always a good thing as long as traffic flows nicely.

• In any of these newly natural areas that we’ll be creating, as a condition of the grading permit, Allerton will be required to seed these to prevent erosion and it is also Allerton’s intent to add landscaping back to try to match what is existing there.

• The next point, point number three that Robinwood is making in their letter, deals with the safety which Gary also brought up in the staff report. It’s the opinion of the Engineering Department and also the Department of Transportation that his new intersection at Gatehouse Road with the new alignment of it will as I quote “be an improvement from a safety standpoint” rather than any negative aspect to the traffic flow there.

• The next point deals with the connectivity and the emergency access. The point the portion of Lakeshore Drive that connects Robinwood and Allerton as it is now. As Gary was saying, they’re proposing to install an emergency access gate there. They want to leave it available as emergency access only. As an attempt to improve connectivity though they do want to leave that paved pedestrian walking or biking trail so it’s our opinion that that will still help to connect the two neighborhoods and avoid any sort of divide by allowing free pedestrian connectivity.

• One more point that they make is in the cost of any landscaping or maintenance. As I said earlier, Robinwood has been providing the landscaping and irrigation of this area and they can certainly continue to do that. They may be required to fill out any of those encroachment agreements or anything with the Department of Transportation but they will certainly be able to continue to maintain even any new landscaping that the Allerton folks would provide.

• Another important point that they were concerned with is the relocation of their entry sign. They were concerned with the cost of this relocation and Allerton is proposing to include the relocation of this sign with their construction so long as there aren’t any repairs or additions or anything needed to that sign they do intend to relocate that. I know there was some confusion about whether or not they would be held to, but they do intend to relocate the sign.

• The last point that Robinwood had brought up in that letter is potential access from Millerwood Drive which is to the south of this. It’s a stubbed out street to the south and I believe Engineering did take a look at this and determined that it is not feasible just because of the steep topography that’s existing there. So I just wanted to point that out.

• The Allerton folks have really tried to conform with any of the recommendations and requirements that the Planning staff and all the other departments have asked of us to the maximum extent possible. They’ve offered to add an asphalt overlay on the intersection at Gatehouse Road where they’ll be patching, removing pavement, and adding pavement over the islands so they’ve offered to overlay that as per the City streets.
• The Planning staff asked that they reconfigure the Lakeshore Drive to a “T” intersection and I really don’t know that that’s feasible. We looked at doing that but it’s really not deemed feasible because of the excessive construction costs that it’s going to incur and any easements that would need to be modified for that and it would also undermine adding a second access to the development. It would undermine the gate.
• One other thing was the proposal to relocate the optional gate further in towards Lot 1 of the Allerton development. We’d really like not to do this because of the close proximity to those lots. We don’t really want to place the gate right in front of Lot 1 as it seems to almost isolate Lot 1 from the rest of the community. It would be a much better option I believe if they choose to install that gate if it were installed further out towards Gatehouse Road. In the event that the gate in installed the Allerton folks have agreed as recommended by the City Transportation that they will coordinate access of that gate with any emergency services, garbage services, anything other than the residential traffic that may need access to that gate. They will coordinate with them as far as how they will access that as far as when the gate will be closed, that sort of thing. So I think they’ve really made an attempt to do the best they can with the situation they’ve got.
• That’s about it from a technical stand-point. I’d be glad to answer any questions that anybody may have.

David Murray, 3141 Allerton Lake Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
• I’m the president of Allerton Lake Association and am also a property owner in Robinwood.
• I would like to correct one thing that was said here tonight. I think what was said was that we were doing this because of speed bumps and that’s not correct. That is a reason, but it is not the primary reason.
• 18 years ago the neighborhoods were created and I think at that time the accesses were created. I think Robinwood at that time felt they didn’t have a voice in what was done. I think we still pay for that voice today.
• We’re trying to correct a situation that happened 18 years ago that shouldn’t have happened. It should have been a one-way in and out for Allerton and we should never have come through Robinwood development. That’s what we’re proposing to fix with this street.
• Now people who come to visit us can’t find their way out. They go out the one-way street or they go out through Robinwood and get lost in Robinwood because most people leave a development the same way you came in. It’s confusing and awkward.
• There are financial reasons. There is a maintenance agreement. We pay a yearly fee to Robinwood and we also have paid somewhere in the neighborhood of 58% of all the costs of repaving and the speed bumps. Of course we paid for those too which I hate to admit.
• From another point, the feedback we get from realtors is negative. It’s awkward for people leaving.
• All of that is the reason we’re looking to separate this and taking this part on.
• The effect on Gatehouse Road is that the basic format is the same. All we’re doing is shifting the islands over and separation of the median.
• It’s sad because people cannot visualize what is on a one sheet drawing. I think a year from now when it’s all built people will say, “What was all the to-do about?” It’s a very simple thing.
• I hate that the two neighborhoods are squabbling the way we are about it.

AGAINST:

