CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD STAFF REPORT

	PETITION INFORMATION						
Docket #	W-3340						
Staff	Gary Roberts, Jr. AICP						
Petitioner(s)	Three Properties, LLC						
Owner(s)	Same						
Subject Property	PIN#s 6825-82-2910, 6825-82-2914, 6825-82-2919, 6825-83-1297,						
	6825-83-2014, 6825-83-2113, 6825-83-2202, and 6825-83-2297						
Address	The addresses range from 1429 to 1475 West Fourth Street.						
Type of Request	Special use rezoning from RM18 and RSQ to RMU-S						
Proposal	 The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Maps for the subject property <u>from</u> RM18 (Residential, Multifamily - 18 units per acre maximum density) and RSQ (Residential, Single Family and Quadraplex) <u>to</u> RMU-S (Residential, Multifamily Unlimited Density – special use zoning). The petitioner is requesting the following uses: Residential Building, Multifamily; Residential Building, Townhouse; Residential Building, Duplex; Residential Building, Twin Home; Residential Building, Single Family; and Planned Residential Development 						
Neighborhood	The petitioner's representative, Dan Donathan, has submitted a summary						
Contact/Meeting	of the neighborhood outreach efforts (see Attachment B).						
Zoning District	The RMU District is primarily intended to accommodate multifamily						
Purpose	uses at unrestricted densities. This district is appropriate for GMAs 1 and						
Statement	2 and may be suitable for Metro Activity Centers where public facilities,						
	including public water and sewer, public roads, parks, and other						
	governmental services, are available and the site has direct access to a						
	minor or major thoroughfare.						
Applicable	(R)(1) - Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of						
Rezoning	the requested zoning district(s)?						
Consideration	Yes, the request is for a high density, multifamily residential						
from Chapter B,	development. The site is located within the Urban Neighborhoods GMA						
Article VI,	2 with frontage on an expressway (Peters Creek Parkway) and direct						
Section 6-2.1(R)	access onto a collector street (Fourth Street).						
T	GENERAL SITE INFORMATION						
Location	West side of Peters Creek Parkway and the east side of Fourth Street						
T	south of Business I-40						
Jurisdiction	City of Winston-Salem						
Ward(s)	Southwest						
Site Acreage	\pm 1.97 acres						
Current	The subject property is currently used for residential purposes consisting						
Land Use	of various building types including single family, duplex, and multifamily units. There are a total of approximately 20 dwalling units						
	multifamily units. There are a total of approximately 20 dwelling units						
	currently located on the site.						

Surrounding	Direction	Zoning District	Use				
Property Zoning	North	RSQ	Single and multifamily				
and Use			residential				
	East	HB	Modest sized businesses				
			across Peters Creek Parkway				
	South	HB	An adult establishment				
	West	RSQ	Single and multifamily				
			residential				
Applicable		the use(s) permitted under					
Rezoning	classification/request compatible with uses permitted on other						
Consideration	properties in the						
from Chapter B,			lding, Multifamily is generally				
Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)		the residential uses permit					
Section 0-2.1(K)	1 1	s, the proposed density of 7	ved in RM18 and RSQ, with				
		-	ig being very different. Said				
		• • •	some of the uses permitted				
	-	HB zoned properties.	some of the uses permitted				
Physical	· · ·	site abuts an expressway an	d has a moderate to steep				
Characteristics	1	d toward the southeastern p	-				
	-	gnated floodplain of Peters					
Proximity to		d sewer are available to the					
Water and Sewer							
Stormwater/	The site plan proposes a subterranean stormwater management facility to						
Drainage	be located in the southwestern corner of the lot. A stormwater study will						
	be required.						
Watershed and	The site is not located within a water supply watershed.						
Overlay Districts	L 2006 d	1					
Historic, Natural	In 2006, the subject property, along with other properties on this portion						
Heritage and/or Farmland	of Fourth Street, were determined to be eligible for listing on the National						
Inventories	Register of Historic Places by the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office However, this area, known as the West Fourth Street						
Inventories	Preservation Office. However, this area, known as the West Fourth Street Historic District, is currently not listed on the National Register of						
		-	oric district. Therefore, the site				
		5	ateness design review process				
	•		their staff, nor is it eligible for				
	such benefits a	s grants, loans, or tax ince	ntives that have listing on the				
	National Regist	ter as a prerequisite. Howev	ver, properties in this area will				
		-	process if there is a federal				
			permit, license, funding etc.)				
	proposed on the						
Analysis of		n portion of the site is signi					
General Site	U U	dplain of Peters Creek. A F	1 1				
Information			l also be required to relocate				
			torm sewer line located in the				
	southeastern portion of the site in order to accommodate the proposed building.						
	Junuing.						

