



**Date:** May 12, 2025

**To:** Claudia Hager, County Manager  
**Through:** Maurice Jones, Deputy County Manager  
**From:** Sara M. Young, AICP, City-County Planning Director  
**Subject:** *Unified Development Ordinance* Text Amendment – Page/Miami Design District (TC2400002)

### **Executive Summary**

The Page/Miami Design District is the next application of the Compact Suburban Design District after it was established alongside the Patterson Place Design District in 2019. While looking at the Page/Miami area in context, staff initiated two technical text amendments for clarity. *Unified Development Ordinance* Text Amendment (TC2400002) contains a set of minor revisions to the UDO. These revisions are proposed to clarify the Sign Calculation Standards and applicability of the Transitional Use Area (TUA) Major Special Use Permit in Compact Suburban Design Districts. The Planning Commission heard this zoning request on October 8, 2024, and recommended approval by a vote of 9-0.

### **Motions**

The Board is requested to conduct a public hearing and receive comments and, if appropriate, approve the text amendment to the *Unified Development Ordinance*, with the following motions:

**Motion 1:** To adopt an ordinance amending the Unified Development Ordinance, incorporating revisions to Article 11, Sign Standards and Article 16, Design Districts; and

**Motion 2:** To adopt a Consistency Statement as required by N.C.G.S. Sec. 160D-605.

### **Background**

The Durham City-County Planning Department has prepared a zoning map change for the Page/Miami Design District, an area southeast of Research Triangle Park (RTP) between NC Highway 54, Davis Drive, Hopson Road, Page Road, and South Miami Boulevard. The zoning change aims to encourage transit-oriented development, support future publicly funded multimodal projects (like bus rapid transit, passenger rail, or bicycle and pedestrian improvements), and promote equitable development using the affordable housing density bonus. Staff proposes Place Type Map amendments and a Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment (TC2400002) concurrently with the rezoning.

Due to new state legislation, staff requested consent from property owners in the project area to change the zoning. The new rezoning proposal is not as comprehensive as originally planned and encompasses 25.41 acres, as staff was unable to gain consent from all property owners in the project area.

All of the rezonings are within the city limits and subject to City Council approval. This memo concerns the Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment (TC2400002) portion of the Page/Miami Design District for consideration by the Board of County Commissioners.

## Issues

The proposed amendments are denoted within **Attachment A: Unified Development Ordinance TC2400002 (Track Changes Version)**, with a summary of the proposed changes as follows:

### **Article 11, *Sign Standards***

- Change: Updated the language in 11.2.2. Sign Calculation Standards B. Aggregate Sign Area to clarify application in Compact Suburban Design Districts.
- Reason: The sign calculation references the Compact Neighborhood tier but also delineates application to the Downtown Design District. This edit clarifies applicability in CSD, as well, to reduce confusion around this standard.

### **Article 16, *Design Districts***

- Change: Updated the language and title of 16.1.4. CSD-S1 Transitional Use Area (TUA) Major Special Use Permit to clarify applicability only to the Patterson Place Design District.
- Reason: It was important at the time of creation of the Patterson Place CSD to establish this mechanism for environmentally sensitive features and issues specific to that geography. While evaluating changing the zoning of the Page/Miami area to CSD zoning, staff determined the TUA MSUP section is not necessary for the area.

### **Consistency with the *Comprehensive Plan*; Reasonableness and in the Public Interest.**

The purpose of this text amendment is to update the UDO and implement provisions regarding the Page/Miami Design District zoning map change. This is a reasonable undertaking and in the public interest. Furthermore, the amendments do not appear to conflict with the *Durham Comprehensive Plan*, which promotes responsible governance.

### **Staff Contact**

Kayla Seibel, AICP, Senior Planner, 919-560-4137 ext. 28271, [Kayla.Seibel@DurhamNC.gov](mailto:Kayla.Seibel@DurhamNC.gov)

### **Attachments**

Attachment A: *Unified Development Ordinance TC2400002 (Track Changes Version)*

Attachment B: Consistency Statement

Attachment C: Planning Commission Written Comments