Property: 8211 & 8225 Louisburg Rd

Size: 4.28 acres

Existing Zoning: Wake County HD

Requested Zoning: RX-3-CU
TO: Ruffin L. Hall, City Manager

FROM: Ken Bowers AICP, Director; Donald Belk AICP, Planner II

DEPARTMENT: City Planning

DATE: September 17, 2019

SUBJECT: City Council agenda item for October 1, 2019 – Z-13-19

On August 20, 2019, City Council authorized the public hearing for the following item:

**Z-13-19: 8211 & 8225 Louisburg Road**, near the intersection of Louisburg Road and Leland Drive.

**Current zoning**: Highway District (HD)(Wake County).

**Requested zoning**: Residential Mixed Use-Three Stories-Conditional Use (RX-3- CU).

The request is **consistent** with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

The request is **inconsistent** with the Future Land Use Map.

The **Planning Commission** recommends **approval** in a vote of 7 to 0.

The **Forestville CAC** supports **approval** in a vote of 10 to 9 (June 11, 2019).

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-13-19 – 8211 & 8225 LOUISBURG ROAD

Location
Northeast Raleigh, approximately midway between the intersection of Louisburg Road and Ligon Mill Road and Louisburg Road and Forestville Road. Approximately 2.7 miles north of the Louisburg Road/I-540 intersection, and approximately 0.7 miles north of the Neuse River Greenway.

Address: 8211 & 8225 Louisburg Road
PINs: 1747295817, 1747298944

Current Zoning
HD (Wake County)

Requested Zoning
RX-3-CU

Area of Request
4.28 acres

Corporate Limits
The site is located along Louisburg Road near the intersection of Leland Drive. It is not within the corporate limits or ETJ and will require annexation for Raleigh zoning to be applied.

Property Owner
VBBSS Group, LLC

Applicant
Chad W. Essick
Poyner Spruill LLP
301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1900
Raleigh, NC 27601

Citizens Advisory Council (CAC)
Forestville

PC Recommendation Deadline
September 9, 2019

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CONDITIONS (REVISED 7/31/2019)

1. Prohibits the following uses: boardinghouse, dormitory, fraternity, emergency shelter type B and overnight lodging – all types.

2. Maximum density limited to 15 dwelling units per acre.

3. A Zone A, Type 2 Protected Yard, with landscaping and fence details, is specified for the site’s boundary with HD-Wake County and R-6 zoning.

4. A minimum 40-foot setback from the existing right-of-way of Louisburg Road is specified.

5. The parking setback shall be a minimum of 40 feet with parking allowed along the primary access drive to the property.
6. To meet the intent of the Parkway frontage requirement, a protective yard with an average width of 50 feet is specified. No part of the protective yard shall be less than 10 feet.

7. The Property shall not have to comply with block perimeter requirements.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GUIDANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
<th>Low Density Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form</td>
<td>Parkway Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consistent Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 2.6 - Zoning and Infrastructure Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 5.4 – Density Transitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 5.6 – Buffering Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 8.1 – Housing Variety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 8.5 – Conservation of Single-Family Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inconsistent Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 1.2 – Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 1.3 – Conditional Use District Consistency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 4.5 - Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>March 6, 2019; Six (6) persons in attendance</td>
<td>Forestville: May 10, 2019 (Presentation)</td>
<td>June 11, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 11, 2019 (Vote: 10 in favor, 9 opposed)</td>
<td>June 27, 2019 (PCCOW) August 13, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

☒ The rezoning case is Inconsistent with the relevant policies in the Comprehensive Plan, but Approval of the rezoning request is reasonable and in the public interest due to changed
circumstances as explained below. Approval of the rezoning request constitutes an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to the extent described below.

| Reasonableness and Public Interest | The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map. It is compatible with the area, which is a mix of single-family residential, townhome developments, as well as retail and commercial uses at the Forestville Village Mixed-use Activity Center. The proposal will enable development of a constrained site and add to the housing stock of the area. The applicant has addressed many of the concerns of neighbors through conditions to mitigate the impacts of increased residential density. |
| Change(s) in Circumstances | |
| Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan | If approved, the Future Land Use Map will be amended as to the subject parcels only, from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. |
| Recommendation | Approval |
| Motion and Vote | Motion: Lyle  
Second: Tomasulo  
In Favor: Jeffreys, Lyle, Novak, Tomasulo, Geary, McIntosh, and Winters. |
| Reason for Opposed Vote(s) | |

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Staff report  
2. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Analysis  
3. Rezoning Application  
4. Revised conditions  
5. Citizen correspondence

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.

August 13, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Planning Commission Chair</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Staff Coordinator: Don Belk: (919) 996-4641; Donald.Belk@raleighnc.gov
OVERVIEW

The site is located in northeast Raleigh approximately equidistant between the intersection of Louisburg Road with Ligon Mill Road and Louisburg and Forestville Road, about five miles south of the Town of Rolesville. Presently, the proposed rezoning site is vacant and zoned Highway District (HD, Wake County). The site is wooded and slopes to the southeast, with steeper grades along a stream that runs north to south along the eastern portion of the property.

