



**WALKERTOWN PLANNING BOARD MEETING
WALKERTOWN LIBRARY AUDITORIUM**

APRIL 3, 2007 3:00 P.M.

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Planning Board meeting of April 3, 2007, was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chair Peggy Leight. Sitting as a quorum of the Board were Ms. Leight, Al Slater, Marilyn Martin, Larry Marshall, and Don Whitaker.

Present for the meeting were City-County Planning Staff member Aaron King, Clerk Lynn, Manager Bell, Attorney Houff, and in the audience Town Council members Ralph Landreth, Wayne Hester, and Sarah Welch.

The agenda was amended before approval by moving Item #1. Public Hearing on Walgreen's and McDonald's to Item #3 and moving the other two items up a number. Making a motion to do this was Marilyn Martin, seconded by Larry Marshall, and unanimously approved.

The minutes of the March 6, 2007 Planning Board meeting were approved on a motion by Al Slater, seconded by Don Whitaker and unanimously approved.

PUBLIC SESSION - Please limit your talk to 3 minutes.

Public Session was opened and closed at 3:02 p.m. with no speakers.

BUSINESS AT HAND

- PUBLIC HEARING**
DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON:
**WA-030 – PROPOSED BUILDING FOR EXTREME FITNESS
REZONING PLAN**

Request to rezone almost an acre from HB-S to PB-S

DISCUSSION:

Aaron King spoke to this issue by saying that the petitioner has asked that this request be withdrawn from consideration as the deal with the potential client has fallen through. Attorney Houff said that with the Planning Board's permission this could be accomplished – there is no absolute right that the petitioner can withdraw. The zoning would remain the same. On a question as to when they would resubmit, Patrick Hennigan answered that the potential buyer can't buy the property and when they get another prospective buyer, they will come back and apply at that time.

**MOTION: TO ACCEPT THE WITHDRAWAL PETITION OF WA-030 –
EXTREME FITNESS – FROM CONSIDERATION**

BY: AL SLATER
2ND: LARRY MARSHALL
VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION:**
WALKERTOWN MIDDLE SCHOOL
REQUEST FOR A POD – CLASSROOM BUILDING

DISCUSSION:

Aaron King said that last month, approval was granted for a mobile individual unit at this portion of the site and the school folks had said they would be coming back for approval of the pod. It is located on a portion of the site that it takes up some of the football field. The school folks said they could re-work the football field to still fit it in on that site. It meets UDO requirements. Staff recommends approval of this issue.

Some of the discussion included:

- It is not immediately available as to how much of the pod is in the football field.
- The building is more like individual units jammed together into one bigger seven-classroom unit, with the rooms looking right into the field.
- It's not being put on the north end of the building because the site is already graded – saves cost.
- It is assumed that some of the bleachers would probably be moved.
- The pod would likely be a good ways from the main building.
- Students would likely have to cross the bus route – how the bus goes around the school - and also through the parking lot.

None of the school folks were at the meeting to explain several of the above issues.

It was decided that it might be best to delay until the next meeting and let the school people bring a drawing showing how it would work with the football field.

MOTION: TO CONTINUE PB-01-05 – WALKERTOWN MIDDLE SCHOOL REQUEST FOR A POD – UNTIL THE MAY MEETING

BY: MARILYN MARTIN
2ND: AL SLATER
VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **PUBLIC HEARING**
DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON:
WA-029 - PROPOSED FOOD AND DRUG STORE AND RESTAURANT WITH DRIVE THROUGH WALGREEN'S AND MCDONALD'S

DISCUSSION:

Aaron King spoke on this. A little bit of history includes this is a rezoning request to **HB-S and LO-S – TWO PHASE** and also for **SIDA**. This request came before the Planning Board in December, 2006 and was recommend for DENIAL to the Town Council. In between the Planning Board meeting and the Town Council

meeting, it was noted that a portion of this property was actually in NC-DOT's right-of-way and dedicated in 1950 so that subsequently led to some revisions in the site plan. The Town Council heard this matter and remanded it back to the Planning Board. It has taken a couple of months to get a site plan that meets UDO requirements but it does now.

Mr. King: I'll just run through a few of these revisions – things that have changed since last time.

FIRST CHANGE: SIDA request. The original request in December was for 11 acres which would have taken care of the whole site. It would have allowed up to 70% coverage of the whole site. The petitioners have reduced this request to only 2.84 acres, which would cover the HB-S portion of the site. Approval of this request would leave 38.99 acres in SIDA bank for future allocation.

SECOND CHANGE: Road improvements. From the very first, NC-DOT has required a right turn lane on 158 be installed and a median along NC-66 past Martin Street be installed. That is still a requirement. After hearing the concerns about traffic, the petitioners have volunteered to extend the three-lane cross section along NC-66 from 158 to tie in with the Whitehall Village project.

After about 80 feet of right-of-way was taken out of the front portion of the site, some minor revisions were made to the site plan. They reduced the number of parking spaces from 143 to 128. They provided some angled parking spaces which requires a little bit less aisle width and in turn, less impervious area. The original plan showed a stormwater pond but when the first round of revisions came back, that turned into underground retention – but that won't work with SIDA. With SIDA, you have to do above ground storm water retention pond and so that pond has moved over, with an easement from that property owner (Ms. McGee). The total impervious coverage for this site is 69.8% - so it stays below the threshold for SIDA.

Those are the changes that have occurred since the last time the request was brought to this Board. Again, in December, 2006, Staff recommended to the Town Council APPROVAL and the Planning Board recommended DENIAL by a vote of two to one. Staff does again recommend APPROVAL to the somewhat revised site plan.

Peggy Leight: Question; what are the circles on the site plan?

Unknown: Trees.

Ms. Leight: They're just showing the area of the tree being in to the parking lot.

Mr. King: To give you an idea of the canopy there.

Ms. Leight: It says there's a 5-foot building setback but in the Staff Report, it says that a 10-foot setback is required.

Mr. King: I know the HB district will let you go as close as 6-inches or greater than 12-feet – either way it meets setbacks.

Ms. Leight: What's the buffer requirement between an HB-S and an LO-S – a 10-foot buffer?

Mr. King: Yes, you can go down as small as 10-feet. The more narrower the buffer, the more plantings you are going to put in there.

Ms. Leight: What is the area of the retention pond? It looks about an acre.

Mr. King: I think on the front end of this we just asked for the easement to be shown and then if approved, that's when they go back and engineer the pond and the size of it. It's just a generalized area there for that easement.

Ms. Leight: On the side, it says "Proposed Water Quality Pond Access" --- does that mean it's inaccessible or unbuildable land on the side as well.

Mr. King: That's actually been on there on the previous two submittals -- maybe labeled a little differently.

Ms. Martin: Who owns this pond, then? Will the developer have ownership of the retention pond?

Mr. King: I guess technically it would still be on that property -- they would have maintenance agreement for that -- part of the UDO -- as far as the maintenance of that pond -- I guess the developers would be responsible for that.

Ms. Martin: But he won't be the actual owner. He'll just be responsible for maintaining it. Is that the agreement?

Mr. Houff: He'll own an easement to the property -- the right to go on there to do that. And, of course, the site plan would require them to in fact do that. But an easement is not a direct ownership right -- interest -- in property. What it is is a right to go on the property, to do certain things.

Ms. Leight: Does the easement stay with whoever owns the property?

Mr. Houff: The easement typically runs with the land and so the person that developed the property would typically be deeded also -- that easement would run with that.

Ms. Martin: So whoever buys it owns the easement.

Mr. Houff: That's correct. I haven't seen the easement language but that's typical.

Ms. Leight: We're saying that the 2.84 acres is pretty much almost four acres because that has to go with the two pieces of property now.

Mr. King: It's used for SIDA purposes for this but it doesn't make the zoning lot any bigger. That's still a 2.84 acre piece of HB property, if approved.

Ms. Leight: But the other is unbuildable.

Mr. King: Yes. If this is governed by a Special Use site plan, only thing that can go there is a storm water pond. You couldn't put another building right there -- or parking or access -- that's the only thing that can go right there.

Ms. Leight: One of the things that was mentioned with the LO-S property was any LO-S is probably going to require SIDA as well -- it's just we removed the 7 1/2 acre request until some other time, correct?

Mr. King: Pretty much, yes.

Ms. Leight: There was a requirement that 50% of anything that goes into the LO-S be residential. Can you discuss the Staff reason behind that?

Mr. King: Yes. The Staff put that in there. When we looked at this Community Activity Center (CAC) which the site is part of -- there's a lot of commercial zoning in there. There's some office zoning in there but I think as part of this is a tradeoff for allowing some of that commercial activity up at the corner. We tried to get that mixture of uses and we felt like the LO-S district allows residential and office uses. We felt that was a way to get some of the residential uses in there -- to require at least -- and I don't know if 50 is the magic number.

