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Regular Council Meeting Tuesday, February 2 - Afternoon and Evening Sessions
Reminder that Council will meet next Tuesday in regularly scheduled sessions at 1:00 P.M. and 7:00 P.M.
The agenda for the meeting was published on Thursday:

https://go.boarddocs.com/nc/raleigh/Board.nsf

Reminder: If there is an item you would like to have pulled from the consent agenda for discussion, please send an e-mail mayorstaff@raleighnc.gov by 11 A.M. on the day of the meeting.

You will be receiving information on joining the WebEx Events session on Monday; staff will be available to assist with log ins and joining the virtual City Council meeting.

INFORMATION:

Utility Payments Update
Staff Contact: Aaron Brower, Raleigh Water, 996-3469, aaron.brower@raleighnc.gov

As Council will recall, Raleigh Water stopped credit and collections of utility accounts in early March 2020 due to COVID-19, ahead of the Governor issuing Executive Order 124, which temporarily prohibited utilities from terminating service. That prohibition ended in July.
On January 5, staff provided Council with an update on the status of past due accounts. There are approximately 12,000 single family residential accounts that are currently past due.

Over the last several months staff has increased outreach efforts to customers who may need assistance. Efforts have included mailing postcards, calls and messages through Everbridge, coordination with our merger partner communities, and social media. In addition, Raleigh Water is temporarily utilizing nine (9) employees from the Raleigh Convention and Performing Arts Center (RCPAC) to reach out to local non-profits and faith-based organizations as well as individual customers via phone and email.

A special phone number and email address have been created to help connect customers with available assistance. That phone number is (919) 996-3333, and the email address is UtilityBillHelp@raleighnc.gov.

Resources for utility bill assistance continue to evolve. Limited funding is still available in the Utility Customer Assistance Program (UCAP) and Project Share. Staff continues to explore other options through the County and the State and will update promotional materials as additional assistance opportunities come available.

Raleigh Water expects to restart credit and collections effective February 6. Under this timeline, disconnects for non-payment will begin in mid- to late February. Staff will continue to push out information regarding funding assistance and payment plans in the coming weeks.

(No attachment)

“Operation PPE” – Small Business Drive Thru Event Scheduled for February 3

Staff Resource: Mark Weldon, Office of Economic Dev. & Innovation, 996-3139, mark.weldon@raleighnc.gov

Shop Local Raleigh, the NC Division of Emergency Management and other local and statewide partners have announced Operation PPE. Operation PPE has the goal of supporting small businesses which are the backbone of our local economies across the state by making PPE supplies available to small businesses in North Carolina, at no cost. Inventory includes contactless thermometers, N95 masks, face shields and more. Supply pick-ups are planned at various locations across the state including in Raleigh.

The first scheduled distribution is at Big Boss Brewing Company, 1249 Wicker Drive, Raleigh. The distribution will be held February 3 from 10:00 – 2:00 P.M. This distribution of critical resources has been communicated to Economic Development and Business Alliance partners, and to the general public. Please share with your small business networks. Additional information may be found at:

https://shoplocalraleigh.org/operation-ppe/

(No attachment)
General Follow Up Item

MWBE Disparity Study Update

Staff Resource: Audrea Caesar, Office of Equity & Inclusion, 996-5698, audrea.caesar@raleighnc.gov

As directed by Council at the September 8, 2020 work session, staff initiated the process of exploring a possible collaboration with Wake County to complete a disparity study. As shared in the December 18, 2020 City Manager’s Weekly Report (Issue 2020-47), staff from Wake County, Wake County Public Schools and the City of Raleigh released a joint RFI (Request for Information) to identify what a collaborative study could look like, the feasibility of one company handling a study of this scope and if there was any cost savings associated with a joint RFP. The RFI closed on January 27, 2021.

Staff from Wake County, Wake County Public Schools and the City of Raleigh have a series of meetings scheduled in February to review the information provided. Staff will provide Council with a recommended course of action in late February.

(No attachment)

Follow Up from the January 19 City Council Meeting

Building Height Categories in the UDO and TC-19-19 (Mayor Baldwin)

Staff Resource: Kenneth Bowers, Planning and Development, 996-2633, ken.bowers@raleighnc.gov

During the meeting Council requested that staff report back on the possibility of adding one or more additional height categories to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). The current code includes the following height categories in stories: 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 20, and 40. Categories between 3 and 5 also include a height limit in feet, while categories 7 and above do not. A specific issue is the large jump between the 20 and 40 story categories. Petitioners wishing to construct any building greater than 20 stories in height must request 40 story zoning, even if their intent is only to build, say, a 22-story building. Forty is a large number (no building of this height exists in Raleigh today) and therefore becomes attached to news headlines and discussion of the rezoning petition going forward.