Brandt Deal, 2990 Bethesda Place, Winston-Salem, NC 27103
• I represent the owners of Robinwood.
• Asked those present who support Robinwood community to stand.
• As stated in Planning staff’s presentation, Robinwood is a single-family planned residential development of 37 lots which was originally platted almost 30 years ago. At that time it was one of the first if not the first green development in the City with emphasis on natural landscaping and the natural beauty. It has won numerous awards for the landscaping and the style of development.
• The entranceway of Gatehouse Road which commences at Petree Road sets the tone and design for Robinwood. As the photographs reveal, though Gatehouse Road is a public street, the Robinwood Homeowners Association has taken great pains and great expense to landscape the entranceway, the sign, to irrigate it, and to even hire an arborist who comes in periodically and trims the trees and maintains it. As you can see from the pictures, it is a spectacular entrance which sets the tone for this neighborhood.
• I would challenge the board to find entranceways for any neighborhood that looks any nicer and more serene than the one going in at Robinwood.
• 12 years after Robinwood was started CB Development Company platted and began construction on Allerton as a single family development. It has 38 lots.
• It’s entrance is off Gatehouse Road. It has been that way for the last 17 years.
• After 17 years, some of the owners of Allerton want in our opinion to alter if not destroy the beauty of Robinwood’s entrance by creating a gated community as proposed today.
• With the exception of three property owners in Robinwood who also have lots in Allerton and whose houses are for sale, all Robinwood residents have signed the petition of opposition to this request.
• To destroy 40’ of landscaped island with mature crape myrtles, azaleas, and lighting to reduce the size and relocate the island where our sign is located and to remove that large specimen oak tree which is over 30 years old so that a neighborhood which has operated this way for 17 years can now become a gated and I suppose more exclusive neighborhood in their estimation is to place too large a burden to place on Robinwood which has been creating and maintaining this neighborhood for over 30 years. To gate off neighborhoods as shown on their plans does not lead to the furtherance of connectivity of neighborhoods as stated as a goal of this board. As stated in staff report, street connectivity reduces emergency response time, aids in evacuation procedures, and vital public services such as postal and sanitation. It has been a stated position of this board that y’all like connectivity. Notwithstanding what they say about the gates being optional, that is the reason this is being done is so that they can gate off their community.
• To have two-way traffic entering Gatehouse Road at Allerton Drive, I know DOT’s opinion is different, but we contend that crossing over Gatehouse and turning left to go onto Petree will create some traffic problems and potentially some accident opportunities.
• I obviously was not involved in the process when this subdivision was first proposed and approved 17 years ago, but I imagine these traffic issues and this pattern of development was considered at the time this subdivision was originally done and the Planning Board and the Board of Aldermen at that time approved it based upon the reasons we feel are obvious.
• This proposal places all the burden on the owners of Robinwood. Though Gatehouse is a public street, the City has not had to spend a dime of taxpayer money maintaining what you have seen. I think it is a gem for the City. You know, this 240 feet divided road which leads from Petree is one of the prettiest in the City and to cut it off and lose 40 feet of it and to change it all we think is a real travesty. Though removing that may reduce some of the cost to the Robinwood Association, they’re here today to say they don’t mind paying for what they’ve got and would like to keep the neighborhood as it is.
• We would respectfully request that the petition we denied.

Betsy Baldwin, 220 Forest Brook Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
• I’m a homeowner and board member in Robinwood.
• I think I speak for my neighbors and myself when I say that we’re concerned about this plan because of what it would do to the natural environment.
• Like me, my neighbors made a conscious decision when we bought in that neighborhood. We didn’t buy majestic homes, we bought a majestic setting.
• We’re really concerned about maintaining and protecting that green space. That is our primary concern here.
• We would like for you to seriously look at the pictures, the photographs, and take our concerns seriously.
• I don’t think we’ve said that there wouldn’t be a compromise but we don’t want that entrance which is a major part of our natural setting to be diminished because we feel that would diminish the overall integrity of the neighborhood and the overall property value of the neighborhood.

Gene Metcalf, 235 Forest Brook Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
• I’ve lived in Robinwood for over 10 years and have also served on the board of Robinwood for about eight of those years.
• As you’ve heard, Robinwood is a very unique and special community. It won awards and accolades when it was designed in 1981 I believe it was.
• Allerton was built some ten years later and it was intentionally built and designed so that they would be connected and continuous communities. That is, they were connected for a reason because it was designed to be a joined community. Because of that when it was built they were given an entrance to one way and then to connect the neighborhoods they exit through our neighborhood. It has been that way for 20 years. There has never been a problem. There has never been an accident to my knowledge.
• The neighborhoods were designed to be together and it has worked well that way.
• The City actually has a policy and this Board has a policy which encourages neighborhoods to be connected.
• What this is really all about is not speed bumps. It is about the desire of Allerton to gate and close themselves off. To make themselves an exclusive, gated community. I would be fine with them doing that, but they’re asking us to pay the price.
• For 30 years Robinwood has maintained and nurtured its landscape including the entranceway. Our single biggest budget item is for landscaping and preservation. In fact, we have a long-term reforestation plan. We pay a professional arborist, not just a tree service company, to come in and care for our trees. That’s how seriously we take our community. That community starts at the entranceway.
• For 30 years we have maintained it. Allerton has not. We are the ones who have done it and we feel like we should be protected from any changes.
• It has worked well. There are now two entrances into Allerton. There’s the one-way entrance or you can come down and enter through our neighborhood.
• From a safety standpoint I think that makes a big difference.
• You asked about compromise. We were never approached for a compromise by Allerton. Allerton never came to us for input before this plan was submitted to the City for approval. Yes there is a compromise and there is another proposal. We asked them to meet with us and we met with them after this was done. We said, “how about putting this on hold and let’s talk about other alternatives?” That was rejected. It’s our way or no way from Allerton’s standpoint, but they want us to pay the price for that.
• It was the entranceway that sold me my house. It is such a unique special place that I drove through the neighborhood. I wasn’t looking for a house, but when I realized what a unique neighborhood this was, I bought my current house.
• This is like living in the country in the middle of the City.
• Our neighborhood starts at our entranceway. We ask that you protect that. We ask that you protect our neighborhood. And we ask that you protect the City’s policy of connectivity.
• If you turn this down, then maybe Allerton may come back and talk to us about other alternatives that there could be.

WORK SESSION

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

1. Allan Younger: One of the concerns was Millerwood Road and whether there would be a better two-way access to Allerton. Looking at the picture, what is that that would occupy where Millerwood Drive would run into Allerton? Gary Roberts: That is a vacant lot and it dips down significantly. The City Engineer looked at that and it is not feasible to extend Millerwood Drive.

2. Lynne Mitchell: If you have a gate, how does a visitor come to see you in the neighborhood? David Murray responded that the gate was an option for the future and that they could have a gated community. There are systems that would allow them to do that.

