Request:

11.27 acres from

R-4 (10.99ac) & R-6-CU (0.28ac)

to R-6

w/
Case Information Z-7-17 Paint Rock Lane

| **Location** | North and south of Paint Rock Lane, between Madeline Way and Pine Barren Lane  
Address: 6611 Paint Rock Lane  
PIN: 1732601818 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td>Rezone property from R-4, and R-6-CU to R-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of Request</strong></td>
<td>11.27 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Property Owner** | First National Bank of Pennsylvania  
3600 Glenwood Ave, Ste 203  
Raleigh, NC 27612 |
| **Applicant** | Steve Gurganus  
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice  
555 Fayetteville St, Ste 1100, Raleigh NC 27601 |
| **Citizens Advisory Council (CAC)** | Southeast CAC  
Co-Chairperson: Ulysses J. Lane, 919-247-0988, ulane6@nc.rr.com  
Co-Chairperson: Lee Weaver, 919-522-8462, leeweaver1@yahoo.com |
| **PC Recommendation Deadline** | July 24, 2017 |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FUTURE LAND USE</strong></th>
<th>Low Density Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>URBAN FORM</strong></td>
<td>No Designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **CONSISTENT Policies** | Policy LU 1.2 – Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency  
Policy LU 2.6 – Zoning and Infrastructure Impacts  
Policy LU 3.1 – Zoning of Annexed Lands  
Policy LU 3.4 – Infrastructure Concurrency  
Policy LU 4.5 – Connectivity  
Policy LU 5.1 – Reinforcing the Urban Pattern  
Policy LU 8.5 – Conservation of Single Family Neighborhoods  
Policy LU 8.10 – Infill Development  
Policy LU 8.12 – Infill Compatibility  
Policy T 2.3 – Eliminating Gaps |
| **INCONSISTENT Policies** | None |
Summary of Proposed Conditions

General Use – No Conditions

Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Meeting</th>
<th>Southeast CAC</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/19/17</td>
<td>3/9/17: No Vote:</td>
<td>Deferred: 4/25/17</td>
<td>6/6/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/11/17: Y-31 No-0</td>
<td>5/23/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments

1. Staff report

Planning Commission Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Approve.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Council may now schedule this proposal for Public Hearing, or refer it to committee for further study and discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Findings & Reasons               | The request is consistent with the Future Land Use Map and the Comprehensive Plan. |
|----------------------------------| It creates the public benefits of removing the eyesore site, increases connectivity within the neighborhood, and may increase property values for neighboring property owners. |

| Motion and Vote                  | Motion: Alcine |
|----------------------------------| Second: Jeffreys |
|                                  | In Favor: Alcine, Fluhrer, Hicks, Jeffreys, Tomasulo, and Braun |

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.

5/23/17

Planning Director Date Planning Commission Chairperson Date

Staff Coordinator: Kyle Little (919) 996-2180; kyle.little@raleighnc.gov
Case Summary

Overview

The proposal seeks to rezone a single, residentially-zoned property totaling 11.27 acres north and south of the terminus of Paint Rock Lane between Madeline Way and Pine Barren Lane. The request is to rezone from R-4 (10.99 acres) and a northern portion zoned R-6-CU (.28 acres) to R-6. The property is located outside the city of Raleigh within the city’s extraterritorial jurisdiction.

The site was originally planned to be developed as phase-4 of the Johns Pointe Cluster Subdivision. The cluster subdivision allowed for parcels zoned R-4, to be subdivided at R-6 densities in exchange for setting aside open space. Open space required by code for the cluster subdivision was satisfied in previous phases of development. Due to foreclosure, the property has remained vacant, and the previously approved site plan for cluster development has expired.

The subject property is vacant and currently has mounds of overburden leftover from the construction of the first three phases of Johns Pointe. Trees and vegetation have regrown as the site returns to its natural state.

