1701 Trailwood Dr
2.16 acres
R-4 & R-6 w/ SRPOD
R-10-CU w/SRPOD
TO: Ruffin Hall, City Manager  
THRU: Ken Bowers, AICP, Director  
FROM: Sara Ellis, Senior Planner  
DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development  
DATE: November 18, 2020  

SUBJECT: City Council agenda item for December 1, 2020 – Z-4-20

On November 17, 2020, City Council authorized the public hearing for the following item:

**Z-4-2020 1701 Trailwood Drive**, approximately 2.16 acres located at **1701 Trailwood Drive**.

Signed zoning conditions provided on October 30, 2020, prohibit the apartment building type.

- **Current zoning**: Residential-4 and Residential-6 with the Special Parking Overlay District (R-4 & R-6 w/ SRPOD)
- **Requested zoning**: Residential-10 with Conditions and the Special Residential Parking Overlay District (R-10-CU-SRPOD)

The request is consistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The request is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map.

The Planning Commission recommends approval/denial of the request (10 - 0).

Attached are the Planning Commission Certified Recommendation (including Staff Report), the Zoning Conditions, the Petition for Rezoning, and the Neighborhood Meeting Report.
**Case Information: Z-4-20; 1701 Trailwood Drive**

| Location | Northeast corner of Trailwood Drive and Tanager Street, more generally located about a mile northeast of the intersection of I-40 and Gorman Street. Address: 1701 Trailwood Drive |  |
|PINs: | 0793103411 |  |
| iMaps, Google Maps, Directions from City Hall | Current Zoning | R-4 & R-6 w/ SRPOD | Requested Zoning | R-10-CU w/ SRPOD | Area of Request | 2.16 acres |
| Corporate Limits | The site is located within Raleigh’s Corporate City limits. | Property Owner | William Anderson Marlowe III | 3700 Computer Drive - Suite 280 | Raleigh, NC 27609 |
| Applicant | William Anderson Marlowe III | 3700 Computer Drive - Suite 280 | Raleigh, NC 27609 |
| City Council District | West CAC | Meets the 3rd Tuesday of the month | Jonathan Edwards, Community Relations Analyst | Jonathan.edwards@raleighnc.gov, 919-996-5712 |
| PC Recommendation | October 23, 2020 |

**Summary of Proposed Conditions**

1. The apartment building type will be prohibited.

**Comprehensive Plan Guidance**

| Future Land Use | Low Density Residential |
| Urban Form | None |
| Consistent Policies | Policy LU 2.2 Compact Development | Policy LU 8.10 Infill Development | Policy LU 8.12 Infill Compatibility | Policy H 1.8 Zoning for Housing |
**Inconsistent Policies**

| Policy LU 1.2 Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency |
| Policy LU 8.3 Conserving, Enhancing, and Revitalizing Neighborhoods |

**Future Land Use Map Consistency**

The rezoning case is □ Consistent  ✗ Inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map.

**Comprehensive Plan Consistency**

The rezoning case is ✗ Consistent  □ Inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

**Public Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Meeting</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 18, 2019</td>
<td>No CAC review expected</td>
<td>03/26/2020 (Meeting cancelled), 05/26/2020 (Deferral), 06/23/2020 (Deferral) 08/11/2020, 10/13/2020, 11/10/2020</td>
<td>08/18/20 (Time Extension Request), 10/20/2020 (Referral back to Planning Commission), 11/17/2020 12/01/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Commission Recommendation**

The rezoning case is Inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map and Consistent with the relevant policies in the Comprehensive Plan, furthermore Approval is reasonable and in the public interest because:

<p>| Reasonableness and Public Interest | The request is reasonable and in the public interest because although it is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map, it is consistent overall with the Comprehensive Plan and supported by policies Policy LU 2.2 Compact Development, Policy LU 8.10 Infill Development, Policy LU 8.12 Infill Compatibility and Policy H 1.8 Zoning for Housing. |
| Change(s) in Circumstances | N/A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan</th>
<th>If approved, the Future Land Use Map will be amended as to the subject parcel only from Low Density Residential to Moderate Density Residential.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Motion and Vote                     | Motion: O'Haver  
Second: Lampman  
In Favor: Bennett, Fox, Hicks, Lampman, Mann, McIntosh, Miller, O'Haver, Tomasulo and Winters |
| Reason for Opposed Vote(s)          | N/A                                                                                                                                        |

**ATTACHMENTS**
1. Staff report  
2. Rezoning Application  
3. Comprehensive Plan Analysis

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 and Comprehensive Plan Amendment Analysis.

_____________________________________________________
Ken A. Bowers, AICP    Date: 
Planning and Development Deputy Director

Staff Coordinator: Sara Ellis: (919) 996-2234; Sara.Ellis@raleighnc.gov
Update for November 10, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting

On October 13, 2020 the Planning Commission voted to recommend unanimous approval of Z-4-20; 1701 Trailwood Drive and the case was reported out to the City Council on October 20, 2020 in the Report of the Planning Commission. However, members of the public had signed up after the deadline to speak in opposition of the case after the sign-up deadline had closed and were unable to provide comment at the October 13, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. The City Council directed staff to send the item back to the Planning Commission to allow the public an opportunity to comment, and the Commission the ability to reexamine the case with public comment.

