

**CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD  
STAFF REPORT**

<b>PETITION INFORMATION</b>	
<b>Docket</b>	W-3529
<b>Staff</b>	<a href="#">Tiffany White</a>
<b>Petitioner(s)</b>	Hubbard Realty of Winston-Salem, Inc.
<b>Owner(s)</b>	Same
<b>Subject Property</b>	PINs 6803-48-8148, 6803-38-5166, and 6803-47-3375
<b>Address</b>	801 Somerset Drive, 2450 and 2515 Lockwood Drive
<b>Type of Request</b>	Special Use rezoning
<b>Proposal</b>	<p>The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Map for the subject property <b>from</b> RS9 (Residential, Single Family – 9,000 sf minimum lot size) <b>to</b> RM5-S (Residential, Multifamily - 5 units per acre maximum density – Special Use). The petitioner is requesting the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult Day Care Home; Child Day Care, Small Home; Family Group Home A; Residential Building, Duplex; Residential Building, Single Family; Residential Building, Twin Home; Swimming Pool, Private; Planned Residential Development; Residential Building, Townhouse; Utilities; and Child Day Care, Large Home</li> </ul>
<b>Neighborhood Contact/Meeting</b>	A summary of the petitioner’s neighborhood outreach is attached.
<b>Zoning District Purpose Statement</b>	The RM5 District is primarily intended to accommodate low density, pedestrian-oriented sites and communities containing duplexes, twin homes, multifamily, and townhouse residential buildings with three or four units, and similar residential uses at a maximum overall density of five units per acre. This district is intended for GMAs 2 and 3 and may be suitable for GMA 4 and Metro Activity Centers where public facilities, including public water and sewer, public roads, parks, and other governmental support services, are available.
<b>Rezoning Consideration from Section 3.2.19 A 16</b>	<b>Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of the requested zoning district(s)?</b>
	The proposed density is less than five units per acre, and the site is located along a major thoroughfare. The site is also located within GMA 3.
<b>GENERAL SITE INFORMATION</b>	
<b>Location</b>	South side of Somerset Drive, west of Sparkling Place and east side of Lockwood Drive, north of Caraway Lane
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	Winston-Salem
<b>Ward(s)</b>	Southwest
<b>Site Acreage</b>	± 88.08
<b>Current Land Use</b>	The site is currently undeveloped.

<b>Surrounding Property Zoning and Use</b>	<b>Direction</b>	<b>Zoning District</b>	<b>Use</b>	
	North	RS9	Single-family homes	
	East	RS9	Single-family homes	
	South	RS9	Single-family homes	
	West	RS9	Single-family homes and undeveloped property	
<b>Rezoning Consideration from Section 3.2.19 A 16</b>	<b>Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity?</b>			
	Considering the central location of the townhomes within the project and the self-contained site design, the proposed residential uses are compatible with the residential uses permitted on the surrounding properties.			
<b>Physical Characteristics</b>	The site is undeveloped and heavily wooded. It slopes downward from the northeast to the southwest. There are multiple streams on the property to the west and south, and portions of the property are in the flood zone and floodway.			
<b>Proximity to Water and Sewer</b>	Public water and sewer are available along many roads adjacent to the property. There is a sewer main that crosses the southern portion of the property.			
<b>Stormwater/ Drainage</b>	The proposed site plan shows three stormwater management facilities in various locations throughout the site. A stormwater management study will be required.			
<b>Watershed and Overlay Districts</b>	The site is not located within a water supply watershed.			
<b>Analysis of General Site Information</b>	The undeveloped site is in a single-family residential setting and has some development constraints specific to streams and designated floodplains.			
<b>RELEVANT ZONING HISTORIES</b>				
There are no relevant zoning histories in the general area.				
<b>SITE ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION INFORMATION</b>				
<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Classification</b>	<b>Frontage</b>	<b>Average Daily Trip Count</b>	<b>Capacity at Level of Service D</b>
Somerset Drive	Minor Thoroughfare	370 feet	5,300	15,800
Lockwood Drive	Local Street	320 feet	N/A	N/A
<b>Proposed Access Point(s)</b>	The site will have a primary access onto Somerset Drive and a secondary access onto Lockwood Drive.			
<b>Planned Road Improvements</b>	An unfunded project with right-of-way dedication would connect Stratford Road and Ebert Road, realigning Somerset Drive with Kimwell Drive. WSDOT will require an eastbound right slip lane and a westbound left turn lane on Somerset Drive in association with this proposed development.			
<b>Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed</b>	The submitted Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) projects approximately 1,931 trips per day. See TIA analysis comments below.			