That's what we started at – we felt, in order to get some in there, that that was appropriate in this case.

Ms. Leight: But, again, that was a Staff recommendation? (Yes) Because one of the things I didn't think residential sites or parcels met SIDA criteria because it doesn't increase jobs. It doesn't do a lot of the things that normally you look at when you ask, can this meet SIDA requirements?

Mr. King: Yes. But on the other side of that, you can also look at it being in conformance with – if you have an adopted area plan – that's one of the criteria looking at that – if it does call for that there, then that's something the Board could go on.

Ms. Leight: If it comes back and says they want to make the entire area town homes?

Mr. King:Sure.... And, again, I think that generally, when we were looking at this CAC that when you look at it in the Walkertown Area Plan, it's just kind of one green color – there's not specific parcel by parcel land use recommendations in there. And we laid it out that way so that was some flexibility left in there so that it could swing either way. But I think we did want to see some residential in there. The tendency would be is all of that to come in as office rather than all of it residential – I don't know but I would guess. But we just tried to aim at getting some of that mixture of uses in there but certainly the Planning Board could take that condition out. You could change numbers. It's certainly up to you guys.

Ms. Leight: You said there was some office in there?

Mr. King: Yes. It's LO-S that was approved that was part of the Glenwood – hasn't been developed yet – but there is some LO-S zoning.

Ms. Leight: But everything else is pretty much HB-S at this point?

Mr. King: Yes. There is some RM-18-S that was approved...

Ms. Leight:the apartment complex..... And the areas that are not listed are outside Walkertown jurisdiction, right?

Mr. King: ...Well, the green boundary – that's the boundary of the CAC – that's part of the area plan.

Discussion then was about specific lots and parcels – some of which are in the zoning jurisdiction of Walkertown and some of which are still in Forsyth County only.

Ms. Martin: I think basically in the Land Use Plan it does say that there's already existing commercial development at this location and the commercial development surrounded by vacant land. And the potential therefore exists to add multi-family residential and office uses at this location --- This is at US-158 and NC-66 ---- transforming it into a Mixed Use area. And the intensity of the development of this CAC is limited by watershed regulations because of its location within the Salem Lake Watershed. And, of course that goes on in recommendation is about considering it's in the watershed.....

Mr. King: Yes. You guys were part of the Land Use Committee and I think part of this was a little different than starting with a vacant area for activity center. We kind of had to retrofit this to what was already there. So that impacted some of those decisions.

Ms. Leight: In one of the previous planning reports, the Staff had recommended a limitation on the financial institution and that's no longer there?

Mr. King: Should be..... I don't know if it got left out between versions.
Ms. Leight: Then we could still have LO-S as being Banking and Financial Services. But before you had recommended no banking.
Mr. King: We had some discussions with the petitioner and I don't want to speak for them but I think they were agreeable to taking that use out. Our thought being that banks are a pretty high traffic generator and even though they are allowed in that limited office district they are typically a commercial use. So that was our request to petitioner – I'll let them speak that they're agreeable to taking that use out.

From the audience, Mr. Kelley agreed to that statement.

Mr. King: Okay. I just want to make sure on that. So they were agreeable to removing that use.
Mr. Houff: If that's not included, that would be a part of any motion – assuming there may be a motion to approve. Just recall at that time that whoever might make that motion, that you'd want to include that as a condition because it apparently is not on the site plan right now.
Mr. King: Yes. I believe it ended up getting lost in one of the revisions.
Ms. Leight: Would you give a brief explanation of when you have a Two Phase, that once the approved LO-S Two-Phase, what would the next step be for the developers and for Walkertown?
Mr. King: Well, in the next step, it would be – it would come back similar to a rezoning. It would come back to Staff review, Planning Board and then up to the Council for the final decision. But, keep in mind that Two Phase is a little bit different than what you're seeing now. This is pretty much the first bite of the apple. There's things that the Planning Board has concerns about – you need to ask for them **now** because on the second phase **it's pretty much a site plan review. Zoning has already been approved. Uses have been approved. So those are not up for debate anymore. They are already taken care of.** What you would be looking at then would just be site design and there's some limited authority that the Planning Board has to ask for a few things. And that's why I like to look through the conditions. I tried to list some in there as far as like the sidewalks for LO-S Two Phase so if it's approved now, we don't have to debate that on the second phase. And as far as you mentioned – the 50% residential on that. The vehicular connection to this site. So if there's things that the Planning Board has concerns with, it would be good, if the petitioners' are agreeable to, to condition it on this first go-round.
Ms. Leight: It's very hard to put conditions on a piece of property when it could be anything from a bank to a town home to a veterinary office. Because there's no delineation of the lots, the sizes of the lots – no road – nothing that we have had in the past with Phase Two where we knew the size/site of the lots and any changes to that would have to come through. But here, it's 7 ½ acres of open property.
Mr. King: And I think as far as some of the uses there, we looked at the residential uses obviously, but some of the lower kind of intensity offices – I think the thought was that we would have the office and maybe transition the residential kind of adjoining some of the existing residential back in there and that was the thought on that.

Ms. Leight: It's a nice thought, but unless it's on the site plan, it doesn't mean anything at all, correct?

Mr. King: Unless, number one there was a condition. And number two, the petitioner would come back and wouldn't show what's on there --- I know that's not their intent -- but unless they were going to show what was going to happen on the LO-S now, or the Planning Board condition it now.

Ms. Martin: Once it's rezoned, it's rezoned.

Mr. King: Correct.

Ms. Martin: And you can't go back on that second phase and say, well, let's do it a different way.

Mr. King: Correct. Like I said, this pretty much is putting the zoning and the land uses in place and all you're really going to be looking at on second phase is site plan design. That's what you'd be getting on the second phase.

Ms. Martin: But we don't have now, though.

Ms. Leight: The only thing we know of is that one acre ____ would not be buildable.

Mr. King: Correct.

PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED AT 3:27 P.M.

(1) Mike Kelley
1076 West Fourth Street

Let me talk to you a little bit about the adjoining piece of land so we can talk to you a little bit about what our thoughts were. What we wanted to do about a year ago, we came to you for the first time. Some of the concern initially was that the "retail" side of this didn't continue on down 158. And so all we tried to do was provide you all the assurances that 158 wouldn't become Stratford Road or Hanes Mall Blvd. or something with a lot of high use. We went to Ms. McGee and asked her if she would join in the petition -- and I will tell you all on this Board that it was not exactly the easiest meeting we've ever had because Ms. McGee has had that piece of land forever -- as a drive-in theatre. She still sees it one day begin developed by her family. I don't think she sees herself developing it. So to come to her and take off the retail options for her -- she actually viewed that as a little bit of a tough pill because at the end of the day, the value of the retail component would be - at that point -- a whole lot less than it would be if it was a multi-family, or office. So I want you guys to know in the front end, when we met with Ms. McGee, that was really to benefit you all to prevent any future retail moving down 158. Obviously, we love that piece of land. We'd like to see it multi-family. We know there's multi-family that's already being built in the area -- but I see that piece of land as some nice complimentary uses to what we want to do. So, again, I want to reiterate that point of why Ms. McGee's land is sort of -- what's stated on the site plan. Because at the end of the day, if we're going to invest over \$12million for you all next door, we would see us to hopefully, one day be the benefactor or we could work with Patrick or we could work with anybody to work collectively. Because Patrick's put a lot of time and energy on this corner already. I guess the main thing today is to tell you, we've been here a little over a year. We've listened to you. Ms. Leight, we've listened to you very carefully on this plan. Ms. Martin, we've listened to you and your husband about the right-of-ways ---- and we've surely learned the hard way that we were incorrect initially. We've changed engineers to Stimmel Associates