The request to rezone to R-6 would permit the property to be subdivided and developed with similar lot size and density as the surrounding properties. The completed portion of Johns Pointe to the west and Griffis Glen to the east have R-4 zoning entitlement. The property to the south is 29 acres consisting of a single-family residence and a wireless tower, the zoning for this property is also R-4. To the north, the Chastain Subdivision is zoned R-6-CU. A northern portion of the subject property retains the R-6-CU zoning designation associated with the Chastain Subdivision. Johns Point, Griffis Glen, and the Chastain subdivision were all developed as Cluster Subdivisions.

The Future Land Use Map designates the property as Low Density Residential. Low Density Residential supports up to 6 units per acre. The rezoning request of R-6 would be consistent with the current Future Land Use Map designation. Properties directly adjacent to the subject property are also designated as Low Density Residential. Neither the subject property nor adjacent properties are designated on the Urban Form Map.

The property is in the city’s Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ). Resolution 1993-208 requires property owners to submit a voluntary petition for annexation before the site can be connected to city sewer and water utilities. The petitioner may initiate the annexation process concurrently with the rezoning request.

Outstanding Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Request:

11.27 acres from
R-4 (10.99ac) & R-6-CU (0.28ac)
to R-6
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>R-6-CU</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>R-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Single Family Residential (Cluster Subdivision)</td>
<td>Single Family Residential (Cluster Subdivision)</td>
<td>Single Family Residential (Cluster Subdivision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form (if applicable)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Current vs. Proposed Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density:</td>
<td>4 DU/acre (34 units)</td>
<td>6 DU/acre (51 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side:</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Intensity Permitted:</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Intensity Permitted:</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Estimated Development Intensities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R-4 (10.99 AC) R-6-CU (.28 AC)</td>
<td>R-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Building SF (if applicable)</td>
<td>74,800</td>
<td>112,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. # of Residential Units</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Office SF</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Retail SF</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Industrial SF</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
<td>Not Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential F.A.R</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.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.

The proposed rezoning is:

☑️ **Compatible** with the property and surrounding area.

☐ **Incompatible.**

**Analysis of Incompatibility:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposed rezoning is compatible with the surrounding area. The scale, dimensional requirements, and intensity of the rezoning request are comparable to the surrounding properties. Rezoning would facilitate development of an otherwise underutilized vacant property. Development will enable improved connectivity between Johns Pointe and Griffis Glen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Future Land Use Map  Z-7-2017

Request:

11.27 acres from

R-4 (10.99ac) & R-6-CU (0.28ac)
to R-6

Submittal Date

3/3/2017
Request:
11.27 acres from
R-4 (10.99ac) & R-6-CU (0.28ac)
to R-6
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:
A. Is the proposal consistent with the vision, themes, and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan?
B. Is the use being considered specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map in the area where its location is proposed?
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?
D. Will community facilities and streets be available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property?

A. The proposal is consistent with the vision, themes, and policies in the Comprehensive Plan.
B. The property is designated on the Future Land Use Map as Low Density Residential. The request is consistent with the Low Density Residential Designation.
C. The use is specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map.
D. City infrastructure appears to be sufficient to accommodate development from the rezoning. Additional study of infrastructure requirements will be required during the site plan review and building permit stages of the development process.

2.2 Future Land Use

Future Land Use designation:

The rezoning request is:

☑ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:

The requested rezoning is consistent with the Low Density Residential designation. Low Density Residential supports up to 1-6 units per acre of single family residential use.

2.3 Urban Form

Urban Form designation:

☑ Not applicable (no Urban Form designation)
2.4 Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is Consistent 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. See Text Box: Evaluating Zoning Proposals and Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

The request is consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

**Policy LU 2.6 Zoning and Infrastructure Impacts:** Carefully evaluate all amendments to the zoning map that significantly increase permitted density or floor area to ensure that impacts to infrastructure capacity resulting from the projected intensification of development are adequately mitigated or addressed.

Existing city facilities appear to be able to accommodate changes in density from the requested rezoning.

**Policy LU 3.1 Zoning of Annexed Lands:** The zoning designation for newly annexed land into the City of Raleigh shall be consistent with the Future Land Use Map. In those cases where the annexed lands are within a special study area (as shown on the Future Land Use Map), a special study will need to be completed prior to zoning and development of the property.

The rezoning request is consistent with the Future Land Use Map designation; the property is compatible with the annexation process.