SITE	ACCESS AND T	RANSPORTA	FION INF(ORMATION	
Street Name	Classification	Frontage	Average Daily Trip Count	Capacity at Level of Service D	
Peters Creek Parkway	Expressway	±368'	22,000	73,400	
Fourth Street	Collector Street	±369'	NA	NA	
Apple Blossom Trail	Local Street (shown on the site plan to be constructed)	212'	NA	NA	
Proposed Access Point(s)	The vehicular ac Street.	cess into the proj	posed parkin	ng deck will be from Fourth	
Planned Road Improvements	freeway facility f scheduled for rec beginning in late closed for constr replaced with a v Peters Creek Par September/Octob Sidewalks will a Fourth Street brid Street will be wid exclusive westbo Construction for the summer of 20 2018. If approved coordinated with	from Fourth Street construction with 2018. Before this uction, the Peters vider structure ar kway bridge reploser ber of 2017. Iso be constructed dge over Business dened at Peters C bund right turn la the Peters Creek 017 and is anticip d, the development NCDOT as the peters the peters the peters	et eastward a temporar is portion of s Creek Park d the interc acement is d along Pete s 40 will be Creek Parkw ne. Parkway an pated to be c ent of the su projects ove	uth of Business 40. This to Church Street is y closure of this section F Business 40 is temporarily kway Bridge will be hange will be rebuilt. scheduled to begin in ers Creek Parkway. The e replaced and Academy ray to accommodate an rea may begin as early as completed by the winter of bject request must be erlap.	
Trip Generation - Existing/Proposed	Existing Zoning: RM18 and RSQ .61 acre of RM18 = 10 units + 1.36 acres of RSQ = 20 units = 30 total units x 6.65 (Apartment trip rate) = 200 Total Trips per Day. Proposed Zoning: RMU-S 144 units x 6.65 (Apartment trip rate) = 958 Trips per Day.				
Sidewalks	Sidewalks are located along both sides of Fourth Street and will be required along the frontage of Peters Creek Parkway and both sides of the new street.				
Transit	Routes 80 and 83				
Connectivity	The site has good connectivity in that it is located on Fourth Street, which is a Collector Street, and the site plan includes a new public street which will have right-in/right-out access to Peters Creek Parkway.				

