Request:
16.25 acres from 
R-1 w/ SHOD-1 & FWPOD 
to R-10-CU 
w/ SHOD-1 & FWPOD

Submittal Date 
1/8/2016
Case Information: Z-1-16 – Strickland Road

| Location     | Strickland Road, north side, west of its intersection with Springdale Drive  
|              | Address: 13120 Strickland Road  
|              | PIN: 0788155943 |
| Request      | Rezone property from Residential-1 with Special Highway Overlay District  
|              | & Falls Lake Watershed Protection Overlay District (R-1 w/ SHOD-1 & FWPOD) to Residential-10–Conditional Use with Special Highway Overlay District & Falls Lake Watershed Protection Overlay District (R-10-CU w/ SHOD-1 & FWPOD) |
| Area of Request | 16.25 acres |
| Property Owner | Edna Saintsing Dillard/ 9608 Old Leesville Road/ Raleigh, NC 27613 |
| Applicant    | Isabel Worthy Mattox/ PO Box 946/ Raleigh, NC 27602 |
| Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) | Northwest--  
|              | Jay Gudeman, Chair: (919) 789-9884; jay@kilpatrickguteman.com |
| PC Recommendation Deadline | June 20, 2016 |

Comprehensive Plan Consistency
The rezoning case is ☑ Consistent ☐ Inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Future Land Use Map Consistency
The rezoning case is ☑ Consistent ☐ Inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map.

Comprehensive Plan Guidance

| FUTURE LAND USE         | Rural Residential  
|                         | (max. 1 dwelling unit per acre) |
| URBAN FORM              | Center: None  
|                         | Corridor: Parkway (I-540)  
|                         | Within Transit Stop Half-Mile Buffer? No. |
| CONSISTENT Policies     | Policy LU 5.4 – Density Transitions  
|                         | Policy LU 5.6 – Buffering Requirements  
|                         | Policy LU 8.10 – Infill Development  
|                         | Policy EP 2.3 – Open Space Preservation  
|                         | Policy EP 5.5 – Forested Buffers  
|                         | Policy AP-FL 3 – Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Impervious Surface |
| INCONSISTENT Policies   | Policy LU 1.2 – Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency  
|                         | Policy LU 1.3 – Conditional Use Consistency  
|                         | Policy LU 4.5 – Connectivity  
|                         | Policy EP 2.2 – Environmentally Sensitive Development  
|                         | Policy EP 3.3 – Water Supply Protection  
|                         | Policy EP 3.6 – Maintaining Drinking Water Quality |
Summary of Proposed Conditions

1. Residential density limited to max. 4 units per acre and 64 units total on site.
2. Min. 38'-wide protective yard buffer along east lot line; any allowable encroachments permitted only outside tree conservation or forestation areas.
3. Prohibition of street connection to Saxon Way prescribed; length of Saxon Way capped at 1,250 feet.
4. Min. 15% of gross site area prescribed for tree conservation area.
5. Min. 43% of net site area prescribed for forestation area.
6. Impervious surfaces limited to max. 23% of gross site area.
7. Min. of 18 visitor parking spaces provided.
8. Min. 100’ setback for site dwellings from east lot line required.

--amended May 13, 2016

Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbor Meeting</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>Committee of the Whole</th>
<th>City Council</th>
<th>Public Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/3/15</td>
<td>2/9/16; 3/8/16: Y-24, N-126</td>
<td>3/22/16 (sent to Committee of the Whole); 5/24/16</td>
<td>5/3/16 (referred back to Planning Commission)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments

1. Staff report
2. Traffic Study Worksheet
3. Memo: Z-01-16 Review by Public Utilities Department and Stormwater Division

Planning Commission Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Findings &amp; Reasons</th>
<th>Motion and Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This document is a true and accurate statement of the findings and recommendations of the Planning Commission. Approval of this document incorporates all of the findings of the attached Staff Report.

Planning Director Date Planning Commission Chairperson Date

Staff Coordinator: Doug Hill: (919) 996-2622; Doug.Hill@raleighnc.gov
Case Summary

Overview
The proposal seeks to rezone the site to allow greater density, of a potentially different Building Type than that permitted under the existing zoning.

The site is currently zoned R-1, which allows only one dwelling unit per acre. A single-family residential subdivision, Wynbrooke III, was approved for the subject site, with R-1 density in January, 2007 (as S-54-06), but the plan sunset in January, 2012. The requested rezoning is conditioned to allow up to 4 dwellings per acre. Changing site zoning to R-10 would permit construction of grouped Townhouse units (R-10 is the least-dense residential district in which townhouses can be built). Development of the property is also subject to two zoning overlays: Special Highway Overlay District-1 (SHOD-1), which requires a 50-foot wide protective yard along I-540, and the Falls Lake Watershed Protection Overlay (FWOD), which provides certain use and impervious surface restrictions. Both overlays would remain in place under the rezoning.

The present zoning on the property dates from 1999, when several large areas north of Strickland Road were brought into the City’s Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction. At that time, the bulk of the area was zoned Rural Residential; however, the 20 acres just west of the subject site—at the then-planned intersection of Strickland Road and a new right-of-way for Leesville Road—was zoned Shopping Center (SC).

In the years since, the latter area has become a focal point of area commercial activity; the shopping center today contains more than 130,000 square feet of retail uses, with additional commercial development now found on the northwest and southeast corners of the Leesville/Strickland intersection. Zoning there now is Commercial Mixed Use-3 Stories (CX-3). Two properties southwest of the site, across Strickland Road, are zoned Neighborhood Mixed Use-3 Stories (NX-3), but at present are in low-density residential use.

East and southeast of the subject site, residential zoning predominates. The adjacent Springdale Gardens and Wynbrooke neighborhoods are characterized by large-lot, wooded, single-family parcels, zoned R-1. All properties north of Strickland Road are additionally zoned SHOD-1 and FWPOD. Twelve Springdale Gardens properties line Springdale Drive, a 1,200-foot long cul-de-sac street. Housing there was developed in the early 1980s. The Wynbrooke subdivision was built out from 2007 to 2011. Access to and from the existing 99 Wynbrooke lots is by means of a single point on Strickland Road, via Allsbrooke Drive. From Allsbrooke, Saxon Way extends 1,000 feet westward to stub at the subject site’s east lot line. From the stub to Strickland Road is a distance of some 2,000 feet.

At the southwest corner of the subject parcel, close to Strickland Road, a single house stood until 2013. With the exception of the former house site, the property is almost entirely tree-covered.

On the subject property, and within the adjacent neighborhoods, the grade falls from Strickland Road northward into the Falls Lake watershed; the lowest point on the rezoning site, at the parcel’s northeast corner, is some 80 to 85 feet below Strickland Road. On the west, construction
of the shopping center altered site grade such the retail area is relatively flat and drains away from the watershed. Where the retail area adjoins the subject site, steep fill and a planted transition yard restrict opportunities for cross-access; retail buildings face away from the site, with their service and loading areas closest to the subject parcel.

Houses in the adjoining Springdale Gardens subdivision are on septic systems. City water and sewer lines extend into the Wynbrooke neighborhood, with a pumping station located in the northeast section of the subdivision. Utilities are thus proximate to the subject site. However, City policies urge caution toward extension of utilities into the Falls Lake watershed.

The requested prohibition of access to the existing street stubout of Saxon Way would result in conditions exceeding City block perimeter and dead-end street standards. Staff has identified several case conditions for which clarifications to language is recommended.

### Outstanding Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outstanding Issues</strong></th>
<th><strong>Suggested Mitigation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposed density in the Falls Lake watershed is greater than policy supports.</td>
<td>1. Reduce proposed density to 1 dwelling unit/acre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prohibiting cross-access to Saxon Way.</td>
<td>2. Permit street connection to Saxon Way (delete Condition 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff comments on amended zoning conditions.</td>
<td>3. Address staff comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rezoning Case Evaluation

1. Compatibility Analysis

1.1 Surrounding Area Land Use/ Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Property</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>Residential-1</td>
<td>Residential-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood Mixed Use-3 Stories; Residential-4</td>
<td>Residential-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>Special Highway-1; Falls Lake Watershed Protection</td>
<td>Special Highway-1; Falls Lake Watershed Protection</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>Special Highway-1; Falls Lake Watershed Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>Neighborhood Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant Interstate Highway</td>
<td>Single-unit living</td>
<td>Single-unit living</td>
<td>Shopping center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form (if applicable)</td>
<td>Parkway Corridor (I-540)</td>
<td>Parkway Corridor (I-540)</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>Parkway Corridor (I-540)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Current vs. Proposed Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density:</td>
<td>1 DU/acre (16 DUs max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td>Detached house:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side:</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Intensity Permitted:</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Intensity Permitted:</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Estimated Development Intensities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R-1 w/ SHOD-1 &amp; FWPOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Building SF</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. # of Residential Units</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Office SF</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Retail SF</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Industrial SF</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential F.A.R.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Per conditions.
The proposed rezoning is:

☐ Compatible with the property and surrounding area.

☒ Incompatible.

Analysis of Incompatibility:

While moderate-density residential development (14 or fewer dwellings/acre) may be considered an appropriate transition between low-density residential and non-residential development under many circumstances, the proposed density is greater than what has been identified by city policy as compatible with the Falls Lake watershed. Further, the conditioned restriction of access to Saxon Way would concentrate all site traffic to a single point on Strickland Road.
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2. Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis

2.1 Comprehensive Plan

Determination of the conformance of a proposed use or zone with the Comprehensive Plan includes consideration of the following questions:

- Is the proposal consistent with the vision, themes, and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the use being considered specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map in the area where its location is proposed?
- If the use is not specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map in the area where its location is proposed, is it needed to service such a planned use, or could it be established without adversely altering the recommended land use and character of the area?
- Will community facilities and streets be available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property?