<b>Sidewalks</b>	Sidewalks are required along one side of the proposed streets. The proposed site plan shows sidewalks along one side of the new internal streets. Payment-in-lieu will be made for the sidewalk required along Somerset Drive.	
<b>Transit</b>	There is no transit service currently available in this area.	
<b>Connectivity</b>	The project proposes to connect to Somerset Drive to the north and Lockwood Drive to the south. Environmental constraints prevent other external connections. Internal connectivity is sufficient.	
<b>Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA)</b>	<p>This site is proposing a combination of 115 single-family homes and 101 townhomes, totaling 216 homes. This is expected to generate approximately 1,931 trips per day, with approximately 136 of those trips arriving during the AM peak and 177 in the PM peak. The AM peak trip generation breakdown is 38 vehicles entering and 98 vehicles exiting. During the PM peak, the breakdown is 107 vehicles entering and 70 vehicles exiting.</p> <p>Expected trip distribution is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 percent to and from the north on Stratford Road</li> <li>• 25 percent to and from the south on Stratford Road</li> <li>• 25 percent to and from the north on Jonestown Road</li> <li>• 10 percent to and from the east on West Clemmonsville Road</li> </ul> <p>Per the TIA, the development will add an additional 43 PM peak left turns and 21 PM peak right turns. Given the trip distribution and turn lane warrant analysis, WSDOT will require a left turn lane and a right slip lane at the Somerset Drive entrance. The left turn lane will have a minimum of 25 feet of storage and an appropriate design speed taper, and the right slip lane will widen from zero to 12 feet over a 100-foot distance.</p>	
<b>Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information</b>	The site will be accessed primarily from a minor thoroughfare that has ample capacity. Required improvements on Somerset Drive will allow for turning into and out of the site.	
<b>SITE PLAN COMPLIANCE WITH UDO REQUIREMENTS</b>		
<b>Units (by type) and Density</b>	115 single-family homes and 101 townhomes on 88.08 acres = 2.5 units per acre	
<b>Building Height</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
	40 feet	Two stories
<b>Impervious Coverage</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
	N/A	23.27 percent
<b>UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4.5.13: RM5 District</li> <li>• Section 5.2.71: Residential Building, Multifamily; Townhouse; or Twin Home (use-specific standards)</li> </ul>	
<b>Complies with Section 3.2.11</b>	<b>(A) Legacy 2030 policies:</b>	Yes
	<b>(B) Environmental Ord.</b>	Yes
	<b>(C) Subdivision Regulations</b>	Yes

<b>Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements</b>	The site plan shows 115 single-family homes and 101 townhomes fronting along new internal public streets. The townhomes are internal to the site and surrounded by single-family homes. Required buffering along streams and wetlands has been provided, along with a greenway easement along Little Creek.
<b>CONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES</b>	
<b>Legacy 2030 Growth Management Area</b>	Growth Management Area 3 - Suburban Neighborhoods
<b>Relevant Legacy 2030 Recommendations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage a mixture of residential densities and housing types through land use recommendations.</li> <li>• Increase infill development in the serviceable land area.</li> <li>• Promote standards requiring high-quality design for infill development that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.</li> <li>• Promote quality design so that infill does not negatively impact surrounding development.</li> </ul>
<b>Relevant Area Plan(s)</b>	<i>Southwest Suburban Area Plan Update (2015)</i>
<b>Area Plan Recommendations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan recommends single-family (0-8 du/ac) residential uses at this location.</li> <li>• Low-density attached residential development has a density of up to eight (8) dwelling units per acre. Generally, low-density attached residential land use is recommended for sites greater than two acres that are most appropriately developed with multifamily, townhouses, duplex, triplex, or quad units.</li> </ul>
<b>Site Located Along Growth Corridor?</b>	The site is not located along a growth corridor.
<b>Site Located within Activity Center?</b>	The site is not located within an activity center.
<b>Rezoning Consideration from Section 3.2.19 A 16</b>	<b>Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition?</b>
	No.
	<b>Is the requested action in conformance with <i>Legacy 2030</i>?</b>
	Yes.