A pending text change, TC-19-19, represents the second step in transitioning Design Adjustments and Administrative Alternates to the Appearance Commission to be heard and decided in a quasi-judicial hearing format. As part of this text change, staff has undertaken a comprehensive review of the UDO standards giving rise to requests for relief from these standards through the Administrative Alternate process. The building massing standards for tall buildings have generated many such requests in the past, and staff is proposing modifications to these standards. Among the proposals in the draft text change is to add a new height category of 30 stories to the UDO. In addition, the requirement for a building step-back would be applied to buildings above 12 stories rather than 7, and the maximum floor plate of 25,000 square feet...
above the 12th floor will be converted into an equivalent floor area allocation that will give architects and developers options to build shorter and wider, or taller and thinner towers within the overall height limit.

A staff memorandum with a detailed update on TC-19-19 is included with the Update materials.

(Attachment)

Capital Plaza Hotel Redevelopment - Broadstone Oak City Proposed Streets (Council Member Cox)

Staff Resource: Daniel King, Transportation, 996-2408, daniel.king@raleighnc.gov

During the meeting and following public comment, Council requested staff to provide an update regarding the proposed development at 2815 Capital Boulevard and to determine if a roundabout or other traffic management solution would be appropriate at the intersection of Glenridge Road, an existing residential street; and Alloy Street, a proposed street that runs parallel with Capital Boulevard.

A memorandum discussing these issues is included with the Update materials.

(Attachment)
Council Member Follow Up
TO: Marchell Adams-David, City Manager
THRU: Patrick O. Young, AICP, Department
FROM: Ken Bowers, Deputy Director
Travis Crane, Assistant Director
Lee Stevens, Urban Designer

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development
DATE: January 22, 2021
SUBJECT: TC-19-19 Summary Update

**Introduction**

In 2019 the City began a two-step transition of certain formerly administrative decisions into a quasi-judicial format to better align with accepted law. The first step, TC-17-19, amended the standards for Design Adjustments and shifted them from the Board of Adjustment (where they had found a temporary home) to the Appearance Commission. The second step, TC-19-19, will convert Administrative Alternates to Design (AADs) into a quasi-judicial process. Both Design Adjustments and Administrative Alternates to Design will be known as Design Alternates and will be reviewed by the Appearance Commission performing the duties of the Planning Commission, imbuing them with the power to serve as a quasi-judicial body. TC-19-19 makes the necessary changes to the findings for the nine current AADs to become compliant with a quasi-judicial review process.

Quasi-judicial review allows for the Appearance Commission to evaluate cases based on presented facts and apply judgement. With this review authority, Design Alternate findings may be subjective in nature, allowing them to better encompass design quality. In both of these text changes, staff went beyond process changes to also include (1) revisions to the required findings for approval, to better align with the nature of quasi-judicial decisions; and (2) to reevaluate the UDO standards giving rise to frequent requests for Design Adjustment and AAD relief.

Staff have examined data from eight years of Administrative Alternate to Design (AAD) review to address common issues with compliance and common approved design solutions to update the General Requirements for several of the AAD sections to produce better design outcomes. These proposed updates should reduce the number of projects that need to seek relief before the Appearance Commission.

Staff are in the final stages of preparing the draft and all associated tables to post the text change to the public input portal, after which it will be presented to the Planning Commission.

Recommendations Proposed in TC-19-19

**Build-to**—In addition to updated findings, the corner build-to requirement is clarified to specify that buildings on corners must be placed within the intersection build-to for each street. Additionally, use this text change to remove the build-to requirement for all townhouse building types, and for apartment building types outside of urban frontages. The text change proposes changes to the Build-to General Requirement to allow the required build-to percentage to be reduced by one-third when the area otherwise occupied by building is substituted with an amenity area meeting the requirements set forth in UDO Sec. 1.5.3.

**Pedestrian Access**—The text change proposes only requiring one entrance per non-residential unit or townhouse ground floor unit for public-facing street in urban frontages. The findings also need to be updated for Quasi-Judicial format.

**Transparency**—Update findings for Quasi-Judicial format.

**Blank Wall**—Update findings for Quasi-Judicial format.

**Private Residential Garage Parking Options**—The applicability of the private residential garage parking options is updated to apply to only National Historic Districts. The findings are updated for a Quasi-Judicial format.

**Building Massing**—The most substantial changes are recommended for Building Massing. In addition to updating the findings for a Quasi-Judicial format, the intent of the ordinance has been clarified. The stepback requirement is proposed to only apply to buildings 12 stories or more, with stepbacks falling above the 1st floor or 25 feet, whichever is greater, but below the 12th floor. This will allow flexibility for mixed-use buildings to both meet the Build-To requirement, which creates a minimum 25’ high urban streetwall, and also develop upper floors that respond efficiently to building needs and typology. TC-19-19 proposes changing maximum floor plate area for tower floors. Above the 12th floor, instead of being limited to 25,000 sf per floor, towers will be allowed 25,000 square feet of buildable area per story allowed by the site’s zoning. The allowable area can be distributed within the tower in a variety of ways: larger floors will result in shorter, bulkier towers; smaller floors will result in thinner, taller towers (not to exceed the zoning floor limit). **An additional height category of 30 stories will be added between the 20 and 40 story limits.** The findings have been altered to more directly address the pedestrian environment and buildings address the public realm.