The proposal is largely inconsistent with the visions, themes, and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan. The Future Land Use map designates the site for Rural Residential development, with a maximum of one dwelling per acre. The rezoning request would allow up to 4 units per acre (64 units total, on the 16.25 acres). Policy AP-FL 2 suggests such density would be appropriate only if clustered on a portion of the site, and only if the overall site density were held at one unit per acre. Increased density also contrasts with vision themes Managing Our Growth and Greenprint Raleigh, which place high value on resource conservation.

The proposal is consistent with the Urban Form map in retaining SHOD-1 zoning, which requires a 50-foot protective yard along the I-540 right-of-way on the property’s north lot line, corresponding with the Parkway frontage designated there. The request is also consistent with policies pertaining to buffering, open space preservation, and impervious surface limitations.

However, regarding community facilities and streets, the proposed condition restricting the street connection to the east runs contrary to policy and to Code, and would result in street lengths inconsistent with City standards, both inside and outside the property. Also, while City water and sewer lines are accessible to the site (although water pressure and sewer adequacy would need to be confirmed), the City’s long-time policy has been to restrict density in the watershed to substantially less than the proposal would permit.

2.2 Future Land Use

Future Land Use designation:

☐ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☒ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:

The Future Land Use designation is Rural Residential, recommending a maximum residential density of 1 dwelling per acre. The proposal would allow up to 4 dwellings per acre.
2.3 Urban Form

Urban Form designation: Parkway Corridor (along I-540)

☐ Not applicable (no Urban Form designation)

The rezoning request is:

☒ Consistent with the Urban Form Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:

(N/A)

2.4 Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is inconsistent with the following policies:

Policy LU 1.2 – Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency
The Future Land Use Map shall be used in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan policies to evaluate zoning consistency including proposed zoning map amendments and zoning text changes.

Case conditions would permit up to 4 dwellings per acre. The Future Land Use designation—Rural Residential—caps density at 1 unit per acre.

Policy LU 1.3 – Conditional Use Consistency
All conditions proposed as part of a conditional use district (CUD) should be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy LU 4.5 – Connectivity
New development and redevelopment should provide pedestrian and vehicular connectivity between individual development sites to provide alternative means of access along corridors.

The proposal is conditioned to allow density greater than that prescribed by the Future Land Use Map, and policies aimed at protecting City water supply. The proposal would also prohibit access to the existing street stub on Saxon Way, a restriction inconsistent with City standards for increasing connectivity among developed and developing parts of the City.

Policy EP 2.2 – Environmentally Sensitive Development
Ensure Raleigh’s growth and land development practices are compatible with the City’s natural form, vegetation, topography, and water bodies and streams. This will decrease erosion, reduce stormwater run-off and flooding, improve water quality, protect wildlife habitat, and provide buffers and transitions between land uses.

Policy EP 3.3 - Water Supply Protection
Protect major water supply overlay districts through open space conservation, community programs that promote tree coverage, floodplain preservation, and limits to impervious surface cover.
**Policy EP 3.6 - Maintaining Drinking Water Quality**

Improve the ecological integrity of the City’s primary drinking water sources by further protecting streams from encroaching development and expanding the protection of buffers.

The proposed density is inconsistent with established City policies and practices aimed at limiting development in the Water Supply Watershed. In other recent rezonings within the Secondary Watershed area for which greater intensity of uses has been requested, the City Council has either required directing site drainage out of the watershed (Z-5-13, Lifetime Athletics, on the eastern portion of Strickland Road), or denied the request (Z-28-13, on Ray Road). Given the critical relationship between water quality, public health, and local economic livelihood, watershed protection seeks minimal disturbance to natural conditions, toward long-term improvement of ecological integrity. Approval of increased density on the subject site could challenge that objective, and create a precedent for future upzoning requests elsewhere in the watershed.

**Policy PU 2.1 – Utility Service Extension Outside the City**

Ensure that proposals to extend utility service outside the City are:

- Consistent with service expansion plans;
- Not into current or future water supply watersheds except in accordance with Falls Lake and Swift Creek small area plan policies;
- Sufficient in capacity to accommodate the extension;
- Meet City standards; and
- Enhance the contiguous development of the City.

The site is located within the Falls Lake water supply watershed. Policy AP-FL 2 of the Falls Lake Area Plan recommends site density in the Secondary Watershed area not exceed one unit per acre. The proposal is not in accordance with that area plan policy, as it would permit up to 4 units per acre.

2.5 Area Plan Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is inconsistent with the following Area Plan policies:

**Policy AP-FL 2 – Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density**

In the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Protection Area, there should be an average density of one dwelling unit per acre. In those cases where extensions of public utilities will allow clustering of housing, a density of up to four units per acre should be allowed only where compensating permanent open space is set aside resulting in an overall development average of one unit per acre.

The proposal would allow a density of four units per acre across the entire site. Achieving the overall development average of one unit per acre recommended by this policy would require confining four-unit per acre density to one-fourth of the parcel, with no units built elsewhere on site.

**Policy AP-FL 4 – Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Utilities**

In the Secondary Watershed Protection Area, public utility extensions are allowed when the following conditions are met:

- The capacity of water and sewer facilities is adequate for an extension;
- An extension is deemed appropriate to promote the orderly provision of public services and facilities in the Raleigh area;
• There will be no reduction in water quality or degradation of the watershed as a result of public utility extension or the more intense development which may result;
• It is determined that annexation of a proposed development would be in the best interest of the City of Raleigh.

While City water and sewer utilities are available to the site, their extension—as expressed by the memorandum by the Public Utilities Department accompanying this Report—would run counter to long-held City policy, and to the public interest in maintaining that policy.

3. Public Benefit and Reasonableness Analysis

3.1 Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning

• Use and density provide a transition between existing development (shopping center and large-lot residential development).
• The proposal could bring active use to a long-vacant site, and expand housing options in the immediate area.

3.2 Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning

• Potential impacts on the Falls Lake water supply watershed, and the precedent possible from permitting rezoning which could pose those potential impacts.
• Site access is restricted (due to limited street frontage, internal topography, and requested restriction on street connection).

4. Impact Analysis

4.1 Transportation

The site is located on the north side of Strickland Road approximately 1/4 miles east of Leesville Road. Strickland Road (SR 1829) is maintained by the NCDOT. This segment of Strickland Road currently has a two-lane, ribbon-paved cross section without curbs or sidewalks. Strickland Road is classified as a major street in the UDO Street Plan Map (Avenue, 4-Lane, Divided). An existing local street (Saxon Way) stubs into the subject parcel's eastern side. Saxon Way is a paved street with curb, gutter and a sidewalk.

There are no City of Raleigh CIP projects planned for Strickland Road. There are no state STIP projects for Strickland Road in the vicinity of the Z-1-2016 site. Offers of cross access to adjacent parcels shall be made in accordance with the Raleigh UDO section 8.3.5.D: Internal vehicular circulation areas shall be designed and installed to allow for cross-access between abutting lots. If an abutting owner refuses in writing to allow construction of the internal vehicular circulation on their property, a stub for future cross-access shall be provided as close as possible to the common property line. If cross-access is waived by the Public Works Director in accordance with Sec. 8.3.6., bicycle and pedestrian connections shall be provided between abutting properties except where there is a perennial wet stream crossing greater than 15 feet in width that interferes with such access.

Site access will be provided via Strickland Road and Saxon Way. In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for R-10 zoning is 2,500 feet. The block perimeter for Z-1-2016 is restricted by the I-540 eastbound entrance ramp, which abuts the
subject parcel on the north. Direct vehicular access to the I-540 ramp is prohibited by NCDOT. If the extension of Saxon Way is blocked or otherwise denied, then the subject parcel cannot meet the City's block perimeter or dead-end street length standards.

Approval of case Z-1-2016 would increase average peak hour trip volume by 36 veh/hr; daily trip volume will increase by 393 veh/day. A traffic impact analysis report is not required for Z-1-2016.

**Impact Identified:** Extension of Saxon Way.

### 4.2 Transit
Transit is not currently available in this area, and neither the City of Raleigh Short Range Transit Plan nor the Wake County Transit Plan call for future service on Strickland Road. There are no transit requests.

**Impact Identified:** None.

### 4.3 Hydrology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Floodplain</th>
<th>Drainage Basin</th>
<th>Stormwater Management</th>
<th>Overlay District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lower Barton Creek</td>
<td>Section 9.2 UDO</td>
<td>Falls Watershed Protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site is subject to Section 9.2 stormwater management regulations. There are Neuse Buffers located on the site. Site is located within the Falls Lake Watershed Protection Overlay District (FWPOD) and is subject to Section 9.5.2 of the UDO.

**Impact Identified:** Any development in Falls Lake will be subject a maximum impervious of 30% regardless of zoning on the property. Per Condition 8 offered by the applicant, the “first one inch” would be a higher standard than what is currently required by UDO 9.5.2.C.1; in order to exceed 12% but stay under 24% impervious, the code requires that only the first ½ inch be captured.

### 4.4 Public Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Demand (current)</th>
<th>Maximum Demand (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>10,000 gpd</td>
<td>50,625 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>10,000 gpd</td>
<td>50,625 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed rezoning would add approximately 40,625 gpd to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the City.

This site is one of the relatively limit number of situations where only one half the use control policy (in this case, the density limitation) is in place. However, municipal water and wastewater service would be allowed at this parcel. This site is tributary to Falls Lake, but is located south of I-540, and within the City’s ETJ & utility service area. It also already has immediate access to 24” water in Strickland Road and 8” sewer in Saxon Way. Development of this site should maintain the 655 pressure zone and a downstream sewer capacity study may be required for the adjacent Wynbrooke subdivision pump station.