<b>Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues</b>	<p>The request would accommodate 115 single-family homes and 101 townhomes fronting along new internal public streets. The surrounding development pattern is single-family residential in character.</p> <p><i>Legacy</i> recommends a variety of housing types when designed in a complementary manner with the surrounding context. The proposed density is consistent with the number of detached homes allowed under the current zoning and recommended in the area plan. The scale of the townhomes is compatible with the nearby single-family homes. The site is accessed primarily from a minor thoroughfare with a secondary access onto a local street.</p> <p>Given the specific setting of the site and the proposed design, the request is consistent with <i>Legacy</i> and the area plan and serves as a good opportunity for infill residential development.</p>
--	---

**CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION**

<b>Positive Aspects of Proposal</b>	<b>Negative Aspects of Proposal</b>
The proposed density is comparable to allowable development under the current zoning.	The area plan recommends single-family use of the site.
The scale of the proposed units is compatible with the nearby single-family homes.	
Somerset Drive is a minor thoroughfare with existing capacity for this development.	
The request is consistent with <i>Legacy</i> in that it would offer a variety of housing choices in the area with a context-sensitive design.	

#### **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 THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:**
  - a. Developer shall have 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. Relocation or installation of any stormwater management device into any buffer areas, vegetated areas designated to remain, or in close proximity to adjacent residentially zoned land shall require a Staff Change approval at minimum and may require a Site Plan Amendment.
  - b. Developer shall obtain a driveway permit from the City of Winston-Salem; additional improvements may be required prior to issuance of the driveway permit. Required improvements include:
    - Construction of an eastbound right slip lane, widening to 12 feet in width over 100 linear feet along Somerset Drive;
    - Construction of a westbound left turn lane with 25 feet of storage along Somerset Drive;
    - Dedication of right-of-way 30 feet from the centerline of Somerset Drive; and
    - Payment in lieu of required sidewalk along the Somerset Drive frontage.
- **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS:**
  - a. Developer shall record a plat in the office of the Register of Deeds. The plat shall show tentative building locations and all common open space, as well as all access, greenway, and utility easements.
  - b. Developer shall record a negative access easement along Somerset Drive and Lockwood Drive.
  - c. The proposed building plans shall be in substantial conformance with the submitted elevations as verified by Planning staff.
- **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF OCCUPANCY PERMITS:**
  - a. Developer shall complete all requirements of the driveway permit.
  - b. Buildings shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the approved building elevations as verified by Planning staff.

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

**NOTE:** These are **staff comments** only; the City-County Planning Board makes **final recommendations**, and **final action** 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-3529  
MAY 12, 2022**

Tiffany White presented the staff report.

Melynda asked about other opportunities for connectivity with this development. She pointed out that there seem to be other streets that stub up close to the subject property and wondered about the reasoning for not making those connections. Tiffany deferred to Luke Dickey with Stimmel Associates.

Mo McRae asked whether activity other than grading would occur in buffer areas, and Tiffany again deferred to Mr. Dickey.

George Bryan's question about the quality of Lockwood Drive was referred to Jeff Fansler (WSDOT).

George Bryan then asked whether any of the proposed houses will be built beneath the level of the water that is in the surrounding area. Tiffany indicated that none would be built in the floodplain and explained the topography of the area. She later clarified that the homes are proposed to be built at a higher elevation than an existing pond to the south.

George then asked whether there have ever been complaints about stormwater runoff from residents in the area. Tiffany indicated that the stormwater division will require a stormwater management plan that will be reviewed and permitted. Their staff did not raise any concerns about flooding at Little Creek.

Jack Steelman asked whether a lower speed limit could be implemented for the proposed development's primary street because of its potential to be used for cut-through traffic. The question was referred to Mr. Fansler.

In reference to Melynda's earlier question about connectivity, Desmond added that there are topographical challenges with crossing Little Creek, and streets that appear to stub to the subject property actually stop short because of an intervening private driveway along the eastern boundary.

Jeff Fansler then responded to questions about access to the western leg of the Northern Beltway and addressed concerns that had been mentioned earlier. George asked for clarification regarding the TIA's consideration of the Northern Beltway in its calculation of trip destination, and Jeff indicated that the Beltway was referenced in the traffic analysis.