to make sure we addressed all the SIDA issues, all the site plan issues, all the landscaping issues. The landscaping was a big issue in one of our town meetings. The D.O.T., Mr. Kemp, is going to show you his plan. We're spending about three to four hundred thousand dollars extra on connecting that connection up the road there to Whitehall. We brought Pat Ivey to ya'll. We brought J.P. Couch. We brought all the top D.O.T. officials to Walkertown. I think I told everybody at the meeting that I've been doing this for thirty years and I've never seen D.O.T. officials as they did that day to sort of tell you the long-term plans of Walkertown. I think they've admitted to us all that whatever goes on that corner, will see D.O.T. improvements similar to ours. The only difference is the person who's going to be doing that won't take the connection up to Whitehall. So, at the end of the day, I've listened. I've listened very closely for a year! And I know the traffic is the biggest issue. I've had Ramey go back and study the traffic accident data to let you know sort of what's happened there over the last seven years so you can know statistically what's gone on in that intersection – because that was always a concern. So, at the end of the day, landscaping was an issue. Site plan was an issue. Right-of-way was an issue. I can't think of anything that I haven't heard you say that I have not addressed and I know it's a real sensitive case and I'm very much appreciative of that and I just know at the end of the day the people who own this land are aggressively trying to market it. And, so one day it's going to be something. All I'm trying to do is bring you somebody that I think is a real good tenant. And Walgreen's – I can take you throughout the state at the nine I've built, and you can ask around how they've done. McDonald's – I know that's one you have concern about but we do have a local franchisee out of Kernersville. He's told us how he'll limit the access for trucks; how he employs several, several folks within the area – he lives five minutes from the site. So, good news – it's not a corporate store – it's a local, Kernersville resident who will own that store. So I've tried to give you everything I know and given you thirty years of experience, and, most importantly, I've given you my heart and soul on this one. And if there's anything that I haven't addressed but the good news – more than any project that I've done in the last year and a half – this is the one I've focused on. I live ten minutes from here – work ten minutes from here – so it's not like I'm an out-of-towner. You've just got to tell me if there's something I miss. So what I want to do is turn it over to Ramey and he's the best at doing this in the state. And please ask him any questions but just don't forget that connection to Whitehall. No one's asked me to do that but **me** !! And I'm doing that because I've heard you say that as a concern. So at this time, Ramey, I'll give it to you. Thank you.

(2) Ramey Kemp: Some of this we've shown you already. We've got a few things that we have added – quite a bit of change has occurred on some of the site plans but basically the traffic design – the roadway design is very similar to what was presented the last time we were here.

THE FOLLOWING IS BITS AND PIECES OF MR. KEMP'S PRESENTATION OF OVERHEAD SLIDES AS HE DESCRIBES THE SLIDES

This is the aerial view. This is Old Hollow Road – 66 – this is 158 going back towards Winston-Salem. This is Walkertown in the distance. You can see the outline here of the retail component of the site and you can see the Lowe's, the

Sheetz, the Wendy's. Traffic study of the site – very similar to traffic studies we do throughout a nine-state area. We do probably 200 of these a year and we handle them by a set of guidelines that were established by the Institute of Transportation Engineers – that's a national policy group that exists through the cooperation of the federal government, state governments and you can see the P.M. peak, very similar to the A.M. peak, is generating 13 new cars. This is new traffic in the peak hour – in addition to what's on that road already. We've got 25 coming from the northbound direction, coming from Reidsville. We've got 18 coming from Kernersville – this is the traffic that we have generated coming into the site and then you can see traffic going away from the site. 12 going down Bellaire, which is the only way we've got to get back to Walkertown once the island goes in. 14 going towards Winston-Salem. This is all new traffic. I was asked by our attorney what kind of percent does this represent in this new traffic as compared to the existing traffic – this is about a 3% increase over what is on the road now. This number represents about a 5% increase and this represents about a 4%. So it's a very small percentage that we're adding to the existing traffic. As a result of the traffic study, we've met with NC-DOT; we've met with the Town. We've worked with DOT and their insistence that a concrete island go down Old Hollow Road past Martin Street, turning those streets into right-in and right-outs. As a result of the traffic study, we added pavement on to Old Hollow Road, creating a longer, much longer left turn lane as it approaches Reidsville Road. Right now, it's about 50-feet of left turn lane – we were prepared to go in and add 450-feet until Mike decided he would agree to extend this three-lane section all the way back to the Whitehall improvements, that are 3-lanes so that we carry all of those improvements now, all the way back to Darrow Road. So you would have a three-lane section all the way from Reidsville Road back to Darrow Road, which, based on the driveways along here, was a great added improvement to the roadway. In addition to that, we added a right-turn lane on southbound – the direction of Winston-Salem – a right turn lane going in to the site and we carried that pavement on around the radius here so that traffic making a U-turn here, we could accommodate vehicular traffic that would make that U-turn coming back this way. This is showing you how trucks will approach the site and move through the site and you can see that they will come in from the direction of Reidsville – they will go through the intersection – they'll pass up into the site and then back in to the area adjacent to the store. One thing you'll see from this is that you can get two cars passing each other in this area, even with the truck parked there. It's a pretty standard design for Walgreen stores. This will allow truck traffic coming from Reidsville – it will allow truck traffic coming from Kernersville – and those would be the two primary directions for the truck traffic coming to the site, if they came down Old Hollow road, there is plenty of good radius here for them to make this turn also. Now, here you'll see the truck traffic leaving the site will go out on to Martin Street, come down Old Hollow Road, and from there, they can turn in any of three directions. This drawing here shows something Pat Ivey asked us to go back and look at, knowing that 30 years from now, there may be a need to widen Reidsville Road – not to 4-lanes but to 6-lanes. He was concerned about that and he was concerned that we had enough right-of-way to do that in with this development. And what we did was go in and actually look at what the pavement width would be with dual lefts in the future turning on to Old Hollow Road - three lanes northbound, an additional right turn lane and then three lanes southbound. And

we were able to show him, and he agreed that we did have enough right-of-way to accommodate that section. Now, this shows you the improvements that are planned and agreed to and offered by Mike Kelley as part of this development where we would extend the 3-lane section that DOT asked us to place there by our traffic study all the way back to Whitehall Village. And there's a blow-up of that – it actually comes a little bit to the north and the west of Martin Street where it ties into Old Hollow Road and extend back to what Whitehall Village is proposing to do. Now, we were asked to consider what would happen if we were to locate on this side of the road and one of the things we wanted to point out to you was the discussion with DOT. They planned to put a concrete island over there also along Old Hollow Road all the way back to that second entrance that's being constructed right now. And along Reidsville Road, they were planning to extend the concrete island all the way up to the second entrance to the north. Here's the site Walgreen's has proposed. There's the Lowe's and this is the main access and I know there's a back access that's being built here but if this were to go forward that would be the primary access for that shopping center. Here's a new graph. We went to the DOT to obtain data over the last seven years from their Traffic Engineering Analysis System. This is data that they accumulate from the Highway Patrol and the Police Departments, Sheriffs Departments, throughout the state. They keep a very careful compilation of this data. It is crash data that involves motor vehicles that have \$1,000 or more damage. As they pointed out to me, it doesn't take much to get up to a \$1,000 these days. Over the last seven years, the total number of crashes at Old Hollow Road and 158 – there were 75 total crashes. That worked out to be a little less than one a month and that was looking at the distance of 500 feet either side of the intersection. There were no fatalities. There was one Class A crash. A Class A typically is when you have to transport somebody to the hospital. That was one over seven years. There were five Class B's which means that when the medical people got there, somebody had a bruise or they felt like they were stiff – swelling, limping, or other painful movement – not necessarily going to the hospital. There was less than one annually. Class C crashes – when there's complaint of pain but no visible signs of injuries – there were 28 -roughly 4 a year. This gives you an idea of what has happened over the last seven years at this intersection. Here's a graph with information from the same data base, looking at the whole of Forsyth County and how this intersection ranked with all others – it ranked 56 in total number of accidents. You can see that the highest ranking intersection had 354 crashes or roughly one a week compared to one a month at this location. Here is a typical Walgreen's that Mike Kelley has built – on Pisgah Church Road and Elm Street in Greensboro. You can see the truck parked behind the Walgreen's and how there's a great deal of pavement out here – but this is the back of the store..... You can see they load from the back of the truck typically or the side.....This wall is going to be increased 6-feet, this is where the trash container goes

.....

A member of the audience asked if a traffic light was planned at Bellaire and NC-66 and Mr. Ramey responded not that he knew of. It was not warranted and you have to meet the warrants for signals that DOT lays down. There are nationally standard guidelines. Typically, you do not get signals anymore without meeting those guidelines. Thirty and forty years ago, if you wanted a signal, and you

wanted a signal – you put up a signal. That’s why we have a lot of signals. We’ve actually been asked to go out and analyze some that other cities want taken down.

Ms. Leight: This traffic count – these are in addition to existing traffic counts which

Mr. Kemp: ...Yes....

Ms. Leight:are both higher than the roadway currently is set for.

Mr. Kemp: ..Well, that 13 represents about 3% of what the total traffic on that roadway is from that approach.

Ms. Leight: This is assuming one-half of the 3300 trips per day are new trips and this is the new trip number?

Mr. Kemp: Yes. New trip. New traffic.

Ms. Leight: If you have 25 all of these cars are going into the Walgreen’s – half would come back. And I guess my numbers on adding up don’t seem to add up.