Traffic Impact	A traffic assessment is not required for the subject request.						
Assessment (TIA)							
Analysis of Site	Vehicular access to the site will be provided along Fourth Street which						
Access and	is a Collector Street. The site will also include a new public street						
Transportation	(Apple Blossom Trail) which will have right-in/right-out access to Peters						
Information	Creek Parkway and full movement at Fourth Street. The site is also well						
	served by sidewalks and transit. The request would result in a significant						
	increase in traffic compared to what could be expected under the current						
	zoning.						
	ONFORMITY TO PLANS AND PLANNING ISSUES						
Legacy 2030	Growth Management Area 2 - Urban Neighborhoods						
Growth							
Management							
Area							
Relevant	• Increase infill development within the Municipal Services Area.						
Legacy 2030	• Promote <i>compatible</i> infill development that fits with the context of						
Recommendations	its surroundings.						
	• Identify Growth Corridors for quality infill, density and transit.						
	• Apply traditional, walkable neighborhood design principles and						
	standards to existing neighborhoods.						
	• Encourage redevelopment and reuse of existing sites and buildings						
	that is <i>compatible and complementary</i> with the surrounding area.						
	• Promote a pedestrian-friendly orientation for new development and						
	redevelopment and reduce the visual dominance of parking areas.						
Relevant Area	South Central Area Plan Update (2014)						
Plan(s)							
Area Plan	• Consistent with the current zoning, the site is recommended for a						
Recommendations	mixture of single-family residential, low-density attached						
	residential, intermediate-density, and high-density residential use on						
	the proposed land use map.						
	Growth Corridor: The site is located along the Peters Creek Parkway						
	Growth Corridor. However, it is just beyond the portion of the						
	corridor where the area plan recommends an urban form.						
	Recommendations for the urban form portion of the growth corridor						
	include:						
	• Create a pedestrian-friendly character through the						
	development/redevelopment of properties by making sure buildings						
	are designed for pedestrian orientation. Locate buildings close to the						
	street to create an interesting and inviting public/private streetscape.						
	• Design building facades to add interest to the street and include						
	pedestrian-friendly features such as awnings, porches, recessed						
	doors and no blank walls facing streets.						
	• Locate parking to the rear or side of primary structures to de-						
	emphasize the visual impact of vehicles.						

	• Add street trees, planting areas/planters with flowers or evergreen plants where feasible.						
Site Located	The site is located along the Peters Creek Parkway Growth Corridor.						
Along Growth							
Corridor?							
Site Located	The site is located immediately northwest of the West Salem Activity						
within Activity	Center which is located at the intersection of Peters Creek Parkway and						
Center?	Academy Street.						
Greenway Plan	The originally proposed greenway along Peters Creek was deemed						
Update	unfeasible for construction by the Winston-Salem Engineering						
Information	Department. As such, the <i>Greenway Plan Update</i> recommends a side						
	path/on-street facility along the western side of Peters Creek Parkway to						
	eventually provide a connection between Hanes Park and a future						
	greenway along Silas Creek. The Peters Creek Parkway Bicycle and						
	Pedestrian Facilities Study was completed to enhance the Peters Creek						
	Parkway corridor by providing landscaping, improved pedestrian						
	facilities (i.e. sidewalks and pathways), and accommodations for						
	bicycles and transit while maintaining a level of traffic service that will						
	accommodate commuters. The Study recommends a reduction in travel						
	lanes as well as a 14' side path adjacent to the southbound lanes of						
	1 5						
	traffic along Peters Creek. The site plan shows an 8' sidewalk along						
	Peters Creek Parkway.						
Addressing	Floor plans and building elevation plans must be submitted in order for						
A	addresses to be issued prior to permitting.						
Applicable	$(\mathbf{R})(3)$ - Have changing conditions substantially affected the area the notifier?						
Rezoning	the petition?						
Rezoning Consideration	the petition? No						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B,	the petition?						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI,	the petition? No						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R)	the petition? No (R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030? See comments below.						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11,						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only difference between the current request and W-3327, is that two modest						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only difference between the current request and W-3327, is that two modest sized lots were added to the northern end of the site.						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only difference between the current request and W-3327, is that two modest sized lots were added to the northern end of the site.The site plan consists of a four and five story apartment building with						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only difference between the current request and W-3327, is that two modest sized lots were added to the northern end of the site.The site plan consists of a four and five story apartment building with 144 units surrounding a four story parking deck. The building is pulled						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only difference between the current request and W-3327, is that two modest sized lots were added to the northern end of the site.The site plan consists of a four and five story apartment building with 144 units surrounding a four story parking deck. The building is pulled up to Peters Creek Parkway, Fourth Street, and the new proposed street						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only difference between the current request and W-3327, is that two modest sized lots were added to the northern end of the site.The site plan consists of a four and five story apartment building with 144 units surrounding a four story parking deck. The building is pulled up to Peters Creek Parkway, Fourth Street, and the new proposed street in a pedestrian oriented manner. The request also has some merit in						
Rezoning Consideration from Chapter B, Article VI, Section 6-2.1(R) Analysis of Conformity to Plans and	the petition?No(R)(4) - Is the requested action in conformance with Legacy 2030?See comments below.The subject rezoning request is from RSQ and RM18 to RMU-S in order to accommodate a high density, multifamily residential project. The 1.97 acre site was included within a larger, mixed use rezoning request to GB-S which was withdrawn at the November 7, 2016 City Council meeting. A second rezoning request which included a majority of the subject property (W-3327) was continued from the April 13 and May 11, 2017 Planning Board meetings before being withdrawn. The only difference between the current request and W-3327, is that two modest sized lots were added to the northern end of the site.The site plan consists of a four and five story apartment building with 144 units surrounding a four story parking deck. The building is pulled up to Peters Creek Parkway, Fourth Street, and the new proposed street						

