CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD STAFF REPORT

| PETITION INFORMATION | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Docket | W-3442 | |
| Staff | Gary Roberts, Jr., AICP | |
| Petitioner(s) | Zinat Management, LLC | |
| Owner(s) | Same | |
| Subject Property | PINs 6813-75-6993, 6813-75-8795, 6813-75-6710, and 6813-76-9082 | |
| Address | The site does not currently have an address assignment. | |
| Type of Request | Special Use rezoning from RS9 to RM5-S | |
| Proposal | The petitioner is requesting to amend the Official Zoning Map for the subject property <u>from</u> RS9 (Residential, Single Family – 9,000 sf minimum lot size) <u>to</u> RM5-S (Residential, Multifamily - 5 units per acre maximum density – Special Use). The petitioner is requesting the following uses: Residential Building, Single Family; Residential Building, Twin Home; Residential Building, Duplex; and Residential Building, Townhouse | |
| Neighborhood Contact/Meeting | A summary of the petitioner's neighborhood outreach is attached. | |
| Zoning District Purpose Statement | 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. | |
| Rezoning | Is the proposal consistent with the purpose statement(s) of the | |
| Consideration | requested zoning district(s)? | |
| from Section 3.2.15 A 13 | The proposed density is less than 5 units per acre, and the site is located along a major thoroughfare. The site is also located within GMA 3. | |
| | GENERAL SITE INFORMATION | |
| Location | West side of Ebert Road, across from Truelove Lane | |
| Jurisdiction | Winston-Salem | |
| Ward(s) | South | |
| Site Acreage | ± 7.5 acres | |
| Current Land Use | The site is currently undeveloped. | |

| Surrounding | Direction | Zoning Di | strict | Use | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Property Zoning | North | RS9 | | Single-family homes | |
| and Use | East | RS9 | | Single-family homes | |
| | South | RS9 | | Undeveloped property and | |
| | West | RS9 | | single-family homes | |
| D | | | | Single-family homes | |
| Rezoning | Is/are the use(s) permitted under the proposed classification/request | | | | |
| Consideration | compatible with uses permitted on other properties in the vicinity? | | | | |
| from Section 3.2.15 A 13 | Considering the scale of the proposed twin homes and the self-contained site design, the proposed residential uses are compatible with the | | | | |
| 3.2.15 A 15 | | | | | |
| | residential uses permitted on the surrounding properties. | | | | |
| Physical | | | vily wooded | I. It has a moderate slope | |
| Characteristics | downward to the | e south. | | | |
| Proximity to Water and Sewer | - | A public water main and sewer outfall are located under Ebert Road. | | | |
| Stormwater/ | | - | | management facility in the | |
| Drainage | south-central po | rtion of the site. | A stormwat | ter study will be required. | |
| Watershed and Overlay Districts | The site is not lo | The site is not located within a water supply watershed. | | | |
| Analysis of | The undevelope | d site is located | within the c | ontext of a single-family | |
| General Site | | | | to have any development | |
| Information | | | | floodplains, or water supply | |
| | watersheds. | | | | |
| | RELEVA | NT ZONING I | HISTORIE | S | |
| Т | here are no releva | nt zoning histor | ies in the ge | neral area. | |
| | ACCESS AND | | | | |
| | | | Average | | |
| Street Name | Classification | Frontage | Daily Trip | Capacity at Level of Service D | |
| | | | Count | | |
| Ebert Road | Major Thoroughfare | 368 feet | _ | 15,300 | |
| Ebert Road Starling Meadows Drive | | 368 feet 553 feet | Count | | |
| Starling Meadows | Thoroughfare Private Street | 553 feet | Count 8,900 N/A | 15,300 | |
| Starling Meadows Drive | Thoroughfare Private Street | 553 feet | Count 8,900 N/A | 15,300 N/A | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. | 553 feet ve a primary acc | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e | 15,300 N/A | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access Point(s) | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. The Comprehen | 553 feet ve a primary acc sive Transporta | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e <i>tion Plan</i> red | 15,300 N/A mergency access from Ebert | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access Point(s) Planned Road | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. The <i>Comprehen</i> section for Eber sidewalks. WSD | 553 feet ve a primary acc <i>sive Transporta</i> . t Road with wid OOT will require | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e tion Plan red e outside lar a southbour | 15,300 N/A mergency access from Ebert commends a three-lane cross nes, curb, gutter, and nd right slip lane on Ebert | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access Point(s) Planned Road | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. The <i>Comprehen</i> section for Eber | 553 feet ve a primary acc <i>sive Transporta</i> . t Road with wid OOT will require | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e tion Plan red e outside lar a southbour | 15,300 N/A mergency access from Ebert commends a three-lane cross nes, curb, gutter, and nd right slip lane on Ebert | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access Point(s) Planned Road | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. The <i>Comprehen</i> section for Eber sidewalks. WSE Road in associat Existing Zoning | 553 feet ve a primary acc sive Transporta. t Road with wid OOT will require tion with this pro- c: RS9 | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e tion Plan red e outside lar a southbour oposed deve | 15,300 N/A mergency access from Ebert commends a three-lane cross nes, curb, gutter, and nd right slip lane on Ebert lopment. | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access Point(s) Planned Road Improvements | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. The <i>Comprehen</i> section for Eber sidewalks. WSE Road in associat Existing Zoning | 553 feet ve a primary acc sive Transporta. t Road with wid OOT will require tion with this pro- c: RS9 | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e tion Plan red e outside lar a southbour oposed deve | 15,300 N/A mergency access from Ebert commends a three-lane cross nes, curb, gutter, and nd right slip lane on Ebert | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access Point(s) Planned Road Improvements Trip Generation - | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. The <i>Comprehen</i> section for Eber sidewalks. WSE Road in associat Existing Zoning | 553 feet ve a primary acc sive Transporta. t Road with wid OOT will require tion with this pro- c: RS9 | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e tion Plan red e outside lar a southbour oposed deve | 15,300 N/A mergency access from Ebert commends a three-lane cross nes, curb, gutter, and nd right slip lane on Ebert lopment. | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access Point(s) Planned Road Improvements Trip Generation - | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. The <i>Comprehen</i> section for Eber sidewalks. WSE Road in associat <u>Existing Zoning</u> 7.5 acres / 9,000 | 553 feet ve a primary acc sive Transporta. t Road with wid OOT will require tion with this pro- c: RS9 | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e tion Plan red e outside lar a southbour oposed deve | 15,300 N/A mergency access from Ebert commends a three-lane cross nes, curb, gutter, and nd right slip lane on Ebert lopment. | |
| Starling Meadows Drive Proposed Access Point(s) Planned Road Improvements Trip Generation - | Thoroughfare Private Street The site will hav Road. The Comprehen section for Eber sidewalks. WSE Road in associat Existing Zoning 7.5 acres / 9,000 trips per day Proposed Zonin | 553 feet ve a primary acc sive Transportant t Road with wid DOT will require tion with this pro- $\frac{1}{2}$: RS9 $\frac{1}{2}$ of $f = 36$ homes $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$: RM5-S | Count 8,900 N/A ess and an e tion Plan rea e outside lar a southbour oposed deve | 15,300 N/A mergency access from Ebert commends a three-lane cross nes, curb, gutter, and nd right slip lane on Ebert lopment. | |