Mr. Kemp: Yeah. Let’s look at it. We’ve got 13 coming in from this direction. We’ve got 12 and 1 going away.

Ms. Leight: If you’ve got 13 coming down, the only entrance for them to turn on to 158, they can’t turn down Martin – and 25 coming from Reidsville Road, that’s 38, right there – going in to.....

Mr. Kemp:Right and those two numbers don’t always totally agree. They should be roughly in agreement but we are guided by our national guidelines by how much traffic is entering and how much is exiting.

Ms. Leight: Okay. And the 14 that’s coming up 158 – that means they were going in to the McDonald’s – that means they would be the ones making a U-Turn.

Mr. Kemp: Yes. They will be making a U-turn right there.

Ms. Martin:But they compared it to their U-turn in Kernersville on a busy street – not a U.S. Highway – but transfer trucks coming down at 55 mph – so it’s kind of like comparing apples and onions – they just don’t mix.

Mr. Kemp: This protected permissive move is fairly common throughout North Carolina.

Ms. Martin: I’m still not in agreement.

Mr. Kemp: Well, does everybody understand what a protected permissive move is? Initially, you get – when the light goes green in your direction for you to move – you get in that left hand lane, an arrow and a green ball. You get both. And at some point during the green phase, the arrow will go yellow and then it will just go green ball, which tells you that after the traffic is basically clearing on the other side, you’ve got a chance to go ahead and make a turn. Now, at sometimes, at schools in particular, they take that alternative away. You don’t have the permissive – you’ve got to go only under the green arrow...

Ms. Leight:But in this case, the DOT specified that they could turn on an unprotected green.

Mr. Kemp: Yes. Now the reason for that is it just encourages people – it’s very frustrating – to sit there in off-peak and get a green arrow and then a red ball that tells you that you cannot turn left and there’s no traffic coming in from the other direction. You’re sitting there – you could turn – but you’re not

allowed to. Now, usually the only time they do that now is at schools. They don't want to give kids the alternative. They want them to turn only when they allow them to turn.

Mr. Slater: Am I correct in your saying that the count you have is during peak hours only. So, okay, we get away from 7 til 9 in the morning and then 4:30 to 6:30 – so the rest of the day, it's only local traffic. So, basically, you've got the traffic going to work in the morning, in peak hours, and the rest of the day, we don't have traffic.

Mr. Kemp: No. No. No. No. Yeah, we could look at the off-peak. It's just that the off-peak is never going to be critical.

Ms. Leight: This is average over a 10-hour day, is it not?

Mr. Kemp: No. That's your peak.

Mr. Slater: So your traffic count is going to be a lot less is what I'm trying to point out – during the rest of the day.

Mr. Kemp: Right!! Your traffic count is less and your traffic going to the site is less.

Mr. Slater: So if the business is approved and located there, the people going down there will be the same people that's out there today going down through there at 10:00 in the morning or 2:00 in the evening going through that intersection.

Mr. Kemp: Some of them – but that's been accounted for in our numbers.

Mr. Leight: But if the 3300 trips per day, 3300 cars going into this location, whether they were going to be on the road or not – that's for a day and these hours are..... Do you have the numbers for non-peak?

Mr. Kemp: We never have to look at that because every time you do – it's insignificant. The traffic volumes drop off on existing roadways. Our numbers drop off. Nobody cares. They want us to design the streets for the worst case. In fact, it's worse than that ---- we typically design for the worst 15-minute period.

Ms. Martin: But if you live here, it's not insignificant. It's still traffic – a constant.

Ms. Leight: If half of the 3300 trips a day, were people passing through this location anyway, you're looking at about 1800 cars a day – and given the limited hour range, if you're picking a 10-hour day, that's 180 cars per hour. By hour, if you broke that down, into all these numbers, it would equal that. But you're saying there would be more at our peak time and 3:00 in the afternoon, there might not be as many cars.

Mr. Kemp: Right. And that figure is correct. The pass-by trips amounted to 53 in the A.M. and 35 in the P.M.

Ms. Martin: Has this taken into account the 53 additional trucks that'll be coming out of Belews Creek traveling up 158 per day, going to Business 40? They're going to Mt. Holley to a Gypsum plant, is my understanding. So that'll be 53 heavily loaded trucks coming up and going back every day.

Mr. Kemp: Well, we counted truck traffic and I don't see it here. I'm sure it's accounted for in our numbers but, yes, we count trucks.

Ms. Martin: We just received this information about this.

Mr. Kemp: If they're not there now, we didn't count them. We did project volumes – that is part of what we do.

Someone in the audience asked what procedure did they use to project volumes and was it based on increasing construction in the area.....??? What do you take into account to project volumes??

Mr. Kemp: Typically, we grow traffic at 2% to 3%. The City of Winston-Salem had input into this. But we typically use figures that are provided to us. Sometimes if we don't have those figures and we are in deep curiosity, we'll go in there and look at the growth in the ADT on a highway and we'll get our number that way. But, typically, that's less than 3 – so

From the audience --- If you would take an airplane and just fly over the area and look at the concentration of development _____ in a 3-mile radius, I think you'd be a little bit amazed and perhaps adjust your projections to include more traffic – very concentrated within a circle.....

Mr. Kemp said they would go back and look at this and see if DOT's traffic numbers would actually project higher than 3%, which is a pretty high growth rate – 3% per year.

Ms. Leight: I believe you are using the 33/29 that was in the Staff report and what they recommended trip generation for an HB-S area. It may vary plus or minus in an area that has more concentration or less concentration but they give an average for a particular zone. That's my understanding.

Mr. Whitaker: You have checked the peak traffic on Highway 66, haven't you? How much more traffic will it handle in peak traffic than it now has.

Mr. Kemp: Yes. I don't have that figure. We could develop it for you.

Ms. Leight: I've got the 2005 HP count for Forsyth County and 158 is at 17,000 trips per day and it's capacity is 16,700 so it's over capacity right now. The traffic count for 66 is 16,000 and the capacity is 14,600 – again, both of those roads are over capacity – currently, without any new development anywhere. And that's not just peak – that's the entire day!

Mr. Kemp: Now, that's existing roadway widths and did not include the 3-laning of 66, is that correct?

Ms. Leight: Existing and 2005 numbers for the DOT.

Mr. Kemp: The 3-laning of 66 will add capacity to the roadway. I'd have to get their figures from the DOT on how much capacity that will add. But they're doing this in a lot of areas throughout the state where they don't have the money now to 4-lane and they're putting in 3-lanes as a big step in that direction and it does add a lot of capacity to the roadway, particularly where you've got a lot of driveways along the road. And that's what you've got here. You can see them in this drawing – all of the homes, each one of those homes is served by a driveway going in to Old Hollow Road. And those people, when they're trying to make a left, they stop all the traffic on 66. What we're proposing is a third lane on Old Hollow Road that would allow them to get over into that middle turn lane and get out of the through roadway and allow the traffic to continue through. You will see the improvement.

Ms. Leight: You said Walgreen trucks will be coming from.....

Mr. Kemp:They'll either be coming from Kernersville or

from Reidsville, and.....

Ms. Leight:Distribution points are not in Winston, so they wouldn't be coming up 158?

Mr. Kemp:If they do, they'll stop back here on the way back. That can be controlled by Walgreen's. They get typically 3 trucks a week.

Ms. Leight:And what about the other trucks that come to Walgreen's....like Lay's...

Mr. Kemp:Now, some of those can make that U-turn and that pavement is about 26 to 28 feet.....

Ms. Leight:So you're saying that these smaller trucks will make the U-turn and access.

Mr. Kemp:The ones that can, will. The ones that can't, they're going to find out real quick that they can't. They will find the correct way to come in to the site.

Ms. Leight: Do you know how many other trucks, other than the 3 Walgreen trucks, will make deliveries?

Mr. Kemp: I do not.

Mr. Kelley: McDonald's franchisee controls his trucks – he tells them the time of day or night that they're allowed.....He'll control those times.

Mr. Kemp:Didn't he say one truck a week?

Mr. Kelley: It's not a lot. I'd say less than five and maybe three..

Ms. Leight: And Walgreen's gets Frito-Lays, Pepsi, Coke, Lance, etc.?

Mr. Kemp: Yes.....Yes.....Yes....

Mr. Kelley:I do know that trucks would be coming from the Kernersville store, the closest store. They'd be coming down 66 and making a left at the light, up 158. How many trucks, Frito-Lays, Coke, Pepsi, I don't think I can give you that number.

Mr. Kemp; this is not any different than what you've got over at Wendy's across the street. It's typical of the retail centers.

