### CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD STAFF REPORT

	PETI	TION INFORMATION		
Docket	W-3567			
Staff	Marc Allred			
Petitioner(s)	WR Hutchings Construction, LLC			
Owner(s)	Same			
Subject Property	PIN 6847-89-8458			
Type of Request	Special Use rezoning			
Proposal	<ul> <li>The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Map for the subject property <u>from</u> RS9 (Residential Single Family – 9,000 square feet minimum lot size) <u>to</u> RM8-S (Residential, Multifamily – 8 units per acre). The petitioner is requesting the following uses:</li> <li>Residential Building, Multifamily; Residential Building, Single Family; Residential Building, Duplex; Residential Building, Townhouse; Residential Building, Twin Home; and Planned Residential Development</li> </ul>			
Neighborhood Contact/Meeting	A summary of t	he petitioner's neighborhoo	d outreach is attached.	
Zoning District	The RM8 District is primarily intended to accommodate duplexes, twin			
Purpose	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 site is in GMA 3 and has adequate access to public			
3.2.19 A 16	infrastructure.			
	GENERAL SITE INFORMATION			
Location	Northeast corner of the intersection of Old Walkertown Road and			
	Dippen Road.			
Jurisdiction	Winston-Salem and Forsyth County (Pending City Annexation)			
Ward(s)	Northeast			
Ward(s) July 2023	Northeast			
Site Acreage	± 7.19 acres			
Current	The site is currently vacant land. The site was previously the location of			
Land Use	a nursing care facility that was demolished during construction of the Northern Beltway.			
Surrounding	Direction	Zoning District	Use	
Property Zoning	North	RS9	Vacant land	
and Use	South	RS9	Church and vacant land	

		East	RS9		Agric	cultural land
		West	N/A		-	ern Beltway
Rezoning	ŋ	Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request				
Consider		compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity?				
from Sec		_	sidential Buildir			-
3.2.19 A	16		in the vicinity.			
	-	1 1	land, large lot s		-	-
		south. The closest multifamily district is approximately <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> mile to the southeast along New Walkertown Road.				
Physical					lat due to it	s former use for a
Characte	eristics		cility. The site do			
		northern end.			j	
Proximit	tv to	Public water and sewer are available to the property.				
	nd Sewer	r done water and se wer are available to the property.				
Stormwa		The property ge	enerally drains to	the north. T	here are no	stormwater
Drainage	e	The property generally drains to the north. There are no stormwater devices currently proposed for this development. If the site is annexed				
U			Winston-Salem			
			rements. The sit			
		stormwater controls as the proposed development would result in a net				
		decrease in impervious area from the previous nursing care facility				
		development. The developer will need to provide additional				
		documentation to verify compliance with the Stormwater Division.				
Watersh	ed and	The site is not located within a water supply watershed.				
Overlay						
Analysis		The subject property is currently vacant and generally flat due to its				
General		previous use for a nursing care facility. The site has adequate access to				
Informat	tion	public utilities and is not located within a water supply watershed.				
			ANT ZONING	1		
Case	Reque			Acreage		nmendation
		Date	from Site		Staff	ССРВ
			rior rezonings e			
a.		ACCESS AND				
Street	t Name	Classification	Frontage	Average	-	city at Level of
				Daily		Service D
				Trip		
011111	11 .			Count		10.000
	lkertown	Major	556'	7,000		18,200
	oad	Thoroughfare	4021	<b>NT</b> / 4		
Dippe	n Road	Collector Street	483'	N/A		N/A
Proposed Point(s)	d Access	The proposed si	ite plan shows a	single acces	s point from	1 Dippen Road.
Proposed	l Road	No additional road improvements are required for the proposed				
-		development.				
Improve	ments	development.				

Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed	Existing Zoning: RS9 7.19 acres = 34 potential homes(RS9) x 9.57 (single-family trip rate) = 325.38 trips per day					
	325.38 trips per day					
	<u>Proposed Zoning: RM8-S</u> 56 units x 6.65 (apartment trip rate) = $372.40$ trips per day					
Sidewalks	Sidewalks are proposed on one side of the internal private street. No additional sidewalks are existing or proposed along either public road frontage.					
Transit	No transit opportu	nities exis	t in this area	•		
Analysis of Site	The proposed site plan depicts a single vehicular access point and					
Access and				ivity between the parking area		
Transportation	and the apartment buildings. No sidewalks exist or are proposed along					
Information	either public street frontage. There is no public transit available in the area.					
	The number of trips generated by this development would be					
				n developed under the current		
	RS9 zoning district. The anticipated traffic generation is not expected to have a significant impact on the capacity of this section of Old					
				of this section of Old		
STTE	Walkertown Road. PLAN COMPLIANCE WITH UDO REQUIREMENTS					
Building	PLAN COMPLIANCE WIT			Placement on Site		
Square Footage	· · ·		The two-	The two-story building is on the eastern		
~ que e a compe	5,552 square feet.		portion of the site.			
	(4) – three story buildings		The remaining three-story buildings are			
	(4) - unee story b	81101118				
	of 6,460 square fe	-		in the northern and southern		
	-	et each.	located	in the northern and southern portions of site.		
Units (by type)	-	et each. Two	located	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units		
Units (by type) and Density	of 6,460 square fe	et each. Two To	located - bedroom - - btal units - 5	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 5 units		
and Density	of 6,460 square fe	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1	located o bedroom - otal units - 5 9 acres = 7.7	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 5 units 9 units per acre		
	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b>	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b>	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = $7.7$ posed	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 5 units 79 units per acre Layout		
and Density Parking	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b>	located o bedroom - otal units - 5 9 acres = 7.7	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 6 units 79 units per acre Layout 90-degree parking		
and Density	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b>	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b>	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = $7.7$ posed	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 50 units 79 units per acre Layout 90-degree parking Proposed		
and Density Parking Building Height	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45'	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b> um	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = $7.7$ posed	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 56 units 79 units per acre <b>Layout</b> 90-degree parking <b>Proposed</b> 37'		
and Density Parking	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b>	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b> um	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = $7.7$ posed	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 50 units 79 units per acre Layout 90-degree parking Proposed		
and Density Parking Building Height Impervious	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45' <b>Maxim</b> 70%	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b> um	located b bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = 7.7 posed 113	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 59 units per acre <b>Layout</b> 90-degree parking <b>Proposed</b> 37' <b>Proposed</b>		
and Density Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45' <b>Maxim</b> 70% • Section 4.5.	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b> um um	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = 7.7 posed 113 3; Residentia	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 50 units 79 units per acre <b>Layout</b> 90-degree parking <b>Proposed</b> 37' <b>Proposed</b> 22.28%		
and Density Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45' <b>Maxim</b> 70% • Section 4.5. • Section 5.2.	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b> <b>um</b> 12: RM18 71: Reside	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = 7.7 posed 113 3; Residentia ential Buildi	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 79 units per acre <b>Layout</b> 90-degree parking <b>Proposed</b> 37' <b>Proposed</b> 22.28% I Multifamily District		
and Density Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45' <b>Maxim</b> 70% • Section 4.5. • Section 5.2.	tet each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b> um um 12: RM18 .71: Resido ownhouse	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = 7.7 posed 113 3; Residentia ential Buildi c; or Residen	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 59 units per acre <u>Layout</u> 90-degree parking <u>Proposed</u> 37' <u>Proposed</u> 22.28% 1 Multifamily District ng, Multifamily; Residential		
and Density Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45' <b>Maxim</b> 70% • Section 4.5. • Section 5.2. Building, To (use-specifi • Table 6.1.2	et each. Two To 5 units/7.1 <b>Pro</b> um .12: RM18 .71: Reside ownhouse c standard 2: Motor V	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = 7.7 posed 113 3; Residentia ential Buildi c; or Residen ls)	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 59 units per acre <u>Layout</u> 90-degree parking <u>Proposed</u> 37' <u>Proposed</u> 22.28% 1 Multifamily District ng, Multifamily; Residential		
and Density Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45' <b>Maxim</b> 70% • Section 4.5. • Section 5.2. Building, To (use-specifi • Table 6.1.2 Requirement	tet each. Two To 5 units/7.1 Pro um 12: RM18 .71: Residu ownhouse c standard 2: Motor V nts	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = 7.7 posed 113 3; Residentia ential Buildi c; or Residen ls) Vehicle and F	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 59 units per acre <b>Layout</b> 90-degree parking <b>Proposed</b> 37' <b>Proposed</b> 22.28% 1 Multifamily District ng, Multifamily; Residential tial Building, Twin Home (W)		
and Density Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request Complies with	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45' <b>Maxim</b> 70% • Section 4.5. • Section 5.2. Building, To (use-specifi • Table 6.1.2	tet each. Two To 5 units/7.1 Pro um 12: RM18 .71: Residu ownhouse c standard 2: Motor V nts	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = 7.7 posed 113 3; Residentia ential Buildi c; or Residen ls)	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 59 units per acre <b>Layout</b> 90-degree parking <b>Proposed</b> 37' <b>Proposed</b> 22.28% 1 Multifamily District ng, Multifamily; Residential tial Building, Twin Home (W)		
and Density Parking Building Height Impervious Coverage UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request	of 6,460 square fe 56 <b>Required</b> 98 <b>Maxim</b> 45' <b>Maxim</b> 70% • Section 4.5. • Section 5.2. Building, To (use-specifi • Table 6.1.2 Requirement	tet each. Two To 5 units/7.1 Pro um um 12: RM18 .71: Reside ownhouse c standard 2: Motor V nts icies:	located bedroom - btal units - 50 9 acres = 7.7 posed 113 3; Residentia ential Buildi c; or Residen ls) Vehicle and F	in the northern and southern portions of site. 56 units 59 units per acre <b>Layout</b> 90-degree parking <b>Proposed</b> 37' <b>Proposed</b> 22.28% 1 Multifamily District ng, Multifamily; Residential tial Building, Twin Home (W)		