To the west lies a single-family residential neighborhood (also zoned HD). It dates from the late 1980’s and consists of 26 lots on approximately 17.6 acres, a density of approximately 1.48 units per acre. A vacant tract with a pond lies to the north of the proposed rezoning site. The site is bordered on the south by Louisburg Road (US-401). The Highland Creek townhome development lies to the east and was built in 2013-2014. It consists of 136 units on 13.8 acres, a density approximately 10 units per acre. The site adjoins properties zoned R-6-CU to the north and east.

The site is not annexed and is adjacent to Raleigh’s extraterritorial jurisdiction. Annexation will be required for City of Raleigh zoning to be applied. An annexation petition (AX-08-2019) is pending and will be presented to City Council concurrently with the zoning request.

The site is constrained by a lack of potential street or pedestrian connections; future development of the tract would be accessed from Louisburg Road.

The site is presently zoned HD-Highway District (Wake County). This zoning is primarily intended for residential uses, but it also allows public & civic uses such as schools, churches, libraries, governmental buildings, and day care. The HD zoning permits retail/convenience stores with gasoline sales by right. Several types of non-residential uses, including vehicle repair, service, and sales, telecommunications towers, light manufacturing, warehousing, C&D landfills, and ‘all other’ retail sales and services’ are allowed with a Special Use Permit.

The proposal would reduce the present (HD) entitlement for retail from 55,931 square feet to 4,000 square feet but would increase the residential entitlement from six units (about 1.5 units/acre) to 64 units (maximum per applicant’s condition of 15 units per acre).
Update for August 13, 2019

On June 11, 2019, the Planning Commission voted to defer this case to the Committee of the Whole, per Planning Commission bylaws requiring such review for cases that are inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map and the Comprehensive Plan.

At the PCCOW meeting of June 27, 2019, discussion was focused on the revised conditions submitted by the applicant on June 17. The revised conditions stipulated that an undisturbed protective yard with an average width of 50 feet shall be provided along the site’s frontage of Louisburg Road. This condition meets the intent of the Parkway Frontage requirement, and thus brought the proposal into compliance with Urban Form Map.

The PCCOW recommended that the proposal return to the Full Planning Commission with a recommendation to approve at their August 13 meeting.

Following the PCCOW meeting, the applicant submitted revised conditions on July 31. The revised conditions (1) clarified which properties were defined as ‘Adjacent Properties (Condition #3); (2) reduced the building setback and the parking setback from the existing right of way on Louisburg Road from 50 feet to 40 feet (Conditions #4 and #5) to better adapt to the physical constraints of the site; and (3) relieve the applicant from compliance with block perimeter requirements (Condition #7). Staff recommends more precise wording of the condition to aid future site review and permitting. While limiting connectivity with zoning conditions is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies T2.4, T2.5, and T2.6, staff recognizes that site characteristics make street connections extremely challenging.

OUTSTANDING ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Revise Condition #7 with more precise wording to aid future site review and permitting.</td>
<td>1. Submit revised Condition #7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Zoning

Z-13-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>8211 &amp; 8225 Louisburg Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>4.28 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>Wake County HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Zoning</td>
<td>RX-3-CU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>8211 &amp; 8225 Louisburg Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>4.28 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>Wake County HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Zoning</td>
<td>RX-3-CU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Property Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>8211 &amp; 8225 Louisburg Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>4.28 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>Wake County HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Zoning</td>
<td>RX-3-CU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location:** Urban Form Z-13-2019

[Map of the property area with labels and coordinates]
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?

The request is consistent with the Expanding Housing Choices theme, as the proposed rezoning could provide new housing for residents, specifically townhouse or apartment building types in an area of predominantly detached house building types.

The request is consistent with the Coordinating Land Use and Transportation vision theme which calls for coordinating transportation investments with desired land use patterns to plan more effectively for housing, employment and retail uses, and for public services. The request for RX-zoning supports this theme by providing for higher density residential development adjacent to a mixed-use activity center and along a major transportation corridor. However, the site lacks connectivity with adjoining sites and ingress/egress would be limited to Louisburg Road.

The request is consistent with the Growing Successful Neighborhoods and Communities theme, which calls for accommodating new growth while conserving our unique neighborhoods. This proposal would allow for the development of new housing at a constrained site.

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

No. The site is designated on the Future Land Use Map as Low Density Residential, which generally applies to single-family residential neighborhoods where overall gross densities range from 1 to 6 units per acre.

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 proposed use could be established without adversely altering the character of the area. There is an existing townhome development adjacent to the site along Louisburg Road, and the site is near the Forestville Village mixed-use activity center with a mix of retail and commercial uses. Adjoining single-family residential exists on large, deep lots and the required Neighborhood Transition would further distance new development from this area.

D. Will community facilities and streets be available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property?

Yes. Community facilities and streets appear sufficient to serve the proposed use.
Future Land Use

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

The rezoning request is

- [ ] Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.
- [x] Inconsistent

The proposal to rezone to Residential Mixed Use (RX-) will permit building densities in excess of the 1-6 units per acre recommended by the property’s Future Land Use designation of Low Density Residential.