3. Barry Lyons: I know that Millerwood Drive was originally offered up as a different solution and that’s been taken off the table. Is there any form of reconfiguration which Robinwood would accept that would maybe achieve the same purposes that Allerton is looking for? Brandt Deal: You mean to turn them into a gated community? I’m not sure what the question is. Barry Lyons: I know there’s a desire not to remove the islands or the sign. Is there another option that would achieve it without having to do that? Is there a possibility for a compromise? Brandt Deal: The compromise I think somebody spoke is to the speed bumps. That seems to be a point of contention between the neighborhoods.
We are surely willing to change, remove, reduce the size, the number, whatever that seems to be an issue with the folks at Allerton about the speed bumps. It was done for safety purposes, but I don’t believe there’s been an accident. I don’t know of any and no one in the neighborhood that I’m aware of and maybe the Allerton folks can speak to it, but I don’t know of any accidents that have occurred so I don’t think it’s as big of a problem.

4. Allan Younger: I know where this development is but have never driven into Robinwood. For clarification, are the properties along Maple Hill Court and Lakeshore Drive part of Allerton Place or Robinwood? Brandt Deal: That’s part of Robinwood. Allan Younger: Okay, so when the neighborhood was originally built it was intended for access out of one neighborhood to go through another neighborhood? Brandt Deal: I would suppose so since that road was stubbed.

5. Arnold King asked Gene Metcalf if Allerton folks wanted the speed bumps there, if they were consulted when the speed bumps were put in? Gene Metcalf: I’m not sure about that, but I can say this. There was a problem with people going way too fast from Allerton around our street. While I was on the board we wrote several letters to Allerton asking them to talk to their residents about slowing down as they came through the neighborhood. It never changed so finally we put in some speed bumps just to slow things down. But at our meeting recently we told Allerton that if the speed bumps were the issue then talk to us about speed bumps. We will agree to either lower them, remove some or all of them if that’s what it takes to make this right. We are willing to make compromises. We were never given the opportunity to do that.

6. Arnold King: What’s the objection to them putting a two-way street in and taking the traffic out of your neighborhood? Gene Metcalf: The objection is that they do so at the expense of our entryway. We lose landscaping that has been there for 30 years. We lose at least one majestic oak tree that is a signature tree on our entranceway. Once you cross that entryway from Petree Drive to Gatehouse Road, it is an entirely different community. It just washes over you. What they’re wanting to do is to bump that way down, take out a significant amount of landscaping that we now have, and to install a large amount of pavement. And they are wanting to do that so that they can gate themselves off. The City of Asheville a while back passed a moratorium on gated communities and wouldn’t approve any more. Their reason was that if people were going to live in their community, they wanted them to be part of their community. This is something that isn’t needed. It’s wanted. But we’re being asked to pay the price for it.

7. Arnold King asked David Murray how important this gate is to Allerton? David Murray stated that the gate was not important. As I said before, it’s an option. In response to a question earlier about the curvature of the road, when Robinwood was originally built, all of the land in Allerton was to be part of Robinwood. Part of what is Ridgemere today, part of what was Staunton Court, was all part of Robinwood. After ten years or so, the developers sold it off in pieces. That’s how the road at the intersection, how the two became connected.
8. Arnold King asked David Murray if they would be willing to talk to the folks in Robinwood if we continued this thing for a month and see if you can work out something? David Murray: As president of the association I have access to our files. This has been brought up over the years and the same comments continue to come back. It really comes back to one thing: Robinwood thinks they own what is really a City street. Arnold King: I just want a simple yes/no answer. David Murray: I’m sorry. I think the point, we would sit down with them, look at landscaping, but as far as a road, I don’t know how there is any way to move past that. Yes.

9. Paul Mullican: One person said that Robinwood actually took care of the entranceway. Does Allerton pay anything or maintain any part of the entranceway? David Murray: Part of our property comes up to and abuts Gatehouse Road. We take care of that part. Robinwood maintains the island in the center of the road. There are Duke power lights in there and there is some landscaping. In the fees we pay to them we have been paying half or 51% of their light bill in their neighborhood. That’s how we have paid them money over the years. However that money is used, it is used for Robinwood’s purposes. It may be taking care of landscaping. It may be paying for lights.

10. Lynne Mitchell: I feel like I’m a parent dealing with some quibbling children. I hear both sides and I’d really like y’all to get together and see if you can come to a compromise. At least make a good-faith effort.

11. Arnold King: It’s been going on for 20 years so I don’t think another month is going to hurt anything. I’d like to suggest then that we come back here again next month and we’ll give each of the sides 10 minutes or 5 minutes to present their case instead of going to a full-blown public hearing. Or ask one person to represent each association and take five minutes each next month to tell us their position as to whether they’ve come to any common ground and if not then we can make the decision. Or we can do that today if you want us to.

12. Clarence Lambe: Shared maintenance agreements are difficult. Arnold King: That’s part of the problem here too. Clarence Lambe: I don’t know how you solve that if you don’t grant the second part of this new entrance situation.

13. Arnold King to Board members: What are the issues you would like these folks to address?
   - The gate.
   - The specific amount of landscaping which will come out. I’d like to see a better site plan or something we all could understand to see what the entrance would look like.
   - What landscape is coming out and what’s going in.
   - They need to come to some agreement if that sign’s got to be moved.

Arnold King: I don’t know how we get involved in Allerton paying if they’re
going to move the sign for Robinwood. That is beyond our purview but they need to have some sort of agreement on that. We’re getting into this squabble between neighbors and we’d like you to go see if you can’t work it out and come back next month.

14. Wesley Curtis: Certainly persons from each side can understand the point of view from person of the other side of those points. At least say what they might be willing to compromise a little bit on and try to get to that middle ground. Each side has a valid point of why they think this should or shouldn’t happen. Maybe each side needs to think what little compromise they can make on each of those points that might lead to a compromise. Maybe it’s not there. I think the bottom line today is the petitioner’s decision on whether they want to continue it and work on it or whether they want our vote today. We can certainly do that too.

15. Arnold King asked David Murray and Brandt Deal if each side would be willing to continue it for 30 days.

16. Barry Lyons: I have to say at this point I’d be more inclined to deny it because I do feel the burden is on Robinwood. It seems like there’s been very little give on the part of Allerton and asking an awful lot of Robinwood to give up. In some sense I think they have some sort of claim just because they’ve been there for a while.

17. Paul Mullican: They’re taking traffic off the street though. When I saw this plat I figured Robinwood would be tickled to death. However, if I understand this correctly, that has nothing to do with it. It’s about the entranceway. If we can get some drawings to show us what this landscaping is going to look like, it may help everyone understand it better and come to a meeting of the minds.