**Policy LU 3.4 Infrastructure Concurrency:** The City of Raleigh should only approve development within newly annexed areas or Raleigh’s ETJ when the appropriate transportation, water, stormwater, and wastewater infrastructure is programmed to be in place concurrent with the development.

The parcel is required to be annexed before city sewer and water infrastructure will be provided for the site. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the proposed rezoning area.

**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 Rezoning request will facilitate development which should increase connectivity between Johns Point Subdivision and the Griffis Glen Subdivision to the east of the site.

**Policy LU 5.1 Reinforcing the Urban Pattern:** 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.

New development will be constructed at the same scale, intensity, and dimensional requirements as the surrounding cluster subdivisions.
**Policy LU 8.5 Conservation of Single Family Neighborhoods:** 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.

The requested rezoning would develop vacant underutilized land, and help preserve the low density residential character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

**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.

The rezoning would facilitate development on a vacant lot that is currently detracting from the character of the surrounding single family neighborhoods.

**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 rezoning would permit development intensities and dimensional requirements that are consistent with the adjacent properties.

**Policy T 2.3 Eliminating Gaps:** Eliminate “gaps” in the roadway system and provide a higher roadway grid density that will increase mobility options and promote the accessibility of nearby land uses.

The proposed rezoning will facilitate development that eliminates gaps in the roadway network by extending public street stubs between Johns Point and Griffis Glen at the time of development.

### 2.5 Area Plan Policy Guidance

The rezoning request has no applicable area plan guidance.

### 3. Public Benefit and Reasonableness Analysis

#### 3.1 Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning

- Development of vacant property.
- Increased connectivity will be established at the time of development.
- The development will reflect the surrounding neighborhoods low density single family character

#### 3.2 Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning

- None Anticipated
4. Impact Analysis

4.1 Transportation
The Z-7-2017 site is located 1/2 mile northeast from the intersection of Rock Quarry Road and Battle Bridge Road; it lies between the Johns Pointe and Griffis Glen subdivisions. The existing parcel is vacant; it is surrounded by single family residential neighborhoods on the north, east and west. The adjoining parcel to the south is undeveloped.

There are no City of Raleigh CIP projects or state STIP projects planned in the vicinity of the Z-7-2017 site.

There are three public street stubs abutting the boundaries of the Z-7-2017 parcel. These existing stubs will be extended into the site to provide an interconnected network of streets. The alignment of these new public streets has not been determined but the typical block perimeter in the adjoining subdivisions ranges from 1,500 feet to 2,500 feet.

The existing parcel generates no traffic. Approval of case Z-7-2017 would increase average peak hour trip volumes by less than 20 veh/hr in the AM and PM peak periods; daily trip volume will increase by less than 200 veh/day compared to the current R-4 zoning. A traffic impact study is not required for case Z-7-2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-7-2017 Existing Land Use (Vacant)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z-7-2017 Current Zoning Entitlements (Residential Single family, detached)</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-7-2017 Proposed Zoning Maximaums (Residential Single family, detached)</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-7-2017 Trip Volume Change (Proposed Maximums minus Current Entitlements)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Identified: None

4.2 Transit
This area is not currently served by transit. Neither the City of Raleigh Short Range Transit Plan nor the Wake County Transit Investment Study call for service in this neighborhood however they do call for new service along Barwell Rd and for service be extended along Rock Quarry Rd between Barwell and Battle Bridge.

Impact Identified:
Increased development will create additional demand for transit in what is currently an unserved area. Transit is expected to extend to the general area within the next 3 years. Although the neighborhood will be out of our standard walking distance of 1/3 mile, transit will be available ~3/4 mile away.

4.3 Hydrology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterbody</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain</td>
<td>No FEMA Floodplain present but Alluvial soils are present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Basin</td>
<td>Neuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Subject to stormwater regulations under Article 9 of UDO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Identified: none
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>22,500</td>
<td>39,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>39,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Identified:**

The proposed rezoning would add approximately 3500 GPAPD or 39,445 gpd to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the City. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the proposed rezoning area.

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.