Mr. Kelley: The volumes of Walgreen's is not a handful – it's not a big box user. It's not somebody that's constantly merchandising.....like Costco or Wal-Mart's. They merchandise their store with very much the lightweight products so they don't need all the trucks that you mention. It's more a health and beauty aid product more than toys or lawnmowers or big box stuff. So that's the advantage of Walgreen's as compared to some of these that are out there. And their prime time – it's not like a high-impact type user. It's sort of like an average type retail guy that sells goods from 9 in the morning til 9 at night.

Ms. Leight: Does the truck back into and crosses back over the drive-thru exit up there?

Mr. Kemp: Yes. Common move.

Ms. Leight: And then the McDonald's trucks would also load on the back side of _____??????????

Mr. Kemp: ??????????????????????

Much of this discussion could not be heard clearly.

Coleman Alderson: Wouldn't the number of crashes be based on volume of traffic?

Mr. Kemp: What it tells you is you're getting 75 crashes over a 7-year period at this intersection. I would say there is probably more traffic at these intersections but it also tells me they probably need more improvements. I think the priority with DOT is pretty far down the list in making any improvements to this intersection.

Ms. Leight: If I could speak for Mr. Alderson, I think what he's trying to say is there's 75 accidents with an average daily count of 17,000 cars. That may be higher percentage-wise than 354 accidents if there's 100,000 cars a day going through that intersection. So there could be different percentage depending on how you figure.

Mr. Whitaker: How many lanes of traffic is it at 52 and 421? Don't they have more accidents where there are multiple lanes of traffic than they do for just single lanes?

Mr. Kemp: Not necessarily. If you have good sight distance; if you get the proper number of lanes to handle the traffic, no, I wouldn't agree with that. I think probably your chances of exposure are higher but still they're typically operating very well even with higher volumes. But certainly your chances are higher.

Ms. Martin: I know when they block Martin Street from the left hand turn – there is a school bus that comes directly down Martin Street to our church school and before and after school program. So I'm just assuming that the county evidently is going to re-route that school bus so it'll probably come down Bellaire and around Martin Street.

Ms. Leight: I would like to hear what Mr. Kelley thinks would be a good use of the other property.

Mr. Kelley: I would see where there's a need in Walkertown for something in the medical side – dental side – to me, that would be an important use. The multi-family side or some nice, maybe not apartments but the two connected living accommodations. Something in the \$175,000 to the \$250,000 range would be something that would be a nice complement to what we're doing. I see Ms. McGee's land a real, sort of a crown jewel, to do something very complementary to what needs to be – so you don't have that mass of traffic that you're concerned about on 158 – like with banks or office buildings, etc. So I see something more complementary than what you might be concerned with on the traffic generating side. So, we talk to Ms. McGee on a regular basis. We are not opposed to looking at it. We're looking at it with Patrick, if he'd be interested in doing something with us there because he has a lot of experience as well. But, again, I see Ms. McGee's land as just a bland, just sort of buffer what continues on on 158 so you all don't have what's happened on so many areas where bigger boxes come, or car lots come, or Jiffy Lubes come. That would not be right. I'll just say thank you. I know this is a tough one. There's a lot of pro and cons each way and all I'll let you know is if there's something else we could talk about, I think we've all been together for a year. I'll just tell you thank you and I'll look forward to your vote either way. I still support all of you in Walkertown 100%.

(2) Patrick Hennigan
107 Kingsbury Ct.

Mooresville NC

Actually, I'm not pro or con but I just wanted to state for the record what I think. If you put yourself in my shoes, if this project happens across from our project, that's a good thing. It'll help make our project to make our intersection a more essential intersection in town. So that's a good thing if you put yourself in my business shoes. On the other hand, we have the ability to purchase the site – the Neal property across the street – we don't own it. And, clearly Walgreen's and McDonald's prefer this site – that's their favorite site. They don't want to talk to us about our site until they get a decision on this site. And, it's like going to the ice cream store --- if your favorite flavor is chocolate, you don't want to talk about strawberry until you find out they're out of chocolate. That's probably the simplest way to put it. If I was to call these folks, they would say, 'No. We're not interested. We've got our site. We like our site and that's where we want to be.' And, in fact, they might say, 'We don't want your site. We want to go up to where Mickey's is. We want to go here or we want to go there.' I don't know exactly what my point is but I just wanted to let you know that this is their preferred site and they don't want to look at another site until they find out they can't go here. And I can look Mike in the eye and tell him that. So, anyway, I'm ambivalent. I wish you luck. That's a great traffic analysis – one of the best ones I've seen. And if Mike does this project, he's doing a ton of roadway work and that's a good thing. And so, anyhow, thanks!

(3) Harold Warner
2958 Lakawanna
Walkertown NC

I was born and raised in this community and lived here with the exception of 17 years for the 80 years that I exempt to you today. I come before you because I'm interested in Walkertown future and the present. Of course, the future I probably will not live in, as you can see. And I am opposed to your zoning this for the businesses that have been proposed to you. And I think I have legitimate and certainly very valid reasons for it. I certainly found your statistics very interesting, sir ---- 13 cars a day – I'm sorry, I'll do that myself!! Now, I learned long term in business for my boss, for my own protection, I can take a survey and I can take statistics – I pretty much can make and show what I want you to see. I don't wish to deny your statistics, sir, but....today is one thing, tomorrow is another. All you can do is project today and tomorrow from your statistics. Let me tell you something about it. First of all, I'd like to thank this Planning Board in the presence of all of you, for giving of their time and talents to serve me as a citizen, the entire citizens of Walkertown, and the town. Resting on their shoulders, of course, as you realize, is going to be what Walkertown is to the youngsters of today and I certainly want to thank you very much for giving of yourself, your talents, sacrificing your families for this. And I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you. Now, even though I was very impressed with some of the things you gave, sir, all of you here – a lot of them I cannot accept – traffic, and so forth and so on. Let me say this: I want Walgreen's and I want McDonald's, even though my doctor doesn't – here in Walkertown, not only for myself but for our youngsters to come, and also for the betterment of the town. The more business and services that we can get here for the citizens of Walkertown, the better for all

of us. However, I don't want to bring these services in at the expense of the town when we have alternates. My view is this, that while I want Walkertown to benefit by Walgreen's and McDonald's – your tax base – the convenience to the citizens and all like that, we can have this but not according to what you're proposing. We have many ultimate properties available, some already zoned Business, that can accommodate you, and I think be very profitable for you. And I think in doing so, it would eliminate a lot of the negative aspects, as I see it, and also dangers. Let me tell you why I feel this way. First of all, the properties that you're talking about having rezoned, while you presented a truck route and etc., that's theoretical. What's actually going to happen – you and I do not know about today, we can only suspect. My suspect is a little different from yours. Let's have some of the truck traffic coming in to the facility from Winston-Salem. I know you pointed out that the distribution and all is in Greensboro. That is today! Tomorrow, due to the changing times, we don't know where your distribution will be. I foresee truck traffic coming from Winston-Salem on 158. At the intersection of Darrow Road and 158, they will turn left. They will go on Darrow Road to Martin Street, they will turn right; they will go in to the back entrance to the facility. That's going to certainly have a very negative impact on the Martin Street neighborhood as well as also, it's going to be an additional expense to the Town of Walkertown because today you do not have Martin Street structurally and width-wise to accommodate what I'm talking about. Of course, this is my opinion. You might differ with me and I welcome you to do so. Now let's look at another item. We talk about traffic coming down Highway 66 right into 158, turn right and go in. We're going to have three lanes of traffic. Now, it's true a lot of that will turn right into the facility if it goes through. However, when we get backlogged for anything, we're all impatient. I'm going to turn on Bellaire, go Bellaire down and turn left on Martin right into the back of your Walgreen's and your McDonald's. And I don't think I'm unusual at all. I think I'm the average citizen. So what I'm saying to you today is to put these businesses in the properties you want, you're going to very negatively affect the neighborhood on Bellaire, which has existed for a long period of time. People invested in their homes for a good, safe residential neighborhood. You're going to do likewise on Martin Street and all. However, there are properties where you will not do this and yet we would have you in Walkertown. Now, I haven't mentioned to you another serious concern of mine. We have had for a number of years a very outstanding church on Martin Street – Morris Chapel United Methodist Church. Your traffic that you are going to generate coming off of Darrow Road on Martin Street and, even you're going to have a lot of people turning through the parking lot of that church, is going to very negatively impact that church. They have a very efficient and very wonderful daycare center – children are around – safety. Funeral services, out in their cemetery interrupted by heavy trucks coming in, cars coming out. You're going to also have trucks, car carrier trucks, trucks of that nature pulling in to eat at McDonald's. They do it right to day at Sheetz – they block all of these. These are some of the things I'd like to bring to your attention today. And I feel justified that we'll certainly tell you that this is not the location for your businesses, particularly since I do know that we have many properties already available to you. Most recently, there was properties, I believe the Dudley family had zoned for business. You had properties at the corner of Darrow Road and 158. There's a stop light there. There's a Texaco service station across. You would not have the dangers to the traveling public and others if you got those

properties and located your business there and yet we in Walkertown would still have you; appreciate you. We'd have your tax base and all of the advantages and our youth of the future would certainly appreciate you. Thank you very much for your time.