| Sidewalks Transit | Sidewalks are required along one side of the proposed streets. The proposed site plan shows sidewalks along both sides of the new internal streets. Payment-in-lieu will be made for the sidewalk required along Ebert Road. WSTA Route 83 serves Peters Creek Parkway approximately one mile | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| | east. | | |
| Connectivity | The surrounding development pattern does not lend itself to street connectivity. | | |
| Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) | A TIA is not required. | | |
| Analysis of Site Access and Transportation Information | The site will be accessed from a major thoroughfare that has ample capacity. The proposed trip generation is less than what could be expected with residential development under the current zoning. | | |
| | PLAN COMPLIANCE W | ITH U | DO REQUIREMENTS |
| Units (by type) and Density | | 36 twin home units on 7.5 acres = 4.8 units per acre | |
| Building Height | Maximum | | Proposed |
| | 40 feet | | Two stories |
| Impervious | Maximum | | Proposed |
| Coverage | N/A | | 40.1 percent |
| UDO Sections Relevant to Subject Request | Section 4.5.13: RM5 District Section 5.2.71: Residential Building, Multifamily (use-specific standards) | | |
| Complies with | (A) Legacy 2030 policies: | Yes | |
| Section 3.2.11 | (B) Environmental Ord. | N/A | |
| | (C) Subdivision Regulations | Yes | |
| Analysis of Site Plan Compliance with UDO Requirements | The site plan shows 36 twin home units fronting along new internal public streets. A 20-foot Type II bufferyard is provided around the perimeter of the site adjacent to properties with RS9 zoning. The request provides almost twice the amount of required common recreation area and includes some hardscape areas. | | |
| | ONFORMITY TO PLANS | AND | LANNING ISSUES |
| Legacy 2030 Growth Management Area | Growth Management Area 3 - Suburban Neighborhoods | | |
| Relevant <i>Legacy 2030</i> Recommendations | Increase infill development in the serviceable land area. Facilitate land use patterns that offer a variety of housing choices. Encourage quality infill development on both vacant land and redeveloped sites with an emphasis on conforming to the | | |
| | neighborhood's exi | sting cl | haracter and scale. |

| Relevant Area Plan(s) | Southwest Suburban Area Plan Update (2015) | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Area Plan Recommendations | The plan recommends single-family residential uses at this location. | |
| 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. | |
| Rezoning Consideration | Have changing conditions substantially affected the area in the petition? | |
| from Section | No | |
| 3.2.15 A 13 | Is the requested action in conformance with <i>Legacy 2030</i> ? | |
| | Yes | |
| Analysis of Conformity to Plans and Planning Issues | The rezoning request would accommodate 36 attached homes fronting along new internal public streets. The surrounding development pattern is single-family residential in character. | |
| | <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 attached homes is compatible with the nearby single-family homes. The site is accessed from a major thoroughfare. | |
| | Given the specific setting of the site and proposed design, the request is consistent with both <i>Legacy</i> and the area plan and serves as a good opportunity for infill residential development. | |