The public hearing for this item was not scheduled, but the City Council directed staff to place this on the Planning Commission’s November 10, 2020 meeting. Per Section 10.2.4 of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) following the recommendation of the Planning Commission notice of the public hearing shall occur within 60 days which would require the item reappear before the Council for scheduling no later than December 1, 2020. The last Planning Commission meeting before that deadline is November 24, 2020.

On October 29, 2020 a revised application was submitted converting the case to Conditional Use and adding a zoning condition prohibiting the apartment building type. The staff report has been updated to reflect that change.

Update for October 13, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting

On September 22, 2020 the applicant revised their application to request to rezone to Residential-10 general use. The original request was to rezone to RX-3 general use. This request resulted in the case becoming consistent overall with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, however it is still inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map designation of Low Density Residential the recommends residential uses at a density of one to six units per acre, the request would permit up to approximately 9.72 units per acre. If approved, the request would amend the Future Land Use Map designation from Low Density Residential to Moderate Density Residential. The change in request shifted the consistency of policies relating to infill development and compatibility to consistent because the request would no longer permit retail, and the requested residential density is present in the surrounding area.
OVERVIEW

The request is to rezone a single 2.16-acre parcel that is currently split zoned Residential-4 and Residential-6 with the Special Residential Parking Overlay District (R-4 & R-6 w/SRPOD) to Residential-10 with Conditions and the Special Residential Parking Overlay District (R-10-CU w/SRPOD). Associated zoning conditions prohibit the apartment building type. The Special Residential Parking Overlay District (SRPOD) would be retained on the entirety of the site, which limits the vehicular surface area located in the front yard of single-unit living in detached dwellings. The site is located at 1701 Trailwood Drive, at the intersection of Trailwood Drive and Tanager Street in west Raleigh. The site is currently an undeveloped, forested lot with relatively flat topography and no other significant development constraints.

The area surrounding the site is developed with low to medium-density residential uses. The area directly to the north and west of the site is located within the Trailwood Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District (NCOD) and is zoned R-2, which has a 20,000 square foot minimum lot size, a minimum 60-foot front yard setback, and a minimum of 100 feet of lot frontage, making these lots slightly larger than the average lot in the neighborhood.

Bordering the site to the southeast is a 700-acre parcel owned by the State of North Carolina with Office Mixed-Use zoning with a five-story height limit and conditions (OX-5-CU) that is a part of the master plan for Centennial Campus. The site is adjacent to a forested area used for storage and is located about 700 feet from Centennial Middle School. To the north of the site, across Tanager Street are two detached dwellings that are zoned R-4 and R-2 respectively and sit on lots that are about one acre in size.

Just outside of the Trailwood NCOD and adjacent to the rezoning site to the south along Trailwood Drive is about sixteen acres zoned R-6 which contain a mixture of housing types including an enclave of about 40 townhomes and 26 detached dwellings on 10,000 square foot lots. The site’s neighbor to the south is Raleigh Fire Station #20 and it shares the R-6 zoning designation.

The request is to rezone a single parcel from R-4 and R-6 with the SPROD overlay to R-10-CU, retaining the SRPOD overlay. This would increase the residential entitlement on the site from 8 units to 21 gross units or a density of 3.70 units per acre to 9.72 units per acre. The request would also allow the townhome building type, which is not currently permitted in R-4 or R-6 district unless as part of an approved conservation subdivision which requires a larger minimum parcel size than this site has.

The request is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map designation for the area of Low-Density Residential, which recommends residential uses at a density of one to six units per acre. It is consistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan overall.

OUTSTANDING ISSUES

| Outstanding Issues | 1. None. | Suggested Mitigation | 1. N/A |
Property: 1701 Trailwood Dr

Size: 2.16 acres

Existing Zoning: R-4 & R-6 w/ SRPOD

Requested Zoning: R-10 w/ SRPOD
Property: 1701 Trailwood Dr

Size: 2.16 acres

Existing Zoning: R-4 & R-6 w/ SRPOD

Requested Zoning: R-10 w/SRPOD
Property: 1701 Trailwood Dr
Size: 2.16 acres
Existing Zoning: R-4 & R-6 w/ SRPOD
Requested Zoning: R-10 w/SRPOD
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

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

A. Is the proposal consistent with the vision, themes, and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan?

   Yes, the request is consistent overall with the vision, themes and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan.

   The request is consistent with the Expanding Housing Choices vision theme as it will expand the housing supply and permit smaller lot sizes that may increase the affordability of housing in the area.

   The request is consistent with the Managing Our Growth vision theme as it may facilitate the development of a vacant parcel of land with adequate infrastructure to serve it.

   The request is inconsistent with policies relating to Conserving, Enhancing and Revitalizing Neighborhoods and Future Land Use Map consistency.

B. Is the use being considered specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map in the area where its location is proposed?

   No, the use is not considered on the Future Land Use Map, which is currently designated for Low Density Residential, and envisions residential uses at a density of 1 to 6 units per acre. The request would permit up to 9.72 units per acre, or 21 total units. This is an increase from the currently permitted 8 total dwelling units.

C. 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?

   Yes, the R-10 zoning district can be established without adversely altering the recommended land use character of the area. The site is located about 150’ north of an existing townhome community, and about a quarter mile south of an existing apartment home community.