18. Arnold King: I would think it could be redesigned and still be attractive.

19. Allan Younger: One of the comments that was made is that the desire for a two-way street is because it’s confusing for people who are visiting Allerton about how to exit. That’s a legitimate concern. However, maybe the discussion needs to include some consideration to directing people out. Is there even a sign to say that this is the way that you exit? That would be a lot less costly.

20. Arnold King asked David Murray if they were willing to continue this 30 days or if they want a vote today. David Murray stated they would be willing to continue this 30 days. Arnold King noted that the Board would leave it up to the petitioner and the Robinwood folks to discuss it and be back in 30 days.
MOTION: Clarence Lambe moved continuance of the Site Plan Amendment to December 9, 2010.
SECOND: Wesley Curtis
VOTE:
    FOR: Wesley Curtis, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Darryl Little, Barry Lyons, Lynne Mitchell, Paul Mullican, Allan Younger
    AGAINST: None
MOTION: Paul Mullican moved continuance of the Site Plan Amendment to January 13, 2011.
SECOND: Wesley Curtis
VOTE:
   FOR: Wesley Curtis, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Darryl Little, Barry Lyons, Lynne Mitchell, Paul Mullican, Allan Younger
   AGAINST: None
CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
PUBLIC HEARING  
MINUTES FOR W-3081  
JANUARY 13, 2011

Gary Roberts presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman King stated: I'll remind everyone. We did have the public hearing. Staff had
recommended approval of this. At the public hearing a couple months ago there were some
concerns expressed by some of the members of the board. We asked the two parties to see if
they could get together and resolve those issues and come back. So we're going to allow five
minutes for each (the proponents and opponents) and ask that each of them designate one person
to represent them and we'll start with the proponents.

FOR:

Page West, 3109 Allerton Lake Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106
- Allerton residents share an attention to natural surroundings and landscaping for our own
  properties and for the common areas and entrance.
- We have a common shared interest with Robinwood ensuring that Gatewood Road
  presents a beautiful entrance. We care deeply about this as much as anyone.
- Reiterated a couple of points from previous packet of information about the proposal.
- The primary purpose of this proposal is to improve access out of Allerton.
- Our proposal also accomplishes a number of other benefits such as improving traffic
  safety at the Gatehouse Road and Petree intersection. It will eliminate unwanted purely
  pass-through traffic in Robinwood along Lakeshore Drive which Robinwood has
  previously complained to us about. It eliminates confusion for folks who are exiting
  Allerton. It improves the aesthetic qualities of the Gatehouse entrance.
- To address earlier questions by Allan Younger and Wesley Curtis about landscaping at
  the entrance, we intend to replant as much as possible of the landscaping that will be
  taken out of the island. More importantly we're going to add approximately 1,000 square
  feet of green space which provides the opportunity for more green plantings which would
  make the entrance that much prettier.
- At our expense we'll reconnect sprinklers to maintain the area.
- We have formally offered the following to Robinwood:
  - A landscaping plan that increases green space and preserves the look and feel of
    the entrance.
• At our expense we will continue to provide power for the sprinkling system which we’ve done all along and we will connect part of the renovated system to Allerton’s own sprinkler system for our common area.
• At our expense we will relocate the Robinwood sign.
• We invite Robinwood to be part of a joint landscaping committee once this initiative goes forward.
• We’re happy to remove any indication of a gate from the plan. In fact that has already been done. This is not about gates and gated communities. We are happy to keep the connection open to Lakeshore Drive to facilitate interconnectivity between the neighborhoods and facilitate City vehicles.
• We also welcome Robinwood residents to use the new two-way Allerton Drive.
• In support of the proposal we have two additional items we’d like to offer for the Planning Board to consider.
• Submitted letters of support from realtors and a petition from Allerton Lake Homes Property Owners. Copies are on file.

AGAINST:

Brandt Deal, 2990 Bethesda Place, Winston-Salem, NC 27103
• A little over a week after the last Planning Board meeting, when we hadn’t heard from the proponents we wrote them a letter saying we would like some specifics about whether speed bumps were an issue, their contributions toward our electric bill, as well as specifics to the plan as it was amended.
• Mallory Oldham is now representing them. She called me and we met with two members each from Robinwood and Allerton.
• They told us then and have said today that speed bumps were not the issue and their contribution toward our electric bill was not an issue.
• We did ask for some specifics and were given none. After that they did file the amended plan. They have presented some of the specifics we requested earlier and at the subsequent meeting.
• At their annual meeting last week, the Robinwood members were presented with the amended plan, looked at it again, and voted to object to the plan.
• Though they have made some changes and amendments to the plan, at the end of the day 125 feet of that 30-some year old median is destroyed, the island is reduced by 50%, and our sign is moved further to the west. We lose a 60-foot tall specimen oak tree.
• Although all these improvements are on City right-of-way, they have been installed and maintained by Robinwood for the past 30 years.
• The entranceway for Allerton in its current configuration was designed that way and has served Allerton for 17 years. Now they want to change their entrance and in their mind enhance their entranceway into the neighborhood. That in and of itself is not bothersome to Robinwood. The problem is that it comes at the expense of Robinwood’s entrance.
• In our opinion there is no over-riding reason to change the status quo and what has served Robinwood for 30 years and Allerton for 17 years. To change this at the expense of Robinwood is unfair.
• We request that the Board recommend denial of the proposal.
WORK SESSION

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

1. Lynne Mitchell: Private streets are always an issue with me. Streets are public. However, Gatehouse is public and all the streets leading onto it are private. From a technical point, if I choose to drive there or walk along the road as an uninvited person, can I be charged with trespassing? What does a private street mean for someone who doesn’t live in the neighborhood? Staff responded that it is private property and if it’s posted a person could be charged. Arnold King said he had never heard of anyone being charged and the main difference would be that private streets are the responsibility of private parties to maintain. Lynne Mitchell: We’re talking about private streets being inviting. Clarence Lambe: Probably the biggest reason they are private now is that they weren’t built to the standards the State has now so the State won’t take them over as public streets. Lynne Mitchell: I’m stretching to try to find rationale for how I will vote on this. That didn’t help me!