**Impact Identified:** The developer may be required to submit a downstream sanitary sewer capacity study, and those required improvements identified by the study must be permitted and constructed in conjunction with and prior to the proposed development being constructed. Modification of zoning will become a precedent for deviating from the use
control policy. As such, it may have ramifications for the implementation of use control as a water quality protection method in this and other water supply watersheds.

Verification of available capacity for water fire flow is required as part of the building permit process. Any water system improvements required to meet fire flow requirements will also be required.

4.5 Parks and Recreation
There are no existing or proposed greenway trails, corridors or connectors on this site. An existing greenway easement is located adjacent to the site in the northeastern corner. The nearest trail access is Hare Snipe Creek, 2.8 miles. Recreation services are provided by Strickland Road Neighborhood Park, 0.4 miles.

Impact Identified: None.

4.6 Urban Forestry
R-1 zoning to R-10 would change the required tree conservation area amount from 15% to 10%, but Condition 4 increases the tree conservation area amount to the R-1 standard.

Impact Identified: None.

4.7 Designated Historic Resources
The site does not include and is not within 1,000 feet of any Raleigh Historic Landmarks or properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places. However, the site is approximately 600 feet from the c. 1906 Leesville School Teacherage (9513 Old Leesville Road; PIN 0788048627), which has been determined by the NC State Historic Preservation Office as potentially being eligible for nomination to the National Register (survey number WA 1345) and is a potential Raleigh Historic Landmark.

Impact Identified: None.

4.8 Community Development
This site is not located within a redevelopment plan area.

Impact Identified: None.

4.9 Impacts Summary
1. Potential impacts to Falls Lake watershed.
2. Prohibiting cross-access to Saxon Way conflict with City block perimeter and dead-end street standards, as well as subdivision access standards.

4.10 Mitigation of Impacts
1. Limit density to one dwelling per acre.
2. Permit street connection to Saxon Way (delete Condition 3).

5. Conclusions
The proposal is inconsistent with the Future Land Use map and several Comprehensive Plan policies, which call for a maximum density of one dwelling per acre within the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed. However, City water and sewer lines are available to the site, and case
conditions seek to mitigate potential impacts of site development (e.g., exceeding the tree conservation requirements for R-10, and the minimum watershed forestation percentage). Prohibiting access to the Saxon Way street stub, though, is inconsistent with City block perimeter and dead-end street standards. Provisions of several case conditions should be clarified.
Staff Comments: Z-1-16 Conditions (as amended 5/13/16)

Condition 2

Tree conservation areas do not allow encroachments listed in this condition after the tree conservation area is established. In addition, fences and walls are not allowed in tree conservation areas. With regard to the forestation areas, those are based on percentage and removal of such areas will require a like replacement in other areas. Also, the encroachments authorized in Condition 2 may not be allowed by UDO Sec 7.2.4.D.

Condition 3

Delete. Prohibiting connectivity to Saxon Way compromises safety. If the Z-1-16 site does not connect to Saxon Way, then the response time and travel distance from Fire Station #23 to homes along Saxon Way will increase by a significant margin. Terminating the street will also cause it to exceed the block perimeter standards, the dead-end street length standards (max. 300’ for R-10 zoning) and subdivision access standards (stub street extension) of UDO Sec 8.3.4.C.4. Saxon Way already exceeds the maximum length for a dead-end street by a considerable margin. If the City Council determines that a motor vehicle connection is not in the City’s best interests, then the developer could provide a landscaped island that permits pedestrians & cyclists to travel uninterrupted along Saxon Way, but blocks cars & trucks. An administrative design adjustment may be granted for the causes listed in Section 8.3.6 of the UDO, but that section is not applicable to rezoning cases.

Since Condition 3 is based on TC-8-15, the finding required in UDO Section 10.2.4.E.2.c, Section 6 of TC-8-15 (Ordinance NO (2015) 518 TC 375), should be part of the recommendation of the Planning Commission. The UDO required finding reads as follows:

Such zoning conditions shall only be approved by the City Council when the City Council makes a determination that the offered zoning condition provides safe, efficient and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access within the development and between adjacent developments and does not adversely affect traffic congestion.

The applicant should specify in a memorandum to the Commission, separate from these conditions, evidence of compliance with the finding.
# Rezoning Application

## Rezoning Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rezoning Request</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ General Use</td>
<td>Transaction Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Conditional Use</td>
<td>448096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Master Plan</td>
<td>Z-216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Zoning Classification** R-1/SC  
**Proposed Zoning Classification** Base District R-10-CU w/ SHOD & FWPOD  

If the property has been previously rezoned, provide the rezoning case number.

Provide all previous transaction numbers for Coordinated Team Reviews, Due Diligence Sessions or Pre-Submittal Conferences. 448096, 451725

---

## General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Deed Reference (Book/Page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13120 Strickland Rd</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>00554/0-E-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27613</td>
<td>January 8, 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property PIN**  
0783156943

**Nearest Intersection**  
Strickland Rd and Leesville Rd

**Property Owner/Address**  
Edna Saintsing Dillard  
9608 Old Leesville Rd  
Raleigh, NC 27613

**Project Contact Person/Address**  
Isabel Worthy Mattox  
PO Box 946  
Raleigh, NC 27602

**Property size (in acres)**  
16.25 acres

---

**Owner/Agent Signature**  
Edna Saintsing Dillard

---

A rezoning application will not be considered complete until all required submittal components listed on the Rezoning Checklist have been received and approved.
Conditional Use District Zoning Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Case Number</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z-1-16</td>
<td>Transaction Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date Submitted: May 12, 2016

Existing Zoning: R-1/SC w/ SHOD-1 & FWPOD

Proposed Zoning: R-10-CU w/ SHOD-1 & FWPOD

NARRATIVE OF ZONING CONDITIONS OFFERED

1. Residential density shall not exceed four dwelling units per acre and shall not exceed 64 total dwelling units.

2. Unless a different protective yard is required under the UDO, a Type B1 or B2 protective yard as defined in UDO Section 7.2.4 (as determined by the property owner) with a minimum width of 38 feet shall be maintained along the eastern lot line of the subject property (except for areas where public right-of-way abuts the western line) and adjacent to the following adjoining properties (PIN 0788-16-8450, DB 14244/323; PIN 0788-16-8076, DB 6082/639; PIN 0788-15-8758, DB 15467/2403; PIN 0788-15-8469, DB 14694/169; PIN 0788-15-8291, DB 3347/270; and PIN 0788-14-8972, DB 12209/2658), provided that wooded areas which meet the requirements for Tree Conservation Areas or forestation areas under UDO Section 9.1 may be substituted for required plantings. Subject to requirements for protective yards required under the UDO, as applicable, and Tree Conservation Areas (“TCAs”), as applicable, and/or forestation areas, as applicable, the protective yard may be crossed by utility lines and easements, stormwater facilities and pedestrian access, provided that such encroachments do not exceed 30% of the protective yard in the aggregate. The allowable 30% encroachment into protective yards applies only to those portions of protective yards not designated as TCAs or forestation areas.

3. Subject to City Council approval, the maximum block perimeter standards in UDO Section 8.3.2, the dead-end/stub street standards in UDO Section 8.3.4, and the motor vehicle cross access requirements of UDO Section 8.3.5 shall be modified such that a motor vehicle street connection shall not be made to Saxon Way and in such case, the property owner shall terminate Saxon Way on the subject property with a landscaped island which permits pedestrian and bicycle cross access or in such other manner as is approved by the City of Raleigh Public Works Department and the length of Saxon Way stubbed street shall not exceed 1,250 feet.

4. A minimum of 15% of the net site area of the subject property shall be designated as Tree Conservation Area.

5. A minimum of 43% of the net site area of the subject property shall be maintained as a forestation area under Section 9.1.9 of the UDO.

6. Subject to UDO Section 9.5.2, impervious surface area on the subject property shall not exceed 23% of the gross site area.

7. A minimum of 18 visitor parking spaces shall be maintained on the subject property.

8. All dwelling units shall be placed at least 100 feet from all of the following lots (PIN 0788-16-8450, DB 14244/323; PIN 0788-16-8076, DB 9062/639; PIN 0788-15-8758, DB 15467/2403; PIN 0788-15-8469, DB 14694/169; PIN 0788-15-8291, DB 3347/270; and PIN 0788-14-8972, DB 12209/2658).

9. The first one inch of stormwater which directly or indirectly runs off the surfaces (in excess of 12% impervious surfaces) on the Property shall be either:
   (i) Retained for either infiltration into the soil or for evaporation into the air; or
   (ii) Detained for at least a 12-hour period; or
   (iii) Captured by an appropriate stormwater treatment device.

These zoning conditions have been voluntarily offered by the property owner. All property owners must sign each condition page. This page may be photocopied if additional space is needed.

