CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD DRAFT STAFF REPORT

	PETITION INFORMATION			
Docket	W-3659			
Staff	Rory Howard			
Petitioner(s)	Walter T. Wilson and Helen S. Wilson			
Owner(s)	Same			
Address	3078 Sides Road			
Subject Property	PIN 6823-75-8215			
Type of Request	Special Use Rezoning			
Proposal	The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Map for the subject property from Residential, Single Family on at least 9,000 square feet of land (RS9) to Residential, Multifamily – maximum of 8 units per acre, Special Use Zoning (RM8-S). The petitioner is requesting the following uses: Residential Building, Single-Family Residential Building, Duplex Residential Building, Twin Home Residential Building, Townhouse Residential Building, Multifamily Planned Residential Development Library, Public 			
Neighborhood	• Child Day Care Center A summary of the petitioner's neighborhood outreach is attached.			
Contact/Meeting				
Zoning District	The RM8 District is primarily intended to accommodate duplexes, twin			
Purpose Statement	homes, townhouses, multifamily, and other low intensity multifamily			
Statement	uses at a maximum overall density of eight (8) units per acre. This district is appropriate for Growth Management Areas 2 and 3 and may be suitable for Metro Activity Centers where public facilities, including public water and sewer, public roads, parks, and other governmental support services are available.			
Rezoning	Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of the			
Consideration	requested zoning district(s)?			
from Section	Yes, the proposal is for a multifamily development located in GMA 3			
3.2.19 A 16	with direct access to a collector street and public utilities.			
	GENERAL SITE INFORMATION			
Location	The site is located along the west side of Sides Road, south of West Clemmonsville Road.			
Jurisdiction	Winston-Salem			
Ward(s)	Southeast			
` /				

Current Land Use		The site is currently undeveloped and is mostly cleared. An electric power transmission line runs along the southern and western portion of the subject property.							
Surrounding		Direction			Zoning Dist	rict	Use		
	Property Zoning		North		HB-S		Retail Store		
and Use		South			RS9		Utilities		
		East			RS9		Single-family homes		
							and a utility power		
		XX .			D (C 1 D	1	station		
Dharainal			Vest		Peters Creek Par		Public right-of-way		
Physical Character	ictics	The sit	e is mostry	cieai	red and is relativ	ery mat.			
Proximity		Public	water and s	2W/21	r are available a	long Sides	Road		
Water and		1 done	water and s	C 44 CI	are available a	iong bides .	.coud.		
Stormwate		The sit	e plan depic	ts o	ne proposed stor	rmwater ma	nagement de	evice,	
Drainage					n the southern p			,	
Watershed	l and				within a water s			lay district.	
Overlay D									
Analysis o					at, largely cleare				
General Si					gits southern an		_	J	
Information	on				by single-famil				
		Peters Creek Parkway. One stormwater device is proposed on-site and the site will be served by public water and sewer.							
					ONING HISTO				
C	D						D	l - 4 ²	
Case	Requ	iest	lest Decision Date		Direction from Site	Acreage	Recommendation Staff CCPB		
W-3124	RS9 to	HR-S	Withdray	7 n	Subject	8.80	Denial	Denial	
VV-312 4	W-3124 RS9 10		12/08/201		Property 8.80		Demai Demai		
W-3025	W-3025 RS9 to I		RM8-S Approved		Northeast	8.68	Approval	Approval	
			4/6/2009						
	SITE	ACCE	SS AND TI	RAN	SPORTATION	N INFORM	IATION _		
Street Name		Classification			Street Maintenance	Frontag		Capacity at Level of Service D	
Sides Road		Collector Street			WSDOT 684 fee		N/A	N/A	
Peters Creek		Expressway			NCDOT 691 fee		27,500	49,000	
Parkway Proposed Access Point(s)		The site plan proposes the construction of one new driveway connection to Sides Road, which would access the proposed parking area.							