   It would however mark a change in character from the Trailwood neighborhood bordering the site to the north. Trailwood has a Neighborhood Conversation Overlay District and a base zoning of R-2 which do not permit the apartment or townhome building type and have a minimum front yard setbacks of 60 feet, minimum side yard setbacks of 20’ within the first 100 feet of the lot; otherwise minimum of 10 feet. The request would permit the townhome building types and allow for minimum front yard setbacks of 10’, which would permit buildings much closer to the street than the Trailwood neighborhood to the north.
D. Will community facilities and streets be available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property?

   Yes, sufficient community facilities and streets are available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property.

**Future Land Use**

**Future Land Use designation:** Low Density Residential

The rezoning request is

☐ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☒ Inconsistent

The Future Land Use Map designation for the parcel is Low Density Residential, which recommends a residential density of one to six units per acre with R-6 being an appropriate corresponding zoning district. The request to rezone from R-4 & R-6 with SRPOD to R-10 w/SRPOD is inconsistent with this designation as it would permit the townhome building type at a density of up to 10 units per acre.

**Urban Form**

**Urban Form designation:** None

The rezoning request is

☐ Consistent with the Urban Form Map.

☐ Inconsistent

☒ Other (no Urban Form designation)

**Compatibility**

The proposed rezoning is

☒ Compatible with the property and surrounding area.

☐ Incompatible.

The request is compatible with the surrounding area as it would permit residential uses at a density of 9.72 units per acre, which while this is a greater density than envisioned by the FLUM, exists within a quarter mile of the site along Trailwood and along Gorman Street. The area is characterized by a diverse mixture of housing types; single family detached lots with R-2 zoning and minimum 60’ front yard setbacks to the north and east, Office and Residential Mixed Use (though presently forested land) to the west, and smaller lot detached single family residential homes to the south.
While the request is a greater density than the Future Land Use Map envisions for the area, the setbacks of the building and the use would remain similar to the majority of residential development in the area.

**Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning**

- The request would increase the number of housing units allowed on the site and reduce the minimum lot size, potentially increasing the affordability of units.
- The request may bring a piece of currently undeveloped land into production.

**Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning**

- The request may increase the traffic in the area.

**Policy Guidance**

*The rezoning request is consistent with the following policies:*

**Policy LU 2.2 Compact Development**

New development and redevelopment should use a more compact land use pattern to support the efficient provision of public services, improve the performance of transportation networks, preserve open space, and reduce the negative impacts of low intensity and non-contiguous development.

*This request would allow for a greater density of dwelling units on the site and allow for an increase from approximately 8 units to approximately 21 units or an increase from approximately 3.70 units per acre to 9.72 units per acre.*

**Policy LU 8.10 Infill Development**

Encourage infill development on vacant land within the city, particularly 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.

**Policy LU 8.12 Infill Compatibility**

Vacant lots and infill sites within existing neighborhoods should be developed consistently with the design elements of adjacent structures, including height, setbacks, and massing through the use of zoning tools including Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Districts.

*The site is a single, undeveloped parcel along Trailwood Drive in an area that is otherwise developed. The request may facilitate infill development by rezoning to a single zoning district, it is currently split zoned R-4 and R-6. The setbacks in the R-10 zoning district for the apartment building type are very similar with the exception of the side lot line that is 5’ greater in R-6. The largest departure would be the front setback, which is currently 20’ in R-4 and would be reduced to 10’ in R-10. The request height would remain the same.*
Policy H 1.8 Zoning for Housing

Ensure that zoning policy continues to provide ample opportunity for developers to build a variety of housing types, ranging from single-family to dense multi-family. Keeping the market well supplied with housing will moderate the costs of owning and renting, lessening affordability problems, and lowering the level of subsidy necessary to produce affordable housing. In areas characterized by detached houses, accommodations should be made for additional housing types while maintaining a form and scale similar to existing housing.

The request may help facilitate the development of an undeveloped forested parcel that is currently split zoned R-4 and R-6. The request will increase the permitted residential density on the site and provide an increase of approximately 13 units to the housing stock in the area, as well as allow for a smaller minimum lot size for the townhome building type. The request will also permit the attached and townhouse building types which would allow for a greater variety of housing choice in the area.

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.

The request to rezone from R-4 & R-6 w/ SRPOD to R-10 w/SRPOD is inconsistent with the FLUM guidance for the parcel of Low-Density Residential, which recommends residential uses at a density of one to six units per acre. This request would permit up to 9.72 units per acre, or a total of approximately 21 units.

Policy LU 8.3 Conserving, Enhancing, and Revitalizing Neighborhoods

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.

The request may permit a change in character from the neighborhood to the north, by allowing the townhome building type with smaller primary street setbacks than the current entitlement. The minimum primary street setback in R-4 is 20’ and would be reduced to 10’ if the request to rezone to R-10 was approved. This inconsistency can be mitigated by adding zoning conditions increasing the front yard setback.
HOUSING AFFORDABILITY & ENERGY EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS

Carbon Footprint: Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City Average</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Score</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>This score is lower than the City’s average and indicates that nearly all errands require a car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Score</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>There are some transit options, but the lack of sidewalks in the area and the fragmented street network may pose a larger challenge to pedestrian accessibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Walk Score is a publicly available service that measures pedestrian friendliness by analyzing population density and road metrics such as block length and intersection density. The higher the Transit Score or Walk Score, the greater the percentage of trips that will be made on transit or by walking, and the smaller the carbon footprint. The scores also correlate with shorter vehicle trips, which also produce less carbon. The city has a wide range of scores. Raleigh Municipal Building, for instance, has a Walk Score of 92, meaning the area is highly pedestrian-friendly and that many destinations are within a short walk. Some areas in the city have scores in single digits, indicating that few if any destinations are within walking distance, so nearly all trips are made by car.

