CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD STAFF REPORT

| | PETI | TION INFORMATION | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Docket | W-3544 | | | |
| Staff | Marc Allred | | | |
| Petitioner(s) | Hatcher Associates Inc | | | |
| Owner(s) | Same | | | |
| Subject Property | PIN 6829-92-5350 | | | |
| Address | 563 Old Hollow | v Road | | |
| Type of Request | Special Use district rezoning | | | |
| Proposal | The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Map for the subject property <u>from</u> RS9 (Residential Single Family) <u>to</u> NB-S (Neighborhood Business – Special Use). The petitioner is requesting the following uses: • Services A; Residential Building, Single Family; and Offices. | | | |
| Neighborhood Contact/Meeting | • | he petitioner's neighborhoo | | |
| Zoning District | | t is primarily intended to ac | | |
| Purpose | intensity office, retail, and personal service uses close to or within | | | |
| Statement | residential areas. The district is established to provide convenient locations for businesses which serve the everyday household needs of | | | |
| | nearby residents without disrupting the character of the neighborhood. The district is not intended to accommodate retail uses which attract customers from outside the neighborhood or which primarily cater to motorists. This district is intended for application in GMAs 2, 3, 4, and 5. | | | |
| Rezoning | Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of the | | | |
| Consideration | requested zoning district(s)? | | | |
| from Section | Yes, the uses being proposed would serve the area while protecting | | | |
| 3.2.19 A 16 | nearby residences from the impacts of intense commercial uses. | | | |
| | CENER | AL SITE INFORMATIO | V | |
| Location | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | North side of Old Hollow Road, west of Germanton Road. City of Winston-Salem | | | |
| Ward(s) | Northeast | | | |
| Site Acreage | ± 0.98 acres | | | |
| Current | Single-Family Residential | | | |
| Land Use | | | | |
| Surrounding | Direction | Zoning District | Use | |
| Property Zoning | North | RS30 | Undeveloped Land | |
| and Use | East | RS9 and RS30 | Germanton Road | |
| | South | LB | Services A | |
| | West | RS9 | Single Family Residential | |

| Rezoning Consider | | Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity? Yes, both Services A and Offices would be allowed in the LB zoned property to the south. These uses are also appropriate near residential areas. | | | | | - |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| from Sec 3.2.19 A | tion | | | | | | he LB zoned |
| Physical Characte | eristics | The site is mostly flat with a gentle slope to the northwest. The existing house, two accessory buildings, and connecting driveway occupy about | | | | | |
| | | a quarter of the property. The remaining area consists of a lawn with a few small ornamental trees. | | | | | |
| Proximit | v | The site has access to public water and sewer on Old Hollow Road. | | | | | ollow Road. |
| Water an Stormwa Drainage | ter/ | No known issues exist for this site. | | | | | |
| Watersho Overlay | ed and | The site is not located within a water supply watershed. | | | | | |
| Analysis General | of Site | The subject property includes a single-family home with frontage along Old Hollow Road. The property has good topography and is not located | | | | nd is not located | |
| Informat | ion | with | | pply watershed | | | |
| Case | Reque | st | Decision & | NT ZONING I | Acreage | | ımendation |
| Cuse | reque | 5c | Date | from Site | ricreage | Staff | ССРВ |
| W-2596 | LB to HI | B-S | Approved; 2/3/2003 | 220 feet to the south | 0.51 | Approval | Approval |
| W-2589 | LB to HI | B-S | Approved; 12/2/2002 | 50 feet to | 1.12 | Approval | Approval |
| W-2228 | RS9, RS and RM1 NSB-S | 2 to | Denied; 9/7/2011 | 260 feet to the east | 3.45 | Approval | Approval |
| | | | ESS AND T | RANSPORTA | ATION INI | FORMATIC | N |
| Street | Name | Clas | ssification | Frontage | Average Daily Trip Count | | ity at Level of ervice D |
| | Iollow NC-66 | Major Thoroughfare | | 144 feet | 6,100 | | 15,300 |
| | nanton /NC-8 | Major Thoroughfare | | 251 feet | 9,200 | | 18,200 |
| Proposed Point(s) | | The only proposed access point will be off Old Hollow Road. | | | | | |
| Proposed Improve | ments | The developer is being required to realign the driveway to the western portion of the property | | | | | |
| Trip Gen Existing/ | eration - Proposed | Existing Zoning: RS9 One single-family home x 9.57 (SFR trip rate) = 9.57 trips per day | | | | | |