Owner/Agent Signature
________________________________________
Print Name
Edna Saintsing Dillard
**Rezoning Application Addendum**

**Comprehensive Plan Analysis**

The applicant is asked to analyze the impact of the rezoning request. State Statutes require that the rezoning either be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan, or that the request be reasonable and in the public interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transaction Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Case Number</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY**

Provide brief statements regarding whether the rezoning request is consistent with the future land use designation, the urban form map and any applicable policies contained within the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

1. The zoning request is consistent many Comprehensive Plan policies as set forth below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 1.2 / Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency</strong></td>
<td>The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation for the subject property is “Rural Residential” in which intensification of urban uses is not expected and gross densities are generally one unit per acre. However, this category does provide for small pockets of clustered housing. If developed as a capped-density townhouse neighborhood, it could successfully serve as a transition between the adjacent shopping center to the west and the large lot single-family homes to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 1.3 / Conditional Use District Consistency</strong></td>
<td>The zoning document has been developed with emphasis on providing compatibility with the goals of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 2.1 / Placemaking</strong></td>
<td>The vacant subject property lies at the juxtaposition of Rural Residential, Moderate Density Residential, and Neighborhood Mixed Use land use areas. A large suburban shopping center is to the west of the property and rural residential is to the east. Townhouse development would provide a functional and attractive transition between the shopping center and the low-density rural residential while providing an opportunity for greater diversity of age ranges and family units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 2.2 / Compact Development</strong></td>
<td>The proposed townhouse development, while limited in density, will provide a more compact development than the adjacent R-1. Increasing density in this area will help to preserve open space and more efficiently use public services and transportation networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 2.3 / Cluster Development</strong></td>
<td>Townhouse development on this vacant lot in a rural residential land use area would effectively preserve open space while serving as a transition between the R-1 area to the east and the commercial mixed-use area to the west of the subject site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND USE / Policy LU 2.5 / Healthy Communities**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New development, redevelopment, and infrastructure investment should strive to promote healthy communities and active lifestyles by providing or encouraging enhanced bicycle and pedestrian circulation, access, and safety along roads near areas of employment, schools, libraries, and parks.</th>
<th>The subject property lies adjacent to residential and commercial areas. Development of this vacant lot would provide greater pedestrian and bicycle circulation between the residential areas and the shopping center.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 3.2 / Location of Growth</strong></td>
<td>The development of vacant properties should occur first within the City's limits, then within the City's planning jurisdiction, and lastly within the City's USAs to provide for more compact and orderly growth, including provision of conservation areas.</td>
<td>The subject site is vacant and within the Raleigh corporate boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 4.4 / Reducing VMT Through Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>Promote mixed-use development that provides a range of services within a short distance of residences as a way to reduce the growth of vehicle miles traveled (VMT).</td>
<td>The proposed townhouse development would be adjacent to an existing shopping center in a Neighborhood Mixed Use area. The close proximity to a mix of uses would encourage walkability and the use of other modes of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 5.1 / Reinforcing the Urban Pattern</strong></td>
<td>New development should be visually integrated with adjacent buildings, and more generally with the surrounding area. Quality design and site planning is required so that new development opportunities within the existing urban fabric of Raleigh are implemented without adverse impacts on local character and appearance.</td>
<td>The proposed project would have a higher density than the R-1 area to the east but would have significant open space and forestation areas, thereby preserving the local character of the rural residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 5.4 / Density Transitions</strong></td>
<td>Low- to medium-density residential development and/or low-impact office uses should serve as transitional densities between lower-density neighborhoods and more intensive commercial and residential uses. Where two areas designated for significantly different development intensity abut on the Future Land Use Map, the implementing zoning should ensure that the appropriate transition occurs on the site with the higher intensity.</td>
<td>The subject property lies at the border of Rural Residential and Neighborhood Mixed Use areas on the Future Land Use Map. The proposed low-density townhouse development would serve as an effective transition between the low-density single family residential to the east and the shopping center to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 5.5 / Transitional and Buffer Zone Districts</strong></td>
<td>null</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain and enhance zoning districts which serve as transitional or buffer areas between residential and commercial districts and which also may contain institutional, non-profit, and office-type uses. Zoning regulations and conditions for these areas should ensure that development achieves appropriate height and density transitions, and protects neighborhood character. (1, 3, 6)</td>
<td>The subject property lies between an area zoned R-1 and an area zoned SC. The proposed low-density townhouse development would serve as an effective transition between the low-density single family residential to the east and the shopping center to the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New development adjacent to areas of lower intensity should provide effective physical buffers to avoid adverse effects. Buffers may include larger setbacks, landscaped or forested strips, transition zones, fencing, screening, height and/or density step downs, and other architectural and site planning measures that avoid potential conflicts.</td>
<td>The proposed development includes significant open space, forestation, and tree conservation areas that buffer the adjacent R-1 neighborhood and preserves the natural scenic beauty along I-540.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Accommodate growth in newly developing areas of the City through mixed-use neighborhoods with a variety of housing types.</td>
<td>While not technically in a mixed-use area, the subject site lies between a Neighborhood Mixed Use lot being used as a shopping center and a Rural Residential area with large single-family lots. The addition of townhouses in this area would serve as a transition between land uses of differing intensities, increase housing variety, and be more inclusive to a variety of age ranges and family units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Recognize the importance of balancing the need to increase the housing supply and expand neighborhood commerce with the parallel need to protect neighborhood character, preserve historic resources, and restore the environment.</td>
<td>The proposed townhouse development on the subject property would effectively preserve the neighborhood character of the adjacent single-family neighborhood to the east and also provide a transition to the higher intensity commercial use to the west. The property would have a capped density and will fulfill a watershed forestation requirement to both preserve the rural feel of the area and to reduce stress on the environment of a watershed protection area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Protect and conserve the City’s single-family neighborhoods and ensure that their zoning reflects their established low density character. Carefully manage the development of vacant land and the alteration of existing structures in and adjacent to single-family neighborhoods to protect low density character, preserve open space, and maintain neighborhood scale.</td>
<td>The proposed limited density townhouse development on this vacant site would create a buffer for the low density single-family neighborhood from the more intensive commercial use of the nearby shopping center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New residential development should be developed with common and usable open space that preserves the natural landscape and the highest quality ecological resources on the site.</td>
<td>The proposed project includes ample open space and tree conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 8.10 / Infill Development</strong></td>
<td>Pragmatically in areas where there are vacant lots that create “gaps” in the urban fabric and detract from the character of a commercial or residential street. Such development should complement the established character of the area and should not create sharp changes in the physical development pattern.</td>
<td>The rezoning of the subject property will facilitate the development of a vacant site that will complement the area and serve as a transition between low density residential and commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE / Policy LU 8.11 / Development of Vacant Sites</strong></td>
<td>Facilitate the development of vacant lots that historically been difficult to develop due to infrastructure or access problems, inadequate lot dimensions, fragmented or absentee ownership, or other constraints. Explore lot consolidation, acquisition and other measures that would address these.</td>
<td>The rezoning of the subject property will facilitate the development of an oddly-shaped vacant site in a way that will enhance the character of the surrounding area and preserve open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT / Policy EP 2.3 / Open Space Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Seek to identify all opportunities to conserve open space networks, mature existing tree stands, steep slopes, floodplains, priority wildlife habitats, and significant natural features as part of public and private development plans and targeted acquisition.</td>
<td>The proposed project includes ample open space, forestation, and tree conservation areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT / Policy EP 2.4 / Scenic Vistas and Views</strong></td>
<td>Explore options for protecting and creating scenic vistas and views of natural landscape</td>
<td>The proposed project preserves the natural scenic vista along I-540 by adhering to the requirements of its Special Highway Overlay District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT / Policy EP 3.3 / Water Supply Protection</strong></td>
<td>Protect major water supply overlay districts through open space conservation, community programs that promote tree coverage, floodplain preservation, and limits to impervious surface cover.</td>
<td>The subject property is located in a Falls Lake Watershed Overlay district, which was taken into consideration in the site plan. This project will use cluster housing with limited density to preserve open space, set aside tree conservation and forestation areas, and install BMPs to limit stormwater impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION / Policy EP3.12 / Mitigating Stormwater Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Public Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Potential stormwater impacts from new development on adjoining properties should mimic pre-development conditions and control the rate of runoff so as to avoid erosion of stream banks, inundation of natural waterways and to allow the recharging of groundwater. The intent is to avoid environmental and economic damage to the adjacent properties and City infrastructure.</td>
<td>BMPs will be added to this development to control stormwater runoff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT / Policy EP 5.5 / Forested Buffers</td>
<td>The subject property lies in a Special Highway Overlay District and will comply with the required 50’ forested yard along the portion of the lot adjacent to the highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Conserve forested buffers along Raleigh’s freeways and expressways through the use of Special Highway Overlay Districts and conditional use zoning.</td>
<td>The subject property lies in a Special Highway Overlay District and will comply with the required 50’ forested yard along the portion of the lot adjacent to the highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSING / Policy H 1.1 / Mixed-Income Neighborhoods</td>
<td>The addition of a townhouse style housing development will bring a wider mix of incomes to this area that is dominated by large single-family lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Promote mixed-income neighborhoods throughout the City, particularly within high-density development at employment centers, downtown, and along transit corridors.</td>
<td>The addition of a townhouse style housing development will bring a wider mix of incomes to this area that is dominated by large single-family lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>URBAN DESIGN / Policy UD 5.4 / Neighborhood Character and Identity</td>
<td>The proposed residential townhouse development with limited density will provide an effective transition parcel between the low density single family lots to the east and the higher intensity commercial parcel to the west. This project will help preserve the visual quality and feel of the adjacent rural residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Strengthen the defining visual qualities of Raleigh’s neighborhoods. This should be achieved in part by relating the scale of infill development, alterations, renovations, and additions to existing neighborhood context.</td>
<td>The proposed residential townhouse development with limited density will provide an effective transition parcel between the low density single family lots to the east and the higher intensity commercial parcel to the west. This project will help preserve the visual quality and feel of the adjacent rural residential area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC BENEFITS

Provide brief statements regarding the public benefits derived as a result of the rezoning request.

1. This rezoning will facilitate additional residential development in a way that will buffer the adjacent rural residential area from the nearby shopping center thereby helping to preserve the rural character of the residences.
2. This rezoning will provide a development that will serve as an intensity transition between a low density residential area and a higher intensity shopping center
3. This rezoning will expedite development of a vacant lot in a way that will complement the surrounding area and fill a gap in the urban fabric, all while complying with the strict FWPOD and SHOD Overlay District requirements.
4. This rezoning with the limited density condition will ease the addition of higher density cluster housing into a rural residential area thereby providing a wider range of housing options for the area.

### URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

If the property to be rezoned is shown as a "mixed use center" or located along a Main Street or Transit Emphasis Corridor as shown on the Urban Form Map in the Comprehensive Plan, the applicant must respond to the Urban Design Guidelines contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

This development does not meet the criteria to necessitate responses to the guidelines below.
Mr. Daniel Band
Planner I
City of Raleigh Planning Department
One Exchange Plaza, Suite 204
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601

RE: NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING REPORT Regarding Proposed Rezoning Petition of Edna Saintsing Dillard (the “Owner”) of approximately 16.25 acres, located at 13120 Strickland Road, Raleigh, NC 27613 (the “Property”).

Dear Daniel:

As indicated in my attached letter, the Neighborhood Meeting for the above-referenced prospective rezoning case was held on December 3, 2015 at 7:00 PM in the Lake Lynn Community Center Art Room, 7921 Ray Road, Raleigh, NC 27613, to discuss the proposed rezoning of the Property located at 13120 Strickland Road.

The persons and organizations contacted about this meeting are indicated on the attached list. Those in attendance were:

Richard Horvath
Elsa Jimenez
Thomas Erwin
Edna Dillard
Allan and Gail Johnston
Isabel Worthy Mattox – Attorney for Applicant
Stephen Freeman – Developer representative
Curt Blazier, McKim & Creed, Engineer for Applicant

Issues discussed were as follows:
1. We generally discussed the zoning process, the Comprehensive Plan guidance for the property which suggests low density residential but allows for small pockets of clustered housing and the proposed zoning requested.

2. Product type. The prospective developer indicated its intent to develop 72 townhouse units on 16+ acres of land. The units will be three-story units with three bedrooms and two baths. Purchase prices of the units are expected to be in the range of $250,000-$350,000. We believe this product will be desirable for young professional singles and couples, empty nesters and/or parents of residents of nearby Saxon Way or Wynbrooke neighborhood.

3. Connection to Saxon Road. We indicated that the City Planning Department had stated that the connection to Saxon would be required; however, we also informed the neighbors that a text change, TC-8-15, had been passed recently which gives some leeway to City Council about requiring road connections.

4. Grading. The prospective developers indicated that the site would need to be balanced, which would require moving some soil from one side to the other, and may possibly require a retaining wall, but they indicated their desire to do it in the most sensitive manner possible.

5. New right-of-way. We discussed the construction of a Sensitive Area Residential Street. The required dimensions include a 70-foot right-of-way with 20 feet of pavement with swales rather than curb and gutter. We agreed that it seems odd to have a 20-foot wide swale and then have a sidewalk on the other side of the swale. We hope to convince the City that curb and gutter would make sense on the side of the road where the townhouses will be located and that swales would work on the side of the road which abuts a natural area. One of the meeting attendees stated that there are many neighborhoods in Raleigh which have this condition, specifically Cameron Park, Fallon Park and Hayes Barton.

6. Property values. Some neighbors believed that the development of a townhouse project adjacent to their neighborhood would negatively affect their property values.

7. Visitor parking. Neighbors were concerned that there would not be enough visitor parking provided and that visitors to the townhouses may park on Saxon Road in front of their houses instead. The prospective developer agreed to consider more visitor parking.

8. Proximity to 540 and the shopping center. One neighbor asked why the prospective developer decided to locate the townhouses directly adjacent to the existing adjacent shopping center rather than directly adjacent to the single-family residential neighborhood. It was explained that the prospective developer is trying to develop a project which causes the least impact to the existing neighborhood and felt that leaving a natural area adjacent to the neighborhood would be preferable to the neighbors. The question of noise from nearby 540 was raised. Although there may be noise from Highway 540 which is audible to the new development, the prospective developer does not have major concerns about the noise.
9. Location of six units closest to Saxon Way. We discussed the possibility of reduction or relocation of the six townhouse units which would be in close proximity to Saxon Way.

10. Green development. The prospective developer indicated its desire to develop a “green” project. A 40% forestation requirement will be imposed for this property in the Falls Lake Watershed. The development will have a natural area adjacent to the single-family neighborhood as well as natural areas in the SHOD yard adjacent to 540. In addition, a new public street will be a Sensitive Area Residential Street which requires less pavement than typical and requires swales instead of curb and gutter.

Very truly yours,

Isabel Worthy Mattox

Enclosures

cc: Stephen Freeman
TO ALL ADDRESSEES:

RE: NOTICE OF MEETING Regarding Proposed Rezoning Petition of 13120 Strickland Road, Raleigh, NC 27613, 16.25 acres, PIN # 0788155943, Wake County Registry (the “Rezoning Property”), owned by Edna Saintsing Dillard (the “Owner”).

Dear Property Owners:

You are receiving this letter because you are the owner of property located in the vicinity of the Rezoning Property for which a rezoning is now being contemplated. The proposed rezoning will rezone the Rezoning Property from R-1/SC to R-10 Conditional Use with a maximum of five dwelling units per acre. The R-10 zoning classification is needed to allow townhouse style buildings, but we will not seek R-10 density. We believe townhouses will provide a good transition between the adjacent shopping center to the west and the low density residential to the east. We anticipate that a Rezoning Application will be filed on behalf of the Owner in the near future.

In accordance with the requirements of the Raleigh Unified Development Ordinance, notice is hereby given to you as the owner of the Rezoning Property or the owner of property within 100 feet of the Rezoning Property (collectively, Notice Neighbors) of a meeting to discuss the prospective rezoning to be held at the Lake Lynn Community Center Art Room, 7921 Ray Road, Raleigh, NC 27613, at 7:00 p.m. on the evening of Thursday, December 3, 2015.

I will be present to meet with you and answer any questions which you may have regarding this Rezoning Application.
If the Rezoning Application is filed as now planned, it will be vetted by City Staff over the next few weeks and referred to the Planning Commission for review. To follow this process, please consult the City’s website at www.raleighnc.gov/planning. If you have any questions about the proposed Rezoning Application, either before our meeting of December 3, 2015 or at any time after our meeting, I hope you will feel free to contact me.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Isabel Worthy Mattox

cc: Stephen Freeman
Curt Blazier
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Horvath</td>
<td>13028 Saxon Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa Jimenez</td>
<td>13028 Saxon Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fitch</td>
<td>401 Beberie Road #5600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9600 Old Wendover Rd, Rtp 27613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aline &amp; Emil Johnson</td>
<td>13527 Ashford Lake Dr. 27613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rezoning Valid Statutory Protest Petition (VSPP)

Submit this form to:
City Clerk
Raleigh Municipal Building, Room 207
222 W. Hargett St.
Raleigh, NC 27602

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Use Only</th>
<th>Administrative Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>3.17.2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Heather West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>9517 Springdale Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>27613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>919-601-6256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email: swest17@nc.rr.com

If a Valid Statutory Protest Petition (VSPP) is filed in opposition to a rezoning request, the City Council cannot approve the request unless it does so by a vote of three-fourths of all Council members. A simple majority can approve all other requests. To file a VSPP, the petition must:

- Be signed by the owner(s) (including both husband and wife if there is joint ownership) of twenty percent (20%) or more of the area of the lots included in the rezoning request; OR five percent (5%) of a 100 foot wide buffer extending along the entire boundary of each discrete or separate area proposed to be rezoned. A street right-of-way shall not be considered in computing the 100 foot buffer area as long as that street right-of-way is 100 feet wide or less. When less than an entire parcel of land is subject to the proposed zoning map amendment, the 100 foot buffer shall be measured from the property line of that parcel. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the city may rely on the county tax listing to determine the "owners" of potentially qualifying areas;

- Include a statement of opposition on each page of signatures at the top of the petition. The statement should be simply and clearly worded;

- Be submitted no less than two (2) full working days prior to the hearing, not including the actual day of the hearing and not including any holidays, Saturdays or Sundays. For instance, if the hearing occurs on Tuesday, the form must be submitted by the previous Thursday at 5:00 p.m.;

- Be delivered to the office of the City Clerk, Raleigh Municipal Building, Room 207, 222 W. Hargett Street, before 5:00 p.m. on the deadline date; and

- Have signatures attached to this sheet on the form provided. The signature form may be duplicated if necessary.

Valid Statutory Protest Petition

Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: 

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z-1-16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ___________________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ___________________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ___________________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ___________________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ___________________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ___________________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ___________________________________

Signature: ____________________________
Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ___________________________________

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ____________________________________

Signature: ________________________________ Print Name (clearly): Beth A Norton

Address: 5017 Trail Ridge Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________ Print Name (clearly): Joseph Norton

Address: 5017 Trail Ridge Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________ Print Name (clearly): Richard Grzebielski

Address: 5017 Trail Ridge Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________ Print Name (clearly): Inge Grzebielski

Address: 5017 Trail Ridge Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________ Print Name (clearly): James W. Darree

Address: 5007 Trail Ridge Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________ Print Name (clearly): David Darree

Address: 5007 Trail Ridge Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________ Print Name (clearly): Matthew W. Darree

Address: 5007 Trail Ridge Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL2.