(4) Chuck Anas
3619 Annie Lane
Walkertown NC

I'm on the other side of Martin Street and my traffic issues are a matter of fact due to where I decided to live. All my trips due to the proposed changes to NC-66 will all start heading north, regardless of where I'm going. I want to thank Mr. Warner. He covered an awful lot of the issues that I did want to bring up. And I think he did a real super job on that. And same way with me, it's not the Walgreen's and McDonald's that I'm concerned about. They're both fine establishments – love to have them here in town. But it's going to be the impact on a dangerous and busy intersection. I know we've said it's not the most dangerous intersection in Forsyth County, but, really, any accidents are more than we really want to bear. Now, this development is going to add the U-turn lane for NC-158 and it's going to continue to leave the speed limit at 55 mph. I don't think we have a chance of getting that lowered because it is a truck route. I'm also concerned about the local truck traffic. Now, we've talked about the trucks that are going to be serving these businesses and the 1, 2, 3, 4 a week – whatever. I think that's a very minor issue. If you look across the street at Wendy's at noon-time or Hardee's up on 66, particularly at breakfast time, you'll see their parking lots and the adjacent parking lots loaded with truck traffic. And I'm not talking pick-ups --- I'm talking service trucks, vans, I've seen plenty of 18-wheelers parked in there – be it in the Rose's lot or over along next to Sheetz or along by Lowe's. Even our own Fire Department parks there. Now, when I look at the plans for the parking for the McDonald's and Walgreen's, I don't see really much parking in there for anything much more than a passenger car. Angled parking spaces sure don't give you room to park a construction trailer or whatever like that. We have to realize that 158 is a truck route and Walkertown is a blue collar neighborhood. We have a lot of working folk and their equipment that would like to partake in these establishments and get themselves a breakfast or lunch or whatever. Again, I just used the example of Wendy's and Hardee's. And, basically, I just feel that Martin Street is going to be a service road for these stores. You've got the prohibitive left turn, but that's only for the contracted delivery trucks. Other folks, as Mr. Warner said, are going to be coming down Martin Street to access Walgreen's and McDonald's. We all know that most of the truck traffic on 158 – lot of repeat drivers going up and down those roads every day. It's not going to take them very long to discover that all they have to do is wait until they get to 158 and Darrow Road is to cut down Martin Street right by the churches he so eloquently explained. I'm concerned about that plus the two new housing developments that we've got going up. That's not going to help the situation. That's obviously is going to also impact Bellaire. Obviously, the site's going to be commercially developed – no doubt about that – but hopefully it's going to be something that's not such a high-traffic business. The DOT study, or whoever actually did the study on the traffic, the additional vehicle trips per day, the 13, or 18, or 25 – those are additional trips and I'm really concerned about the traffic that we have today. We've obviously just said that both

roads are overloaded but that's the traffic that's going to be going in and out of these businesses. It is not the 13 extra people that are going to drive out of their way to go find a McDonald's. There's one on almost every street corner in town so people aren't going to come this way to find a McDonald's. It's going to be the daily traffic that we have that's going to be using these – the 3300 cars – or whatever the number was. And I again agree that there are several more sites in the Walkertown area that are more suited, appropriately zoned, that would be much more appropriate for these businesses. And that's about it. All I can say is if this development is approved and we go ahead and have a big accident at "Dead Man's Crossing" --- at least I can say to myself, 'I came here. I said something. I tried.' Thank you.

6. Coleman Alderson
7028 Discovery Lane
Walkertown NC

We bought an investment property on Bellaire Circle and it's property that we see and hopefully see as appreciating in value. It's a quiet street. One of the bonuses was that it was convenient to Highway 158 and that seems to be part of the mixed bag of blessings that we have received because it is so close to development and commercial areas. I got out my little girl's paste stuff, stick 'em sticks, and a map and all this and I have stars here and I don't have any fancy Dell computer to shine up there but this is the map of the same intersection. And what I did, and this is just a layman's representation, of all the developments that are going on in this area. If we could strap ourselves in a nice little Super-Cub airplane and fly slow and low over this area, you'd be amazed at the kind of development that's just right within this circle. It's almost shocking. Plus, I went ahead and drew in – this is the mythical northern beltway – it's somewhere in the offing. But we know, with several exits coming off into Walkertown, this beltway is going to not only be receiving traffic, it's going to be feeding traffic up 158 and everywhere. So, with all due respect, sir, it is very hard to project all of the things, in line with what Mr. Warner was saying, all of the things in this scenario where you have a multiplicity of growth events happening here and there commercially and residentially and I really do think --- I support development, we're developers ourselves. We have our own little development north of here. I support Walgreen's. I support capitalism and enterprise, but, goodness! This is a really tough site to work with and given the traffic situation and the safety concerns – Mr. Warner reminded me – of course somebody will be cutting down Bellaire Circle to get to their fast meal. That's just the way we think. And to see, personally, an investment that I thought would quietly just grow and grow become a question mark on a very personal level, is a bit distressing. But above and beyond that is also the whole general impact on the community. The blue star represents the high school that's coming in. I haven't heard anyone mention what impact the high school is going to have. And that's just down the road. And, certainly, we're going to have school buses, we're going to have cars – parents dropping kids off – kids driving themselves. So, I don't see this as a particularly win-win situation for the community and I'm sorry that it's not a good fit. But that's my solid opinion on it. Thank you.

Public Hearing was closed at 4:32 p.m.

Discussion was then opened for the Planning Board.

Larry Marshall: I keep hearing all this problem talking about traffic problems. I look at all these people and they travel. Walkertown doesn't have a traffic problem – couple hours in the morning, couple of hours in the afternoon. I've lived down Martin Street 42 years – right there at 158 – try to get out. It's tough a couple of times a day. I've learned how to go round thru and come out. Rest of the time we don't have much traffic. I go down to Kernersville and have a lot more traffic problems than we have in Walkertown. I've heard this for two or three years now about the traffic in Walkertown. Most of us that complain about this traffic are retired – we don't have to get out in afternoons most of the time – during the prime times or early mornings. But, I just don't understand about all the traffic problems. We use that against anything we want in town or anything we don't want to get in town. I can't understand why we keep getting all the traffic problem. I have some friends on Bellaire and the other end of Martin Street – are they not state maintained roads?

Ms. Leight: Martin Street and Bellaire are both Walkertown roads.

Ms. Martin: And Larry brought out a good point – he knows the back roads to avoid that traffic – so will everyone in Walkertown and they'll be coming around Bellaire Circle and Martin Street! So that was a good point. Thank you.

Mr. Marshall: I know you and Fred are in the same situation on the other end. You know how to get in and out and avoid all that traffic.....

Ms. Martin:And I'm sure everyone else in Walkertown will soon learn that route.

Mr. Marshall: I don't think we need to keep bringing up the traffic problems all the time.

Fred Martin: What's the roads overloaded with, if they're not traffic??

Mr. Marshall: Whether this is built or not, Fred, we're going to have traffic. I don't think these are going to bring in that much traffic, really. Go up here to Eckerd's and down to Lowe's – you see some extra traffic. It's people in the area making the traffic – we're not going to have people coming in just for a McDonald's or Walgreen's – we're going to have traffic regardless.

Mr. Martin: They're overloaded now. If you don't have traffic coming in for McDonald's and Walgreen's – you don't need to build it!!!

Ms. Leight: In regards to traffic, I don't think this will be that big an issue.....

Mr. Marshall:That's what I'm saying. I don't think this will be a big issue as far as traffic. I'd rather see it built somewhere else in town but I understand their position, too.