	(C) Subdivision Regulations N/A		
Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements	The proposed site plan depicts five apartment buildings which will contain a total of 56 two-bedroom units. Four of the buildings are proposed to be three-story and one building would be two-stories in height. The plan shows all required access, parking, bufferyard, and landscaping. At this juncture it does not appear that active stormwater management would be required for this site. Staff has worked with the developer to provide an additional 20' bufferyard along the frontage with Old Walkertown Road. The addition of the bufferyard will provide some additional landscape screening to attenuate streetscape view impacts.		
	City of Winston-Salem and therefore the site will have to meet all City		
CC	UDO requirements, including any stormwater requirements. DNFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES		
<i>Legacy 2030</i> Growth Management Area	GMA 3 – Suburban Neighborhoods		
Relevant <i>Legacy 2030</i> Recommendations	<ul> <li>Encourage redevelopment and reuse of existing sites and buildings that is compatible and complementary with the surrounding area.</li> <li>Promote the concept of gentle density in existing neighborhoods.</li> <li>Encourage rurally compatible residential development to minimize the impact on the community's rural character.</li> </ul>		
Relevant Area Plan(s)	Walkertown Area Plan Update (2014) Northeast Suburban Area Plan Update (2017)		
Area Plan Recommendations	<ul> <li>Both area plans proposed land use maps recommend institutional land uses on the site in recognition of the previous nursing care facility use.</li> <li>Higher intensity uses should be located within proposed activity centers.</li> </ul>		
Site Located Along Growth Corridor?	The site is not located along a growth corridor.		
Site Located within Activity Center?	The site is not located within an Activity Center.		
Comprehensive Transportation Plan Information	This section of Old Walkertown Road is proposed to be modernized with paved shoulders and bike lane(s).		
Rezoning Consideration	Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition?		
from Section 3.2.19 A 16	Yes. The section of the Northern Beltway near the site has been completed. This site does not have direct access to the Beltway corridor		