Urban Form

**Urban Form designation:**

The rezoning request is

- [x] Consistent with the Urban Form Map.
- [ ] Inconsistent
- [ ] Other (no Urban Form designation)

Louisburg Road is designated as a Parkway Corridor on the Urban Form Map. Of Parkway Corridor’s the 2030 Comprehensive Plan says:

> These are corridors where multi-modal access is not emphasized, and a heavily landscaped approach to street frontage is either called for in adopted plans or represents the prevailing character of the area. A suburban approach to frontage is recommended.

> Site constraints make strict compliance with the Parkway Frontage difficult. However, a new condition to this proposal will provide a frontage with an average width of 50 feet, meeting the intent of the Parkway Frontage requirement. The proposal is consistent with the Urban Form Map.

Compatibility

The proposed rezoning is

- [x] Compatible with the property and surrounding area.
- [ ] Incompatible.

Presently, the area surrounding the proposed site is a mix of single-family residential, townhome developments, as well as retail and commercial uses at the Forestville Village Mixed-use Activity Center. The immediately adjacent neighborhoods to the west and north
will require a transition on the proposed site. There is a vacant parcel (containing a draining pond) between the proposed site and the single-family neighborhood along Lyman Drive and Althorp Drive. The Highland Creek townhome development adjoins the site to the east, and the proposal site lies near a Mixed-Use Activity Center. Careful design and placement of the planned residential development, along with the required Neighborhood Transition, will lessen the impact of the use on the adjoining, single-family residential properties. A condition of this rezoning request specifies that the required Zone A transition will include a Type 2 protective yard with evergreen species for any additional required understory and shade trees, plus the required fence will have a minimum height of seven (7) feet. This will provide additional separation between existing residential areas and new development and mitigate the visual impact from adjoining residential properties.

**Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning**

- The proposal would add to the variety of housing stock in this area of the city.
- The proposal would facilitate development of a constrained site.

**Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning**

- The proposal would result in a residential development along a major highway that would be accessible by only a single entrance off the road and would be unconnected to other streets or pedestrian infrastructure, and unserved by transit.

**Policy Guidance**

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

**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.

- The proposal would not adversely impact existing water infrastructure capacity and would result in a lower trip generation than the existing zoning. The proposal would increase the residential entitlement from 6 to 64 units, but the retail entitlement would reduce from 55,931 square feet to 4,000 square feet.

**Policy LU 5.4 – Density Transitions**

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.
Policy LU 5.6 – Buffering Requirements
New development adjacent to areas of lower intensity should provide effective physical buffers to avoid adverse impacts. 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.

- The proposal will provide a transitional density and intensity between the R-6-zoned areas to the north or the low density (HD, Wake County) area to the west. Low- to medium-density residential development and/or low impact office uses would be more in keeping with Policy LU 5.4. This request also removes the existing significant retail entitlement. Furthermore, the applicant has conditioned the proposal to a maximum density of 15 units per acre, which conforms to the standard for medium density residential. A Neighborhood Transition will be required on the western and northern boundaries of the site, and the proposal has been conditioned to provide a Type 2 protective yard with evergreen species and a seven (7) foot fence to provide more separation and lessen the visual impact that may result from new development.

Policy LU 8.1 – Housing Variety
Accommodate growth in newly developing areas of the City through mixed-use neighborhoods with a variety of housing types.

- The proposal for Residential Mixed Use (RX-) zoning would allow for a variety of housing types.

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 proposal would allow the development of a constrained site with Medium Density Residential development; an appropriate transition to Low Density Residential areas.

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 proposed zoning (RX-3-CU) is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map, which designates this area as Low Density Residential. The residential entitlement under RX would yield ten times the maximum number of residential units allowed under the current zoning, with a higher density (15 units/acre) than recommended for this designation (1-6 units per acre).

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

- The conditions proposed in the request are inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as they would permit a residential density (15 units/acre) that would exceed the recommended maximum (6 units/acre) for Low Density Residential.
Policy LU 4.5 – Connectivity
New development, redevelopment, and infrastructure investment should provide pedestrian and vehicular connectivity between individual development sites to provide alternative means of access along corridors.
- Given the existing adjacent development pattern, this proposal is unlikely to provide additional pedestrian or vehicular connectivity between individual development sites. This condition makes it challenging for development of the site to address this policy.

Area Plan Policy Guidance
The rezoning request is consistent with the following Area Plan policies:

There is no area plan guidance for this site, however the Forestville Village Area Plan is located on the south side of U.S. 401/Louisburg Road, with a core area on the east and west side of Forestville Road. The Village center Plan provide urban design policies to establish a pedestrian-oriented street system that interconnects with surrounding existing and future residential neighborhoods. The intent of the plan is to guide development patterns in order to create a walkable streetscape with buildings and their principal entry fronting a public sidewalk along the street system identified on the attached map.