Summary:
The transit and walk scores for the area are both lower than the City’s average, which may be in part due to the lack of street connectivity in the overall area. The site sits at the intersection of Trailwood Drive where Tanager Street dead-ends into Centennial Campus. There are sidewalks on Trailwood Drive south of the site, but none on Tanager Street. The lack of sidewalks also poses a challenge getting pedestrians to and from the nearby bus stop, which is located less than a quarter of a mile from the site on Thistledown Road.

Carbon/Energy Footprint: Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Average Annual Energy Use (million BTU)</th>
<th>Permitted in this project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Apartment (2-4 units)</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Apartment</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: The request will allow the townhome building type, which is not permitted under the current R-4/R-6 zoning. By allowing the attached and townhome building types the request will allow more energy efficient residences.

Housing Supply and Affordability

| Does it add/subtract from the housing supply? | Adds | This request will allow the number of housing units permitted on the site to increase from a currently allowed 8 to an allowed 21 units. |
| Does it include any subsidized units? | No | No subsidized units were part of this request. |
| Does it permit a variety of housing types beyond detached houses? | Yes | The request will permit the attached and townhome building types, which are not currently allowed. |
| If not a mixed-use district, does it permit smaller lots than the average? | N/A | N/A |
| Is it within walking distance of transit? | Yes | The site is located within walking distance of the Route11 bus, however, the transit and walk scores for the area are fairly low and may pose barriers to access. |

*The average lot size for detached residential homes in Raleigh is 0.28 acres.

Summary: The request will increase the permitted residential density in the area to an estimated 21 units but does not include any subsidized or affordable housing. While transit is within walking distance of the site, the lack of sidewalks in the area may pose a challenge to accessibility.
IMPACT ANALYSIS

Historic Resources

The site is not located within or adjacent to a National Register Historic District or Raleigh Historic Overlay District. It does not include nor is adjacent to any National Register individually-listed properties or Raleigh Historic Landmarks.

Impact Identified: None.

Parks and Recreation

1. This site is not directly impacted by any existing or proposed greenway trails, corridors, or connectors.
2. Nearest existing park access is provided by Mary Belle Pate Park (1.4 miles) and Kentwood Park (1.9 miles).
3. Nearest existing greenway trail access if provided by Walnut Creek Greenway Trail (0.8 miles).
4. The current park access level of service in this area is graded a B letter grade.

Impact Identified: None.

Public Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Demand (current use)</th>
<th>Maximum Demand (current zoning)</th>
<th>Maximum Demand (proposed zoning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Identified:

1. The proposed rezoning would add approximately 8,125 gpd to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the City.
2. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the proposed rezoning area.
3. At the time of development plan submittal, a Downstream Sewer Capacity Study may be required to determine adequate capacity to support the proposed development. Any improvements identified by the study would be required to be permitted prior to the issuance of Building Permit & constructed prior to release of a Certificate of Occupancy.
4. Verification of water available for fire flow is required as part of the Building Permit process. Any water system improvements recommended by the analysis to meet fire flow requirements will also be required of the Developer.
**Stormwater**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floodplain</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Basin</td>
<td>Walnut Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Identified:** No downstream structural impacts identified.

**Transit**

Further comments from Transit are pending a Site Plan submittal or any applied transit conditions to site development.

**Impact Identified:** None.

**Transportation**

**Site Location and Context**

**Location**

The Z-4-2020 site is located in southwest Raleigh on Trailwood Drive at the intersection with Tanager Street. East of the subject site is an undeveloped section of the North Carolina State University’s Centennial Campus.

**Area Plans**

The Z-4-2020 site is not located within or near an area plan.

**Existing and Planned Infrastructure**

**Streets**

Trailwood Drive is a 2-lane divided avenue maintained by the North Carolina DOT. South of the subject site, it is built to a similar curb to curb width as the standard for the street type. At the subject site and northward, it is built with two lanes and ditches.

In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for R-6 zoning districts is approximately 5,000 feet, and the maximum length for a dead-end street is 600 feet. Block perimeter in residential districts is dependent on lot size. The block perimeter for this site is very large due to Lake Raleigh, Walnut Creek, and Centennial Campus. If Tanager Street were extended through NCSU property to Main Campus Drive, the resulting block perimeter would be approximately 3,300 feet.

**Pedestrian Facilities**

Sidewalks on Trailwood Drive are complete south of the subject property to south of Lineberry Street. There is no sidewalk on Tanager Street.
**Bicycle Facilities**

There are no bicycle facilities in the immediate vicinity of the site. Bicycle lanes are planned on Thistledown Drive between Trailwood Drive and Gorman Street. Bicycle lanes exists on Gorman Street. The long-term bikeway plan calls for a bicycle lanes on Trailwood Drive. The Walnut Creek Greenway Trail crosses Trailwood Drive approximately ¾ mile north of the subject site.

**Greenways**

There is an unpaved loop greenway trail around the western half of Lake Johnson near the subject property.

**Transit**

GoRaleigh Route #11 operates on Thistledown Drive and Trailwood Drive south of their intersection. Service is every 30 minutes during peak times and hourly during off-peak times. The nearest stops are on Thistledown Drive within a quarter mile of the subject site.

