

## Falls of Neuse Area Plan: Compilation of Comments and Responses

Commentor	Comment	Response
1	This plan allows continued high level growth based on an existing quality base. It does not destroy what is now good and desirable in the area. This plan will encourage progress and growth with the support of the citizens most affected in the area.	No change was made.
2	Supports the plan's exclusion of retail at Raven Ridge. Strongly supports the plan overall	No change was made.
3	Likes that plan does not include retail at Raven Ridge	No change was made.
4	Confirmation Group is not fully representative of the area.	No change was made. The Confirmation Group was selected and approved by City Council.
5	Supports FN 11: Falls of Neuse/Raven Ridge Area	No change was made.
6	No need for sidewalk improvements on west side of Falls from Durant Road to Raven Ridge Road. Eliminate actions FN1 and FN2.	No changes were made. The first of the two actions would make the intersection ADA compliant. A ramp facilitating the crossing of Raven Ridge on the west side of the intersection already exists on the north side, but no corresponding ramp exists on the south side. The second action recommends only that the city "explore the possibility" of a sidewalk along the west side of Falls of Neuse. A study would examine costs and potential usage of such a connection.
7	Language regarding market study could be clearer	Revisions were made to add clarity.
8	Language regarding market study could be clearer	Revisions were made to add clarity.
9	Supports retail at Raven Ridge.	No change was made. Of the two options presented for this area, the one that excluded retail gathered significantly more support than the option that included 10,000 sf of retail. The option with no retail was supported by 73% of survey respondents and by five of eight groups during the community workshop.

10	What about changing FLUM recommendation for parcels behind Raven Ridge to LDR?	No change was made. The plan recommends a significant decrease of intensity in this area. The area currently is designated for Office and Residential Mixed Use. The plan recommends allowing residential uses only, and no apartment buildings.
10	Instead of (or in addition to) wording like the existing "Office uses should be limited to the area within 150' of Falls of Neuse Road or Raven Ridge Road," why don't we see anything like "XYZ type of development should be confined to an area no closer than 150' from existing residential development?"	No change was made. Only a few existing residential properties would be within 150' of any nonresidential development. UDO standards requiring a 50' transition, as well as landscaped transition yards, apply.
11	Can there be better separation between pedestrians and cars on Falls of Neuse bridge over Neuse River?	An action (FN 10: Falls of Neuse Bridge Pedestrian Improvements) calling for study of the issue was added to the project report.
11	Why is the possibility of a whitewater park not in the plan?	No change was made. The study of a whitewater park would be wrapped into the broader study of the Leonard Tract.
12	Consider Streetside HOD for Falls Community	This had been addressed only by a policy. FN 8: Falls Community, stated that "The character and the design of new development or redevelopment in the historically-significant Falls Community should reflect in material, form, and character the unique character of existing homes in the neighborhood." However, no corresponding action is included. A corresponding action, FN 1: Falls Community Historic Structures, was added. It recommends a study of the issue.
13	Either remove or better justify and illustrate Action FN15 Dehijuston/Raven Ridge Road Connection.	No change was made. City block perimeter standards require an additional connection, which would have the effect of relieving traffic at the Falls of Neuse/Raven Ridge intersection and improving bicycle/pedestrian access to the multi-use path along Falls of Neuse Road. Potential alignments were not considered during the planning process and will depend on topography, development plans, and other issues, and therefore no specific alignment is shown.
14	Market study section does not mention "cottages" as a use	Cottages are shown in conceptual diagrams and are a housing type allowed and envisioned in the recommendations. A definition was added on page 16 in the "Land Use and Zoning" section.

15	The 40% watershed forestation requirement should not be included in the area plan, because the area plan does not cover the entire watershed area and because it is a hardship for property owners.	No change was made. The requirement is currently found in the UDO. The area plan reflects that requirement.
City Comments		
Parks	Park master planning funds won't be available until 2021 (revise timeline for Leonard Tract master plan)	The timeline was revised to reflect this input.
Parks	Parking expansion at greenway trailhead does not have immediate funds. 2-5 year timeline is more likely.	The timeline was revised to reflect this input.
Parks	Add sidewalk along Raven Ridge from Falls of Neuse to main entrance to Wilkerson Nature Preserve (Awls Haven Drive)	An action (FN 16: Wilkerson Nature Preserve Pedestrian Access) was added to address this issue. The action calls for a sidewalk along Raven Ridge Road and the study of additional sidewalks within the park.