- 16:58:52 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh): Welcome to the Ask-A-Planner meeting for the Missing Middle and Transit Overlay Districts! Please feel free to ask a question in the chat or join the discussion by unmuting or raising your hand.
- 17:02:47 From Lorilyn Bailey: Who is speaking representing Raleigh Planning? Was this supposed to start at 5 pm?
- 17:03:18 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): I thought this started at 5 pm as well. I got an email saying as much.
- 17:03:20 From Lorilyn Bailey : Where can we find a plain-language description of this change and its consequences
- 17:03:43 From Joseph Huberman : I would like to ask a question about Western Blvd. next to Boylan Heights.
- 17:04:27 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Can you give a brief overview of the changes and how they will benefit Raleigh residents?
- 17:05:03 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh): https://raleighnc.gov/SupportPages/what-missing-middle
- 17:05:04 From Adam Terando : I second Falyn's question
- 17:05:12 From Donna Bailey: Can you please explain what TC-5-20 says
- 17:05:14 From Pat: Please explain how R2 zoning is affected by "missing middle" change.
- 17:05:14 From Adam Terando: Particularly with respect to the TOD text change
- 17:05:28 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh) :

https://raleighnc.gov/SupportPages/what-transit-overlay-district

- 17:06:03 From Donna Bailey: thank you
- 17:11:19 From Justin Rametta: The biggest change in R-2 will be that attached houses (duplexes) will be allowed on 30,000 sf lots.
- 17:11:19 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Thank you for that explanation!
- 17:12:40 From Nick Fugh: Question: Although TC-5-20 looks encouraging, but the infill regulation could easily kill the feasibility for those infill parcels. Back in the old days front yard deeper than the backyard is common, while the trend is the opposite nowadays. I found it

absurd to force new development to conform the old way. You don't make your iPhone look like a brick keypad phone. How are we revise the infill to make it work with TC-5-20?

- 17:14:06 From Lubin Prevatt to Raleigh Planning(Privately): This amounts to Upzoning. Will you please explain the impact on R-4 again. You started before the beginning time of 5:00 p.m. without an introduction. Looks deceptive.
- 17:14:42 From Amber Lewis : Are the TOD districts form-based?
- 17:15:21 From Joseph Huberman: From the route or the stations
- 17:15:32 From Earl Taylor: Where can we find data numbers on the BRT ridership? current & the future and the total capacity
 There is no ridership data in the annual report
- 17:16:31 From Larry Helfant: Is Six Forks a TOD? If so, there is no plan for affordable housing even though BRT routing is planned.
- 17:16:46 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): I live on Western Blvd close to where it intersects with I-440 and I am very excited about the City encouraging development of walkable public destinations along the BRT routes!
- 17:16:55 From Pat: You describe the "biggest" change in R-2. What are other changes impact R-2? Is anything different when NCOD is in place?
- 17:18:09 From Earl Taylor : re: Cary-Raleigh BRT Will Boylan Heights (RHDC) get rezoned to RX?
- 17:18:29 From Justin Rametta: From the webpage: Most NCODs regulate the subdivision of land through minimum and maximum lot sizes, lot widths and depths, and the form and scale of buildings through restrictions on height and setbacks. These regulations will be unchanged under this text change. However, as is the case with current code, anything not regulated by an overlay district is regulated by the underlying zoning.
- 17:18:30 From Joseph Huberman: What does the 30 years mean?
- 17:18:43 From Lorilyn Bailey: 1) will there be a recording WITH CHAT available later of this meeting? Will you email it? Where will it be available?
- 2) Are HOA neighborhoods exempt from these changes that benefit no one but developers?
- 3) If they are so necessary to increase the city's density, why aren't HOA neighborhoods forced to allow townhouses, cottage courts, etc. in their neighborhoods?