Verification of water available for fire flow is required as part of the Building Permit process. Any water system improvements recommended by this analysis to meet fire flow requirements will also be required of the Developer.

4.5 Parks and Recreation

1. There are no existing or proposed greenway trails, easements, corridors or connectors within or adjacent to this site. Nearest accessible access point is 3.0 miles to Neuse River Trail.

2. Site is south of a proposed greenway neighborhood trail. Connection to this proposed trail is via Bunker Hill Drive and or Marshlane Way. Providing pedestrian access from this site to is recommended to achieve greenway access. There is no design or funding for this proposed trail connection.

3. Recreation access is provided at Barwell Road Park, accessible distance is 1.6 miles. Barwell Road Park is currently in the Master Planning Process and should be adopted late summer 2017. Providing connectivity to the adjacent neighborhoods is a goal of the planning process.

4. Barwell Road Park was developed in 2006 in coordination with Barwell Road Elementary School. The park site is 54.5 acres. The 30,000-square foot community center provides a variety of programs for all ages and is the focus of the park. Exterior amenities on park property are limited to a half-mile walking loop west of the community center and school. Citizens do have access to the elementary school’s playground, multipurpose field, and play courts outside of school hours.

**Impact Identified: None**

4.6 Urban Forestry

1. The subject parcel is larger than two acres in size and is subject to UDO Article 9.1 Tree Conservation when a site development plan is submitted.

2. The provided 3501 Barwell Rd boundary survey may not be correct. I cannot find that the tree conservation areas (TCA) on the parcel have been recorded. If they haven’t been recorded, remove them from the boundary survey. If they have been recorded, provide correct book of maps references for all areas on the parcel shown as TCAs.
3. Other than my comment 2 above, the proposed rezoning would not impact any TCA required by the UDO.

Impact Identified: None

4.7 Designated Historic Resources
The site is not located within or adjacent to a National Register Historic District and/or a Raleigh Historic Overlay District. It does include or is adjacent to any National Register individually-listed properties and/or Raleigh Historic Landmarks.

Impact Identified: None

4.8 Community Development
Site is not located in a designated redevelopment plan area

Impact Identified: None

4.9 Impacts Summary
- Public street stubs will be required to be extended onto the site.
- Water verification for fire flow will be needed.
- Downstream sewer capacity study may be requested.
- Development will create an increased demand for transit in a planned service area.
- The boundary survey provided for tree conservation areas may not be correct.

4.10 Mitigation of Impacts
- Designate areas of right-of-way dedication to extend the street network at the site plan review phase.
- Verification of water as part of the building permit process.
- A Downstream Sewer Study may be requested at the site plan review phase.
- Transit will be extended to the general area within the next three years. The site however will remain out of the standard 1/3-mile walking distance for transit.
- If tree conservation areas (TCA) have not been recorded remove them from the boundary survey. If they have been recorded provided the correct book of maps references for all areas on the parcel shown as TCAs.

5. Conclusions
The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map. The increase in density is comparable to what would have been permitted under the original Johns Pointe Cluster Subdivision, and what is currently entitled for the surrounding properties. Development will improve a vacant site that impedes connectivity and detracts from the character of the surrounding neighborhoods. The property is located in the cities ETJ. Annexation is required before the developer can connect to city sewer and water infrastructure. At the time of development infrastructure impacts relating to street connectivity, fire flow requirements, and Downstream Sewer Capacity will need to be addressed by the developer.
Rezoning Application

Department of City Planning | 1 Exchange Plaza, Suite 300 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2626

REZONING REQUEST

☐ General Use    ☐ Conditional Use    ☐ Master Plan
Existing Zoning Classification R-4 (and sliver R-6-CU)
Proposed Zoning Classification Base District R-6 Height N/A Frontage N/A

If the property has been previously rezoned, provide the rezoning case number: not available

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

Sketch Plan 494398 Trans # 499298 Rezoning Preapp 1/6/2017

GENERAL INFORMATION

Property Address 6611 Paint Rock Lane, Raleigh, NC Date 5/7/2017
Property PIN 1732-60-1818 Deed Reference (book/page) 16246 / 527
Nearest Intersection Bunker Hill Drive & Madeline Way Property Size (acres) 11.27

Property Owner/Address First National Bank of Pennsylvania
3600 Glenwood Ave, Ste 300
Raleigh, NC 27612
Phone 919-659-9015 Fax

Email

Project Contact Person/Address Steve Gurganus, AICP
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice
555 Fayetteville St, Ste 1100, Raleigh, NC 27601
Phone 919-755-2141 Fax 919-755-6041

Email sgurganus@wcsr.com

Owner/Agent Signature

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transaction #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning Case #</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. Site is designated Low Density Residential on the Future Land Use map which allows R-2, R-4 and R-6 zoning districts.

