

UPDATED: Raleigh Station 29 Under Construction

05/28/14 363 W, 16 I - + 14 - 8

May 27

As cited in the [proposed FY15 budget](#), this project has been renamed Fire Station 29. Updates incorporated into the earlier updates below. Here are a pair of new renderings. See also some latest, greatest [construction photos](#). Click to enlarge:



March 2

Here's what the site's looking like today, along with some architectural renderings displayed on the sign. We'll see about getting source files to replace these pictures of pictures:





February 16

Construction has started on the city's twenty-eighth fire station at 12117 Leesville Road, located on the northwestern edge of the city. And, for that matter, at the edge of the county. Originally planned as Station 29 (ergo the detailed drawing below), it's been renamed Station 13 [and subsequently renamed Station 29]. The single-story facility will house a single engine company, Engine 13.

The fire station has been planned for a number of years. City Council approved negotiation of a design contract in October 2010. The architect was Williard Ferm Architects, PA, of Raleigh. They designed the city's three prior fire stations, Stations 26, 27, and 28. On May 21, 2013, City Council awarded a construction contract not to exceed \$2,700,000 to Resolute Building, Inc.

As noted in a May 2013 press release, ~~Station 13~~ Station 29 will have three apparatus bays, sleeping quarters with twenty-seven beds, an exercise room, an office, and a watch station. The facility will have reduced water use and energy efficient HVAC and lighting. The project is pursuing U.S. Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification. The station will occupy a 2.86 acre site.

This'll be the fourth three-bay fire station in the city, after Station 1, Station 23, and Station 28. And how many years late is said Station 13, from when Station 12 and Station 14 were opened? Forty years. Those both opened on October 9, 1974.

Also, how many other cities around here have a Station 13? Asheville not yet, Charlotte yes, Durham yes, Fayetteville no, Greensboro no, High Point yes, Wilmington not yet, Winston-Salem no, Charleston (SC) yes, Columbia (SC) yes, Richmond (VA) yes, Norfolk (VA) yes.

Here's a panoramic photo of the site as of yesterday, a Wake County IMAPS diagram of the parcel, and a drawing of the building. Click to enlarge:





How will this station impact Durham Highway's response area or number of runs?

Joey Sapp - 02/17/14 - 00:13

In Fayetteville Sta 13 has not been established yet but in the CAD engine 13 is actually dispatched and ran out of Stoney Point Sta 13. I think Fayetteville's thinking is that Stoney Point will eventually be a city station since their building is already in the city limits.

2406 - 02/17/14 - 10:24

Wilmington doesn't have a Station 13 due to New Hanover Station 13 (Castle Hayne). City has up to 10 and 15. County has 11-19 except of course 15. Unit numbers go along with that as well.

MCNelson - 02/17/14 - 16:11

for those of us who dont know, what will be the 2nd engine at Central?

Closing station 3 and moving engine 3 over there?

Buckwheat - 02/17/14 - 16:26

@Joey Durham Highway has a contract with Raleigh FD for our station 2 which is there current Station 23. So all the area that 23 will lose to 13, Durham Highway will still respond to, only thing it will change is that some areas Durham Highway will run as second due engine company instead of first due engine company.

DH - 02/17/14 - 19:05

@Buck, latest chatter is that St 1 will no longer house two engines. Basically that the single engine will carry the load. They will likely move the heavy rescue from St 21 to St 1 once E13 moves out.

FL - 02/18/14 - 07:49

DH, I believe that would only apply to "closest response" type of calls.

Bob - 02/18/14 - 07:51

Hey Bob,

With the contract for Station 23, Durham Highway CAN'T loss any area until the contract for Station 23 is up or either party ends the contract. That is why some time back Durham Highway was put back on the run order in area's served by RFD Station 23 and 24 that had been removed by the city in CAD. "No hard feeling."

Its easy for people to look in and say this county station is not needed due to the Raleigh Fire Department building a fire station. The city is only providing a single-engine in closest station response in the county, and if that station is on a call "no other CITY unit is dispatched". However, due to the fact the county has multiple units with auto aid tags in CAD, the city will get a response from that closest county station.

The way it looks from my side of the tracks is that the county gets the short end of the stick. Truly the biggest problem the county taxpayer has is that Towns and the City can taken in an area and leave a donut hole that needs to be protected. The County Commissioners need to step up and tell the Towns and City no more donut holes; take it all and provide the service at an reasonable price.

Don't get me wrong I do agree that some fire stations in the county may need to be shut down or relocated to better service the county. The other problem the county has is that it takes water to put out fires and without a county wide hydrant system it takes Pumpers and Tankers to move water. So those fire stations and people are still needed.

Maybe some will see it's not so easy to close a fire station without a real plan to deal with service countywide.

Just Saying - 02/18/14 - 13:07

Either way, it seems like another nail in the coffin for DH, regardless of the contract. When you get into a situation where you are relying on a contract for \$\$ or responses, it can't be a good thing. Plus, those contracts are rarely renewed once expired from what I am told.

Jake - 02/19/14 - 07:52

So, Mike, are you going to update the renderings once again or simply reinstate the originals?

Rescue Ranger - 05/27/14 - 22:09

Why did the station go from 29 to 13 back to 29?

Fire bug - 05/28/14 - 23:08

What's up with Ladder 10? Where is Ladder 9 going?

LADDER 10 - 05/29/14 - 01:08

@Fire bug, here is the basis for the numbering changes. It was originally #29 because this was obviously the next sequential number. Then it was changed to #13 out of necessity because the station was going to be staffed with the crew from E13. However, since the upcoming budget includes two additional companies this is no longer needed. So the number of the station has reverted back to #29.

AP - 05/29/14 - 07:32

Ladder 10 is next on the wish list, so of course this is unfunded currently. A good guess is that Ladder 10 would be located at the new St 6. However, a lot can change between now and then.

As far as Ladder 9, it will likely end up at new St 12 which should begin construction later this calendar year. Depending on the timing of putting Ladder 9 in service, it will probably have a temporary home until new St 12 is completed. All of this is assuming no shifting of current ladders is required to maximize the response effectiveness of each ladder, so there are multiple factors that will decide the ladder placements when finalized.

AP - 05/29/14 - 07:44

All new stations are being built to accommodate an engine and ladder company at a minimum. Based on this, the renderings showing Ladder 10 at #29 is merely an assumption on part of the architect. As ladder companies are added, they are placed in the most effective station based on anticipated call volume, response times and whether or not the station can accommodate it. So the ladders do not automatically go to the newest station, even though #29 may end up with a ladder one day.

AP - 05/29/14 - 08:00

Mike, the architects should be Williard Ferm, not William Ferm. The company is also doing our station expansion at ALFD.

D. McKay - 05/30/14 - 16:21

Name: (real name
preferred)

E-mail: (optional)

Web Site: (optional)

Comment:

Remember personal info?

Yes

No

/ [Textile](#)