- 4) Where are the transit overlay districts? Did you say you are still working on them?
- 5) What is considered affordable housing in your definition for developers? Who made that up? \$60K for family of four?
- 6) Who made up these rules about increasing heights in exchange for affordable housing? Are they already approved? Who approved them? OR are they part of the text change?
- 17:21:11 From Erik: Other than density, how would the text change affect walkability?
- 17:23:18 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Glad to hear it. Always a shame when we lose permeable landcover but don't increase human density potential.
- 17:24:25 From Earl Taylor : So this is supporting tear downs?
- 17:24:47 From Earl Taylor: dude, that an opinion...not planning.
- 17:25:18 From Earl Taylor: Why is residential parking limited then?
- 17:25:39 From Adam Terando: Very happy that there is no required parking in the TOD districts.
- 17:26:01 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen) to Raleigh Planning(Privately): Hey, I'm an outreach and PR manager at the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. I've got some ideas on how you can improve these meetings for the audience. I think they're awesome but they could be better! If you're interested, shoot me an email at Falyn.owens@ncwildlife.org.
- 17:27:04 From Lorilyn Bailey: WHEN is the developer-funded mayor and developer-funded councilors expected to approve these developer-friendly, anti-resident text changes that are a bit much to consume all at once and need MUCH more explanation and MANY MORE residents to learn about?
- 17:27:58 From Hannah Reckhow (Raleigh Planning and Development) : https://raleighnc.gov/bus-rapid-transit-western
- 17:28:04 From Justin Rametta: Other R-2 Changes: duplexes allowed on 23,000 sf lots in Compact developments (with 20% or 2-acres of open space) and on 15,000 sf lots in a Conservation development (40% or 4-acres of open space).
- 17:29:26 From Larry Helfant: The problem seems to be in the setbacks. As lot sizes diminishes, the building gets closer to street and side boundary. Net result in existing neighborhood is you get larger, taller structures on to of neighbors and streets. Will stick out as sore thumb in established older neighborhoods. Please re=examine set back requirements,

especially	' in r	r-2 a	reas
------------	--------	-------	------

17:32:02	From Adam Terando: On parking: Are there any parallel efforts to revise the
parking code i	n general to reduce parking requirements?

- 17:34:21 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Great guestion, Michael!
- 17:34:39 From Keegan McDonald : Mordecai has a mix as well.
- 17:35:24 From Donna Bailey: University Park is awesome!
- 17:36:34 From Lubin Prevatt: Your earliar comments on existing housing areas amounts to Up-zoning. Will you please explain the impact on R-4 again. You started before the beginning time of 5:00 p.m. without an introduction. This threw people off. Looks deceptive.
- 17:36:35 From Ira Mabel (City of Raleigh): Earl, the TOD overlay will not change the base district
- 17:36:57 From Ira Mabel (City of Raleigh): it oges on top of whatever the zoning is now
- 17:37:05 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): How can I make sure I am notified of opportunities like this to learn about upcoming planning and provide feedback?
- 17:39:44 From Keegan McDonald : GovDelivery is a great resource: https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/NCRALEIGH/subscriber/new
- 17:39:46 From Adam Terando: I hope this 'non-public facing' study isn't trying to determine community values, which are not technical questions!
- 17:40:11 From Keegan McDonald : You can also sign up for BRT specific updates here: https://raleighnc.gov/bus-rapid-transit
- 17:40:47 From Merrilee Jacobson : So how does Chapel Hill manage to get developers to include AH in most of their new developments?
- 17:41:23 From Adam Terando : @Merrilee: basically they are assuming developers won't sue them
- 17:42:03 From Lorilyn Bailey: THANK YOU!
- 17:42:18 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh) : https://raleighnc.gov/planning-and-development