2. Allan Younger: Mr. Deal, I want to make sure I understand the concerns of Robinwood. Are the concerns primarily the entrance and loss of landscaping or are there other concerns? Brandt Deal: That is the primary concern. This is an award-winning entrance. Allan Younger: The residents met last week and voted to oppose the landscape proposal, correct? Brandt Deal: Yes sir.

3. Lynne Mitchell: Did you say that when the site plan was revised they mailed it to you for review? Brandt Deal: No, we had to come down here and get a copy of it.

4. Wesley Curtis: The plan we have here does not show the little bump out, but the bulb is there on the revised plan? At the gateway just as you turn into the new road/drive? Gary Roberts: That was removed from the plan once the gate was eliminated. It was needed for turnaround space for drivers who reached that point and didn’t have gate access. With the gate removed it is no longer necessary.

5. Wesley Curtis: I love trees and love the idea of trying to keep natural vegetation that’s been there for some time as much as possible. In my mind a property owner who has property they are trying to develop for a little safer access is a good thing. I certainly applaud the idea of having a joint committee to oversee what is the prime concern here - the greenery, the landscaping. I like the idea of adding a lot more green area than you had before. That’s a good thing. The one thing that is certainly unfortunate is that there is no way to replace that oak. That to me is the casualty in this whole conflict between the two. I guess since I’m on the fence I’ll be leaning to support the petitioner and the staff in approving this particular request.
6. Lynne Mitchell: I really wish y’all could have resolved it where everybody would have been happy and part of compromise is give and take on all sides and I’m not going to pass judgment on who gives and who takes and who doesn’t but it bothers me that it has to come to us to make a decision that y’all couldn’t have worked it out. That’s what I really would have liked to have seen and that really saddens me. But I think as Wesley really stated, you know there was a lot of concessions made in just trying to involve and just to object to something because we don’t... I mean I know what you’re saying and I understand but I’m tending to lean towards approval as well.

7. Paul Mullican: The reason I made a motion to approve it was because I think it is a win-win situation and I think and I’m not going to repeat what Wesley said but I do want to add that the safety of it that the DOT has approved this that it’s going to be a safer entranceway. Landscaping is going to be there. They’re going to make it a nice entrance. Yeah, I hate about the oak tree too, but they’ll plant ... it’ll grow back. And too, the one thing I cannot understand though is I can’t understand why Robinwood isn’t tickled to death to get all this traffic off their street. I just do not understand that but that’s neither here nor there. That’s not my concern, but that was the reason I made my motion.

MOTION: Paul Mullican moved approval of the site plan amendment and recommends staff conditions.
SECOND: Clarence Lambe
FOR: Wesley Curtis, Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Darryl Little, Lynne Mitchell, Paul Mullican, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger
AGAINST: None
EXCUSED: None

[Signature]
A. Paul Norby, FAICP
Director of Planning
DOCKET #: W3081
(continued from 12/9/10)

PROPOSED ZONING:
Site Plan Amendment

EXISTING ZONING:
RM5-S

PETITIONER:
Allerton Place Association Inc.
and CB Development Co. Inc.
for property owned by Same

SCALE: 1" represents 300'

STAFF: Roberts

GMA: 3

ACRES: 1.6

NEAREST
BLDG: 7' south

MAP(S): 612866
PROPOSED ASPHALT & CURB
PROPOSED ISLANDS/LANDSCAPING
EXISTING TREE (TO REMAIN)
EXISTING TREE (TO BE REMOVED)
PROPOSED TREE (LARGE VARIETY)
PROPOSED TREE (SMALL VARIETY)
PROPOSED EVERGREEN SHRUB

GATEHOUSE ROAD LANDSCAPING SUPPLEMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION/TYPE</th>
<th>REMOVED</th>
<th>ADDED</th>
<th>HEIGHT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LARGE VARIETY TREE - OAK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL VARIETY TREE - CRAPSE MYRTLE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL EVERGREEN SHRUBS</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL FLOWERING PLANTS / ANNUALS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Height denotes the height of vegetation at time of installation. All trees must be 2" in diameter when planted and all shrubs must have a mature height of 36" within 3 years after installation.

Landscaping Note:
Removal of existing vegetation should be avoided wherever possible. It is the owner's intent to install new vegetation to match the existing landscape. Removed vegetation may be replanted in place of new plantings where practicable.

LANDSCAPE PLAN
ALLERTON PLACE ENTRANCE STREET

PROJECT NO. 8629-100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PRELIMINARY COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: City-County Planning staff is responsible for coordinating the Interdepartmental Review of Special Use Rezoning Requests; please contact the appropriate Department at the phone # indicated below if you have any questions about the comments or recommendations lists. Further, please note that additional information may be forthcoming from Departments that indicate &quot;See Emailed Comments&quot; or other similar phrase. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROJECT CASE NUMBER:</strong></th>
<th>W-3081</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT TITLE:</strong></td>
<td>Allerton Place Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE:</strong></td>
<td>October 27, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** | Allerton Lake Drive between Gatehouse Road and Lakeshore Drive |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NCDOT- Phone #</strong></th>
<th>336.703.6600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:wturner@ncdot.gov">wturner@ncdot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;No Comment-NSR&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per e-mail from Jeff Turner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature:</strong></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WSDOT- Phone #</strong></th>
<th>336.747.6872</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:conniec@cityofws.org">conniec@cityofws.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Turnaround at the gate is sufficient for a car, but will the gates be up during the day for larger service vehicles such as sanitation trucks and delivery vehicles?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per e-mail from Connie Curtis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature:</strong></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>City Engineer- Phone #</strong></th>
<th>336.747.6846</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:alberteg@cityofws.org">alberteg@cityofws.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Driveway permit req’d. Road plans req’d for review&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per e-mail from Al Gaskill)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature:</strong></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>City Streets Division- Phone #</strong></th>
<th>336.734.1550</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:robbys@cityofws.org">robbys@cityofws.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Repair any damages to Gatehouse Road that occur from construction. I would recommend overlaying the entrance in on Gatehouse Road from Petree Road to the beginning of the second island. As shown drivers will have to cross over three &quot;patches&quot; within 100'.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per e-mail from Robby Stone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature:</strong></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inspections (Zoning)- Phone #</strong></th>
<th>336.727.2626</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeffv@cityofws.org">jeffv@cityofws.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;If a grading permit is required, tree save legend must be included on plan.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per e-mail from Jeff Vaughn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature:</strong></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inspections (Erosion Control)- Phone #</strong></th>
<th>336.727.2388</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeffk@cityofws.org">jeffk@cityofws.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Land Disturbing Permit req’d. If 10,000 sqft disturbed.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per e-mail from Jeff Kopf)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature:</strong></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERDEPARTMENTAL SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Stormwater Division- Phone # - 336.747.6961 Email: josephf@cityofws.org
No Comment
(per e-mail from Joe Fogarty)

