



**WALKERTOWN PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
WALKERTOWN LIBRARY AUDITORIUM**

**SEPTEMBER 11, 2007      3:00 P.M.**

**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Vice-Chair Al Slater. Comprising a quorum were Mr. Slater, Marilyn Martin, and Don Whitaker. (Chairperson Peggy Leight arrived at 3:14 p.m.) Also present were Secretary Lynn McKinnie, Attorney Bo Houff, and from the City-County Planning Board, Aaron King and Glenn Simmons.

Upon a motion by Marilyn Martin and seconded by Don Whitaker, the agenda was approved as presented.

Upon a motion by Don Whitaker and seconded by Marilyn Martin, the minutes for August 7, 2007 were approved as presented.

**PUBLIC SESSION** - Please limit your talk to 3 minutes.

Public Session was opened at 3:02 p.m. and closed at 3:03 p.m. with no speakers

**BUSINESS AT HAND**

1. **PUBLIC HEARING:**

WA-032 – (#1) ZONING MAP AMENDMENT  
CHANGE ZONING JURISDICTION FROM FORSYTH COUNTY  
TO WALKERTOWN  
1931 CLOVER TRAIL

**DISCUSSION:**

– 1931 Clover Trail --- Aaron King, of the City-County Planning Board gave a brief overview of the first issue – changing the zoning jurisdiction from Forsyth County to the Town of Walkertown. He said it was located just outside of Old Hollow Road, just west of Davis Road – one individual lot, in a subdivision off of Old Hollow Road. This property has already been annexed into the town at the last council meeting. The Staff recommends approval and Mr. King stated that if this was not approved by the Walkertown Planning Board and by the Walkertown Town Council, then there would be no zoning on the property – something the town would not want! This is just a formality to ensure that Walkertown has zoning jurisdiction over this property.

Public Hearing was opened at 3:09 p.m. and closed 3:10 p.m. and there were no speakers.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**TO RECOMMEND TO THE WALKERTOWN TOWN COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR 1931 CLOVER TRAIL – CHANGE ZONING JURISDICTION FROM FORSYTH COUNTY TO WALKERTOWN**

**BY: MARILYN MARTIN**

**SECOND: DON WHITAKER \***

**VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

\*Mr. Whitaker seconded the motion but said he had reservations about doing so because it left a do-nut hole with the small lot to the right of this property.

As an aside, the Planning Board collectively agreed the Council should get on the ball and close up all the do-nut holes.

**2. PUBLIC HEARING:**

WA-032 – (#2) ZONING MAP AMENDMENT  
CHANGE ZONING JURISDICTION FROM FORSYTH COUNTY  
TO WALKERTOWN  
1644 OLD HOLLOW ROAD

**DISCUSSION:**

1644 Old Hollow Road - Aaron King did not speak to this issue but it is the same clean-up as the 1931 Clover Trail — changing the zoning jurisdiction from Forsyth County to the Town of Walkertown.

This property has already been annexed into the town at the last council meeting. The Staff recommends approval of this request.

Again, this is just a formality to ensure that Walkertown has zoning jurisdiction over this property.

Public Hearing was opened at 3:11 p.m. and closed 3:12 p.m. with no speakers.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**TO RECOMMEND TO THE WALKERTOWN TOWN COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR 1931 CLOVER TRAIL – CHANGE ZONING JURISDICTION FROM FORSYTH COUNTY TO WALKERTOWN**

**BY: MARILYN MARTIN**

**SECOND: DON WHITAKER \***

**VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**3. FOR DISCUSSION:**

UDO TEXT AMENDMENTS REVIEW AND DISCUSSION  
WA-UDO- #7, #8, #9

**DISCUSSION:**

Because Ms. Leight had not yet arrived, the Board decided to wait until she arrived to discuss the UDO Text Amendments.