**Access**

Access to the subject site is Trailwood Drive or Tanager Street.

**Other Projects in the Area**

Approximately ¾ mile north of the site, an improvement to the Walnut Creek Greenway Trail is planned. The project, which will began construction soon, will upgrade the greenway trail to follow the stream, rather than the sidewalk on Trailwood Drive and Avent Ferry Road. Total length of the project will be less than 1,000 feet.

**TIA Determination**

Based on the Envision results, approval of case Z-4-20 would increase the amount of projected vehicular trips for the site. The proposed rezoning from R-4/R-6 to R-10 would create 4 new trips in the AM peak and 4 new trips in the PM peak from the current entitlements to the proposed maximum. These values do not trigger a Traffic Impact Analysis based on the thresholds in the Raleigh Street Design Manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-4-20 Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-4-20 Current Zoning Entitlements</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-4-20 Proposed Zoning Maximums</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-4-20 Trip Volume Change (Proposed Maximums minus Current Entitlements)</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Identified: Some increase in traffic in the area.

Urban Forestry
The subject parcel is greater than two acres. Compliance with UDO Article 9.1 Tree Conservation will be required when the property is developed.
Impact Identified: None.

Impacts Summary
The request may generate additional traffic, water, and wastewater usage.

Mitigation of Impacts
None required.
CONCLUSION

The request is to rezone a single 2.16 acre parcel from Residential-4 and Residential-6 with the Special Parking Overlay District (R-4 & R-6 w/SRPOD) to Residential-10 with Conditions and the Special Residential Parking Overlay District (R-10-CU w/SRPOD). Zoning conditions prohibit the apartment building type.

The request is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map designation of Low-Density Residential as it would permit a greater density and the townhome building type which is not envisioned by this designation. If approved, the request would amend the Future Land Use Map from Low Density Residential to Moderate Density Residential.

It is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan overall, as it would facilitate residential infill development of a similar height and setback in an area with sufficient public utility, stormwater and road infrastructure to serve the requested increase in density.

The request is consistent with the vision themes related to Expanding Housing Choice and Managing Our Growth.

CASE TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/17/20</td>
<td>General use rezoning application submitted to rezone from R-4 &amp; R-6 w/SRPOD to R-6 w/ SRPOD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2020</td>
<td>Application revised to request to rezone from R-4 &amp; R-6 w/ SRPOD to RX-3 w/SRPOD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/22/2020</td>
<td>Application revised to request to rezone from R-4 &amp; R-6 w/SRPOD to R-10 w/SRPOD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/2020</td>
<td>Item appeared as report of Council.</td>
<td>Council directed staff to place item back on Planning Commission agenda to allow for public comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2020</td>
<td>Application converted from General Use to Conditional Use.</td>
<td>Conditions prohibit the apartment building type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX

**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><strong>Existing Zoning</strong></td>
<td>R-4 &amp; R-6</td>
<td>R-4 &amp; R-2</td>
<td>R-6 &amp; OX-5-CU</td>
<td>OX-5-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Overlay</strong></td>
<td>SRPOD</td>
<td>SRPOD &amp; Trailwood NCOD</td>
<td>SRPOD</td>
<td>SRPOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Low Density Residential &amp; Institutional</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Undeveloped forested land</td>
<td>Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>Forested land &amp; Middle School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urban Form** None None None None

**CURRENT VS. PROPOSED ZONING SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
<td>R-4 &amp; R-6 w/ SRPOD</td>
<td>R-10-CU w/ SRPOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>Townhouse Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>15’</td>
<td>10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Density:</strong></td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. # of Residential Units</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Building SF</strong></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>22,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Office SF</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Retail SF</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Industrial SF</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential F.A.R</strong></td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The development intensities for proposed zoning districts were estimated using an impact analysis tool. The estimates presented are only to provide guidance for analysis.*
AMENDED MAPS

The approval of this rezoning request will result in an amendment to the Future Land Use Map, changing it from Low Density Residential to Moderate Density Residential. This change is triggered because the residential density on the site, if approved, would increase to 9.72 units per acre which corresponds to the Moderate Density Residential FLUM designation that envisions a density of 6-14 units per acre.

Z-4-2020: Required Amendment to the Future Land Use Map

Existing Designation: Low Density Residential
Proposed Designation: Moderate Density Residential
AGENDA ITEM (E): OLD BUSINESS

AGENDA ITEM (E) 1: Z-4-20 – 1701 Trailwood Drive

This case is located 1701 Trailwood Drive on its west side, about one-mile northeast of the intersection of I-40 and Gorman Street.

Approximately 2.16 acres are requested to be rezoned by William Anderson Marlowe III to be rezoned. This is for a conditional use district; associated zoning conditions prohibit the apartment building type.

Planner Ellis presented the case. She stated this case has been converted to conditional use case and is still inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map.

Without objection the applicant and public will have 10 minutes each side to speak.

Anderson Marlowe representing the applicant gave a brief overview of the case. He stated that the neighbors had asked that apartment designation has been dropped from the conditions which the applicant has done.

Rebecca Hall responded she and many other neighbors are unanimously opposed to this case regarding it being inconsistent with FLUM and rest of the neighborhood, decrease setback and number of cars and would like applicant to be respectful of the issues of the neighbors.

Steve Hall also representing the neighborhood spoke regarding their being no plan for the area and that no one in the neighborhood has spoken in favor of this rezoning.