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 Horseshoe Farm Nature Preserve (2.4 miles) and Berkshire Downs West Park (3.8 miles).
3. Nearest existing greenway trail access if provided by Neuse River Greenway Trail (0.9 miles).
4. Current park access level of service in this area is graded a D letter grade.
5. This area is considered a high priority for park land acquisition or park development.

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 gpd</td>
<td>104,871 gpd</td>
<td>47,500 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>0 gpd</td>
<td>104,871 gpd</td>
<td>47,500 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Identified:

1. The proposed rezoning would add approximately 47,500 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

| Floodplain               | No FEMA floodplain present |
| Drainage Basin          | Neuse                      |
| Stormwater Management   | Subject to stormwater regulations under Article 9 of UDO. |
| Overlay District        | none                       |

Impact Identified: none

Transit

There is no existing transit service within walking distance to the Z-13-19 site.

Impact Identified: None
Transportation

1. **Location.** The Z-13-19 site is currently located in Wake Forest, North Carolina, northeast of I-540 along Louisburg Road.

2. **Area Plans.** The Z-13-19 site is not located within any area plans, planned transit facilities, or school speed zones.

3. **Street Plan.** The subject site fronts Louisburg Road, which is designated as a 6-lane, divided avenue in the Raleigh Street Plan. Louisburg Road is maintained by NCDOT.

4. **Block Perimeter.** In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for RX-3 zoning districts is 3,000 ft. The existing block perimeter, bounded by Ligon Mill Road, Hartham Park Avenue, Leland Drive, and Louisburg Road is approximately 13,700 ft. The site's frontage along Louisburg Road is characterized by challenging topography, which may have implications for where a new public street shall be connected.

Conditions 7 submitted on July 31, 2019 states, “The Property shall not have to comply with any block perimeter requirements set forth in UDO, including but not limited to, UDO Section 8.3.2.” This condition was submitted with letter from Joshue T. Reinke, PE of Ramey Kemp & Associates, Inc., providing the information required by UDO section 10.2.4.E.2.c. Staff recommends more precise wording of the condition to aid future site review and permitting. While limiting connectivity with zoning conditions is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies T2.4, T2.5, and T2.6, staff recognizes that site characteristics make street connections extremely challenging.

5. **Access.** Access to the site will be via Louisburg Rd. For the entirety of the site frontage, there is an existing grass median on Louisburg ranging in width from 30-ft to 40-ft. It is anticipated that development of this site will either require a break in the median or right-in, right-out only access points. This may increase the number of U-turn movements taking place at the intersection of Louisburg Road, Ventura Circle, and Lowell Ridge Road. This intersection is unsignalized.

6. **Pedestrian Facilities.** There are no sidewalks along Louisburg Road in the vicinity of the Z-13-19 site. The nearest signalized crossing is approximately 1/3 of a mile east, where Leland Drive intersects with Louisburg Road. There are mixed-commercial land uses located by this intersection that may serve as an amenity to residents in these surrounding neighborhoods. There have been no recent pedestrian crashes by the site.

7. **Bicycle Facilities.** There are no on-street nor separated bicycle facilities on Louisburg Road. The Long-Term Bike Plan calls for a separated bikeway on Louisburg Road. There have been no recent bicycle crashes near the site. The Neuse River Greenway trail is approximately 3/4 of a mile southwest of the site. It does not currently connect to Louisburg Road. It does connect to Ligon Mill Road and there is a Greenway project currently in design to connect the trail to Mitchell Mill Road as well.

8. **Transit.** There is no existing transit service within walking distance to the Z-13-19 site.
9. **Other Projects in the Area.** There is an NCDOT project (U-5748) to improve the intersection of Louisburg Road, Ligon Mill Road, and Mitchell Mill Road. It plans to reduce congestion and improve vehicular traffic conditions along Louisburg Road. The project limits include the Z-13-19 site frontage and extend both eastward and westward. The preliminary designs are complete with construction planned to start in the Summer of 2020.

The City of Raleigh also has a Capital Improvements Program (CIP) project to widen Mitchell Mill Road southwest of the subject site. Construction on that project is substantially nearly complete.

10. **TIA Determination.** There are site context triggers that affect the Z-13-19 site. There were 2 fatal or disabling crashes at the intersection of Louisburg Road and Perry Creek Road in the past 3 years. This intersection is over a mile southwest of the site. Access to the site will be via Louisburg Road, which is defined as a Major Street in the Raleigh Street Plan. Access may also require a median crossover. Lastly, the site fronts an active transportation project.

Still, this rezoning is anticipated to reduce potential trip generation. Refer to the below table for the change in trip generation anticipated under approval of this rezoning case. Approval is not expected to negatively impact conditions at nearby intersections nor the surrounding transportation network. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) may be more pertinent at the Administrative Site Review or the Subdivision phases of development, when the plan for development is more defined. As such, the TIA requirement is waived for rezoning case Z-13-19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-13-19 Trip Volume Change</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Residential</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Maximums</td>
<td>-752</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Identified: None.**
Urban Forestry

Tree conservation areas will be required at the time of development plan submittal per UDO 9.1.