- 17:42:19 From Erik: Isn't allowing more density akin to promoting affordable housing? Isn't that the goal?
- 17:43:44 From Lorilyn Bailey: I know what HOAs are. SOOO... HOA neighborhoods CAN have cottage courts and townhouses? HOW can HOAs SUPERCEDE CITY ZONING?
- 17:45:56 From Adam Terando: Is there anything in the TOD text change that specifies buildings (particularly commercial buildings) must have the main entrance facing the primary street/bus route? (i.e. the entrance can't be in the rear of the building if they decided to put a parking lot there).
- 17:47:53 From Eric Hodge: Lorilyn Bailey, unless found to be unconstitutional, a restrictive covenant (HOA) can and often does supersede zoning regulations. However, as John Anagnost mentioned, the City does not acknowledge or observe the covenants as the City is not a party thereto.
- 17:49:14 From Donna Bailey: Eric So what you are saying is that HOA's will have to follow these text changes, is that correct?
- 17:49:20 From Russ Stephenson : Would the Cambridge MA Affordable Housing Overlay be legal in Raleigh? https://www.cambridgema.gov/CDD/housing/housingdevelopment/aho
- 17:49:27 From Eric Hodge: But the City Zoning regulations would still be applicable so even if permitted by a restrictive covenant, the City's zoning would have to be followed for a City approval.
- 17:50:03 From Eric Hodge: Lorilyn Bailey, these rules do not trump restrictive covenants.
- 17:50:48 From Keegan McDonald : Adam Terando, a primary street facing pedestrian entrance is required for multi-unit residential and commercial structures within the TOD
- 17:51:10 From Adam Terando : Thanks!
- 17:51:21 From Eric Hodge: But as John mentioned, enforcement of restrictive covenants is done through the courts and the burden of taking legal action is on the other parties subject to the covenants.
- 17:54:17 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Yay! Glad to hear that sidewalks will be required.
- 17:55:07 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Does that include requirements on bike lanes?

- 17:58:14 From Lorilyn Bailey: The way he said it, was WHY would someone want to build a BIG house when he could BUILD TWO UNITS?
- 17:58:35 From Lorilyn Bailey: PRO-DEVELOPER.
- 17:58:55 From Keegan McDonald : Falyn, there are new street cross-sections being developed to better accommodate bicycle lanes behind the curb.
- 17:58:56 From Adam Terando : Perhaps better than pro-mansion?
- 17:59:39 From Adam Terando: There are values espoused in the Comprehensive Plan
- 17:59:51 From Adam Terando: These are choices we made as a community and passed by past city counciles
- 17:59:59 From Donna Bailey: What are the setbacks for ADU's?
- 18:00:01 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Thank you Keegan. As long as a cyclist can travel along busy roads safely, I'm happy!
- 18:00:44 From Eric Hodge: Donna Bailey, the ADU must be behind the back wall of the primary house and 5' from side and 5' from rear
- 18:01:07 From Eric Hodge: Unless attached and then it follows the primary building's setbacks
- 18:01:09 From Lorilyn Bailey: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL do not represent the needs or desires of the residents of Raleigh. City staff are DOING THEIR JOBS. Sounds familiar, doesn't it?
- 18:01:36 From Donna Bailey: So Eric, it doesn't matter the height of the ADU?
- 18:02:20 From Eric Hodge: It does not, ADUs are capped at 25' in height I believe and their height does not dictate their setbacks under the recent ADU rules
- 18:02:31 From Donna Bailey: Thank you
- 18:02:41 From Lorilyn Bailey: Ultimately, the City Council ignores the Planning Commission and does what the developers want. (This opinion is based on previous actions.)
- 18:04:09 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh) : https://raleighnc.gov/planning-commission
- 18:04:37 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh) : To email the Planning Commission: planning.commission@raleighnc.gov

- 18:07:40 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Larry, isn't that what's happening already but McMansions are being built on the lots rather than multi-family units? I'd rather have a multi-family unit than a gigantic house on a postage stamp lot.
- 18:10:17 From Nick Fugh : Are infill rules not racially biased?
- 18:10:21 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Neighborhoods that have a variety of housing types are much more pleasant to live in, more equitable, and more community oriented.
- 18:11:43 From Adam Terando : @Michael, I don't understand what the 'disaster' would be if there are duplexes in a cul-de-sac neighborhood
- 18:11:53 From Eric Hodge: Infill rules are intended to reflect the built character and can allow smaller setbacks than the base zoning as well as require larger setbacks than the base zoning if the comparative properties lean that way
- 18:13:34 From Larry Helfant: I don't think there is a concern about adding duplexes, it is how it is done. Please revise the text to maintain neighborhood setbacks and not revise rules for more density on smaller lots. Mike Lindsay hit it on the head. Keep neighborhoods harmonious in setback and style.
- 18:14:32 From Nick Fugh: Infill Rules: The existing owners users keypad phones, so all the new home owners in the neighborhood cannot use large screen touch-key phones. That is the essence!
- 18:15:48 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Just my opinion here, but I strongly prefer neighborhoods with a lot of variety in visual design and interest. Neighborhoods where the houses are all identical in size, setback, etc. are frankly less interesting and have less character.
- 18:15:58 From Adam Terando : I agree with Falyn
- 18:16:07 From Keegan McDonald Raleigh Planning : Larry, I will note in R-2 and R-4, duplexes will have to adhere to the same setbacks as detached houses
- 18:16:24 From Adam Terando : @Falyn Shows that these are all personal preferences and values. These are not 'objective' decisions, nor should they be
- 18:16:38 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): @Adam: indeed!
- 18:19:39 From Lorilyn Bailey: COMMENT: You use the terms: "Incremental" and " slight changes." Maybe it's a SMALL change when compared to how it affects an entire city. When a building blocks the sun to its next-door neighbor, it's a big deal to that one person -- and