**Parking Administrative Alternate**—The Alternate will be changed to a Parking Alternate Means of Compliance but will remain administratively reviewed. Updates are proposed for data collection to inform the parking study, stating that parking studies must be conducted for peak hours of use.

**Vehicle Parking Lot Landscaping**—Update findings for Quasi-Judicial format.
Landscaping and Screening—Expand findings to more directly address the impact of wall areas and screening elements to create a better condition for the public realm. The Foundation Wall requirement will be moved to its own section from its current place under the section for Retaining Walls. Additionally, TC-19-19 proposes treatment options for blank foundation wall area that could be administratively approved. Treatments include seating, plantings, ramp access, and green walls. Treatment options must cover 75 percent of blank foundation wall area, but the maximum height, including treatments, may not exceed 5 feet.
TO: Marcell Adams-David, City Manager

FROM: Michael Moore, Director

DEPARTMENT: Transportation

DATE: January 29, 2021

SUBJECT: Alloy Street and the Proposed Broadstone Oak City Redevelopment on Capital Boulevard

During the meeting and following public comments, Council requested staff to provide an update regarding the proposed development at 2815 Capital Boulevard and to determine if a roundabout or other traffic management solution would be appropriate at the intersection of Glenridge Rd., an existing residential street, and Alloy Street, a proposed street that runs parallel with Capital Blvd. (See Figure 1)

Background
This proposed development is an “administrative” review, meaning it must be approved by staff if it meets all City Council-adopted development standards found in the Unified Development Ordinance and other Council-adopted requirements. This administrative review resulted in approval (case reference ASR-0048-2020) last week, as it has been found to be compliant with applicable regulations by all reviewing departments. The project is still within the 30-day appeal period for parties, with standing, who believe that some aspect of what has been approved does not meet the regulatory requirements of the UDO.

This property went through a rezoning (Z-35-19) and was approved by City Council on Feb. 4, 2020. The exhibit shown below was provided by the applicant, indicating the degree to which they were willing to support street connectivity/block perimeter for this area. (See Figure 1 below) The roadway alignment has also been proposed for over a year as part of the Capital Boulevard North corridor study (See Figure 2 below), additionally it was a subject of discussion at the Planning Commission and City Council during the rezoning case for this site.
Response to Questions raised during Public Comment

- Glenridge Dr. vs Alloy St. T-intersection question: T-ing Glenridge Dr. into Alloy St. (as opposed to the reverse) makes a better grid and provides an east-west connection parallel to Capital Boulevard consistent with the Capital Blvd. North Corridor Plan. Proposed Alloy St. also creates an improved alignment at the intersection of Highwoods Blvd. This can relieve travel demand for Glenridge Dr. once Alloy St. is connected to Brentwood Rd. If Alloy St. were to T into Glenridge Dr. it would likely create an incentive for drivers exiting the apartments to use Glenridge Dr. to get back to Brentwood Rd. if traffic were queued at the intersection with Highwoods Blvd. This would potentially push more traffic through the neighborhood. There is only one property currently obstructing the connection of Alloy St. to Brentwood Rd. Completing that connection would further relieve the traffic burden on the Highwoods Blvd. intersection and would complete the east-west connector to further discourage traffic from using Glenridge Dr. (See Figure 3)

- Excessive queuing: The TIA did not show an excessive increase in queuing for Alloy St. at Highwoods Blvd., there is also a private driveway access for the site on Capital Boulevard that will provide an additional outlet for some trips from the proposed apartments. (See Figure 3)

- Fire station 11 egress: The alignment doesn’t really change the risk of queuing at Highwoods Blvd. because queuing will happen in either alignment scenario based on the traffic volume on Highwoods Blvd. The left turn lane on the proposed Alloy St. will provide more space for fire trucks to pass queued traffic if needed.

![FIGURE 3](image-url)
Appropriateness of a Roundabout
Using a roundabout at Alloy St. and Glenridge Dr. would have appeal for traffic flow management and aesthetic improvements, however its proximity to the intersection with Highwoods Boulevard and the known congestion at that location makes a roundabout a poor choice in this context. Roundabouts do not function well in proximity to signalized intersections, as long queues from a signal can cause a roundabout to "lock up" once a queue enters the circle. Conventional intersections tend to handle this kind of congestion-related queuing better.

The absence of channelization for a traditional intersection would also provide an advantage for emergency response vehicles originating from Fire Station 11, which is located on Glenridge Dr. close to this location. In the event of a peak-hour queue through the intersection, fire trucks would have the latitude to use the opposite side of the street to bypass any queues. Employing a roundabout with channelized splitter islands would hinder this option.

Request for Direction/Approval from City Council
The applicants are proposing to construct Alloy St. to their eastern property line. Completion of Alloy St. to Brentwood Rd. would help alleviate any concerns about cut-through traffic along Glenridge Dr. This street extension would require the acquisition of a single undeveloped property located at 2925 Brentwood Road. Staff would like authorization from the Council to explore the purchase of this property, which is currently owned by G&M Capital, LLC, for the purpose of this future street extension. Such construction could occur jointly with the development through a cost-sharing agreement, or it could be slated as a standalone capital project in the CIP. (See Figure 3)