Trip Generation -	Existing Zoning: RS9					
Existing/Proposed	42 potential single-family homes x 9.57 (Single Family Detached					
Existing/1 Toposcu	Housing Trip Rate) = 401.94 Trips per Day					
	110using 111p Rate) = 401.94 111ps per Day					
	Proposed Zoning: RM8-S					
		(Anartme	ent Tr	in Rate) = 431.36 Trins Per Day	
Sidewalks	64 apartment units x 6.74 (Apartment Trip Rate) = 431.36 Trips Per Day Sidewalks are proposed along the site frontage of both Sides Road and					
Side walks	Peters Creek Parkway. The site plan illustrates required sidewalks along					
	the internal parking areas, as well as connections to the future sidewalk					
	along Sides Road and Peters Creek Parkway.					
Transit				•	of West Clemmonsville	
	WSTA Route 101 stops at the northeast corner of West Clemmonsville Road and the on-ramp to Peters Creek Parkway northbound,					
	approximately 630 feet north of the subject property.					
Analysis of Site	The site has direct access				•	
Access and	private driveway connection					
Transportation	Parkway, an expressway.	Sidewalk	s are	propose	ed along the entirety of	
Information	both road frontages, with i	nternal si	idewa	lks pro	viding a connection to	
	both. The trip generation r					
	does not present a signific	ant increa	ase fro	om the	trip generation of the	
	single-family homes allow				*	
	PLAN COMPLIANCE V	VITH UI	OO R	EQUIR	REMENTS	
Building	Square Footage		Placement on Site			
	8 apartment buildings, each Throughout the northern and co					
Square Footage		each	Inr	_		
	containing 8 units			po	ortions of the site	
Parking	containing 8 units Required	Pro	opose	ро d	ortions of the site Layout	
	containing 8 units	Pro		ро d	Layout Ninety-degree parking,	
	containing 8 units Required	Pro	opose	ро d	Layout Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed	
Parking	containing 8 units Required 110 spaces	Pro	opose	ро d	Layout Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings	
	containing 8 units Required 110 spaces Maximum	Pro	opose	ро d	Layout Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed	
Parking Building Height	containing 8 units Required 110 spaces Maximum 48 feet	Pro	opose	ро d	Layout Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet	
Parking Building Height Impervious	containing 8 units Required 110 spaces Maximum 48 feet Maximum	Pro	opose	ро d	Layout Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage	Containing 8 units Required 110 spaces Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70%	Pro 153	opose 8 spac	po d es	Layout Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28%	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections	Containing 8 units Required 110 spaces Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% • Section 4.5.12: RN	153 153 1-8 Resid	opose spac	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Samily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% Section 4.5.12: RN Section 5.2.71: Re	153 153 1-8 Resid	opose spac	po d es	Layout Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28%	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% • Section 4.5.12: RN • Section 5.2.71: Re Standards	Pro 153 1-8 Residential	spac spac lentia Build	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Samily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% Section 4.5.12: RN Section 5.2.71: Re Standards Chapter 6: Develor	Pro 153 1-8 Resid sidential	spac spac lentia Build	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Samily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request Complies with	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% • Section 4.5.12: RN • Section 5.2.71: Re Standards	Pro 153 1-8 Resid sidential	spac spac lentia Build	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Samily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% Section 4.5.12: RN Section 5.2.71: Re Standards Chapter 6: Develor	1-8 Residential	spac spac lentia Build	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Samily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request Complies with	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% Section 4.5.12: RN Section 5.2.71: Re Standards Chapter 6: Develop (A) Forward 2045 policies (B) Environmental Ord.	1-8 Residential	spaces sp	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Samily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request Complies with	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% • Section 4.5.12: RN • Section 5.2.71: Re Standards • Chapter 6: Develor (A) Forward 2045 policies	1-8 Residential	space	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Camily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request Complies with	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% Section 4.5.12: RN Section 5.2.71: Re Standards Chapter 6: Develop (A) Forward 2045 policies (B) Environmental Ord.	1-8 Residential	spaces sp	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Camily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request Complies with	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% Section 4.5.12: RN Section 5.2.71: Re Standards Chapter 6: Develop (A) Forward 2045 policies (B) Environmental Ord.	1-8 Residential	spaces sp	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Camily District	
Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request Complies with	Maximum 48 feet Maximum 70% Section 4.5.12: RN Section 5.2.71: Re Standards Chapter 6: Develop (A) Forward 2045 policies (B) Environmental Ord.	1-8 Residential	spaces sp	po d es	Ninety-degree parking, adjacent to the proposed buildings Proposed 32 feet Proposed 28% Camily District	

Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements	The site plan illustrates the development of eight apartment buildings containing a total of 64 units. One new driveway connection to Sides Road is proposed, adjoining a parking area surrounded by buildings which is located in the northern and central portions of the property. Sidewalks are planned along both sides of internal parking areas, and the required Type II Bufferyard against the single-family zoned property to the south is provided. Streetyards are also proposed along both road frontages. In addition, one 18,952 square foot common recreation area is proposed in the center of the parking area. The site plan meets all other						
	UDO requirements.						
	ONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES						
Forward 2045 Growth Management Area	Growth Management Area 3 – Suburban Neighborhoods						
Relevant Forward 2045 Recommendations	 Prioritize density, diversity of uses, and connectivity in areas served by existing infrastructure. Locate higher-density housing near services, schools, workplaces, and transit. Encourage infill development where public services and infrastructure are available. 						
Relevant Area Plan(s)	South Suburban Area Plan Update (2018)						
Area Plan Recommendations	 The Proposed Land Use Map recommends single-family residential development (0-8 dwelling units per acre) for this property. Develop a variety of housing types for different income levels, family sizes, and personal preferences. Goods and services should be available near where people live and work. 						
Site Located Along Growth Corridor?	The site is located along the Peters Creek Parkway Growth Corridor.						
Site Located within Activity Center?	The site is not located within an activity center.						
Rezoning Consideration	Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition?						
from Section	Yes.						
3.2.19 A 16	Is the requested action in conformance with <i>Forward 2045</i> ?						
	Yes.						

Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues This request is to rezone an 8.80-acre parcel from RS9 to RM8-S to allow for a greater variety of residential housing types. The site plan proposes a development with eight buildings containing a total of 64 apartment units.

The request aligns with several recommendations of *Forward 2045* by prioritizing higher-density housing near existing infrastructure and public services. It would expand the local housing supply and offer additional housing options along the Peters Creek Parkway Growth Corridor. The site layout emphasizes pedestrian connectivity, with internal sidewalks that tie directly into required sidewalks along both Sides Road and Peters Creek Parkway.

While the proposed use is inconsistent with the Area Plan's parcel-specific recommendation for single-family residential development at this location, the plan also encourages a variety of housing types to accommodate different income levels, family sizes, and personal preferences. The proposed density is consistent with the Area Plan's recommendation, and the development would be served by public water and sewer, located between an expressway and a collector street, and adjacent to a designated growth corridor. For these reasons, staff believes the proposal is generally consistent with the *South Suburban Area Plan Update*.

CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION					
Positive Aspects of Proposal	Negative Aspects of Proposal				
The request is consistent with the general	The request is inconsistent with the parcel-				
recommendations of Forward 2045 and the	specific land use recommendations of the				
South Suburban Area Plan Update to prioritize	Area Plan.				
higher density housing close to services and					
transit.					
The request would encourage a variety of					
housing types for different income levels, family					
sizes, and personal preferences.					
The request would allow for residential					
development of a site located along a collector					
street in the serviceable land area.					

SITE-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

The following conditions are proposed from interdepartmental review comments to meet established standards or to reduce negative off-site impacts:

• PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF INFRASTRUCTURE PERMITS:

a. The developer shall obtain a commercial infrastructure permit from the City of Winston-Salem; additional improvements or fee-in-lieu may be required prior to issuance of the commercial infrastructure permits. Required improvements will include installation of sidewalks along Sides Road and Peters Creek Parkway.

b. Developer shall submit a stormwater management study submitted for review by the City of Winston-Salem. If required, an engineered stormwater management plan shall be submitted and approved by the City of Winston-Salem.

• PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS:

a. The proposed building plans shall be in substantial conformance with the submitted elevations as verified by Planning staff.

• PRIOR TO THE SIGNING OF PLATS:

 All documents including covenants, restrictions, and homeowners' association agreements shall be recorded in the office of the Register of Deeds.

• PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE(S) OF OCCUPANCY:

- a. Developer shall complete all requirements of the infrastructure permit(s).
- b. Buildings shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the approved building elevations as verified by Planning staff.
- c. Any required "as-built" plats shall be recorded with the Register of Deeds.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval

<u>NOTE</u>: These are **staff comments** only; the City-County Planning Board makes <u>final</u> recommendations, and <u>final action</u> is taken by the appropriate Elected Body, which may approve, deny, continue, or request modification to any request. **THE APPLICANT OR**REPRESENTATIVE IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC HEARINGS WHERE THE CASE WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING BOARD AND THE ELECTED BODY.

CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES FOR W-3659 SEPTEMBER 11, 2025

Rory Howard presented the staff report.

Mr. Pitt inquired about screening requirements along Sides Road. Mr. Murphy explained these requirements and noted staff suggested developing several single-family homes along Sides Road to the developer.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR: Brennan Mahoney, the petitioner and representative for the developer.

• Mr. Mahoney provided a brief overview of the proposed plan.

Mr. Mahoney responded to Mr. Pitt's inquiry regarding screening along Sides Road by clarifying that single-family homes are not part of the developer's business model. Mr. Mahoney explained that the petitioner is pursuing multifamily housing to help address the area's housing shortage and noted that they are seeking Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) funding for the project. Mr. Murphy reminded the Board of their responsibilities to consider the applicable land use policies when making a recommendation on this case rather than the proposed price point of the units. Mr. Mahoney and staff further explained the provisions and requirements associated with the LIHTC program.

AGAINST:

Ms. Rachel Sides

Ms. Sides opposed the rezoning request due to the potential increase in traffic in the area.
 She also expressed concerns that the proposed development could limit the appreciation of her home.

Mr. Adolph Curtin

• Mr. Curtin opposed the proposed rezoning due to the potential for an increase in traffic in the area.

Ms. Katurah Wilson

• Ms. Wilson also expressed concerns related to additional traffic in the area.

WORK SESSION

MOTION: Clarence Lambe recommended that the Planning Board find that the request is

consistent with the comprehensive plan.

SECOND: Salvador Patiño

VOTE:

FOR: Walter Farabee, Haley Gingles, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Salvador Patiño,

Dixon Pitt, Lindsey Schwab, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman

AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None

MOTION: Clarence Lambe recommended approval of the zoning amendment.

SECOND: Salvador Patiño

VOTE:

FOR: Walter Farabee, Haley Gingles, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Salvador Patiño,

Dixon Pitt, Lindsey Schwab, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman

AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None

Chris Murphy, AICP/CZO

Director of Planning and Development Services