Signature

Fire (City)- Phone # - 336.747.7359 Email: kennethw@cityofwsfire.org
“Need 13 feet clear width on all one way streets. Recommend not placing bollards. T intersection of Lakeshore and Allerton Lake Dr. Place gate beyond the T intersection. Remove speed bumps on Lakeshore(slows fire apparatus by 30 seconds for each bump. Need FD Access to gate.”
(per e-mail from Ken West)

Signature

Utilities- Phone # - 336.747.7499 Email: billjs@cityofws.org
“Relocate water main under pavement. Subject to Utilities plan review Authorization to Construct Water or Sanitary Sewer Systems.”
(per e-mail from Bill Shookman)

Signature

Sanitation- Phone # - 336.748.3080 Email: christc@cityofws.org

Signature

Planning- Phone # - 336.747.7043/747.7068 Email: aaronk@cityofws.org
“Staff recommends reconfiguring the intersection of Lakeshore Drive and Allerton Lake Drive and eliminating the proposed bollards to improve connectivity.”
(per e-mail from Aaron King)

Signature

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

Signature

Vegetation Management -336.748.3020 Email: keithf@cityofws.org

Signature

Street Names/Addresses -336.747.7048 Email: benfs@cityofws.org
“No address numbering or street naming concerns.”
(per e-mail from Ben Stamey)

Signature
STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
W-3081
(ALLERTON PLACE ASSOCIATION, INC. AND CB DEVELOPMENT CO. INC.)

The proposed Site Plan Amendment, as revised, to the existing RM-5-S (Single Family Homes) zoned property to convert a portion of Allerton Lake Drive from a one way to a two way private street and to otherwise modify the street configuration and landscaping is consistent with the Legacy Comprehensive Plan and the Polo-Reynolda Area Plan (1985) and is reasonable and in the public interest because:

1. The proposed changes would provide greater connectivity between residential streets and would distribute the total traffic, ease congestion and make movement easier for all modes of transportation;

2. The proposed intersection changes at Gatehouse Road and Petree Road will likely make the proposed two-way access at Gatehouse Road and Allerton Lake Drive safer; and

3. The site has no apparent constraints and it appears suitable for the proposed improvements.
December 1, 2010

Mr. Paul Norby
City/County Planning Director
City of Winston-Salem
100 East First Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27102

Re: Petition of Allerton Place Association, Inc.
Docket No.: W-3081

Dear Paul:

Pursuant to your request, I am writing to advise of the results of a meeting between representatives of Allerton Place Association, Inc. ("Allerton") and Robinwood Homeowners Association ("Robinwood") pursuant to the direction of the Planning Board at its November meeting.

Following the November Planning Board meeting, I contacted Brandt Deal to request a meeting at a time and place convenient for the parties to meet to discuss the issues presented in the case. Two (2) representatives from Robinwood, together with Brandt Deal, and two (2) representatives from Allerton, together with myself, met on Monday evening at Northwest Baptist Church. Prior to this meeting, Robinwood had asked whether the elimination of the speed bumps along Lakeshore Drive and/or Robinwood’s agreement not to ask for a contribution from Allerton for a portion of the electricity for exterior lighting along Gatehouse Road and Lakeshore Drive would alter Allerton’s desire to have a separate two-way entrance and exit onto Gatehouse Road. Robinwood also inquired about the relocation of the existing ground irrigation system and its subdivision sign if Allerton’s proposal was approved.

At the meeting on Monday evening we attempted to answer the questions of Robinwood by advising Robinwood that neither the speed bumps nor the contractual obligation of Allerton to contribute to the common exterior lighting was the basis for Allerton’s desire for its own separate two-way entrance in and to its neighborhood from Gatehouse Road. We also advised Robinwood that Allerton would assume the cost for repairs and/or relocation of the existing ground irrigation system and for the relocation of Robinwood’s existing subdivision sign.

In response to Robinwood’s concern about the modification of the existing landscaping within Gatehouse Road, Allerton indicated that it would relandscape the area as directed by the City of Winston-Salem and would attempt, to the extent it was practical and permissible to do so, to relocate existing landscaping material that will need to be removed or would replace it with comparable vegetation. Allerton also proposed that a joint committee with representatives from
both Robinwood and Allerton be formed to design a suitable landscape plan for the new intersection consistent with applicable laws, rules, ordinances and regulations.

There was some discussion at the meeting about the proposed gate on Lakeshore Drive. While Robinwood expressed that its preference would be to eliminate this gate it is the view of the undersigned that this issue did not seem to be the most important one to Robinwood.

The meeting was adjourned with Robinwood indicating that they would be back in touch with us. Since resolution was not achieved at this meeting Allerton did offer to meet again with representatives from Robinwood prior to the December Planning Board meeting to answer any additional questions or to attempt to reach agreement on changes to the entranceway to the two (2) neighborhoods. I did attempt to reach Brandi Deal earlier today by telephone, however as of the time of the writing of this letter we have not heard back from Robinwood concerning its position. Unfortunately, we did leave the meeting on Monday evening concerned that any proposed modification to Gatehouse Road would be opposed by Robinwood.