Address:

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature] Print Name (clearly): [Name]
Address: [Address]
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: 9408 Owl's Nest Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613
Signature: Jill Mitra
Print Name (clearly): Jill Mitra
Address: 9408 Owl's Nest Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613
Signature: Amy D White
Print Name (clearly): Amy L White
Address: 8934 Henderson St, Raleigh, NC 27613
Signature: Krista Corrigan
Print Name (clearly): Krista Corrigan
Address: 9509 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613
Signature: Meredith Watson
Print Name (clearly): Meredith Watson
Address: 9505 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z-1-16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ____________________________________________

Signature: Matthew Comiskey, Print Name (clearly): Matthew Comiskey
Address: 9321 Springdale Drive, Raleigh, NC

Signature: J. Blake Phillips, Print Name (clearly): J. Blake Phillips
Address: 9313 Flowers Court, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Inga Pickman, Print Name (clearly): Inga Pickman
Address: 5007 Field and Stream Rd, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Jan Finz, Print Name (clearly): Jan Finz
Address: 5005 Field N1 Stream Rd, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Mandy M. Peters, Print Name (clearly): Mandy M. Peters
Address: 9420 Springdale Dr

Signature: Kenneth D. Wilson, Print Name (clearly): Kenneth D. Wilson
Address: 5001 Field and Stream Rd, Raleigh, NC

Signature: Keekira Changappa, Print Name (clearly): Keekira Changappa
Address: 9401 Doe Run Ct, Raleigh, NC
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: __________________________

Signature: __________________________
Print Name (clearly): Lynda Rothman
Address: 9308 Springdale Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________
Print Name (clearly): Surekha H. Bux
Address: 9305 Fox Burrow Ct

Signature: __________________________
Print Name (clearly): Gary Davis
Address: 9304 Fox Burrow Ct, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________
Print Name (clearly): Gay Davis
Address: 9304 Fox Burrow Ct, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________
Print Name (clearly): Jason Tot
Address: 9308 Fox Burrow Ct, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________
Print Name (clearly): Radd Yacoub
Address: 9317 Fox Burrow Ct

Signature: __________________________
Print Name (clearly): Max Vander Ploeg
Address: 9312 Fox Burrow Ct, Raleigh, NC 27613
Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: 9512 Springdale Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): Laurie B. Limbrick-Thomas

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): David Peters

Address: 9420 Springdale Drive, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): Sam Bigelow

Address: 5012 Trail Ridge Dr, Raleigh, NC 27615

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): Hirsch Fishman

Address: 9429 Springdale Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): Michael G. Hettl

Address: 9512 Leesville Rd, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): Patsy King

Address: 9501 Springdale Dr., Raleigh, 27613

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): Alton W. Watkins

Address: 9501 Springdale Cr., Raleigh, 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ___________________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Wes Fulk
Address: 9405 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Kristen Rosko
Address: 5029 Trail Ridge Dr, Raleigh 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Betsy Sasser-Holdes
Address: 9900 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Heather West
Address: 9517 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Gil Lang
Address: 9309 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Kevin F. Lang
Address: 9309 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Marc Bartmann
Address: 9308 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # 2 - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________

Signature: ____________________________

Address: ____________________________
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: __________________________

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: __________________________

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: __________________________

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: __________________________

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: __________________________

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: __________________________

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: __________________________

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the polices EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: 9437 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Harry S. Knight
Address: 9437 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Marcia Knight
Address: ______________________

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): BERNOUX
Address: 9436 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): BERNOUX
Address: 9436 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): MAUREEN MASTER
Address: 9440 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): KAREN SAGE
Address: 9444 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): BURTON SAGE
Address: 9444 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ___________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): DANIEL L CHUDY
Address: 9504 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH NC 27615

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): CAROL CHUDY
Address: 9504 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): SAYED HASHEMEE
Address: 9508 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): NASREEN HASHEMEE
Address: 9508 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): FAWAD HASHEMEE
Address: 9508 Springdale Drive Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): BAGEES HASHEMEE
Address: 9508 Springdale Dr Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): STEPHEN J SANTELL
Address: 9545 Springdale Dr, Raleigh NC 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ____________________________________________

Signature: ___________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________

Address: ________________________________

Signature: ___________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________

Address: ________________________________

Signature: ___________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________

Address: ________________________________

Signature: ___________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________

Address: ________________________________
Valid Statutory Protest Petition

Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ____________________________
Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________

Address: 9500 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH NC 27612
Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________

Address: 9500 Springdale Dr, Raleigh NC 27613
Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________

Address: 3402 SPRINGDALE DR, RALEIGH NC 27613
Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________

Address: 5013, Field and Stream Rd, Raleigh NC 27613
Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________

Address: 944 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, N.C. 27613
Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________

Address: 9433 Springdale Dr, Raleigh NC 27613
Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________

Address: 9433 Springdale Dr, Raleigh NC 27613
Signature: ____________________________ Print Name (clearly): ____________________________

Valid Statutory Protest Petition

Revised 05/20/2014
Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ___________________________________

Signature: Margie Garland  Print Name (clearly): Margie GARLAND
Address: 9421 Springdale Dr., Raleigh, N.C. 27613

Signature: Ray N Garland  Print Name (clearly): Ray N. GARLAND
Address: 9421 Springdale Dr., Raleigh, N.C. 27613

Signature: John Francioni  Print Name (clearly): John Francioni
Address: 9407 Spring Lake Dr.

Signature: Renee Fulk  Print Name (clearly): Renee Fulk
Address: 9405 Springdale Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Carla A. Dennis  Print Name (clearly): Carla A. Dennis
Address: 5014 Fieldstream Rd., Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Yvonne J Torres  Print Name (clearly): Yvonne J. Torres
Address: 1401 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Edgar Torres  Print Name (clearly): Edgar Torres
Address: 1401 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z-1-16

Statement of Opposition:
As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ________________________________________________________________
Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Wyatt Wilzen
Address: 9312 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Jennifer Fishman
Address: 9421 Springdale Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Marshall F. Simons
Address: 9413 Springdale Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Linda J. Simons
Address: 9413 Springdale Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Forrest Hobbs
Address: 9400 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Leatrice P. Phillips
Address: 9305 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Paula Zuber
Address: 9361 Foxborough Ct, Raleigh, NC 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: 9428 Springfield Dr, Raleigh NC 27613
Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Eileen C Anderson
Address: 9428 Springfield Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Eric R. Anderson
Address: 

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Jacqueline M. Peake
Address: 9412 Springdale Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Darrell McPeake
Address: 9412 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Angela J. Francioni
Address: 9409 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Alicia Comekey
Address: 9321 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Donna Zogby
Address: 9321 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ____________________________________________

Signature: __________________________________________________________________________
Print Name (clearly): ______________________________________________________________________
Address: 5021 Trail Ridge Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: __________________________________________________________________________
Print Name (clearly): ______________________________________________________________________
Address: 5021 Trail Ridge Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: __________________________________________________________________________
Print Name (clearly): ______________________________________________________________________
Address: 9400 Springdale Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: __________________________________________________________________________
Print Name (clearly): ______________________________________________________________________
Address: 5021 Trail Ridge Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: __________________________________________________________________________
Print Name (clearly): ______________________________________________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________

Signature: ________________________________
Print Name (clearly): ________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________

Signature: ________________________________
Print Name (clearly): ________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________

Signature: ________________________________
Print Name (clearly): ________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________
Valid Statutory Protest Petition  
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Springdale Gardens we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Address: ____________________________________

Signature: ________________________________  Print Name (clearly): Ilian Whalen
Address: 9520 Springdale Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________  Print Name (clearly): Lorrie Whalen
Address: 9520 Springdale Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________  Print Name (clearly): Doris Dominic
Address: 9625 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________  Print Name (clearly): Wyatt Thompson, Jr.
Address: 9512 Springdale Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ________________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________
Address: __________________________________

Signature: ________________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________
Address: __________________________________

Signature: ________________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________
Address: __________________________________

Valid Statutory Protest Petition  
Revised 05/20/2014
If a Valid Statutory Protest Petition (VSPP) is filed in opposition to a rezoning request, the City Council cannot approve the request unless it does so by a vote of three-fourths of all Council members. A simple majority can approve all other requests. To file a VSPP, the petition must:

- Be signed by the owner(s) (including both husband and wife if there is joint ownership) of twenty percent (20%) or more of the area of the lots included in the rezoning request; OR five percent (5%) of a 100 foot wide buffer extending along the entire boundary of each discrete or separate area proposed to be rezoned. A street right-of-way shall not be considered in computing the 100 foot buffer area as long as that street right-of-way is 100 feet wide or less. When less than an entire parcel of land is subject to the proposed zoning map amendment, the 100 foot buffer shall be measured from the property line of that parcel. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the city may rely on the county tax listing to determine the “owners” of potentially qualifying areas;

- Include a statement of opposition on each page of signatures at the top of the petition. The statement should be simply and clearly worded;

- Be submitted no less than two (2) full working days prior to the hearing, not including the actual day of the hearing and not including any holidays, Saturdays or Sundays. For instance, if the hearing occurs on Tuesday, the form must be submitted by the previous Thursday at 5:00 p.m.;

- Be delivered to the office of the City Clerk, Raleigh Municipal Building, Room 207, 222 W. Hargett Street, before 5:00 p.m. on the deadline date; and

- Have signatures attached to this sheet on the form provided. The signature form may be duplicated if necessary.
Statement of Opposition:


Signature: [signature]
Address: 12909 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Susan Tang

Signature: [signature]
Address: 12909 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Michael Belangia

Signature: [signature]
Address: 12908 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Courtney Keppelian

Signature: [signature]
Address: 12905 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Elizabeth Pedersen

Signature: [signature]
Address: 12905 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Kirk Pedersen

Signature: [signature]
Address: 12904 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Hardy Singh

Signature: [signature]
Address: 12908 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Peter Kaprelian

Signature: [signature]
Address: 12900 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Arshiy A. Siddiqui

Signature: [signature]
Address: 12912 Saxon Way, Raleigh, NC 27613
Print Name (clearly): Heidi Green
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature: Cheryl Pottschmidt
Print Name (clearly): Cheryl Pottschmidt
Address: 12825 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Paul E Pottschmidt
Print Name (clearly): Paul E Pottschmidt
Address: 12825 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Wendy S. Teeter
Print Name (clearly): Wendy S. Teeter
Address: 12818 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Brad Teeter
Print Name (clearly): Brad Teeter
Address: 12818 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Lindsey Sharp
Print Name (clearly): Lindsey Sharp
Address: 12821 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Amy K. Sharp
Print Name (clearly): Amy K. Sharp
Address: 12821 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Carol Harper
Print Name (clearly): Carol Harper
Address: 12813 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Peter Harper
Print Name (clearly): Peter Harper
Address: 10813 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Matthew D. Clark
Print Name (clearly): Matthew D. Clark
Address: 12812 Baybriar Dr. Raleigh NC 27613

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Katherine M. Laskey
Address: 1804 Baybrier Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Joseph T. Laskey
Address: 1804 Baybrier Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Glenn Pinto
Address: 12808 Baybrier Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Verna Pinto
Address: 12808 Baybrier Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): John Nicolson
Address: 19805 Baybrier Drive Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Jeannie Nicolson
Address: 12805 Baybrier Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): 
Address: 

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): 
Address: 

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): 
Address: 

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition  
Case # Z - 1 - 16  

Statement of Opposition:

As Wynbrooke Community we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Road. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies BP 2.2 - Environmentally Sensitive Development, BP 3.3 Water Supply Protection, PU 3.11 Protection of Water Supply, and AP-FL 2 Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density.