**SEE BELOW FOR DISCUSSION.**

4. **FOR DISCUSSION:**

Discuss consideration of façade of new commercial construction  
.....Requested by Al Slater

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Slater said he would like for the Planning Board to discuss consideration of the façade of new commercial construction. He explained his reason for this because last month, we had a proposal for a new building which was subsequently turned down by both the Board and the Council. But the construction of that proposed building was presented, it was just a wood frame building. He would like to see all commercial construction in the Town of Walkertown be a brick façade, facing the highway. There is no ordinance pertaining to that but adjoining towns do have those ordinances in place. Kernersville and Lewisville and Clemmons do have the restriction that each new commercial construction must have a brick facade facing the road.

(Ms. Leight arrived at 3:14 p.m.)

Mr. Houff said that Lewisville requires “overlay” – requirements that are typically in the commercial area – downtown area. It deals with building standards within the area that’s established and they do allow brick facades as well as other natural material facades. They explicitly don’t allow vinyl.

He said, “An overlay may be one way of accomplishing that. And then you also have – you’ve had Special Use zoning come before you – if it’s full fledged, not the hybrid that we’ve been talking about, but if it’s full-fledged, Special Use Zoning, you have the ability to, while you cannot presently demand certain kinds of building materials and looks and things like that, you do have the right to ask the petitioner to agree to some of those requirements that you might have. I would recommend that you establish a policy if that’s the way you want to proceed where you do that in a very consistent way. .... So that everyone would know what’s going on. They don’t have to accept it but then, again, you don’t have to recommend approval and council doesn’t have to approve their Special Use Zoning either. So, that’s the biggest stick that you have.....The benefit of that particular mechanism is that it allows you flexibility what you approve based on where it is, what’s next to it, making it blend in – things like that.”

Note: An overlay would be a town ordinance. It’s an area and it doesn’t deal with the underlying zoning.

Ms. Leight felt we should get copies of the surrounding towns’ ordinances before we put together an ordinance.

**THIS ISSUE WAS TABLED TO ANOTHER MEETING.  
LYNN WILL GET ORDINANCES FROM OTHER TOWNS FOR WALKERTOWN  
PLANNING BOARD TO REVIEW.**

5. **FOR DISCUSSION:**  
Request for SIDA update

.....Requested by Al Slater

**DISCUSSION:**

It was decided that before Walkertown started the process of asking for more SIDA, the town should wait to see how Kernersville comes out with their request.

Delayed until last:

3. **FOR DISCUSSION:**  
UDO TEXT AMENDMENTS REVIEW AND DISCUSSION  
WA-UDO- #7, #8, #9

**DISCUSSION:**

Discussion on the UDO amendments

Aaron King and Glenn Simmons spoke on the issues asked.

All three ordinances were adopted by the City-County Planning Board – the city adopted them, but the county adopted the Limited Use Zoning, the street standards (although they did require street trees) but did not adopt the sign ordinance.

**LIMITED USE ZONING**

Who decides when someone comes up and says I want to rezone my RS-20 – I want to build a commercial building – how do you decide that it should be the SUL versus ...? I know what Walkertown wants – they want to see a site plan – RS-20 to Commercial may not be best for that.

If someone comes to City-County Planning Board with a General Use request – and through the process it may be determined that there is just not enough information so Special Use is required. Oftentimes they'll let someone re-petition with a Special Use request and a site plan and pay the difference in the cost of the Special Use and General and advertising cost. Someone takes a chance in coming for a General Use and it needs to be resubmitted as Special Use. The process would be very similar in terms the Planning Staff would advise someone on Limited Use as on Special Use or General Use to the extent that the staff would explain what it does and doesn't do; advise them what Staff thinks is appropriate in the same way they would advise someone to come in for Special Use versus General Use. But if it looks like a particular request is a good candidate for Limited Zoning – just a very few simple written conditions that doesn't really warrant the expense and extra involvement of site plans, then the Staff might suggest that it might be an avenue for them to take. It would be made clear that it is the Staff's *opinion* at that point.

(Much mention was made on closing up the do-nut holes in Walkertown. The members of the Planning Board are very adamant that this issue needs to be addressed very soon.)