Jeff explained the options for establishing a lower speed for this neighborhood's traffic, including a pre-established limit of 25 miles per hour and making use of the City's traffic calming program. He then further explained the mechanisms of that program at the request of the Chair.

George asked whether any turning lanes were proposed at the intersection of Lockwood Drive and Jonestown Roads and whether staff had discussed it with the developer. Jeff responded that the challenge in those situations is trying to require a developer to make improvements so far away from the frontage they occupy. He said that WSDOT should be held accountable for making necessary improvements because they are tasked with ensuring traffic safety.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

FOR:

Luke Dickey, Stimmel Associates, 601 North Trade Street, Suite. 200, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

- We're representing True Homes (the developer), and Jeff Guerruer is also here representing True Homes. [Mr. Dickey made a presentation before the Board.]
- The site has some limited frontage on Somerset and on Lockwood to the south. I'm not sure who would use it as a cut-through because you have the connectivity of Somerset that goes directly to Jonestown and Stratford unless it's somebody from the actual vicinity that's trying to cut through to avoid some other traffic in the surrounding neighborhoods.
- The existing zoning is RS9, so based on zoning, the maximum number of lots permitted is 426; that equates to about 4.84 units per acre. This site has some constraints, so we know that you won't be able to achieve that from an overall design. Before you is a request to add the use of townhouses.
- True Homes is looking at a different type of product, so they want to be able to maximize the different types of uses on this site. There are 115 single-family lots and 101 townhomes. The single-family lots are basically around the perimeter, with the townhomes on the inside along with the common recreation area. Wherever we have single-family homes surrounding this site, there are single-family homes backing up to it. The proposed density is 2.45 units per acre, which is very comparable to the overall density of the surrounding neighborhoods. Huntington Woods is about 1.8 units per acre. Ashford Drive is about 2.2 units per acre, and there, a PRD was approved. Creekshire is about 3.45 units per acre just a little bit up off Somerset. If you look at the overall density, for the most part, it's at 2.2 units per acre, so we are right in that area.
- We have a 15-foot Type II bufferyard because we are asking for RM5 zoning. If we stay RS9, we don't have any buffer requirements. Multifamily apartments will not be a permitted use that has been stuck from the zoning request environmental sensitivity.
- Approximately 37 acres out of the total 88 acres are to be undisturbed, so 42 percent. Of course, the majority of that is within the floodplain area and stream buffers around the site. We could push the limits a little bit further, but we're not proposing to do that at all with this. We're staying out of those areas, avoiding the wetlands.
- We are keeping all of our grading out of the stream buffers. On our site plan, we're actually showing 100-foot stream buffers. Stormwater management is going to be required for the site just based on the development density. I know the neighbors are probably having problems because the existing ponds weren't designed for the times that these developments were done. The drainage area was probably dammed so they could create a



pond. We've kept everything away from those areas. We make sure we're treating all the water from our site into the stormwater ponds. None of the water from our site would go up into anywhere off Lockwood Court or Huntington Woods or Ashford because everything flows down to Little Creek.

- We sent out 433 invites within the 500-foot buffer that goes around the site, and we did an online Teams meeting. Fifty people signed on to attend. We've had multiple phone calls and emails on this; we tried to be as responsive as possible to the overall requests for information and just walked them through the process of what this is. The overall design and proposed density is compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods, the request is consistent with *Legacy* and the area plan recommendations, and staff recommends approval.
- I will mention that we could have the option to come in as an RS9 PRD, and basically small lot sizes replace all the townhouses that we're showing in the middle. The site plan would be the same; We'd still have the same connection up at Somerset. We'd have the connection down to Lockwood as well. That would result in about 190 single-family lots, kind of what we are showing here today. Right now, I think the traffic analysis says about 1,900 trips, and 190 lots would actually be about 1,800 trips, so it would be a minimal reduction if we go all single-family.

George Bryant asked Mr. Dickey whether the developer had contacted the City for help with the lack of viable alternative access so they could make some improvements that would make this development for everybody. After Mr. Dickey explained the steps taken by the developer to comply with traffic safety requirements, George asked whether the City had offered any help. Mr. Dickey indicated that it had not to date.