Signature: Ulises Fajardo  Print Name (clearly): Rolina Fajardo  
Address: 13020 Saxon Way, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: Elise Fajardo  Print Name (clearly): Julius Fajardo  
Address: 13020 Saxon Way, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: JS  Print Name (clearly): Ryan Taylor  
Address: 13019 Saxon Way, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: Kady Jones  Print Name (clearly): Kati Jones  
Address: 13015 Saxon Way, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: James Jones  Print Name (clearly): James Jones  
Address: 13015 Saxon Way, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: Jim Jones  Print Name (clearly): Justin Fesfar  
Address: 13016 Saxon Way, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: Sunny Fesfar  Print Name (clearly): Sunny Fesfar  
Address: 13016 Saxon Way, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: Claudia Gillen  Print Name (clearly): Carolina Calderon  
Address: 13012 Baybriar Dr.

Signature: Jeff Antionios  Print Name (clearly): Jennifer Anthony  
Address: 13011 Baybriar Dr., Raleigh NC 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature: Carmelita Pietrzak  Print Name (clearly): Carmelita Pietrzak
Address: 12901 Edsel Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Jim Pietrzak  Print Name (clearly): James Pietrzak
Address: 12901 Edsel Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature:    Print Name (clearly): James Moore
Address: 9615 Allsbrook Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature:  Season Moore  Print Name (clearly): Season Moore
Address: 9615 Allsbrook Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Michelle Buza  Print Name (clearly): Michelle Buza
Address: 1301 Baybriar Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature:  Print Name (clearly): Courtney Wallace
Address: 9602 Covel Court, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature:  Print Name (clearly): Matthew B. Wallace
Address: 9602 Covel Court, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature:  Print Name (clearly): Angela Tedesco
Address: 12901 Baybriar Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature:  Print Name (clearly): Nicholas Tedesco
Address: 12901 Baybriar Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:

As Wynbrooke Community we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Road. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies BP 2.2 - Environmentally Sensitive Development, BP 3.3 Water Supply Protection, PU 3.11 Protection of Water Supply, and AP-FL 2 Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density.

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: ___________________________  Print Name (clearly): ______________
Address: ______________________________
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: ______________________________
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z-1-16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Helen O'Shaughnessy
Address: 9701 Allbrooke Dr, 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Declan O'Shaughnessy
Address: 9701 Allbrooke Dr, 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Molly Taylor
Address: 13019 Saxon Way Raleigh, NC

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Luis E. Calderon
Address: 13012 Baybridge Dr Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Elsa M. Jimenez-Salgado
Address: 13028 Saxon Way Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Richard Harkness
Address: 13028 Saxon Way

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Address:

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Address:

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Address:

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Statement of Opposition:


Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ABHA THOMAS
Address: 9619 ALLSBROOKE DR.

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ABRAHAM THOMAS
Address: 9619 ALLSBROOKE DR.

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): KIRAN SAINI
Address: 9613 ALLSBROOKE DR.

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): CURNINDER SAINI
Address: 9613 ALLSBROOKE DR.

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): RANDY PALMER
Address: 9623 ALLSBROOKE DR.

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): KATHLEEN PALMER
Address: 9623 ALLSBROOKE DR.

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # 2 - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature:                                  Print Name (clearly):    Jame Dimitroff
Address: 9675 ALLSBROOK DR

Signature:                                  Print Name (clearly):    Charles P. King
Address: 12817 Baybriar Dr.

Signature:                                  Print Name (clearly):    Stephanie King
Address: 12817 Baybriar Dr.

Signature:                                  Print Name (clearly):    Theresa A Moore
Address: 12812 Edsel Dr.

Signature:                                  Print Name (clearly):    Carmelita Pietrzak
Address: 1291 Edsel Drive

Signature:                                  Print Name (clearly):    Jim Pietrzak
Address: 12901 Edsel Dr.

Signature:                                  Print Name (clearly):    Luis A Samuels
Address: 9627 ALLSBROOK DR
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): [Print Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): [Print Name]
Address: [Address]

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): [Print Name]
Address: [Address]
Statement of Opposition:


Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): STEVEN MUNSON
Address: 9620 Allsbrooke Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613 (currently residing in England)

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): Erin Munson
Address: 9620 Allsbrooke Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613 (currently residing in England)

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Print Name (clearly): ___________________________
Address: ___________________________
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:


Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Peter Harp
Address: 12813 Bagbyair Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Carol Harp
Address: 12813 Bagbyair Dr. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Santiago Rodriguez
Address: 8930 Half Moon Ct. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Address:

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Address:

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Address:

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Address:

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Address:

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly):
Statement of Opposition:


Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): DAV TON
Address: 13022 EDSEL DR. RALEIGH

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): Akin Aydin
Address: 13020 Baybrial Dr. Raleigh

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): Jennifer Tiao
Address: 13022 Edsel DR. Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): Ami Patel
Address: 9627 Allsbrooke Drive Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): Urmilaben D. Patel
Address: 9627 Allsbrooke Drive Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): Dilipkumar A. Patel
Address: 9627 Allsbrooke Drive Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________ Print Name (clearly): Samir D. Patel
Address: 9627 Allsbrooke Drive Raleigh NC 27613
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z-1-16

Statement of Opposition:
Wynbrooke Community

As Citizens that live in the Northwest District of Raleigh, we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive.

The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL2.

______________________________
Signature: Heather Hollerung
Print Name (clearly): Jennifer Hollerung
Address: 7601 Harbison Ct., Raleigh, NC 27613

______________________________
Signature: Clive Hollerung
Print Name (clearly): William Hollerung
Address: 7601 Harbison Ct., Raleigh, NC 27613

______________________________
Signature: Robin Blomquist
Print Name (clearly): Robin Blomquist
Address: 12911 Baybriar Drive

______________________________
Signature: Steven R. Blomquist
Print Name (clearly): Steven R. Blomquist
Address: 3821 Boyer villa Dr., Raleigh, NC, 27613

______________________________
Signature: Phyllis W. Bryson
Print Name (clearly): Phyllis W. Bryson
Address: 12925 Baybriar Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

______________________________
Signature: WCBryson
Print Name (clearly): William C. Bryson
Address: 12925 Baybriar Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

______________________________
Signature: Sharon J. Carr
Print Name (clearly): Sharon Carr
Address: 12917 Baybriar Dr., Raleigh, NC 27613

Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # Z - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:
As citizens that live in the Northwest District of Raleigh, we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive. The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): [Signature]
Address: 12909 BAYBRIAR DR, RALEIGH, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): ANGELA GUYDISH
Address: 12909 BAYBRIAR DR, RALEIGH, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): CHRIS S. CLAYTON
Address: 12908 BAYBRIAR DRIVE, RALEIGH, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Jennifer S. Clayton
Address: 12908 BAYBRIAR DRIVE, RALEIGH, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Leigh Anne Frahm
Address: 18913 Bayboriar Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): Andrew D Frahm
Address: 18913 Bayboriar Dr, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name (clearly): James Powers
Address: 9061 CARMEL CT, RALEIGH, NC 27617

Valid Statutory Protest Petition Revised 05/20/2014
Valid Statutory Protest Petition
Case # 2 - 1 - 16

Statement of Opposition:
Wynbrook Community
As Citizens that live in the Northwest District of Raleigh, we oppose the Rezoning Application of 13120 Strickland Drive.

The application is inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density. The application is inconsistent with the policies EP 2.2, EP 2.5, EP 3.3, PU 3.11 and AP-FL 2.

Signature: (Wayne Carter)  Print Name (clearly): Wayne Carter
Address: 12917 Baybriar Drive, Raleigh, NC 27613-5757

Signature: Chris McCrea  Print Name (clearly): Chris McCrea
Address: 9605 Harbins Ct

Signature: Meghan McCrea  Print Name (clearly): Meghan McCrea
Address: 9605 Harbins Ct

Signature: Ali Zia  Print Name (clearly): Alicia Fitzsimmons
Address: 1209 Baybriar Dr, Raleigh NC 27613

Signature: Harold D Trainer  Print Name (clearly): Harold D Trainer
Address: 9610 Harbins Court, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: Mark C. Trainer  Print Name (clearly): Mark C. Trainer
Address: 9610 Harbins Court, Raleigh, NC 27613

Signature: __________________________  Print Name (clearly): __________________________
Address: __________________________
Raleigh City Planning and Raleigh City Council Members,

We, the voting citizens of Raleigh, oppose the rezoning of 13120 Strickland Road. The re-zoning is inconsistent with Raleigh’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Map and the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density.