**SPECIAL LIMITED USE REZONING -- THE UDO AS WRITTEN WOULD STAND FOR WALKERTOWN.**

**THIS WILL GO FOR A PUBLIC HEARING AND VOTE AT THE OCTOBER, 2007, MEETING.**

**FOLLOWING ARE HIGHLIGHTS FROM DISCUSSIONS:**

**PLEASE NOTE: DISCUSSION ON THE ISSUES WENT BACK AND FORTH – AND SOME DISCUSSION COULD NOT BE HEARD ON TAPE. THE INFORMATION LISTED BELOW IS DISCUSSION ONLY AT THIS POINT.**

**STREET STANDARDS**

**THE FIRST PHASE OF THIS IS ONLY FOR NEW STREETS**

The Pedestrian Facilities Plan will be sent to Walkertown for approval very soon... Make sure that when it is reviewed, to pay attention to what the sidewalks and streets requirements are.

With the county being different on just trees, there happens to be two different lots – with the county lot not having to have trees, but would have to have the sidewalks and other standards would be the same. This is for new public streets built under subdivision regulations – the new streets would require street trees. The first phase of this street standard ordinance is only for new streets. In other words, if this were adopted before the Pedestrian Facilities plan is adopted by Walkertown – then it would apply only to newly constructed subdivision streets. If the Pedestrian Plan is adopted, it would also require that sidewalks be built for any new development that's contiguous to any one of these streets shown on the Pedestrian Plan as a lighter thoroughfare, m\_\_\_\_ thoroughfare, or collector street. And what that will mean is that if someone brought a subdivision in – it would be required to put sidewalks on one side of every new street they built. They would also be required to put a sidewalk along any existing street that the Plan calls for a sidewalk that's contiguous to that subdivision. It would be true for new residential subdivisions; it would be true for any new commercial zoning. (For example, if a new drugstore was built along 66 – which presentably would call for a sidewalk – and a sidewalk, regardless of whether it goes through zoning process, or Special Use Zoning – sidewalk would be required as a condition for building permits – along with anything else that was going on that site. So it would not require any special consideration for zoning for you to get the sidewalk.)

This applies to new subdivisions, new commercial development, and multi-family --- any new development that's contiguous to a street proposed in the Pedestrian Plan would be required to put sidewalk in.

We need to coordinate our town ordinance with this UDO ordinance to make sure that we do not clash on wording and that it covers all potentials. The best way to do this is to have all this information in the UDO because developers would use the UDO more so than town ordinances.

**SIGN ORDINANCE:**

- Individual
- Commercial
- Shopping Center

If the sign ordinance is not enacted, the owners of the larger, taller signs could continue with that by putting up a new one; whereas, if they put up a new one, we could have restrictions in that so many years down the road, they would have to comply with the smaller, lower sign.

If Walkertown adopts the 6-foot high, 36-sqft copy area, the City-County Planning Staff is asking for a little bit more flexibility on non-conforming signs. Some of the existing signs could conform but Walkertown could get to the tall, big signs that Walkertown is going to be sure to deal with.

All gas stations signs are out of compliance – Sheetz is okay – the others are way too tall and big.

Unless Walkertown wants to make a special provision, Walkertown would want to bring them down to meet the new standard, not bring them down to meet the new standard you might accept for grandfathered signs. If they were going to bring the sign down, it seems like you would want to make it in conformance with what the new ordinance requires for new signs. So this means giving them a 50% leeway – saying that's only for if you don't change what you're doing right now – but if you're going to reduce it down in height, you're also going to have to reduce it down in size. That's the way Winston has its ordinance – the 25% increase in size area is only good for existing signs – any new signs that come in would have to meet the new standard.

All along 311 (where the bypass is coming) and on four sides of the bypass on 158 – Walkertown has no control of those areas and that's going to be a huge growth area when the bypass comes through. The other side of 158 between Darrow Road and 66, that's one of the things with the first 200-feet, the fields behind them are considered county land. Residential property in the county are really much of a sign concern because they would have to get rezoned in order to have these commercial signs – you don't have control of these property but you certainly have the right to go to county commissioners and state your concerns. A lot of property will be annexed into Walkertown and if the owners know about the sign regulations, they would probably put in the correct size sign knowing that if they were annexed, they'd be subject to amortization provisions.