However, the proposed density of <u>73 units per acre</u>, is significantly greater that what is recommended in the *South Central Area Plan Update*. The area plan recommends a mix of residential densities reflective of the current zoning and land use pattern along this portion of Fourth Street. In this case, that equates to a density recommendation of approximately 15 units per acre. Staff notes that while developing an area plan, it is not feasible to anticipate or plan for every possible future development scenario which may be proposed on a particular site. However, the proposed density is *significantly* greater than what is recommended.

Staff also notes that from a neighborhood compatibility perspective, the height and massing of the proposed building is completely out of character with the houses which front along Fourth Street. Attachment C uses the dimensions of the proposed development to illustrate how the proposed building relates to the context of the existing streetscape. Based upon the recommendations of the area plan and the overwhelming scale of the proposed structure, staff does not support the proposed rezoning.

RELEVANT ZONING HISTORIES									
Case	Request		Decision &	Direction		Acrea	ige	Recommendation	
			Date	from Site				Staff	ССРВ
W-3327	RSQ and		Withdrawn	Included a		1.74	ł	NA	NA
	RM18 to		prior to	portion of					
	RMU-S		Planning	the current					
			Board on	site					
			6-02-17						
W-3303	RM18 and		Withdrawn	Includ	led	8.3		Denial	Denial
	RSQ to G	B-S	at 11-07-16	current	site				
			City						
			Council						
			meeting						
		PLAN	N COMPLIA		ГН U				
0	Building		Square Footage				Placement on Site		
-			· · ·		F	Pulled up	p to a	ll three stre	et frontages
-		partments and 71,324							
squa			e feet for the parking deck						
Units (by) 144 apartment units on 1.97 acres = 73 units per acre.							
	and Density								
Parking			Required	Proposed			Layout		
		2	65 spaces	313 spaces			Located within a four story		
				(includes 26 bicycle		oicycle	parking deck		g deck
				spaces)					
Building Height			Maximum			Proposed			
Dunuing	0		NA				5 stories		