Please let me know if any further detail or clarification is needed concerning the results of the joint meeting on Monday evening.

Very truly yours,

BELL, DAVIS & PITT, P.A.

Mallory M. Oldham
To: Allerton Lake Homes Property Owners  
From: David Murray  
Date: November 28, 2010  
Subj: Two-Way Entrance To Our Development  

For some years now Allerton has investigated plans to create a two-way access to our development. Such access would enable residents and their friends to both enter and exit Allerton using Allerton Lake Drive, and to avoid going the circuitous route through Robinwood and its speedbumps.

A design for a slightly-revised entrance enabling this change was recently approved by the City’s transportation and engineering departments. When presented recently to the City-County Planning Board, the decision on rezoning to allow this change to proceed was delayed until next month.

When returning to the next Planning Board meeting on December 9, the Board of Allerton would like to demonstrate to the Board the support of our community for approving this change. We would like to present a petition signed by all homeowners expressing support for the rezoning that would allow for this change.

The attached petition does NOT seek approval by the Allerton Board to begin any construction or to raise fees to pay for any change. It ONLY asks you to express your support for a site plan amendment for street configuration that would give our community (present and future homeowners) the right to proceed with change.

Thank you for your support.
We, the undersigned homeowners and residents of the Allerton Lakes community, support changes in the site plan amendment for street configuration that will allow for a two-way entrance to our community using Allerton Lake Drive.

Name

David J. Murray
Diane Murray
Shirley Morell
Beth H. Morell
J. David Morell
Mike & Debra Berndt
Bret & Mary Carroll
Snell & Mary Carroll
Kimberly Beyer
Dave & Cheryl Cooper
Sue & Mark Cooper
Ray & Les Knight
Paul & Dorothy Lenz
Greg & Rose Nelson
Tom & Madeline Douglass
Kevin & Janet Douglass
Karen & Jim Douglass

Address

3141 Allerton Lake Dr.
3141 Allerton Lake Dr.
3160 Allerton Lake Dr.
3160 Allerton Lake Dr.
3156 Allerton Lake Dr.
3156 Allerton Lake Dr.
3159 Allerton Lake Dr.
3171 Allerton Lake Dr.
3121 Allerton Lake Dr.
3175 Allerton Lake Dr.
3129 Allerton Lake Dr.
3125 Allerton Lake Dr.
3125 Allerton Lake Dr.
3124 Allerton Lake Dr.
104 Brampton Ct.
3184 Allerton Lake Dr.
3186 Allerton Lake Dr.
3145 Allerton Lake Dr.
3137 Allerton Lake Dr.
3137 Allerton Lake Dr.
We, the undersigned homeowners and residents of the Allerton Lakes community, support changes in the zoning and streets configuration that will allow for a two-way entrance to our community using Allerton Lake Drive.

Name
Michael Williams
Nancy Sturgis
Al Long
Phil Matson
Becky Huggins
Hilbert
Margaret Clements
Donnalene Warren
Mary Jan
Paul Dachow
Guillermo Alvarez
Luisa Elena Alvarez
Randi Murray
Liz Murray
Ray Makinen
Eveline Kemper
Peter Kemper
Ivy A. Hardison

Address
3144 Allerton Lake Dr
3100 Allerton Lake Drive
3109 Allerton Lake Dr
3113 Allerton Lake Drive
3149 Allerton Lake Dr
3149 Allerton Lake Dr
3137 Allerton Lake Dr
3105 Allerton Lake Dr
105 Brampton Ct
105 Brampton Ct
101 Brampton Ct
3155 Allerton Lake Dr
3155 Allerton Lake Dr
3128 Allerton Lake Dr
3128 Allerton Lake Drive
3101 Allerton Lake Dr
3167 Allerton Lake Dr
3132 Allerton Lake Dr
3132 Allerton Lake Dr
3117 Allerton Lake Dr

We, the undersigned homeowners and residents of the Allerton Lakes community, support changes in the zoning and streets configuration that will allow for a two-way entrance to our community using Allerton Lake Drive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Mr. John Brown</td>
<td>3148 Allerton Lake Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Franklin Minna</td>
<td>3151 Allerton Lake Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Powell</td>
<td>3120 Allerton Lake Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirebeh Mirzafez</td>
<td>3152 Allerton Lake Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sina Mirzafez</td>
<td>3152 Allerton Lake Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjeh Roshan Manesh</td>
<td>3141 Allerton Lake Dr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emma Graham  
1244 Arbor Road B# 504  
Winston-Salem, NC 27104  
(336) 724-3300  
emmagraham@triad.rr.com

December 7, 2010

Dr. Page West  
BB&T Fellow in Capitalism and Free Enterprise  
Wake Forest University  
Winston-Salem NC 27109-7285

Dear Page:

It was so good hearing from you. I thank you for the complement of wanting my opinion on the proposed new entrance at Robinwood and Allerton communities by making Allerton Lake Drive a two way street.

Both Allerton and Robinwood are beautiful areas with mature trees and popular places to live in Winston-Salem. Although, they are quite different in design, they complement each other. Having been a realtor in Winston-Salem/Forsyth County for 28 years, my professional opinion is that both developments will benefit from the changes to the proposed entrance. Allerton residents should benefit from the easier access to their homes. The Robinwood residents should benefit from considerably less traffic flowing through the entrance of their community. The proposed entrance is esthetically inviting and should be a benefit to all residents. These changes should enhance the value of the homes in both Robinwood and Allerton Communities.

As an aside, I find it most surprising that the Robinwood residents would not be in favor of the proposed plan if only to cut down on the extra traffic at the entrance of Robinwood.

My regards to you and Linda,

Emma Graham, Chairman Emeritus  
Graham and Boles Properties (now part of Prudential)
My name is Jeff MacIntosh. I am a Realtor® with Leonard Ryden Burr real estate in Winston Salem. I am very familiar with the current ingress and egress configuration at Allerton/Robinwood.

It is my opinion that property values in both Allerton and Robinwood are negatively affected by the current configuration. The most obvious negative impacts that are mentioned among buyers and agents about the set up are that it is “confusing” and that it funnels a significant and unnecessary amount of traffic through Robinwood. In any real estate market, and especially in our current climate, you do not want the term “confusing” used in any description of your neighborhood if you are trying to sell your property.