Impact Identified: None.

Impacts Summary

The proposed rezoning will have minimal impacts on road infrastructure. Potential impacts to sewer infrastructure will be ascertained if a downstream sewer capacity study is required upon development plan submittal.

Mitigation of Impacts

A traffic impact analysis is not required. Any measures for mitigating the impact on water and sewer infrastructure will be identified during the analyses required prior to development.

CONCLUSION

This is a proposal to rezone 4.28 acres from Highway District (HD; Wake County) to Residential Mixed Use-3 Stories-Conditional Use (RX-3-CU). The request would allow the development of a constrained site and increase the variety and stock of housing in the area. The proposal is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map, but additional conditions have been provided to bring the proposal to consistency with the Urban Form Map and the 2030 Comprehensive Plan overall.

CASE TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/11/19</td>
<td>Application submitted with conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/19</td>
<td>Proposal presented to the Forestville CAC</td>
<td>Applicant is scheduled to return for a vote by the CAC on June 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/2019</td>
<td>Proposal voted on by Forestville CAC</td>
<td>Vote: 10 in favor; 9 opposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2019</td>
<td>Discussion by the Committee of the Whole (COW)</td>
<td>Referred to the August 13, 2019 Planning Commission meeting with a recommendation for approval. Vote: 9 in favor, 0 opposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX

## SURROUNDING AREA LAND USE/ ZONING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT PROPERTIES</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>WEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>HD (Wake County)</td>
<td>R-6-CU</td>
<td>R-6-CU</td>
<td>HD (Wake County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Private Open Space</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>US-401 (Louisburg Road)</td>
<td>Residential (Townhomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CURRENT VS. PROPOSED ZONING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING ZONING</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>HD (Wake County)</td>
<td>RX-3-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density:</td>
<td>1.4 du/ac</td>
<td>15 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. # of Residential Units</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Building SF</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>16,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Office SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Retail SF</td>
<td>55,931</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Industrial SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential F.A.R</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</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.*
OVERVIEW

The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) requires an amendment to change the designation for 8211 & 8225 Louisburg Road to achieve consistency between the map and the rezoning request for a Residential Mixed Use (RX) base district. The map currently designates the parcels for Low Density Residential, which envisions predominately single-family residential uses. The FLUM district corresponding to the RX rezoning request for 15 units/acre is Medium Density Residential, which applies to garden apartments, townhomes, condominiums, and suburban style apartment complexes RX-zoning with a three- or four-story height limit is appropriate for these areas.

List of Amendments

1. Amend the Future Land Use Map for 8211 & 8225 Louisburg Road from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential.
Z-13-19: Required Amendment to the Future Land Use Map

Existing Designation: Low Density Residential

Proposed Designation: Medium Density Residential
# Rezoning Application

**Department of City Planning** | 1 Exchange Plaza, Suite 300 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2682

## Rezoning Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Use</th>
<th>Conditional Use</th>
<th>Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RX</td>
<td>Height 3</td>
<td>Frontage N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning Base District</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Overlay(s) N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning Base District</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Overlay(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: N/A

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

583147

## General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date Amended (1)</th>
<th>Date Amended (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Address**: 8211 Louisburg Road and 8225 Louisburg Road

**Property PIN**: 1747295817; 1747298944

**Deed Reference (book/page)**: Book 11905, Page 0433

**Nearest Intersection**: Louisburg Road and Ventura Circle

**Property Size (acres)**: 4.28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(For PD Applications Only) Total Units</th>
<th>Total Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Owner/Address**

VBBSS Group, LLC
2601 Sherborne Place
Raleigh, NC 27612

**Project Contact Person/Address**

Poyner Spruill LLP
Chad W. Essick
301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1900
Raleigh, NC 27601

**Phone**: see below  **Fax**: see below

**Email**: see below

**Owner/Agent Signature**: [Signature]

**Phone**: (919) 783-2896  **Fax**: (919) 783-1075

**Email**: cessick@poynerspruill.com

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

Zoning Case Number Z-13-19

Date Submitted July 31, 2019

Existing Zoning HD - Wake County Proposed Zoning RX-3-CU

Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

The following principal uses listed in Allowed Principal Use Table (UDO Sec. 6.1.4) shall be prohibited: (i) medical - all types; (ii) office - all types; (iii) overnight lodging - all types; (iv) personal service - all types; (v) eating establishment; and (vi) retail sales - all types; and (vii) boardinghouse, dormitory, fraternity and emergency shelter type B.