2. Adjacent existing subdivisions to the West, North and East all have similar size lots to the proposed R-6 zoning request.

3. Site is not identified on the Urban Form Map

4. 

PUBLIC BENEFITS

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

1. Site is currently vacant having stopped mid construction approximately ten years ago. Large piles of rock and soil make the property a potentially dangerous hangout. Finishing the development will remedy this situation.

2. 

3. 

4. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Historic Resources</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Transaction #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rezoning Case #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

None known

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

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

N/A
Pre-Application Conference
(this form must be provided at the time of formal submittal)

Development Services Customer Service Center | 1 Exchange Plaza, Suite 400 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2495 | efax 919-996-1831
Litchford Satellite Office | 8320 – 130 Litchford Road | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-4200

**PROCESS TYPE**

- [ ] Board of Adjustment
- [ ] Comprehensive Plan Amendment
- [ ] Rezoning
- [ ] Site Review*
- [ ] Subdivision
- [ ] Subdivision (Exempt)
- [ ] Text Change

* Optional conference

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

Date Submitted: January 3, 2016

Applicant(s) Name: Michael J. Kane, PE

Applicant’s Mailing Address: PO Box 1006, Apex, NC 27502

Phone: 919 249-8587

Email: mkane@capitalcivil.com

Property PIN #: 1732-60-1818

Site Address / Location: 6611 Paint Rock Ln

Current Zoning: R-4

Additional Information (if needed):

Per DDS meeting we would like to rezone to R6 which would better match the surrounding existing subdivisions.

**OFFICE USE ONLY**

Transaction #: 499298

Date of Pre-Application Conference:

Staff Signature
CERTIFIED MAIL: RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

YADKIN BANK
3600 GLENWOOD AVE STE 300
RALEIGH NC 27612-4955

Re: Notice of required public neighborhood meeting to discuss proposed rezoning of 6611 Paint Rock Lane formerly known as John’s Pointe Phase 4.

Dear Adjacent Property Owner:

This letter shall serve as the required notice of a public meeting scheduled to discuss the potential rezoning of 6611 Paint Rock Lane, formerly known as John’s Pointe Phase 4. Currently the site is zoned R-4 and we are seeking rezoning to R-6 to better match the existing subdivision lots surrounding the site. Rezoning is necessary as the prior subdivision plans have expired and we must now seek approval under the current City of Raleigh Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

This meeting is scheduled to occur at the Barwell Road Community Center, 5857 Barwell Park Drive, Raleigh NC 27610 in room MPR 2 on Thursday the 19th day of January 2017 from 6:30 pm to 7:30 pm.

Inquiries regarding this public meeting may be directed to my attention at the contact information listed above. More specific information available at the Department of City Planning, 919 996-2626, rezoning@raleighnc.gov or visit the city’s web portal at www.raleighnc.gov.

Please call me with any questions.

Michael J. Kane, P.E.
Capital Civil Engineering, PLLC
SUMMARY OF ISSUES

A neighborhood meeting was held on January 19, 2017 (date) to discuss a potential rezoning located at 6611 Paint Rock Lane (property address).

The neighborhood meeting was held at Barwell Community Center (location).

There were approximately 1 (number) neighbors in attendance. The general issues discussed were:

Summary of Issues:

Ms. Williams was interested to know the size of the homes to be built. Also if there would be any models or spec homes built.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kane - CCE</td>
<td>1011 Pemberton Hill Rd 502203 Apex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latonia Williams</td>
<td>3840 Caregaren Drive 27610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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