Bruce Hubbard, Hubbard Realty, 1598 Westbrook Plaza Drive, Suite 200, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- I grew up in Winston-Salem and have been involved with the real estate business personally since 1975, and we have been involved with many developments in the community.
- We're very knowledgeable about land development activity. We realize that every home that is built creates more traffic. We understand that and defer to the experts on traffic.
- We're here to build a wonderful community, and we've had a lot of experience in doing that. We are very fortunate to have a builder like True Homes and to have a land planner such as Stimmel Associates.

Royal Hindshaw, Davenport, 119 Brookstown Avenue, Suite PH1, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

- We prepared the traffic impact analysis for the site. I really just wanted to let you know that I'm available here to answer any questions if you have any.

George asked Mr. Hindshaw for his analysis of the safety of the proposed access points. Mr. Hindshaw highlighted what the traffic consultants had done to address safety concerns, specifically at the proposed access from Somerset Drive. George then asked for Mr. Hindshaw's analysis of the impacts of the Northern Beltway on the local traffic network. Mr. Hindshaw explained that the Northern Beltway was accounted for when determining trip distribution. He indicated that the presence of the highway should not impact local (internal) traffic circulation.

AGAINST: None

Samuel Villegas, 2581 Lockwood Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- I live there with my wife, and we have lived there for 44 years. I hope you have watched the video we submitted and read the letter submittals. We oppose this zoning change.
- The staff says the area plan recommends single-family use, and there's no compelling reason to change that recommendation to multifamily, high density. It's out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. The so-called secondary entrance for this development is Lockwood Drive, a 25-mile-per-hour undivided street with no sidewalks. It would turn Lockwood Drive into an unwalkable thoroughfare. A number of serious accidents have been pointed out that occurred at the corner of Lockwood and Jonestown Road. You'll hear more about that later.
- Keep the character of the surrounding neighborhoods as it is and deny this zoning request. It's just unsafe and adds too much traffic 800 trips per day to Lockwood Drive. [Mr. Villegas asked those in attendance who were opposed to the request to stand. Most attendees stood.]

Elizabeth Carter, 2621 Lockwood Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- I oppose the rezoning request.
- I'm speaking on behalf of the many residents of the Lockwood and Huntington Woods neighborhoods who have serious concerns about pedestrian safety. Lockwood Drive and surrounding streets are identical to when my family built the home in the mid 1960s. It is a narrow street with no center lane dividing, no curbs, no gutters, and of course no sidewalks. Mailboxes are at the edge of the pavement. We, when possible, maintain lawns to the pavement edge.
- Over decades, stormwater has flowed down the street to the dead end and floodplain below, cutting low areas and deep ditches in some places.
- This and other streets in the established neighborhoods are used frequently and on a daily basis for exercise, often with dogs, children, bikes, tricycles, and even the occasional baby stroller. Large vehicles, such as school buses, delivery vans, and landscaping trucks with trailers, most often drive the same center of the street because of the aforementioned issues.
- In summary, these neighborhood streets are our sidewalks. Please consider our serious safety concerns and vote no.

Preston Corbett, 1624 Briar Lake Circle, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- In February 2011, I set up a Facebook page for Huntington Woods. One of the biggest problems that has surfaced through the last few years is water outages. We've had 20 water outages that have been posted on that Facebook page during that period of time. I can only imagine that addition of these 233 homes is going exacerbate that particular problem.
- Another concern of mine is the unauthorized utilization of the three private ponds that are on the boundaries of the subdivision (to the south of the development). My lot incorporates about a third of the Briar Lake, so I have a great concern about unsupervised children from the subdivision fishing or swimming in the pond and the liability it presents. Furthermore, the six homeowners bordering Briar Lake have gone to great lengths to landscape and beautify the pond to make it a peaceful, bucolic place for all the neighbors to enjoy. The tranquil setting will be deeply impacted by the additional traffic that will result from the proposed subdivision residents that are trying to avoid the queue that will inevitably form

at the corner of Lockwood and Jonestown, especially when you have people coming to Lockwood from the other side trying to turn left. There are going to be a lot of wrecks there.

- Finally, I would like to speak to what Mr. Bryan was referring to about these ponds. In 2020, epic rains flooded both lakes and were spilling over the entire length of the dam on the bigger pond down there. Any subdivision built on this land is almost surely going to have to build a bridge to accommodate the kind of water going over there. Otherwise, another pond is going to be created, or it's going to flood that particular pond, too. I believe the connection to Lockwood Drive is an unacceptable solution, and I vehemently oppose that connection there.

