



Technical Review Group – Meeting 1 Summary

On Wednesday, June 8, 2022, at 11:30am the first meeting of the Wake Forest UDO Comprehensive Update Technical Review Group (TRG) was conducted.

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Technical Review Group Role
3. Project Overview
4. UDO Update Discussion
5. Next Steps

Discussion Summary

Ease of Use

When asked if there are any specific aspects of the UDO that are unclear or difficult to understand and how we could make the code more user-friendly, TRG members discussed:

- Online code is not as user friendly as it could be – search function is not very helpful. However, using the online publication ensures the most recently adopted version is being used.
- Pros and cons to the level of specificity of regulations – less specificity provides opportunity for dialogue but it can also be ambiguous and not provide fair certainty.
- One of the easier documents to go through compared to other communities in the region.
- Cross references between the UDO and MSSD need to be clearer, and some information may be more appropriately located in the MSSD instead of the UDO.

Development Standards

When asked if there are specific development standards or land use regulations in the existing UDO that should be evaluated, TRG members discussed:

- Driveways
 - Front loaded townhome driveways are not clear in the UDO, in part because it is discouraged. Standards that are applied for driveway width and location are too stringent. Allowing front loaded townhomes was discussed.



- Parking
 - On-street parking allowances, requirements and enforcement need to be evaluated to ensure sufficient width for vehicle passing, driveway clearance, delivery vehicles and guest parking.
 - The design of on-street parking also needs to be clarified in the UDO and evaluated for what should and shouldn't be required (ex. bump outs, striping etc.).
 - Parking minimums should be re-evaluated, especially for large retailers and multifamily that often have excess parking.
 - Both parking minimums and maximums should be required.
- Sidewalks
 - Installation of sidewalk for new projects can lead to sidewalk gaps.
- Traffic studies
 - Transportation Impact Analyses (TIAs) can provide a lot of important information; more public education on understanding the content could be beneficial.
 - Clearer fee in lieu standards are needed.
- Stormwater and erosion control
 - Stormwater requirements take into account entire parcel regardless of undevelopable area.
 - Stormwater and erosion control regulations are unclear, and it is difficult to understand how they are applied. New, more modern standards should be adopted.
 - Water quality requirements talk about pre- and post-volume requirement which is unusual compared to other communities.
- Conservation design
 - Gross density calculated using the total acreage can lead to development that is not in keeping with surrounding neighborhoods.
 - Density calculation is misleading.
- Tree canopy
 - Look at other municipalities in the region. For example, Cary's specimen tree requirements make it very difficult to remove trees.
 - Canopy requirement is a design challenge in residential development. The Town should consider lowering canopy tree requirements in higher density residential areas because it is difficult to fit all the trees on site. Current canopy requirements are based on zoning district, but the type of use or development may be more relevant. A fee in lieu option should be considered.
 - Replacement rates should be evaluated.
- Retaining walls
 - Proposed retaining walls are not adequately detailed in development plans.
 - New standards are needed to only allow retaining walls in certain circumstances or require certain design requirements to lessen the visual impact of the walls.
 - Terraced plateaus with vegetation would be more desirable – 10 foot section maximum.



Permit Decision Making Processes

When asked whether the current UDO provides a fair and appropriate level of review of applications, the TRG discussed:

- The recent revision to allow by right subdivisions under staff review is beneficial.
- Subdivision process doesn't need to be shortened anymore.
- Rezoning approval takes 9 months at minimum and 12 months for more complicated developments – this is too long.
- There has been a significant level of change in the last 12 months regarding submittals and reviews so it's difficult to say whether there is an adequate level at this point.
- Process is fair and predictable – staff is communicative about time it takes for review and approval.
- For conditional district rezonings, the Master Plan for the development must be submitted including all conditions, making it part of the district itself. Getting down to the specifics of the conditions takes a long time, a more predictable process would be preferred.
- Architectural guidelines are difficult to understand and apply.
- Process for involving public with required neighborhood meetings is better now since it occurs earlier in the review process.
- Moving towards more legislative hearings vs quasi-judicial hearings has been beneficial.