2. The maximum density of dwelling units on the property shall not exceed 15 dwelling units per acre.

For purposes of this zoning condition, the following properties shall be defined as "Adjacent Properties": 1. PIN: 174729179 (DB 121201, PG 1037); 2. PIN: 1747292902 (DB 4554, PG 229); 3. PIN: 1746201983 (DB 6892, PG 202); 4. PIN: 1748001177 (DB 16009, PG 226); 5. PIN: 1748100050 (DB 10908, PG 321); and 6. PIN: 1748208468 (DB 14387, PG 677). In those areas along the Adjacent Properties where a Neighborhood Transition under UDO Section 3.5 is required: (i) a Type Z protective yard pursuant to UDO Section 3.5.3.B shall be provided in Zone A; (ii) any additional undisturbed and shaded space that must be planted to satisfy the landscaping requirements shall be an evergreen species; and (iii) the required fence along the Adjacent Properties shall be a minimum of seven (7) feet in height.

4. The building setback from the existing right-of-way for Louisburg Road (U.S. Hwy 401), as shown on Highway Map 0004, Pages 235 and 236, Wake County Registry, shall be a minimum of forty (40) feet.

The parking setback from the existing right-of-way for Louisburg Road (U.S. Hwy 401), as shown on Highway Map 0004, Pages 235 and 236, Wake County Registry, shall be a minimum of forty (40) feet; provided that, parking shall be allowed within said 40 foot setback so long as such parking is located along the primary access drive to the property and west of the existing City of Raleigh Sanitary Sewer Easement (DB 14066, PG 959) that runs parallel to Louisburg Road (U.S. Hwy 401).

An undisturbed protective yard with an average width of fifty (50) feet shall be provided along the frontage of Louisburg Road (U.S. Hwy 401); provided that, no portion of the protective yard shall be less than ten (10) feet in width. The protective yard set forth in this condition may be located immediately adjacent to the right-of-way regardless of any public or private easements located on the property and breaks for pedestrian and vehicle access and ground signs are allowed within the protective yard.

7. The Property shall not have to comply with any block perimeter requirements set forth in UDO, including but not limited to, UDO Section 8.3.2.

8.

9.

10.

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 ___________________________

Samir J. Patel, Manager of VBBSS Group, LLC
July 31, 2019

Chad W. Essick  
Poyner Spruill LLP  
301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1900  
Raleigh, NC 27601  
cessick@poynerspruill.com


Subject:  Transportation and Block Perimeter Assessment

Dear Mr. Essick:

This letter provides the interpretation from a traffic standpoint of Ramey Kemp and Associates, Inc. (RKA) regarding the block perimeter requirements set forth in Section 8.3.2 of the City of Raleigh’s Unified Development Ordinance (“UDO”) and the City Council’s ability to accept zoning conditions that alter the maximum block perimeter standards pursuant to Section 10.2.4.E.2.c of the UDO.

It is our understanding that if the block perimeter requirement cannot be met, a city street that stubs out for future connection can be provided as an effort to potentially satisfy the block perimeter requirement in the future. For the two parcels (8211 & 8225 Louisburg Road) that are the subject of zoning case Z-13-19, both are surrounded by existing developments that do not have existing stub-outs in which the proposed parcel could connect. In fact, to the north are two existing storm water ponds that serve residential development that was recently constructed. To the east, is an existing and built out low-density residential subdivision, where the rear of the lots back up to the subject parcels. All of these lots are located within Wake County’s territorial jurisdiction. Whether the future internal site roadway network is constructed as a private street or as a city street with a stub-out, it will still not be able to connect to the neighboring parcels unless one or more of the surrounding developments or homes are deconstructed and entirely re-developed. With this understanding, whether the proposed roadway is a city street that technically meets the block perimeter requirement by providing a stub-out that will likely never be connected to, or is a private street which would not technically meet the block perimeter requirement, the functionality of both roads would have the same level of safe, efficient and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access within developments and between adjacent developments and the private road would not adversely affect traffic congestion more than a public road would.

Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, the applicant’s proposed zoning condition altering the maximum block standards such that the parcels would not have to comply with the block perimeter requirements would provide the same functionality and level of safe, efficient and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access within developments and between adjacent developments, and the same level of traffic congestion as the parcels would if they met the block perimeter by means of providing a public street with a stub out.
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.

The subject property is located outside of Raleigh's corporate limits as well as the City's planning and zoning jurisdiction. Nonetheless, the property is identified on the City's Future Land Use Map as Low Density Residential. A review of the City's FLUM shows that Low Density Residential has been mapped on virtually every parcel of land located outside the City's planning and zoning jurisdiction and appears to serve as more of a placeholder rather than an evaluation of future land use patterns along a corridor (Louieburg Road) that is designated as an Avenue, 6 Lane Divided on the City's Street Plan Map.

The proposed rezoning would allow a higher residential density than what is contemplated by the Low Density Residential designation, however, the proposed rezoning is consistent with the FLUM insofar as the existing Highway District (Wake County) zoning would allow by right certain nonresidential uses such as retail sales (with or without gas sales) as well as other nonresidential uses with a special use permit such as animal shelters, gas stations, office uses, self-storage, vehicle sales and repair and industrial warehousing. The proposed rezoning would eliminate these as potential uses of the property and ensure the property is primarily developed for residential uses which is more consistent with the FLUM designation.