| | Proposed Zoning: NB-S 872 sf / 1,000 sf = 0.872 x 44.32 (specialty retail) = 38.65 trips per day | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Sidewalks | No new sidewalks are being proposed as part of this development. One existing internal sidewalk will connect the building with the parking lot. | | | | |
| Transit | Transit is not available in this area. | | | | |
| Analysis of Site | The site has frontage along | | | proughfares. The existing | |
| Access and | | | | dge of the property due to its | |
| Transportation | | | | n Road and Old Hollow Road. | |
| Information | The Services A use is not expected to generate any negative traffic | | | | |
| | impacts. | | | | |
| | PLAN COMPLIANCE W | TTH U | DO RE | _ | |
| Building | Square Footage | | Placement on Site | | |
| Square Footage | 872 | | Western portion of the property. | | |
| Parking | • | ropose | | Layout | |
| | • | spaces | S | 90-degree head-in | |
| Building Height | Maximum | | | Proposed | |
| | 40 feet | | No change in height from existing | | |
| - | 7.5 | | one-story structure | | |
| Impervious | Maximum | | | Proposed | |
| Coverage | No Limit | | | 17.76% | |
| UDO Sections | Section 4.6.5: Neighborhood Business District | | | | |
| Relevant to | Section 6.1.2 Off-Street Parking Requirements | | | | |
| Subject Request Complies with | (A) Legacy 2030 policies: | Yes | | | |
| Section 3.2.11 | | | | | |
| | (B) Environmental Ord. N/A | | | | |
| | (C) Subdivision Regulations N/A | | | | |
| Analysis of Site | The request would convert a single-family home into a beauty shop. Th | | | • | |
| Plan Compliance | total proposed building square footage will not change from what | | | | |
| with UDO | currently exists on site (872 square feet). The residential structure was | | | | |
| Requirements | built in 1939 and was originally adjacent to Germanton Road. With the creation of the Eastern Leg of the Northern Beltway, however, the right-of-way of Germanton Road was expanded. The petitioner is proposing a | | | | |
| | | | | • | |
| | | | | | |
| | privacy fence, along with vegetation to the exterior side of the fence as an alternative to the 15' Type II Bufferyard on the western side of the primary structure. A 15' Type II Bufferyard is proposed along the remainder of the western and northern property line, and a required | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | streetyard is included to the east of the proposed parking area. | | | | |
| CO | ONFORMITY TO PLANS | | | | |
| Legacy 2030 | | | | | |
| Growth | Growth Area Management 3 – Suburban Neighborhood | | | | |
| Management | | | | | |
| Area | _ | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Relevant | Increase infill development in the serviceable land area. | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Legacy 2030 | Recycle and reuse land and buildings. | | | |
| Recommendations | | | | |
| Relevant Area Plan(s) | North Suburban Area Plan Update (2014) | | | |
| Area Plan Recommendations | This plan calls for the creation of new commercial opportunities and the improvement of existing commercial areas that blend with existing development and do not infringe on nearby neighborhoods. Commercial areas should be compact with limited access to major thoroughfares and should not promote strip development. The reuse of vacant buildings and the redevelopment of existing undeveloped and underutilized sites is recommended, where possible. | | | |
| Site Located | The site is not located along a growth corridor. | | | |
| Along Growth | | | | |
| Corridor? | | | | |
| Site Located | The site is not located within an activity center. | | | |
| within Activity | | | | |
| Center? | | | | |
| Comprehensive | U-2579, also known as the Eastern Leg of the Northern Beltway around | | | |
| Transportation | Winston-Salem, realigned and widened Germanton Road between the | | | |
| Plan Information | new beltway and Old Hollow Road. As part of this project, a roundabout | | | |
| _ ,,,,, | was installed at the intersection of Germanton Road and Old Hollow | | | |
| | Road. | | | |
| Rezoning | Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the | | | |
| Consideration | petition? | | | |
| from Section | Yes, the Northern Beltway interchange will lead to more traffic along | | | |
| 3.2.19 A 16 | nearby thoroughfares which in turn will create more pressure for | | | |
| 3.2.17 11 10 | commercial development in this area. | | | |
| | Is the requested action in conformance with <i>Legacy 2030</i> ? | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Yes. | | | |
| Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues | This request would rezone property from RS9 to NB-S to allow for a beauty shop. The proposed site plan depicts the existing 872 square foot building, along with an accessory unit in the rear yard and eight parking spots to the east of the principal building. | | | |
| | The reuse of an old single-family residence as a small neighborhood business is in line with <i>Legacy</i> recommendations, as well as the <i>North Suburban Area Plan Update's</i> recommendation for new low-impact commercial opportunities in this area. | | | |
| | The proposed development allows for needed commercial development while preventing future strip-style development in the area. As the current planning policy for the area was developed prior to the Beltway becoming a reality, it does not consider significant commercial activity | | | |

at this intersection. Future planning efforts would be necessary to evaluate the appropriateness of additional, comprehensively-planned commercial development in the area.

| CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Positive Aspects of Proposal | Negative Aspects of Proposal | | | |
| The request includes the reuse of an | | | | |
| existing building | | | | |
| It provides a new commercial opportunity | This proposal could lead to additional requests | | | |
| for the area | for strip commercial development in the area. | | | |
| The request provides infill development in | | | | |
| the 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 GRADING PERMITS:

- a. The developer shall obtain a driveway permit from the City of Winston-Salem and NCDOT; additional improvements may be required prior to issuance of the driveway permits. Required improvements include:
 - Installation of new driveway with required amount of minimum pavement.
 - A three-party encroachment agreement with owner, NCDOT, and Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Utilities.

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-3544 SEPTEMBER 8, 2022

David Reed presented the staff report.

George asked if the property that is immediately next to this and is in our interchange plan is expected to go commercial as well. David advised that there are about three houses to the west of this site that might have similar conversion requests. We would expect those properties to come in for similar low-intensity use conversions, keeping some of the residential character and using the houses for offices or Services A.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR: None

AGAINST: None

WORK SESSION

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

consistent with the comprehensive plan.

SECOND: Jason Grubbs

VOTE:

FOR: George Bryan, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Mo McRae, Salvador

Patiño, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman

AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None

MOTION: Clarence Lambe recommended approval of the ordinance amendment.

SECOND: Jason Grubbs

VOTE:

FOR: George Bryan, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Mo McRae, Salvador

Patiño, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman

AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None

Chris Murphy, AICP/CZO

Director of Planning and Development Services