| CONCLUSIONS TO ASSIST WITH RECOMMENDATION | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Positive Aspects of Proposal | Negative Aspects of Proposal | | | |
| Positive Aspects of ProposalThe proposed density is comparable toallowable development under the currentzoning.The scale of the proposed units iscompatible with the nearby single-familyhomes.Ebert Road is a major thoroughfare withample capacity.A 20-foot Type II bufferyard wouldprovide physical and visual separationbetween the proposed development and thesurrounding detached homes.The request is consistent with Legacy inthat it would offer a variety of housingchoices in the area with a context-sensitive | Negative Aspects of Proposal There are no other attached homes in the general area. | | | |
| 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 treatment device into any buffer areas, vegetation designated to remain, or 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 driveway permit. Required improvements include: | | | | |
| • <u>PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS:</u> a. 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

<u>NOTE</u>: These are **staff comments** only; the City-County Planning Board makes <u>final</u> <u>recommendations</u> on proposals, 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-3442 MAY 28, 2020

Gary Roberts presented the staff report.

Melynda Dunigan stated that the site plan shows an emergency access road and partially shared driveway with a single-family home; she asked if there was any possibility that it would be opened up as a secondary access, or if there was any prohibition against using that as a secondary access.

Aaron King stated that this was a Special Use site plan, and it locks them in to exactly what is shown on the site plan. Therefore, it will have to be an emergency only access road. Should anyone want to change the condition of that road, it would trigger a Site Plan Aamendment.

Chris Murphy stated that there is a house located to the west of the northernmost cul-de-sac that can be accessed via that driveway, but they actually have a driveway into the subdivision off of Brookhill Drive. They can use this driveway that goes out to Ebert, but they have a formal driveway that goes and ties in to the cul-de-sac on Brookhill Drive. The piece of property on the corner of that emergency access road and Ebert is a Bell South building, it is not a home.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR:

Steve Causey, Allied Design, 4720 Kester Mill Road, Suite C, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- We prepared the site plan for the petitioner. We did have a neighborhood meeting. We had a couple folks in attendance. One was an adjoining property owner, and the other was a lady across the road. They expressed more curiosity and interest than anything. I think you have the meeting summary in your agenda packets.
- We felt like the density was consistent with the area plan. The twin-home clustering arrangement allows us to deal with topography. We have 50 feet of fall across the site from one end to another, so it did allow us to densify things more internally. I think Gary pointed out the bufferyards around the perimeter would not be required with single-family development. We did agree to a little extra sidewalk. We actually have sidewalks along both sides of the streets, at staff's request. The developer has agreed to that. I think he referenced the sidewalk along Ebert, we would be making a payment in lieu of that sidewalk because it is not practical to construct at this time.

Majid Mirzazadeh, 842 Windalier Lane, Winston-Salem, NC 27106

W-3442 Staff Report

• It's very compatible with the area and should not add any traffic, and it will make that area look better.

AGAINST:

Fred Marlow, 3216 Laurenfields Way, Winston-Salem, NC 27107

- We are within the 500-foot area of the proposed site. The main thing that we're concerned with, as residents here, is that we're in a fairly modest subdivision in Ashton Grove, which is right off the top of the first drawing there off Hope Road, and the homes are pretty similar. They are single-family homes and the square footage on the lot has to be about 9,000 square feet or so. We would like to see if we're going to have additional growth within the area. We have had a lot around the Salisbury Road area on the way to Wal-Mart on Peters Creek Parkway, and all those pockets of homes all seem to have single-family dwellings. The fact that these are duplexes is a concern that we have. It's just not going to look as good as the other homes that we have around. We have a very strong HOA, very enforceable in terms of keeping your house clean, your yard clean, and those kinds of things. And we're just concerned that making the multi-family home change would not be consistent with what we've seen.
- Obviously, a lot of planning has gone into this. I can understand that. We can obviously understand undeveloped areas need to be developed, and we welcome that as well. I know you guys have done a lot of due diligence.
- If you look back at something you talked about earlier, you talked about incompatibility when something was designed and was backed up against single-family homes, that seems like what we have here, and that is the only thing that I would like to go on the record as saying. One other thing is we didn't get information about the meeting. We would have certainly been there. We did get this information recently, and that is the reason I have been on the call. Thank you for that.

WORK SESSION

MOTION: Clarence Lambe recommended that the Planning Board find that the request is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

SECOND: Johnny Sigers

VOTE:

FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Johnny Sigers, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None

MOTION: Clarence Lambe recommended approval of the zoning petition. SECOND: George Bryan VOTE: FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Johnny Sigers, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman AGAINST: None EXCUSED: None

Aaron King Director of Planning and Development Services