The rezoning request is consistent with, among others, the following Comprehensive Plan policies: LU-2.2 (Compact Development); LU-2.3 (Recommended Height Designations); LU-2.6 (Zoning and Infrastructure Impacts); LU-3.4 (Infrastructure Concurrency); LU-5.1 (Reinforcing the Urban Pattern); LU-5.4 (Density Transitions); LU-7.3 (Single Family Lots on Major Streets); LU 8.11 (Development of Vacant Sites); PU-1.1 (Linking Growth and Infrastructure); PU-2.1 (Utility Service Extensions Outside the City); PU-2.2 (Utility Extension Beyond Raleigh's Jurisdiction).

PUBLIC BENEFITS

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

The rezoning request will benefit the public by facilitating the development of the subject properties, which have been difficult to develop given certain site constraints. The annexation, rezoning, and development of these properties will benefit the public by increasing the City's tax base, allowing connections to be made to existing City sewer infrastructure located on the property and by providing additional opportunities for more dense housing along a major corridor.

The rezoning request is reasonable because the properties front along Louieburg Road, a significant north/south major street designated as an Avenue 6-Lane Divided on the City's Street Plan Map. Retail and residential development has been approved directly to the north and east of the properties, and the properties directly to the west and south are currently zoned Highway District under Wake County zoning, which allows a broad mix of uses by right and with a special use permit.

The rezoning request benefits the public, and neighboring property owners, because the request would eliminate certain nonresidential uses allowed under existing County zoning, leaving the properties more consistent with existing residential development in the area.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transaction #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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.

There are no historic resources located on the Property.

## PROPOSED MITIGATION

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

N/A
URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

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 660 feet. Where commercial driveways are used to create block structure, they should include the same pedestrian amenities as public or private streets.
Response:
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>A properly defined urban open space is visually enclosed by the fronting of buildings to create an outdoor &quot;room&quot; that is comfortable to users. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>New public spaces should provide seating opportunities. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Parking lots should not dominate the frontage of pedestrian-oriented streets, interrupt pedestrian routes, or negatively impact surrounding developments. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Convenient, comfortable pedestrian access between the transit stop and the building entrance should be planned as part of the overall pedestrian network. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 6-8 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>
<tr>
<td>General Requirements – Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>YES</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</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>
PROPOSED REZONING

+/- 4.28 Acres – 8211 Louisburg Road and 8225 Louisburg Road

REPORT OF MARCH 6, 2019 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

In accordance with Section 10.2.4 of the Unified Development Ordinance, a neighborhood meeting was held with respect to this proposed rezoning case at 5:30 p.m. on March 6, 2019, at the Anne Gordon Center for Active Adults at Millbrook Exchange Park, 1901 Spring Forest Road, Raleigh, NC 27615. Attached as Exhibit A is a list of those persons and organizations contacted about the meeting. Those persons and organizations were mailed a letter of invitation concerning the meeting, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B. The letters were mailed on or about February 22, 2019, via first class mail.

Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a list of individuals who attended the meeting on March 6, 2019. A summary of the items discussed at the meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

Respectfully submitted this the 10th day of April, 2019.

Chad W. Essick
Attorney for Petitioner
EXHIBIT A

LIST OF PROPERTY OWNERS TO WHOM NOTICES WERE SENT

WESTMORELAND, ROOSEVELT III
WESTMORELAND, MYRA
3300 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9389

GUERRIERO, JOHN M
3412 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

FAGG, ERIKA CHRISTINE
FAGG, TYLER BRANDON
3404 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC
RS FINCHER
PO BOX 1117
APEX NC 27502-3117

NC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
815 STADIUM DR
DURHAM NC 27704-2713

RIDOUT, JAMES DEAN
RIDOUT, TERECA J
3416 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

MORAVCIK, DONALD J
MORAVCIK, HEIDI D
3413 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

ACEVEDO, ALEXANDRA
3417 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

HART, GERALD B
HART, JEANNE C
3409 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

AL-AWAR, SHADY
4512 SANDY WOODS DR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-6867

DEL ROSARIO SANCHEZ, RONNY RAMON
DEL ROSARIO, INELLIS
8181 COHOSH CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343

TA, VICK
5505 PEAKTON DR
RALEIGH NC 27614-9707

THURMAN, MICHAEL S
THURMAN, SHARMON S
8186 COHOSH CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

SINGLETON, GLORIA D
8178 COHOSH CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

SUKNIDI, Nzunga
MADIAMBA, VUNDA
8174 COHOSH CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

VBBSS GROUP LLC
8156 SOMMERWELL ST
RALEIGH NC 27613-6975

BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC
RS FINCHER
PO BOX 1117
APEX NC 27502-3117

MINES, ALTON L
WINSTON, LISA
8177 COHOSH CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343

RABURN, MICHAEL
8173 COHOSH CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343

ESTEVES, LIS
ESTEVES, ISAAC
8170 COHOSH CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347
EZEWUZIE, BONAVENTURE
EZEWUZIE, SYLVIA
7203 MONARDA CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-8697