Ms. Leight: Yes. They want to build in a particular place. They've looked at other places and now it's this one. The concern I have is, when they looked at the alternate sites – if you look at Glenwood Shopping Center – if you look at the Neal property – if you look at going down 158 – all on the other side of the road, there are 28 parcels that we have already zoned HB-S. Now, on the low end of HB-S, it's a 1,000 to 2,000 trips per day. If you think about over the next however many years – if every one of those parcels get developed, that's 28,000 new cars per day right here! And just from being on the Land Use Plan, there has

to be a way – we know that’s going to happen – we’ve already set ourselves up for that because we’ve already zoned it that way. We zoned all those lots. There has to be a way to say enough of that – we’re going to get stuck with that in the first place. Why zone additional property in that highest density as opposed to set up a line – this is the limitation – from here in, we’re talking residential, we’re talking office, we’re talking limitations because we’re going to get those very soon with the other development already. Twenty-eight lots! Just within that one intersection and that’s going to be coming and we can’t stop that! My biggest concern is that 7 ½ acres development. One, is that an acre of that is now excluded because there is going to be a big retention pond there. But the fact that it is two-phase limits this Board – it limits the Town Council – it limits the citizens of Walkertown to say what will or won’t go in there. We have no control at this point, once it is approved, to say what can and can’t go in there. Because once it’s a two-phase, all we can is that, ‘Yes, it meets UDO requirements’ or ‘No, it doesn’t meet UDO requirements’ with small limitations. Because we can’t say what’s going to go in there because we don’t know at this point in time.

Mr. King: At this point in time – you do have some control. There’s five or six uses that concern you – now’s the time to say, ‘We’ve got concerns’ but if they’re approved and those uses are approved – then, no, that’s not for debate any more.

Ms. Leight: We have no choice. It’s like the property that is two-phase across the way. For example, that Extreme Sports – although the fact that they are rezoning, we would have nothing to say as to what goes in there other than it meets the criterion, what it looks like, as long as it meets UDO requirements – and that’s the problem – is that no lots have been defined – no road structures have been defined – no street features, anything, has been defined for that property. That is more of a concern for me than to get this one right here on the corner. And I’m looking years down the road.

Mr. Marshall: That’s what I’m thinking. Most of us are getting older so the younger ones are probably going to be the ones that are more concerned with it than us older people. Some of the younger people really want this McDonald’s and Walgreen’s because they have to go to Kernersville or Winston-Salem now to do it. I’ve talked to several of them.

Ms. Martin: It’s sad that we didn’t have some of the younger people here. I know in the Comprehensive Land Use that at our open meetings that we had, the major concern of the citizens was the fact that if we wanted this type, we would move to Winston or Kernersville. We moved to Walkertown because we wanted a bedroom type community and that was one of the things they asked us to plan. And in planning this, we already had a lot of commercial in place in that area, so we did designate a CAC but in the same vein, we asked for low-density at that particular location because of what was already in place.

Mr. Slater: First, I would like to thank the developer for presenting an outstanding criteria here for this development. First I’m going to talk about traffic. We create all the traffic ourselves. How many of you buy a car for every kid that gets 16 years old? We create that traffic. Most of us, we won’t be concerned about that traffic too many more years. Go out here and talk to the young people who are going to be the future citizens of Walkertown. Are they concerned about traffic? No, they’re not concerned about traffic. And you say, why aren’t the young people here today giving their views? Well, like all of us when we were young – we

were at work supporting our families; dealing with kids. We trusted the people who were sitting on boards like us and our town council to plan for our future. We need to plan for our future here. I see this program that the Walgreen's and McDonald's want to do – excellent opportunity for our younger people. When you talk about traffic, would you rather have them driving to Kernersville, Winston-Salem at gas at four and five dollars a gallon or driving two blocks down here to get a hamburger or going to Walgreen's? How many of you like myself when you grew up had to drive ten miles to get a sack of sugar? As Walkertown grows, and Walkertown citizens are supporting the high school here. That's going to bring in new development to our community. It's going to be a school that people will want to move here so their kids can get a better education.....So when we have development coming into our town, which is a good development, why not support it? Why not give the young people the future, a chance to go and deal with something close by? And that's what we're facing. They are the future of our town and if we don't make the right decision for them, then we have let them down. Back to traffic – if this developer puts in that third lane on 66, everyone living on 66 will be able to get in/out of driveway the best you ever have. Plus 66 will all be commercial one of these days. Some of us may not see it, but 66 will be completely commercial one of these days – I'll predict that..... We have concerns about Martin Street – it's a town street controlled by the town. If you don't want that traffic coming down Martin Street, have your town council to close it off – put it somewhere else. They won't go down there if you close it off. It can be closed off. This was also told by the DOT when they met at the fire station that any road that the town has control over, if you don't want traffic going down that street, close it up. If you're concerned about traffic on Bellaire Circle, that can also be controlled by the town. You can put speed bumps through there. You can slow the people down. If you don't think speed bumps won't do it, check some of the adjoining towns. Put up signs that will limit – tell them it's not through traffic through there. You say that will not work --- well, it will work. I've been in bigger towns than Winston-Salem and they have that problem and they make it work. They keep the trucks and through traffic out. It will work if our town has the go-about to enforce it. I personally am in favor of this – this developer has met the criteria for this intersection. The Planning Staff has given their approval for it and I personally will vote for it. Thank you.

Ms. Martin: I have a question. Where are you proposing they close Martin Street?

Mr. Slater: I'm not proposing.

Ms. Martin: Because if they close it, say, at this end, then that means the traffic from Walgreen's and McDonald's can come right out and come down Martin Street because it will be blocked off to them here. If they close at the other end, then you have the church and church school. So I don't really see that as an alternative to traffic – to close the street.

Mr. Slater: Well, my comment on that, Marilyn, was that if the people wanted that. It could be closed off right at the end of the street or driveway coming out of Walgreen's and no traffic could go down that way.

Ms. Martin: I just don't see closing the street in a residential area as an alternative to traffic.

Mr. Slater: One other comment I'd like to make. I know we have questioned DOT about the traffic on 158 and 66. Are we going to question them on

everything in North Carolina because they have complete control over that intersection? We have no control over that intersection. That was pointed out in the meeting at the fire station. Whatever goes in that corner or on the opposite corner of that intersection will be designed like that. They will not lower the speed limit for the time being. DOT has the last word on controlling the highways out here. Regardless how we feel about the traffic, or accidents, DOT still controls that intersection.

Ms. Leight: I'll respond to that. Once if this site plan is approved, that, yes, these DOT improvements have to be put in place. It goes with the site plan. It's like what happened on the other two – the Neal property – those medians and those roads have to go in place if that's developed because that's part of the site plan. The difference is that I think things are negotiable with the DOT. They can change their mind if we can come with alternative solutions – Walkertown has wanted that 66 not to be with the middle 3 lane – they wanted it to be 4 and 5 lanes. And I think that if we don't approve this, it still leaves you the option to work with the DOT and to say what are the other options, what can be done? Because right now, this is what the DOT wants. It may not be the case in the future.

Mr. Slater: I think I remember that the DOT made the comment on that – if you wanted to make some great improvements on that intersection that Walkertown wants to put up the money, then they'll be glad to do that.

Ms. Leight: And that's one of the best things about the whole plan is that 3-laning.

Mr. Slater: And one great thing about the plan, the developer is going to put forth the money to improve this intersection if he is approved to put those buildings on that lot. That is a plus in my estimate because not many developers will fork over a million bucks to improve the intersection and they are in that neighborhood, of what they will be spending.

Mr. Kelley: (From the audience-could not be heard clearly)
.....budgeting is about \$785,000.....Just remember, DOT's requirement to us is only about half of that....

Ms. Leight:I don't think that saying no to this plan as it stands right now will be recommending denial of it – means that they won't be here. Walgreen's and McDonald's have done their history; they've done their marketing and they know that Walkertown is a financial gain here – that they will make money. And they want to be in an area that's high traffic and very visible. We also all know that they have looked at other properties in Walkertown before this one. They've looked at a number of different places and now they're looking at this one. Saying no to this plan doesn't mean we won't get a McDonald's...doesn't mean we won't get a Walgreen's – it means that they have to live and find another place that meets Walkertown standards a little bit better than what this is doing. There's too many questions about this one. We'll still get a Walgreen's. We'll still get a McDonald's. We're going to get a whole lot more but we need to have them build it in a manner and in a location that suits the citizens and meet the needs of the town.

Ms. Martin: I think Walkertown is really, as a municipality, is a baby because we've just gotten our sewer and we're just starting in our growth process. So we don't have to accept the very first thing that comes. I appreciate this good plan. We want Walgreen's and McDonald's in Walkertown. There's never been a discussion about that but I think we are going to have to rethink the location.

Mr. Slater: Well, I would only add that it seems like the biggest negative that everyone has is the traffic. But why do we have negatives on that traffic but you never had a negative on putting the school traffic right through the middle of the town? That will create more traffic than anything else you put in Walkertown. I have yet to hear anybody talk about the traffic from building a new school out here.

Ms. Martin: I don't think the traffic is a major concern as is the fact that we already have so much already zoned Highway Business that we can use. And why go into residential and rezone this at this point in time when we have 20 to 25 lots sitting there empty just waiting for business?