Impervious	Maximum		Dronogod			
Coverage	85%		Proposed 73.95%			
UDO Sections						
Relevant to	 Chapter B, Article II, Section 2-1.2 (O) RMU District Chapter B, Article II, Section 2-5.64 Multifamily Use Conditions 					
Subject Request	• Chapter B, Article II, Section 2-5.64 Multifamily Use Conditions					
Complies with	(A) <i>Legacy 2030</i> policies: See comments above.					
Chapter B, Article VII,	(B) Environmental Ord.	Ord. See comments below.				
Section 7-5.3	(C) Subdivision Regulation	ions Yes				
Analysis of Site	The site plan proposes t	he remova	al of eight existing residential			
Plan Compliance			e a total of ± 20 dwelling units, in order			
with UDO	to construct a four and f	ive story a	apartment building with a four story			
Requirements	parking deck. An interio	or courtya	rd will be provided in the center. The			
	square footage for the a	partment l	building is 148,277. Because the site			
			n the designated floodplain of Peters			
			Permit will be required prior to the			
	issuance of a Grading P					
	CLUSIONS TO ASSIST					
	ects of Proposal		Negative Aspects of Proposal			
	6 5	The proposed density is significantly higher than				
residential infill deve	-	what is recommended in the area plan.				
Urban Neighborhood		7571 1 1 1				
	0	The height and massing of the proposed five story building and parking deck is not				
Parkway Growth Co		compatible with the homes located along Fourth				
The subject property and sidewalks.		Street.				
		The request would add additional traffic to the				
0		area.				
manner.		Approval of this request could set a precedent				
		for additional development in this area that is not				
		consistent with the area plan.				
			DITIONS OF APPROVAL			
			mental review comments and are			
	meet codes or established	l standard	s, or to reduce negative off-site			
impacts.						
• PRIOR TO	THE ISSUANCE OF G	RADING	PERMITS:			
			gement study submitted for review by			
	e Public Works Department of the City of Winston-Salem. If required, an					
	engineered stormwater management plan shall be submitted and approved by					
-	ublic Works Department. Relocation or installation of any stormwater					
	nent device into any buffer areas, vegetation designated to remain, or close					
proxi	imity to adjacent residentially zoned land shall require a Staff Change					
appro	oval at minimum, and may require a Site Plan Amendment.					
	eloper shall obtain a Floodplain Development Permit from the Erosion					
Contr	ol Division.					

c. Developer shall obtain a driveway permit from NCDOT/City of Winston-Salem; additional improvements may be required prior to issuance of driveway permit.

Required improvements include:

- Payment-in-lieu of sidewalk construction along the frontage of Peters Creek Parkway.
- Dedication of right-of-way along Fourth Street sixty (60) feet from centerline.
- Record negative access easements along Peters Creek Parkway and both sides of Apple Blossom Trail.

• PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS:

- a. The proposed building plans shall be in substantial conformance with the submitted elevations as shown on "Exhibit A" as verified by Planning staff. As volunteered by the petitioner and noted on the site plan, all buildings shall have exterior façade materials consisting of either brick, cementious siding, or veneer stone. All rooftop HVAC equipment shall be screened from view of the adjacent public streets.
- b. An engineered lighting plan shall be submitted to Inspections for the proposed lighting demonstrating the use of full-cut off fixtures, light height of 25' or less and no more than 0.5 foot-candles at the property line.
- c. Developer shall demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Floodplain Development Permit.
- d. Developer shall relocate the sanitary sewer line located in the southeastern portion of the site in order to accommodate the building shown on the site plan.
- e. Developer shall relocate the storm sewer line located in the southeastern portion of the site in order to accommodate the building shown on the site plan.

• PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF OCCUPANCY PERMITS:

- a. Lighting shall be installed per approved lighting plan and certified by an engineer.
- b. Developer shall complete all requirements of the driveway permit including the construction of Apple Blossom Trail to City of Winston-Salem standards.
- c. Buildings shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the approved building elevations as approved by Planning staff.
- d. Freestanding signage along Peters Creek Parkway shall be limited to one (1) six
 (6) foot high monument sign with a maximum copy area of thirty-six (36) square feet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial

<u>NOTE:</u> These are **staff comments** only; <u>final recommendations</u> on projects are made by the City-County Planning Board, with <u>final decisions</u> 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.**

CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES FOR W-3340 AUGUST 10, 2017

Gary Roberts presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR:

Lawson Newton, 110 Oakwood Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- The positive side of this project is the obvious increased tax base of a 15 to 20 million dollar project that would go into providing housing in that area and the creation of 25 to 30 jobs.
- The developer has targeted that 15% of these units, roughly 22 units will be effectively subsidized housing.
- We recognize the concern of increased traffic issues.
- The business owners up and down Peters Creek Parkway are in support of this project.
- We have petitions signed by the remaining residents on that street who are in support of this.