Hank Ballard, 2532 Huntington Woods Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- I am deeply opposed to this development.
- A couple of things have come up while I have been sitting here. The density question has been brought in as a high point for this development; however, of the 88 acres that they're looking at developing, almost half of that cannot be developed. They can't count a floodplain in a density quotient, so their actual density is 5.3 units per acre and not the information they've given you before.
- Also, the traffic study that they've done for Lockwood Drive has it misidentified. They have the sizes wrong. It's not built for this kind of development. There's no way the road will survive their construction. Lastly, they have been very forthcoming about the development, however, the information they gave us originally has been changed. They sold us one bill of goods and have changed it to something else. It needs to be around the same size as our neighborhood homes anywhere from 2,500 to 4,500 square feet. The ones they're leading with now are 1,600 square feet. You've got a 40-foot lot that they are going to try to put a house on. With setbacks, the house can only be 25 feet wide. You can put a two-car garage with a five-foot door or a single-car garage. That was not what they originally brought up in the development questions when they provided this information to us.

Joseph Anderson, 1862 Lake Point Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- [Mr. Anderson made a presentation before the Board.]
- A lot of this has to do with the lack of access, and that's been pretty much admitted here to you. These two access points are just not feasible, and we're here to ask you to keep it at RS9. They're here to ask you to change it to something different, and I submit to you that they have the burden to convince you that it can be done in a good and safe way at this location. It can't. This is Lockwood Drive, it's a narrow undivided road with lots of pedestrians and kids learning how to ride bikes. That's a 25-mile-per-hour speed limit, dog walkers and hardly any traffic currently. They're talking about putting an additional 800 car trips per day, and this is all going to go up to a dangerous intersection with 45-mile-per-hour Jonestown Road.
- Now, Jonestown Road is busy. It's a gateway to Starbucks and Highway 421 to Downtown. It's the gateway to the east to Stratford Road, Food Lion, restaurants, and Hanes Mall. There've already been numerous, numerous, numerous, and numerous accidents at that location, and that is without adding 800 car trips per day. It's not a good fit. It's dangerous. Somerset Drive is a busy road with high speed travel, and there have been 81 accidents in the last few years between Jonestown and Stratford alone on that road because people speed

on Somerset; a lot of these are injury accidents. They're talking about adding 1,200 car trips per day. I'm running through accidents that have happened here just in the last few years without adding another 1,200 car trips per day. Now, they come to Somerset at Jonestown if they come out to the left, the gentleman said that would be the most dangerous direction to come out of this proposed development. They go down a steep hill and end up at Jonestown. This is an uncontrolled intersection already, where there are already numerous accidents. Here's a picture I took driving home about a week ago. Another crash right there at the corner. It's just common knowledge, and here are more crashes without adding 1,200 more cars per day.

- Ladies and gentlemen, if you do this, there will be cars backed up all the way from Jonestown down Somerset all the way to the exit of this development. That's what's going to happen, and that's a fact. Now, let's look at the actual proposed entrance. We all call it "DEAD MAN'S CURVE" because people have died there. They're talking about putting an entrance near my house now. I understand they've moved it a little bit, and they're going to try to move to make the sight lines a little bit less dangerous, but that's where they are talking about putting it, and there have been numerous accidents there already. This is without adding 1,200 cars per day.
- Ladies and gentlemen, high-density rezoning should be denied. It doesn't make common sense.

Lisa Garcia, 1005 Somerset Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- I'm on the higher end of Somerset Drive. towards Jonestown, and I have witnessed a crash right in front of my house where a young lady was coming up Somerset and lost control of her vehicle and flipped her car over practically in my driveway. I work at the hospital, so I ran out and helped her. Numerous accidents have happened, and my kids play in my driveway. They ride their bikes, and school buses pick them up in front of our houses, and so many times cars are zooming past. I realize that the fire station is down the road, and the police department is right down the road on Somerset, which need to use that as an access, but the speed limit currently is 35 miles per hour. People do not go 35 miles per hour on our road, but go upwards of 45-50 miles per hour especially coming down the road and back up past my house. Once they get to Jonestown Road, they could turn left or right. Typically, if there's any additional traffic, that can be backed all the way to my house, which is pretty far from that corner, and my concern is with my kids going to school riding these school buses. The traffic is not being controlled, and there's not a light at the top or bottom of Somerset to get onto Stratford Road. I'm worried that my kids are going to be in the street getting run over. There's going to be dogs, pets, and animals from that wooded area are going to be in the roads. More accidents and more people having more difficulty with their families that's my concern.