multiply that as developers continue to look for "OPPORTUNITIES" to make themselves richer and Raleigh residents more miserable.

- 18:22:38 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh): Russ Stephenson: We will have to get back to you to answer your question as we are not sure what would be legal in Raleigh.
- 18:23:01 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): What I hear here is a lot of fear. Fear of change. But Raleigh is changing regardless of how much anyone resists it. These are well thought out recommendations that will help Raleigh grow in a smart, equitable way. Wishing the city's growth away is not an option.
- 18:24:37 From Lorilyn Bailey: COMMENTS: No one is afraid of change.
- 18:24:53 From Lorilyn Bailey: Thank you for having this.
- 18:25:58 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh) : Please consider signing up for any of the City's email lists via GovDelivery:

https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/NCRALEIGH/subscriber/new

- 18:26:33 From Eric Hodge: ROI
- 18:26:51 From Eric Hodge: Return on Investment
- 18:27:17 From Larry Helfant : Are you aware of the BRT routing and transfer station that was proposed in Midtown Area plan?
- 18:27:48 From Justin Rametta: Contact the Planning Commission or sign up to participate in their meetings here: https://raleighnc.gov/planning-commission
- 18:37:27 From Lubin Prevatt: The notice distance of 100 feet or 500 feet are totally inadequate. Also, since the elimination of the CACs, citizen engagement has been significantly impacted in a negative way.
- 18:38:49 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh) : https://raleighnc.gov/SupportPages/neighborhood-meetings
- 18:40:06 From Eric Hodge: Thanks to all the public who showed up!
- 18:40:06 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): It may be worth it for the city to consider getting an account with NextDoor to help get the word out about its planning and rezoning efforts.
- 18:40:20 From Larry Helfant : Thank you for hosting

- 18:41:22 From Amber Lewis : Could you summarize the New Bern Ave TOD study?
- 18:41:53 From Falyn Owens (Rhymes with Allen): Good to hear. I would think that the staff managing the overarching account should work with other department staff to put out notices for them when appropriate.
- 18:42:37 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh): Thank you Falyn! Yes we are working to incorporate this option more into our future engagement efforts.
- 18:43:32 From D Smoot: Can you please explain Sec 2.3.4.D3 Townhouse Parking Setbacks from side lot line (min): 0' or 3'... can you explain with examples please?
- 18:46:19 From D Smoot: This is from the proposed text change TC-05-20
- 18:47:13 From D Smoot: Thank you
- 18:47:55 From Amber Lewis : Does that create a zero lot line scenario for townhouse subdivisions?
- 18:49:33 From Amber Lewis: Does that building separation vary from one residential district to another to help keep the current building pattern?
- 18:50:01 From Amber Lewis: Thank you!
- 18:53:41 From Lorilyn Bailey: Any good jokes? Just kidding. Thank you again! Bye!
- 18:53:46 From D Smoot: For compact development in R-4 with the following conditions:
- 18:58:54 From David Smoot : This is David Smoot thanking City staff for a very informative session and wishing you success in taking it to Council
- 18:59:15 From Eric Hodge: David: Tell your Dad we said hello!
- 18:59:29 From David Smoot: Will do:)
- 18:59:42 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh) : https://raleighnc.gov/SupportPages/text-change-cases
- 18:59:49 From Katie Dombrowski (City of Raleigh): Thank you everyone for joining!
- 18:59:55 From Eric Hodge: Until you spoke, I thought it was him. He's a sharp tack and a pleasure to speak with.
- 19:00:42 From David Smoot: Much appreciated. I'll pass your good wishes along