Jay Clapp, 621 Jonestown Rd, Suite 221, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- I agree with Gary that there are going to be a significant increase in traffic but I don't know if I would go as far and say this will be a significant impact for what is being proposed.
- When they were looking at the area as a mixed use area, I was brought on to prepare a traffic study and coordinate with NCDOT and WSDOT as far as study area and analysis. I met with them multiple times to discuss what we were looking at and that is where the right in, right out came about from Peters Creek Parkway. We also took into account the improvements that are currently being looked at with the new modification at the interchange on Peters Creek Parkway as well as improvements that are being done on Academy Street.
- We came up with our recommendations and submitted our reports to NCDOT and WSDOT and they concurred with our findings.

Daniel Donathan, 1028 Willowlake Rd, Winston-Salem, NC 27106

- The people I've talked to that we are relocating, I made a moral commitment to them to at least try and get them back into these apartments once they are complete.
- We have made a commitment to them to move them back into the new apartments and give them a rent that is within 15% of what they were paying previously.

AGAINST:

Bonnie Crouse, 2001 Boone Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- We oppose this project. It is such a stark deviation from the area plan in a number of ways, some of which has already been addressed.
- The fact that the property owner may have allowed the exterior to become somewhat unsightly because of deferred maintenance should not go to the benefit of saying "well these houses aren't worth keeping".
- Yes there may be a need for apartments but not on this street or corridor that connects to great neighborhoods
- We are also concerned about the traffic.

JoAnn Mount, 1238 W. 4th Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

- I have lived here for 36 years. This is a historic neighborhood, I knew what I was moving into and I had expected it to stay that way.
- I think the idea of turning this part of 4th street into a building zone with such density, is not good.
- The traffic is bad and to add this kind of density will make it so much worse.
- I opposed it when I came to this meeting because of the traffic and after seeing these visuals, I am adamantly opposed to it.

John Merschel, 3400 Paddington Lane, Winston-Salem, NC 27106

- This is good housing stock. This is housing stock that doesn't need to be torn down.
- If this project is approved, you can count the rest of the houses to go down.
- The traffic is not good.

Dr. Margaret Herman, 122 Piedmont Ave, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

- I'm in one of those houses that do not have a driveway; so we do have to park on the street. We park on both sides of my street. This is going to make the traffic worse.
- It was pointed out that DOT was consulted on this, as you remember in our last meeting, they were not in approval of this.

WORK SESSION

George Bryan: Are there apartments in the floodplain or is the floodplain area under the parking garage? Is that a resolved issue? Gary Roberts: It is both and Matthew Osborne in the Stormwater Department said it is resolvable.

Melynda Dunigan: The subsidized units that you mentioned, is that something you would put in written form that would be legally binding or is it just you saying it's your intentions? Lawson Newton: The thought process is to have units in the project that would be more affordable. This isn't where someone is helping to pay rent, this is reduced rent for those units. Yes, we can make that legally binding.

Clarence Lambe: How would you get to the ball park without a car? Gary Roberts: There is going to be an (8) foot wide sidewalk and that goes up over Business 40 to the multiuse path and that will connect eastward straight to the ballpark along Peters Creek Parkway.

George Bryan: Is there a solution to traffic heading north? Jay Clapp: There has been no change to the improvements that were already being provided.

Melynda Dunigan: Will the subsidized units last for the period of time the tenants live there or are you talking about setting aside those unite indefinitely for this level of rent? Daniel Donathan: We will keep those units available in perpetuity.

Arnold King: Paul, from a legal standpoint, using the term subsidize housing, how does that contractually work if he's going to do any perpetuity? Paul Norby: I think the wording would need to be worked out and checked by our attorney's office.

MOTION: George Bryan moved denial of the zoning petition. SECOND: Chris Leak VOTE: FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Chris Leak, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger AGAINST: Arnold King, Clarence Lambe EXCUSED: None

A. Paul Norby, FAICP Director of Planning and Development Services