The 2030 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Raleigh states that the intent of R1 designation is to preserve the rural character of these areas and achieve compatible resource conservation objections such as watershed conservation and tree protection. Therefore, requesting a zoning change to R1-10-CU is not consistent with the City’s land plan.

The most obvious concern is to provide protection of the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed which supplies Raleigh Citizens with their drinking water. There are two streams that bookend the proposed development both of which are Headwaters for Lower Barton Creek. This creek flows directly into Falls Lake. This development will drain into already flood prone areas along this watercourse. However, 2030 Comprehensive Plan already protects this land in the following policies:

EP 2.2 Environmentally Sensitive Dev. and EP 2.5 Protection of Water Features

EP 3.3 Water Supply Protection and PU 3.11 Protection of Water Supply

AP-FL 2 Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density.

These policies clearly state the reason this small very narrow piece of land (16.25 acre) must be protected from being rezoned from R1 to R10.

Also to note, a committee made up of your peers upheld the City Comprehensive Plan and denied a rezoning request Z-28-13 less than 1 mile (4,000 feet) from this proposed site. That was a request to rezone R1- to R2. The Raleigh Planning Commission cited and I quote “the proposal is not consistent with the Future Land Use Map, which recommends Rural Residential (R1) one dwelling per acre for this environmentally sensitive area which lies within the Falls Lake Secondary Watershed. Falls Lake is the City of Raleigh’s primary source of drinking water. Rezoning to allow such densities would set a precedent for potential up zonings in the Watershed”. This land owner is wanting R10; the maximum density allowed.

We urge you to stand behind the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and the Future Lane Use Map and all the Policies that have been written to protect Raleigh, our citizens and your drinking water. Don’t set a precedent for destruction of Raleigh’s drinking water.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brad Teeter
12818 Baybriar Dr
Raleigh, NC 27613
qusbwt@yahoo.com
Raleigh City Planning and Raleigh City Council Members,

As a long time Raleigh resident and a resident of my home in Springdale Gardens for over 31 years, I have great concern and strong opinions about the rezoning application Z-1-16, 13120 Strickland Road.

This property, currently owned by Edna Saintsing Dillard is in the Falls Lake Watershed. Rezoning this property from R1 to R10 would be a sad state for the watershed and for the city of Raleigh. Lower Barton Creek starts at the back of my property, on this tract of land, and there is also a natural spring on this property. These clear and clean waters flow directly into Falls Lake and supply Raleigh’s drinking water. There can be no manmade improvement over what has worked for centuries on this property. Any construction will severely impact natural water flows. These waters will flow into already flood prone areas along this watercourse.
The 2030 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Raleigh states that the intent of R1 designation is to preserve the rural character and to conserve resources for the good of all.

The 2030 Comprehensive Plan already protects this land in the following policies:

EP 2.2 Environmentally Sensitive Dev. EP 2.5 Protection of Water features

EP 3.3 Water Supply Protection, PU 3.11 Protection of Water supply and

AP-FL 2 Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density

I have many objections to this rezoning but my worst fear is that this rezoning, if it happens, will set a new precedent for all land north of Strickland Road. It will be easier to build properties and rezone land that currently preserves clean water and nature that all of Raleigh enjoys.

I urge you to stand behind the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, the Future Land Use Map and all the policies that have been written to protect Raleigh, our citizens and your drinking water. Please do not set a precedent for destruction of Raleigh’s drinking water.

Your most concerned citizen,

Meredith M. Watson

9505 Springdale Dr.
To: City of Raleigh Planning Committee

From: Patsy King, Springdale Gardens

Date: March 16, 2016

Re: Rezoning Z-001-16

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

As a long time resident of Springdale Gardens, I am writing to register my opposition to rezoning Z-001-16. I am requesting your support in denying this rezoning request, as I fear that this move will set a negative precedent for Raleigh's future development. In order to maintain the established feel and intention of neighborhoods (LU8.10) and the safety of our water supply, this rezoning should be denied. Rezoning from R-1 to R-10 townhomes does not maintain the character nor the spirit of Raleigh's rural areas.

Active feeder streams to Raleigh's water supply lie within the proposed rezoning area. The construction of townhomes within a watershed area is environmentally dangerous and would create conditions harmful to the affected streams and water courses. The builder plans to address the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property, but allowing the front of the property to become 100% impervious surfaces. This would create additional water flow into the marsh area, upsetting the delicate balance of the marshland, causing irreparable damage. Water flow and downstream conditions would be adversely affected during the 18 months construction period by dumping immense amounts of silt and debris into the area.

Properties within the watershed area are near active streams that would be heavily affected by construction, creating an even greater chance of flooding. Problems arising from diverting water flow during and after construction might not become apparent until several years later, leaving the property owners with problems and expenses as the landscape adjusts to these changes. In addition, collateral damage done to the quality of the water supply can not easily be undone.

Please say no to this rezoning and allow our rural neighborhoods to maintain their charm, integrity and character.

Thank you,

Patsy King
Dear Commissioners and Council Members:

I am a native Tar Heel. My husband and I moved back to North Carolina in 2007 after working in Massachusetts for 17 years. We were thrilled to find a home situated in a viable and very connectional neighborhood which was zoned R1. We both believe that healthy neighborhoods are the cornerstone for building sustainable communities and cities, and that all development should be governed by a long-sighted plan that embodies the defining vision for the common good.

The 2030 Comprehensive Plan for the City of Raleigh inspired confidence and confirmed all of our reasons for choosing to make this our home (both now and into retirement and beyond). But in December of 2015, we were notified about a proposed development of the narrow strip of land between our cul de sac on Springdale Drive and the shopping center at the intersection of Strickland and Leesville Roads. The developers are requesting that the property be rezoned from R1 to R10. They propose to build 70 townhomes on a site that, according to the city’s Comprehensive Plan, is environmentally sensitive. The two streams on each end of the proposed development are Headwaters for Lower Barton Creek, which flows directly into Falls Lake.

Please refer to:
- **Policy EP 2.2** and **EP 2.5 Protection of Water Features**
- **Policy EP 3.3** and **PU 3.11 Protection of Water Supply**
- **AP-FL 2 Falls Lake Secondary Watershed Density**

These policies clearly make the case for protecting this small, narrow piece of land and ensuring that future development will align with the vision for city growth that is documented in the 2030 plan.

It was called the 2030 Plan for a reason! We have been entrusted with the responsibility to care for and plan for the growth of this city in a way that ensures it’s neighborly viability and environmental sustainability for future generations.

We, therefore, urge you to stand behind the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map by **denying the request to rezone 13120 Strickland Road.**

Sincerely,

[Signature]

9513 Springdale Drive
March 14, 2016

126 Springmoor Dr.
Raleigh, NC 27612

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh's existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh's water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the water shed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors' properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors' properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

Dorothy F. Mcgee
March 14, 2016

Phyllis H. Johnson
3 Springmoor Dr.
Raleigh, NC 27618

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh’s existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh’s water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the water shed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors’ properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors’ properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

Phyllis H. Johnson
March 14, 2016

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh’s existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh’s water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the watershed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors’ properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors’ properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

[Signature]
March 14, 2016

Barbara E. Kessel
337 Springmoor
Raleigh, NC 27605

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh’s existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh’s water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the watershed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors’ properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors’ properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

Barbara E. Kessel
March 14, 2016
Mary L. Mumma
26 Springmoor
Raleigh NC 27607

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh’s existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh's water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the watershed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors’ properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors’ properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

Mary L. Mumma
March 14, 2016

[Signature]

239 Springmoor Dr.
Raleigh NC 27615

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh's existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh's water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the watershed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors' properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors' properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

[Signature]
March 14, 2016

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh's existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh's water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the watershed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors' properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors' properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

[Signature]

28 Springmoor Drive
Raleigh NC, 27615
March 14, 2016

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh’s existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh’s water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the water shed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors’ properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors’ properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

Doris L. Clark
28 Springmoor Drive
Raleigh NC 27615
Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh’s existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh’s water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the water shed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors’ properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors’ properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

[Signature]

26 Springmoor Ct.
Raleigh, NC 27615
March 14, 2016

Dear City of Raleigh Planning Board Member:

I am a resident of Raleigh. I live in Springmoor, a subdivision located off of Sawmill Road. I am concerned with the zoning petition Z-001-16. I am opposed to this request and encourage you to deny the rezoning request.

I believe it sets a bad precedent for the rest of Raleigh. Infill projects need to be managed to maintain the look and feel of neighborhoods (LU8.10), and allowing a rezoning from R-1 to R-10/town homes does not maintain the character of Raleigh’s existing rural areas.

The construction of town homes in a Watershed area, with active feeder streams to Raleigh’s water supply is environmentally dangerous. The land under consideration is very environmentally sensitive and since it contains active streams and water courses, the disturbance created during construction will affect adversely the streams. Additionally, the builder is meeting the 30% impervious surface requirement by not developing the marsh section at the rear of the property. The problem is that this means the front part of the land will be 100% impervious surfaces, creating additional water flow into the marsh, and upsetting a very precarious balance of the marshland, doing irreparable harm. The 18 months of construction will dump an immense amount of silt and debris into the watershed, affecting water flow and downstream conditions.

The watershed property has active streams that will be affected by the construction. Those flows are precariously close to flooding neighbors’ properties now. Any change during or after construction could cause that water to divert into neighbors’ properties, causing flooding conditions. The changes caused by the construction could take years to become apparent, leaving existing homeowners with the repair bill as the landscape adjusts to the changes over the next decade.

Thank you for your attention,

Elizabeth K. Werner
26 Springmoor Ct.
Raleigh, NC 27615