Mr. Slater: I would argue that point with you as we on the Land Use committee and everything – we approved this for commercial property and according to the staff, they meet all the criteria for that. Just saying that we are disapproving it because of traffic or because someone doesn't like it – that, to me, is going against what we agreed on many, many times before.

Ms. Martin: Well, I just quoted you the section from there on Page 18 that it was for lower density development.

Mr. Whitaker: These folks have done a great job – somebody has put a lot of work in this. And we need another drug store. I just believe that in the best interest of the Town of Walkertown that a different location would be better. So I would have to vote against this.

RECOMMENDATION:

**TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWN COUNCIL
DENIAL OF WA-029 PROPOSED FOOD AND
DRUG STORE AND RESTAURANT WITH
DRIVE THROUGH
(WALGREEN'S AND MCDONALD'S)**

BY:

DON WHITAKER

SECOND:

MARILYN MARTIN

VOTE:

MOTION PASSED 3 to 2

FOR DENIAL – MARTIN

LEIGHT

WHITAKER

AGAINST DENIAL - SLATER

MARSHALL

BEFORE THE VOTE:

Mr. Slater: I think we have one member on the Board that I would say has biased interest in that. She excused herself before and she's wanting to vote today.

Ms. Martin: You can always change your mind. That was yesterday and this is today.

Ms. Leight: The law states that you have to show a direct substantial and identify the financial gain, financial impact, for an individual member for a member to recuse herself.

Ms. Martin: I have no ---- I will not have any direct financial gain.

Mr. Houff: Let me address that further. There is no provision for appearance or anything like that – not suggesting that there is or is not. That's not

my job to do. But there's no provision to allow someone to decide to recuse themselves simply on the basis of what may appear to be, by I understand she has property nearby – you have to meet the statutory requirement. Otherwise, not only may you not recuse yourself – if you attempt to do so or even if the Board would recommend that – that her vote would be taken as a “yes” vote. Actually, in this case, we have a motion to recommend DENIAL – you can have a motion in the affirmative on that motion. So, plus if you improperly recuse yourself, your vote is considered to be an affirmative vote on the measure that's before.

Mr. Marshall: We don't have a guarantee. I know you keep saying that we have all this other property.

Ms. Leight: There's never a guarantee.

Mr. Marshall: That's just a chance we'll have to take. Personally, I'd like to see them here – maybe not in that position, I mean, myself I would prefer somewhere else. But since this is the property that they are wanting to rezone...

Mr. Slater: I would make a comment. Like I said, I think they have met the criteria. I see no reason why we should vote against it. The Staff from the County has approved it to be there and I think we are – if we vote against it, disapprove it, like I say, they may not come back. And I couldn't blame them. They have put a lot of work in this. They could say, 'Okay. Walkertown doesn't want business. Forget about it.' Then let out kids drive 10, 15 miles in the future to get something. I think we're missing the point. Most of us sitting on this Board will never affected by it – maybe Peggy. We got an opportunity to have a great business come in to our town – not only a good tax base for Walkertown, but it also provides jobs for young and older people in Walkertown. Just last week they announced that Hanes is going to close down their plant – 650 people going without a job. Textiles are going out. It's these smaller businesses, like Walgreen's and McDonald's that are giving jobs to young people today. There's no more Reynolds Tobacco Company or Hanes' in town or Piedmont Airlines that used to supply a lot of jobs. So our young people got to have a place to work. To turn a business away just to the point that we don't want it. We haven't given that many good excuses why we don't want it – except traffic is the main thing. I think we're making a big mistake.

Mr. Whitaker: You know ---- you said something about 'tax base' and that has always really stuck in my craw. They talk about tax base – this'll bring tax base – I have never – never known tax base to reduce my taxes! They always go up. It cost more to get something and look what Dell did over here. It cost more to get something in and taxes paid for. But that's beside the point. We need another drug store – McDonald's won't be bad. But I feel like the location wrong.

Mr. Slater: Well, the tax bas is important to our town. Not only commercial tax base brings in more than homes will, in most cases. I foresee, regardless, if we turn it down today, wherever they go and try to build, we're going to still get the opposition. The opposition is still going to be there and it's business that people don't want it. Going to be traffic again – big thing's going to be traffic. And we've been told there's not that much traffic that's going to affect that. We're arguing the point, but that's what we're here for – to argue and discuss it – to make the best decision.

Ms. Leight: If it goes into one of those areas that's already developed HB-S, we can't say no to them – because it's a two-phase, we can't say

no. If they meet UDO requirements like this is done for the rezoning it would be an automatic.

Mr. Slater: But they meet the requirements now.

Ms. Martin: But I would like to see us use some of the already zoned highway business.

Ms. Leight: We have a motion on the floor and a second. Motion is for **recommending denial of this rezoning to the town council**. All those in favor of recommending denial:

Peggy Leight
Marilyn Martin
Don Whitaker

All those opposed:

Al Slater
Larry Marshall

Motion passes three to two.

Mr. Houff: Even though you moved to recommend denial on the zoning, for the purposes of advising the council, you should also consider the SIDA application.

Ms. Leight: There is a request for 2.85 acres of SIDA to go along with this property. It would stay with the property. Is there a recommendation from the Board?

Ms. Martin: To deny the SIDA until we have a developer in place for that property to see what the site plan would be then?

Ms. Leight: Yes. It is my understanding if we approve 2.85 acres of SIDA – it's always 2.85 whether the next developer would need it or not.

Ms. Martin: I make a motion that we postpone granting the SIDA for this property until we have a different plan for this property so we'll know what's required.

Ms. Leight: Could you re-word that? I think it's a motion to deny the SIDA request?

Ms. Martin:To deny the SIDA request...

Mr. Marshall: Probably should. If we're not going to approve anything for this corner, we might as well deny the SIDA.

**RECOMMENDATION: TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWN COUNCIL
DENIAL OF SIDA REQUEST
BY WA-029 PROPOSED FOOD AND DRUG
STORE AND RESTAURANT WITH DRIVE
THROUGH
(WALGREEN'S AND MCDONALD'S)**

**BY: MARILYN MARTIN
SECOND: LARRY MARSHALL**

VOTE: MOTION PASSED 3 to 2

**FOR DENIAL – MARTIN
LEIGHT
WHITAKER**

**AGAINST DENIAL - SLATER
MARSHALL**

BEFORE THE VOTE:

Mr. Houff: You've got a motion and a second and I don't want to direct how you want to rule on the motion except that what you're really trying to do is to advise the council as to what would be ---- you've voted to recommend denial to the council. We don't know how council will react to this. Obviously if they determine that the zoning should be denied, then SIDA request is moot at this point. However, in the event that council were to vote in favor of rezoning, contrary to your recommendation, and in favor of what Staff has said, you want to look at this as not what somebody else might do but if they were to – what would you recommend council to do if they were to go against what you've recommended with regard to zoning but as to the SIDA. So assuming that you had voted yes or assuming that the council votes yes, what would you recommend the council with regard to SIDA. That's the question. The motion is appropriate as it's stated. The question is how would you vote in that instance? Trying to project how council would look at this if they were to approve the zoning?

Mr. Slater: Question on that: If council approves it, would they not also approve the SIDA?

Mr. Houff: I don't know how they would do that. Your action is to keep in mind what you're doing. You're making recommendations to council based upon your analysis of Staff – Staff is the most technical; you are the next level up; you're more technically proficient with these questions than council's going to be – but you also have input/impact from the public to look at. You manage those together then you send it up to council for their ultimate action on it. You've done that with regard to zoning. You've made your determination on how you would recommend on that. Now, what you're looking to do is that same kind of thing – Staff's recommended approval of SIDA request – now you're looking at this SIDA information. Yeah, obviously, if council denies zoning then SIDA request is moot. If they approve it, they should benefit from your analysis with regard to SIDA, despite the fact that you recommended denial of zoning. So they can look at that and say, 'What would Planning Board do with this if zoning were approved?' That's my point.

AFTER THE VOTE:

No further comments.

PUBLIC SESSION (IF NEEDED)

Public Session was opened and closed at 5:36 p.m. with no speakers.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

2007 MEETING SCHEDULE

LIBRARY @ 3:00 P.M.

May 1st

June 5th

July 3rd

August 7th

September 11th

*Due to July 4th holiday

*Due to Labor Day holiday

October 2nd
November 13th *Due to Election Day
December 4th

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 5:38 P.M.

BY: MARILYN MARTIN

SECOND: DON WHITAKER

VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

**LYNN MCKINNIE
PLANNING BOARD SECRETARY**