Patricia Beach, 1209 Trailwood Drive, speaking for the Trailwood Community stated the rezoning as currently proposed is not appropriate for this area and do not welcome development that begins with clear cutting and this will happen R-10 is allowed. She stated this is spot zoning and is not appropriate for this lot area and would like to commission to deny the request.

Tom Kwak, 1333 Trailwood Drive, speaking regarding environmental concerns for this area; protection of neighborhood character and believes this application would destroy not improve this area. He has concerns of forest clearing; transit score is half the city size requirement and exacerbate the problem. This is not the appropriate place for additional development.

There was discussion regarding how many units can be placed on the lot with all the setback.

Mr. Marlowe responded that it is hard to spend money on site plan when you’re not sure what you’re building. He stated that there would be between 16 to 17 units and has built in a tree save into the conditions.

There was further discussion regarding where the overlay was located and does staff have any guidance regarding the Comp Plan when zoning is close to a fire station and single-family homes.

Chair Tomasulo spoke regarding adding 8 to 10 units in an area that needs more housing and helps with infrastructure in an area that is a bit dated.

Mr. O’Haver made a motion to recommend approval the case inconsistent with Future Land Use Map but it is overall consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Lampman seconded the motion.

Commissioners how do you vote?

Bennett (Aye), Fox (Aye), Hicks (Aye), Lampman (Aye), Mann (Aye), McIntosh (Aye), Miller (Aye), O’Haver, Chair Tomasulo and Winters (Aye). The vote was unanimous 10-0
AGENDA ITEM (E): OLD BUSINESS

AGENDA ITEM (E) 1:  Z-4-20 – 1701 Trailwood Drive

This case is located 1701 Trailwood Drive located about a mile northeast of the intersection of I-40 and Gorman Street.

This is a request to be rezoned from R-4 & R-6 w/SRPOD to R-10 w/SRPOD.

Planner Ellis gave a brief overview of the case.

There was no further discussion.

Chair Tomasulo made a motion to approve the case. Mr. Mann seconded the motion.

Commissioners how do you vote?

# Rezoning Application

## General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date Amended (1)</th>
<th>Date Amended (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/16/2020</td>
<td>2/21/2020</td>
<td>10/29/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Address**: 1701 Trailwood Drive  
**Property PIN**: 793103411  
**Deed Reference (book/page)**: 11024/1160  
**Nearest Intersection**: Trailwood Drive & Tanager Street  
**Property Size (acres)**: 2.16  
**Total Units**: N/A  
**Total Square Feet**: 94,089.60  
**Property Owner/Address**:
- William Anderson Marlowe III  
  3700 Computer Drive - Suite 280  
  Raleigh, NC 27609
- **Phone**: (919) 645-1600  
  **Email**: bill.marlowe4@gmail.com  
**Project Contact Person/Address**:
- William Anderson Marlowe III  
  3700 Computer Drive - Suite 280  
  Raleigh, NC 27609
- **Phone**: (919) 645-1600  
  **Email**: bill.marlowe4@gmail.com  
**Owner/Agent Signature**: [Signature]  
**Email**

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

---

**OFFICE USE ONLY**
- **Transaction #**  
- **Rezoning Case #**

**Click here to view the Zoning Map. Search for the address to be rezoned, then turn on the 'Zoning' and 'Overlay' layers.**

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:

---

**REZONING REQUEST**

- **General Use**  
- **Conditional Use**  
- **Master Plan**

**Existing Zoning Base District**: R4/R-6  
**Height**: N/A  
**Frontage**: N/A  
**Overlay(s)**: SRPOD

**Proposed Zoning Base District**: R-10  
**Height**: 3  
**Frontage**: N/A  
**Overlay(s)**: SRPOD

---

**RECEIVED**

**By**: [Signature]  
**Date**: OCT 29 2020

---

**PAGE 1 OF 13**

**WWW.raleighnc.gov**  
**REVISION 5.15.18**
The apartment building type is prohibited.

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: Anderson Marlowe

Print Name: Anderson Marlowe
REZONING APPLICATION ADDENDUM #1

**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.

**OFFICE USE ONLY**

Transaction #

Rezoning Case #

**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 property is currently split zoned between zoning districts R4 and R6 with the majority being zoned R4. We have decided to apply to have a less restrictive zoning district applied to the entire site.

2. If we were to be granted the rezoning on this property, the zoning be not be consistent with the current future land use designation. The property lies in a "Low Density Residential" future land use designation, and RX3 zoning is considered to be "Medium Density Residential."

3. The property is not subject to Raleigh's Urban Form Map. The property does not lie on any main corridors or designated centers.

4. Overall, the rezoning is consistent with the urban form map, and would only be considered one class higher in the future land use map.

**PUBLIC BENEFITS**

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

1. Denser and affordable housing.

2. Any public works improvements that the developer would be subject to construct.

3.

4.
### REZONING APPLICATION ADDENDUM #2

**Impact on Historic Resources**

The applicant is asked to analyze the impact of the rezoning request on historic resources. For the purposes of this section, a historic resource is defined as any site, structure, sign, or other feature of the property to be rezoned that is listed in the National Register of Historic Places or designated by the City of Raleigh as a landmark or contributing to a Historic Overlay District.

**INVENTORY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

List in the space below all historic resources located on the property to be rezoned. For each resource, indicate how the proposed zoning would impact the resource.

- Not applicable

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Provide brief statements describing actions that will be taken to mitigate all negative impacts listed above.