Daryl Hawkins, 2277 Ashford Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- I'm also a local realtor here and have been for several years, I understand the need for housing more than a lot of other people. However, this is not the answer we need in this area.
- The safety concern that you've heard from all of these people is overwhelming. Our house is the first house on Somerset Drive. There's only one way in and one way out. When we come out on Somerset from Ashford, we can go straight across onto Brandywine, left, or right. I make those trips everyday, multiple times, and when you come out, you've got to play a sort of Russian Roulette to get out safely. This is only going to get worse with 1,200

trips on our side, the Somerset side. You've got traffic coming from both ways on Somerset, and you have 105 homes in Ashford that have to come out that way. A lot of those homes I don't believe got the invitation if I looked at the map correctly. They're back in the back part of Ashford, so I don't think they really got and have seen all of the information about what's happening with Somerset Heights.

- I just plead with you: All of the numbers that you have seen are true. We see them every day; it's a grandprix across there. The cops and traffic go down one curve and up a hill. They're flying, and all those kids are on the upper end of Somerset. It's just too dense in there, so I plead with you to say no.

Donna Probe, 2500 Lockwood Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- My dad is 87, so I'm here representing him.
- His property is right across from where the entrance will be coming out. Basically, what I would like to state is that the storm drainage on his property is at the very end of the road on Lockwood, and there is so much water when it really rains. It's like a lake down at the bottom. I am concerned about the storm drainage.

## **WORK SESSION**

Jason Grubs asked about the traffic impacts of uses allowed without rezoning compared to the proposed uses for this petition and whether they tend to generate more or fewer trips per day than residential development. Jeff indicated that there were too many variables to be able to say with any certainty.

Clarence Lambe wanted to clarify whether the property could accommodate up to 190 units through the subdivision process without rezoning. Chris Murphy explained the subdivision and Planned Residential Development process and verified that more than 190 units were possible through those processes, but the developer's designers had determined that 190 was the most practical number.

George Bryan expressed that the case is difficult because the land is going to be developed someday, but he didn't know how to solve the traffic safety issues or ensure that Lockwood Drive would be improved to accommodate additional traffic. He asked whether the petitioner was willing to work with the City to improve Lockwood Drive.

Mo McRae replied that the petitioner should not be responsible for making additional public improvements alone. The petitioner has almost a landlocked site; he has two access points, and he is doing the best he can with those two points.

Jason Grubs added that the Board's scope is limited to evaluating request within the framework of legacy and determining whether a proposed use is reasonable for a particular area. He pointed out that the solutions to planning problems often require better road infrastructure, and sometimes better planning can facilitate better infrastructure, but the Board is not being asked to evaluate that.

Melynda echoed Jason's comment and emphasized that additional traffic or potential traffic hazards cannot be the sole basis for the Board's decisions. She then asked Mr. Dickey whether they had explored all options for additional connectivity. She did not feel comfortable with the

traffic from this development being let out onto a curvy road (in one instance) and a neighborhood street.

Mr. Dickey indicated that they had and pointed out topographical challenges to the west and south, as well as an intervening property to the east preventing more navigable connections

Chris Leak reiterated that the property is likely to be developed, and the challenge for the Board is determining its consistency with the plans in place. Mo added that the Board heard the concerns that had been brought forward and let the audience members know that the Board's vote is a recommendation that goes before the City Council with another public hearing.

Jason reassured those in the audience that, the City Council will be in a better position to do something about the traffic than the Planning Board.

MOTION: Mo McRae recommended that the Planning Board find that the request is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

SECOND: Clarence Lambe

VOTE:

FOR: Melynda Dunigan, Walter Farabee, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Mo McRae, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman

AGAINST: George Bryan

EXCUSED: None

MOTION: Mo McRae recommended approval of the ordinance amendment.

SECOND: Clarence Lambe

VOTE:

FOR: Walter Farabee, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Mo McRae, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman

AGAINST: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan

EXCUSED: None

---

Chris Murphy, AICP/CZO  
Director of Planning and Development Services