Sign regulations that Walkertown Planning Board had discussed enacting were:

- Signs - 6-feet high and 36-sqft copy area for individuals/commercial.
- Shopping centers signs – maximum height 15-feet and maximum square footage area of 100-sqft.
- Each outparcel in shopping center would have its own individual sign 6-foot high and 36-sqft.
- Shopping centers would be allowed to have one sign per frontage but the second sign has to be of the smaller size. (One sign could be 15-feet high with 100-sqft copy area but the second sign on the other street frontage would be a smaller size.  
\*\*(Walkertown Commons is on two major roads and they have big signs on both roads.)

Question – would we have to grandfather one of those ?

Response - That's not the way this is written – they'd have to get rid of one of them. Or put in the wording, designate what is meant by “major” roads and allow them to.

Argument – If this shopping center gets fixed(??) up – is Darrow Road considered a major entranceway? (Center Stage is at corner of Darrow and 66 – is that two major highways?)

Shopping Center would need to choose bringing one sign down to a smaller size – but does not have to get rid of it.

\*\* (On the Neal property, there are 18 lots – 15-foot and 100-sqft to advertise 18 parcels is not very big area and if one of them has to be 6-foot, that seems very small.)

\*This is not considered a “shopping center” per se – it could be called a commercial subdivision. Each outparcel would have their own 6-foot sign on their.

\*A commercial subdivision is just like any business development – it's just that you have individual businesses on individual sites with individual signs. This ordinance would not allow for a subdivision sign.

\*The question was raised whether the property on the Neal property could be classified as a shopping center – those are all individual out parcels and they may not have any single sign of this size. So they wouldn't be allowed a single big sign.

- For a major thoroughfare we allow a secondary or we can say you're limited to one with an amortization – amount of time.
  - \*It's hard to designate a major thoroughfare – but major thoroughfares are classified on the thoroughfare plan.

Mr. King and Mr. Simmons will get together and try to work out the wording on what it is Walkertown wants on signage, especially as pertaining to the shopping center signage. Mr. Simmons said it sounds like you want to have for **shopping centers on major thoroughfares** have the allowance for **two large signs – one on each thoroughfare.**

\*We can amortize Walkertown's two existing shopping centers existing signs - that they have so many years to conform. Seven years seemed to be the consensus among the members.

\*Flashing signs are categorically restricted altogether.

\*Electronic signs are a whole different animal – no electronic message boards or signs – period. Walkertown does not have any at this point. The consensus is that we do not want any.

\*Lighted signs are different and are allowed. (In all districts, there is no internally illuminated sign allowed in residentially zoned district. i.e. Churches, etc.)

\*Movable signs are not okay now – the new ordinance allows for banners for non-profits to be done on a requested basis. It allows for special events banners for businesses three per year. Something like this, however, is on a complaint-based enforcement. If someone complains about any of the banners or signs announcing special events, whether church related or business related or individual related, Inspections Department would have to check into it and make them take it down. Non-profits can apply for a permit for a sign that would last for thirty days and then they can apply for another permit – to get permission to put it up. Currently, it is not allowed.

\*Sandwich boards are illegal.

\*Open House and other lead in signs are allowed the day prior and at the end of the open house.

An **Amortization** period was agreed upon of **seven years** for signs that are too large and need to be replaced.

**ALL THREE OF THE UDO ORDINANCES WILL BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE PLANNING BOARD AT THE OCTOBER 2<sup>ND</sup> MEETING FOR A PUBLIC HEARING.**

**PUBLIC SESSION** (IF NEEDED)

No Public Session – no one in audience.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**2007 MEETING SCHEDULE**

LIBRARY @ 3:00 P.M.

October 2<sup>nd</sup>

November 13<sup>th</sup> \*Due to Election Day

December 4<sup>th</sup>

**ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion by Peggy Leight, and seconded by Marilyn Martin, the meeting was concluded.

**9-1-1 CELEBRATION HONORING WALKERTOWN EMERGENCY SERVICE  
WORKERS – SEPTEMBER 11, 2007 – 6:30 P.M. WALKERTOWN FIRE DEPT.  
PUBLIC IS INVITED.**

Submitted by:

Lynn McKinnie  
Planning Board Secretary

.