		t to it. The impacts of the Northern Beltway on			
	future land uses should be considered in any rezoning of this site.				
	Is the requested action in conformance with <i>Legacy 2030</i> ?				
	No. The request is inco	onsistent with the surrounding development			
	pattern and the suburba	an/rural form and character of the area. The			
	request would allow for	or three-story apartments that are not compatible			
	with the surrounding a	rea.			
Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues	<ul> <li>The request is to rezone an approximately 7.19-acre site from RS9 to RM8-S to develop a 56-unit apartment complex. The petitioner has formally applied for annexation of the Forsyth County portion of the site into the City of Winston-Salem jurisdiction. The ultimate approval of this request is contingent upon annexation approval.</li> <li>The site plan proposes five apartment buildings, four of which are three-stories in height. Both <i>Legacy</i> and both area plans recommend minimizing urban sprawl and keeping higher intensity uses such as midrise apartments along growth corridors and in activity centers. While the site does lie within GMA 3 and has access to water and sewer, it is directly adjacent to GMA 4 which is a rural residential area.</li> </ul>				
	Staff acknowledges that area conditions have changed since the construction and development of this section of the Northern Beltway; however, the closest beltway interchange is at New Walkertown Road, a driving distance of approximately 2.2 miles from the site. The site is surrounded by low-intensity development and is not situated along a growth corridor or within an activity center. While a moderate density attached housing product of no more than two stories may be appropriate at this location, the proposed three-story apartment buildings are out of character with an area dominated by single-story structures and agricultural land. As the proposed development character is inconsistent with both <i>Legacy 2030</i> and both area plan recommendations, staff				
		this request as currently proposed.			
	CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION				
	ects of Proposal	Negative Aspects of Proposal			
The request would allow for the		The request is inconsistent with both the			
redevelopment of a previously developed		Walkertown Area Plan Update and the			
site that has access to public utilities.		Northeast Suburban Area Plan Update land use			
The Newthern Deltarray 1 (14)		recommendations.			
The Northern Beltway has impacted the character of the area and should be a		The request is generally inconsistent with the			
consideration in future rezoning requests		recommendations of <i>Legacy 2030</i> which promotes development which is compatible with			
along the corridor.	re rezoning requests	promotes development which is compatible with its surroundings.			
along the contract.		Approval of the request could promote land use			
		intensification and rezonings in an area that is			
		outside of a growth corridor or activity center.			

#### 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 ANY PERMITS:

a. The entire property shall be accepted for annexation by the City of Winston-Salem.

## PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF GRADING PERMITS:

- a. The developer shall submit a stormwater management study 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 or existing vegetated areas designated to remain, or in close proximity to adjacent property with residential zoning, shall require a Staff Change approval at minimum and may require a Site Plan Amendment.
- b. The developer shall obtain a driveway permit from the North Carolina Department of Transportation; additional improvements include but are not limited to:
  - Record a negative access easement for the property line(s) adjoining Old Walkertown Road.

### 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 ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE(S) OF OCCUPANCY:**

- a. The 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.

## **OTHER REQUIREMENTS:**

a. The developer shall provide a 20' Type II Bufferyard along the entire frontage of Old Walkertown Road.

# STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

<u>NOTE</u>: These are **staff comments** only; the City-County Planning Board makes <u>final</u> <u>recommendations</u>, 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-3567 MARCH 9, 2023

Marc Allred presented the staff report.

George Bryan asked if Walkertown staff was present to address their compatibility concerns with the proposal. Staff explained the proposal was counter to Walkertown's area plan, but that Town staff did not object to this proposal. Jack Steelman asked if this area is served by water and sewer, to which Kirk Ericson replied that it is not. Staff and the Board members discussed the rationale for supporting or opposing high-density development at this location.

#### PUBLIC HEARING

FOR: Steve Causey Mr. Causey, the engineer for the project, stated he was available to answer any questions.

AGAINST: None

#### WORK SESSION

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

SECOND: Jason Grubbs

#### VOTE:

FOR: George Bryan, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Mo McRae, Salvador Patiño, Jack Steelman AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None

MOTION: Mo McRae recommended approval of the ordinance amendment. SECOND: Jason Grubbs VOTE: FOR: George Bryan, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Mo McRae, Salvador Patiño Jack Steelman

Patiño, Jack Steelman AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None Chris Murphy, AICP/CZO Director of Planning and Development Services