Another, maybe less apparent, impact that the current alignment creates is to negatively impact the “branding” of both neighborhoods. Developers spend time, money and effort to create an image of their product that makes it clear to whom they are marketing. Both Allerton and Robinwood are highly desirable neighborhoods but they are also distinctly different. This difference is muddled by having to travel through one if you live in the other.

By reducing confusion and making a clearer distinction between the two neighborhoods the proposed alignment will, in my opinion, have a positive impact on property values in both Allerton and Robinwood.
To: Paul Norby, City – County Planning Director, Winston-Salem

I would like to submit a letter expressing how beneficial it would be to reconstruct the entrance/exits to Allerton and Robinwood developments.

Over the years, I have had numerous listings in this neighborhood and am currently showing buyers available homes in Allerton Lake. I am well aware of the difficulty in navigating in and out of Allerton and the long term negative effect this has had on property values. When showing properties to prospective buyers, comments are always questioning the ‘twists and turns’ necessary to enter and exit.

I can only imagine that restructuring the current traffic flow would enhance the current properties and their values. This improvement is long overdue and I feel confident that it will truly create a lovely ambiance to both Allerton Lake and Robinwood communities.

Please don’t hesitate to contact me for further information or questions. 760-7273

Mary Preston Yates
Fine Homes Specialist
Chairman’s Circle
Tops in the Triad, 2009
To: Members of the Winston-Salem Board of Zoning Adjustment  
From: Laura Kelley  
Re: Zoning Adjustment Requests for Allerton Place  
Date: December 4, 2010

It has come to my attention that you are in the process of evaluating a zoning adjustment request submitted by the Allerton Place Home Owners Association. I would like to add my support for this request and my professional opinion as a local real estate agent that this adjustment will benefit both Allerton and the adjacent Robin Wood community.

The requested adjustment will make for a much more efficient flow of traffic entering and exiting both neighborhoods. While the current traffic pattern may have made sense at one point, I would like to respectfully suggest that the time has now come to allow for each neighborhood to create separate traffic patterns. I believe that this will only add to property values in both areas.

In addition, I have had clients question the reasoning behind this unique traffic flow when showing properties and I have found myself at a loss on how to respond. They remark that it is very cumbersome to enter and exit the communities.

We are most fortunate to have two lovely and well-designed neighborhoods with Allerton Place and Robin Wood. In this current real estate environment, it is imperative that we do everything that we can to help each community be successful. I believe that this is a win-win proposition for all.
November 11, 2010

HAND DELIVERED

Planning Board
City of Winston-Salem
Winston-Salem, NC

RE: Allerton Proposal

Dear Planning Board Members:

We are residents of the Robinwood neighborhood which adjoins Allerton. Robinwood was developed and built in 1981 as a “green community.” It won awards for the unique way in which it was developed and for preserving all of the woods and natural habitat. Only those areas necessary for building roads and the footprints for houses were disturbed. The rest of our community remained natural. If you have ever visited our neighborhood you can appreciate how unique and special it is. If you have not had the chance to visit, we invite you to do so. The entrance to our neighborhood is Gatehouse Drive which intersects Petree Road near Mount Tabor High School. As a community we have maintained the entrance and paid the cost of landscaping for over 30 years. In fact, just this past year we paid a professional arborist to prune the beautiful trees that were preserved and line our entrance way. We have always taken great pride in our neighborhood and have worked hard to maintain it.

In the early 1990’s the Allerton neighborhood was developed next to Robinwood. Allerton uses the entrance to Robinwood to connect to their neighborhood. Allerton has now submitted a proposal to the City Planning Board to expand their roadway, install a gate and change the entrance to their neighborhood. Allerton’s proposed expansion would totally alter and change the entrance to Robinwood. It would also result in significant additional paving at the expense of our beautiful natural setting. Some of the beautiful large trees which we have maintained at our entrance would be lost. In addition to the loss of our neighborhood’s natural beauty, we believe that it would decrease our property values. It is the preserved natural setting of our neighborhood which creates and enhances the value of our homes. It took great effort to create the natural setting in Robinwood and we have worked very hard for the past 30 years to maintain it. The present entrance and exit to Allerton has worked well since it was developed in the 1990’s. It is not necessary to change the entrance. It is a desire by Allerton to change the entrance which comes at the expense of the Robinwood community. As homeowners and as a neighborhood which has worked hard to preserve its beauty, we respectfully request that the proposal by Allerton to change the entrance be denied.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Montgomery</td>
<td>101 Maple Hill Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Wise</td>
<td>101 Maple Hill Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Wilner</td>
<td>109 Maple Hill Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Haye</td>
<td>105 Maple Hill Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Thuring</td>
<td>105 Maple Hill Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Lenn</td>
<td>3025 Lakeshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Kersky</td>
<td>3025 Lakeshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Hale</td>
<td>3019 Lakeshore Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas H. Harle</td>
<td>3017 Lakeshore Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Miller</td>
<td>3005 Lakeshore Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Lee Miller</td>
<td>3005 Lakeshore Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Floyd</td>
<td>3013 Lakeshore Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Freedman</td>
<td>3009 Lakeshore Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Nelson</td>
<td>3001 Lakeshore Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Zhong</td>
<td>3001 Lakeshore Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sue Hagan
236 Forest Brook Drive

Tom Miller
235 Forest Brook Drive

Lauren McCartney
235 Forest Brook Drive

Allan Reynolds
3008 Lookout Ct.

Jane Martin
3013 Lookout Ct.

Margaret Y. orig
3016 Lookout Court

Debra T
3016 Lookout Court

B J Hering
3012 Lookout Ct.

Tom Hillman
3012 Lookout Ct.

Virginia Hebbert
212 Forest Brook Drive

Judith
212 Forest Brook Drive

Kim Byers
3009 Lookout Ct.

NAME
ADDRESS

NAME
ADDRESS

NAME
ADDRESS

NAME
ADDRESS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Jackson</td>
<td>3021 Lakeshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Williams</td>
<td>3021 Lakeshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>