- Not applicable
The applicant must respond to the Urban Design Guidelines contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan if:
   a) The property to be rezoned is within a "City Growth Center" or "Mixed-Use Center", or
   b) The property to be rezoned is located along a "Main Street" or "Transit Emphasis Corridor"
as shown on the Urban Form Map in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Urban Form Designation: N/A
Click here to view the Urban Form Map.

1. All Mixed-Use developments should generally provide retail (such as eating establishments, food stores, and banks), and other such uses as office and residential within walking distance of each other. Mixed uses should be arranged in a compact and pedestrian friendly form.
   Response:

2. Within all Mixed-Use Areas buildings that are adjacent to lower density neighborhoods should transition (height, design, distance and/or landscaping) to the lower heights or be comparable in height and massing.
   Response:

3. A mixed use area's road network should connect directly into the neighborhood road network of the surrounding community, providing multiple paths for movement to and through the mixed use area. In this way, trips made from the surrounding residential neighborhood(s) to the mixed use area should be possible without requiring travel along a major thoroughfare or arterial.
   Response:

4. Streets should interconnect within a development and with adjoining development. Cul-de-sacs or dead-end streets are generally discouraged except where topographic conditions and/or exterior lot line configurations offer no practical alternatives for connection or through traffic. Street stubs should be provided with development adjacent to open land to provide for future connections. Streets should be planned with due regard to the designated corridors shown on the Thoroughfare Plan.
   Response:

5. New development should be comprised of blocks of public and/or private streets (including sidewalks). Block faces should have a length generally not exceeding 600 feet. Where commercial driveways are used to create block structure, they should include the same pedestrian amenities as public or private streets.
   Response:
6. A primary task of all urban architecture and landscape design is the physical definition of streets and public spaces as places of shared use. Streets should be lined by buildings rather than parking lots and should provide interest especially for pedestrians. Garage entrances and/or loading areas should be located at the side or rear of a property.
   **Response:**

7. Buildings should be located close to the pedestrian-oriented street (within 25 feet of the curb), with off-street parking behind and/or beside the buildings. When a development plan is located along a high volume corridor without on-street parking, one bay of parking separating the building frontage along the corridor is a preferred option.
   **Response:**

8. If the site is located at a street intersection, the main building or main part of the building should be placed at the corner. Parking, loading or service should not be located at an intersection.
   **Response:**

9. To ensure that urban open space is well-used, it is essential to locate and design it carefully. The space should be located where it is visible and easily accessible from public areas (building entrances, sidewalks). Take views and sun exposure into account as well.
   **Response:**

10. New urban spaces should contain direct access from the adjacent streets. They should be open along the adjacent sidewalks and allow for multiple points of entry. They should also be visually permeable from the sidewalk, allowing passersby to see directly into the space.
    **Response:**

11. The perimeter of urban open spaces should consist of active uses that provide pedestrian traffic for the space including retail, cafés, and restaurants and higher-density residential.
    **Response:**

12. A properly defined urban open space is visually enclosed by the fronting of buildings to create an outdoor "room" that is comfortable to users.
    **Response:**
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13. | New public spaces should provide seating opportunities.  
Response: |
| 14. | Parking lots should not dominate the frontage of pedestrian-oriented streets, interrupt pedestrian routes, or negatively impact surrounding developments.  
Response: |
| 15. | Parking lots should be located behind or in the interior of a block whenever possible. Parking lots should not occupy more than 1/3 of the frontage of the adjacent building or not more than 64 feet, whichever is less.  
Response: |
| 16. | Parking structures are clearly an important and necessary element of the overall urban infrastructure but, given their utilitarian elements, can give serious negative visual effects. New structures should merit the same level of materials and finishes as that a principal building would, care in the use of basic design elements can make a significant improvement.  
Response: |
| 17. | Higher building densities and more intensive land uses should be within walking distance of transit stops, permitting public transit to become a viable alternative to the automobile.  
Response: |
| 18. | Convenient, comfortable pedestrian access between the transit stop and the building entrance should be planned as part of the overall pedestrian network.  
Response: |
| 19. | All development should respect natural resources as an essential component of the human environment. The most sensitive landscape areas, both environmentally and visually, are steep slopes greater than 15 percent, watercourses, and floodplains. Any development in these areas should minimize intervention and maintain the natural condition except under extreme circumstances. Where practical, these features should be conserved as open space amenities and incorporated in the overall site design.  
Response: |
20. It is the intent of these guidelines to build streets that are integral components of community design. Public and private streets, as well as commercial driveways that serve as primary pedestrian pathways to building entrances, should be designed as the main public spaces of the City and should be scaled for pedestrians.
Response:

21. Sidewalks should be 5-8 feet wide in residential areas and located on both sides of the street. Sidewalks in commercial areas and Pedestrian Business Overlays should be a minimum of 14-18 feet wide to accommodate sidewalk uses such as vendors, merchandising and outdoor seating.
Response:

22. Streets should be designed with street trees planted in a manner appropriate to their function. Commercial streets should have trees which complement the face of the buildings and which shade the sidewalk. Residential streets should provide for an appropriate canopy, which shadows both the street and sidewalk, and serves as a visual buffer between the street and the home. The typical width of the street landscape strip is 5-8 feet. This width ensures healthy street trees, precludes tree roots from breaking the sidewalk, and provides adequate pedestrian buffering. Street trees should be at least 6 1/4” caliper and should be consistent with the City’s landscaping, lighting and street sight distance requirements.
Response:

23. Buildings should define the streets spatially. Proper spatial definition should be achieved with buildings or other architectural elements (including certain tree plantings) that make up the street edges aligned in a disciplined manner with an appropriate ratio of height to width.
Response:

24. The primary entrance should be both architecturally and functionally on the front facade of any building facing the primary public street. Such entrances shall be designed to convey their prominence on the fronting facade.
Response:

25. The ground level of the building should offer pedestrian interest along sidewalks. This includes windows entrances, and architectural details. Signage, awnings, and ornamentation are encouraged.
Response:

26. The sidewalks should be the principal place of pedestrian movement and casual social interaction. Designs and uses should be complementary to that function.
Response:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Requirements – General Use or Conditional Use Rezoning</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have referenced this Rezoning Checklist and by using this as a guide, it will ensure that I receive a complete and thorough first review by the City of Raleigh</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rezoning application review fee (see Fee Schedule for rate)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Completed application; include electronic version via cd or flash drive</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Two sets of stamped envelopes addressed to all property owners within 500 feet of property to be rezoned</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pre-Application Conference</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Neighborhood Meeting notice and report</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trip Generation Study</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Traffic Impact Analysis</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Completed and signed zoning conditions</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Completed Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Completed Response to the Urban Design Guidelines</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. For applications filed by a third party, proof of actual notice to the property owner</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Master Plan (for properties requesting Planned Development or Campus District)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MASTER PLAN SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Requirements – Master Plan</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have referenced the Master Plan Checklist and by using this as a guide, it will ensure that I receive a complete and thorough first review by the City of Raleigh</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total number of units and square feet</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 12 sets of plans</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Completed application; Include electronic version via cd or flash drive</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vicinity Map</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Existing Conditions Map</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Street and Block Layout Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General Layout Map/Height and Frontage Map</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Description of Modification to Standards, 12 sets</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Development Plan (location of building types)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pedestrian Circulation Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Parking Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Open Space Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tree Conservation Plan (if site is 2 acres or more)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Major Utilities Plan/Utilities Service Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Generalized Stormwater Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Phasing Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Three-Dimensional Model/renderings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Common Signage Plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 8, 2019

RE: 1701 TRAILWOOD DRIVE

Neighboring Property Owners:

You are invited to attend a neighborhood meeting on Thursday, July 18, 2019. The meeting will be held at Thomas G. Crowder Center at 5611 Jaguar Park Drive and will begin at 5 P.M.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss a potential rezoning of the property located at 1701 Trailwood Drive. This property is located adjacent to the fire station at the Southeast corner of the intersection of Trailwood Drive and Tanager Street. This site is currently split zoned R4 and R6 and is proposed to be rezoned to R6.

The City of Raleigh requires that prior to the submittal of any rezoning application, a neighborhood meeting involving the property owners within 500 feet of the area requested for rezoning.

If you have any concerns or questions I can be reached at:

Phone: (919) 645-1600
Email: bill.marlowe4@gmail.com

For more information about rezoning, you may visit www.raleighnc.gov or contact the Raleigh City Planning Department at:

Phone: (919) 996-2682
Email: rezoning@raleighnc.gov

Sincerely,

William Anderson Marlowe III
SUMMARY OF ISSUES

A neighborhood meeting was held on _July 18, 2019_ (date) to discuss a potential rezoning located at _1701 Trailwood Drive_ (property address). The neighborhood meeting was held at _Thomas G. Crowder Center_ (location).

There were approximately _15_ (number) neighbors in attendance. The general issues discussed were:

**Summary of Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split Zoning - they were wondering what the current zoning is for the property. We explained it is split zoned, and rezoning to R6 entirely would make it cleaner and would allow for more density.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Improvements - the neighbors asked what improvements would be involved if we were to develop the property. We explained that there would be sewer extensions required as well as road improvements in front of our property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighbors were concerned that R6 is more conducive to &quot;renters.&quot; It appears they only want property owners in their neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer - the neighbors were asking what sewer improvements would be made. We explained we would bring sewer from the fire department R/W. They asked why we didn't want to build one or two lots on septic tanks. We explained that is not feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic - the neighbors raised concerns about additional traffic if we added density to the area. Our explanation was that the road improvements would help alleviate traffic concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The neighbors asked us not to &quot;upzone.&quot; They all believe no upzoning of any sort whatsoever would be in their best interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One neighbor did not want us to rezone because he thought we would try to build a hotel. I explained that would not be permitted in city code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. and Mrs. Wendell Gilliam**</td>
<td>1129 Trailwood Drive**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hall</td>
<td>1632 Crump Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Reid **</td>
<td>3122 Tanager Street**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hunter</td>
<td>3121 Tanager Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Coble**</td>
<td>3215 Tanager Street**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard A. Dapper Jr.</td>
<td>3111 Tanager Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Beach**</td>
<td>1209 Trailwood Drive**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Barton**</td>
<td>1209 Trailwood Drive**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Luginbuhl**</td>
<td>1700 Pictou Road**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han Fang</td>
<td>1628 Crump Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Cullon**</td>
<td>3122 Tanager Street**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy Hoch**</td>
<td>1816 Pictou Road**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kwak**</td>
<td>1333 Trailwood Drive**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Denotes no notice was sent to this attendee. (outside 500' boundary)**