PENNICOTT, JULIET M
LEWIS, SHERINE
7814 BRAEFIELD DR
RALEIGH NC 27616-3315

AMH 2015-1 BORROWER LLC
30601 AGOURA RD STE 200
AGOURA HILLS CA 91301-2148

MASSEY, JESSICA C
MASSEY, JORDAN D
7211 MONARDA CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-8697

ESTEVES, BENJAMIN
ESTEVES, ELIDA PEREZ
7215 MONARDA CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-8697

GODWIN, PATRICIA PERRY
GODWIN, TIMOTHY CHARLES
7219 MONARDA CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-8697

ESTEVES, BENJAMIN
ESTEVES, ELIDA PEREZ
7215 MONARDA CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-8697

PROGRESS RESIDENTIAL 2015-3 BORROWER LLC
PO BOX 4090
SCOTTSDALE AZ 85261-4090

MAZI, FELIX FRANK
7220 MONARDA CT
BRENTWOOD NC 27616-8696

BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC
RS FINCHER
PO BOX 1117
APEX NC 27502-3117

OLSZEWSKI, MATTHEW W
7223 MONARDA CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-8697

MEJIAS, HENRY R
SOLANO, ANA L
7227 MONARDA CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-8697

BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC
RS FINCHER
PO BOX 1117
APEX NC 27502-3117

ROGER HONBARRIER INVESTMENTS INC
6588 WAKEFALLS DR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-6296

BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC
RS FINCHER
PO BOX 1117
APEX NC 27502-3117

RYAN, JAMES J
RYAN, VALERIE G
3332 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9389

HIGHLAND CREEK MASTER ASSOCIATION INC
CHARLESTON MANAGEMENT CORP
PO BOX 97243
RALEIGH NC 27624-7243

CLARK, GREGORY H
CLARK, WENDY C
9805 PINE MEADOW LN
RALEIGH NC 27615-1549

BAREFIELD, RONALD LEE
3348 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9389

RIVERA, CESAR MCKINNES
RIVERA, JODI L
4360 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8459
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOGAN, WILLIAM JOSEPH</td>
<td>4364 LYMAN AVE</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27616-8459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODMEN PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>2249 THE CIR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27608-1447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRUSO, DAVID</td>
<td>CRUSO, SILVIA</td>
<td>4368 LYMAN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIRUMALLA, SHRAVAN K</td>
<td>SHIRUMALLA, MEENA</td>
<td>107 WILLIAM HENRY WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDFORD, DEREK A JR</td>
<td>LEDFORD, ASHLEY M</td>
<td>4361 LYMAN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUZAFFOUR, ADIL</td>
<td>BOuirane, SOUKAINA</td>
<td>4367 LYMAN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALMBERG, DION JOSEPH</td>
<td>COLOPY, JESSICA</td>
<td>3401 VENTURA CIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDSON, MARKEISHA R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLSON, KEVIN A</td>
<td>CARLSON, NICOLE S</td>
<td>4400 LYMAN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAHEEL, MAMDOUNH MASSIH</td>
<td>TOUMAS, MARI GAD ABDEL</td>
<td>4373 LYMAN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZILLIOUX, MATTHEW</td>
<td>ZILLIOUX, DANIELLE</td>
<td>4401 LYMAN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASU, DEEPTA</td>
<td>CHAKRABORTY, PAROMITA</td>
<td>4216 CLAYA DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEYER, NANCY E</td>
<td>3405 VENTURA CIR</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALMBERG, DION JOSEPH</td>
<td>COLOPY, JESSICA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRNER, ANDREW M</td>
<td>4404 LYMAN AVE</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27616-8461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSTOVYV, RUSLAN</td>
<td>BORUG, OLHA</td>
<td>4408 LYMAN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHLAND CREEK MASTER</td>
<td>CHARLESTON MANAGEMENT CORP</td>
<td>4409 LYMAN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDAZZO, PHILIP</td>
<td>RANDAZZO, MILA M</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE, SUSAN D</td>
<td>4419 LYMAN AVE</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS, BRAD M</td>
<td>WILLIAMS, ERIN</td>
<td>4220 CLAYA DR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEAN, JAMES R.  
4224 CLAVA DR  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8464

HOUNG, SEAN L  
HO, THERESA  
4412 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

DRAGOON, JONATHAN D  
DRAGOON, TRACEY A  
4416 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

RESTREPO, JULIAN D  
ORTIZ, VANESSA  
4425 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8462

NGUYEN, LEIGH  
PHAN, JENNIFER BICHCHAU  
4431 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8462

DAVIS, COREY C  
DAVIS, ALANA M  
4420 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

COZART, MICHAEL T JR  
COZART, MELODY L  
4424 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

SLACZKA, KAMIL  
WHITLEY, SARAH  
4428 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

RIVERA, ROGER A  
RIVERA, MARIA R  
1333 HERITAGE HILLS WAY  
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-4467

AMH PROPERTIES LP  
30601 AGOURA RD STE 200  
AGOURA HILLS CA 91301-2148

LYONS, COLLEEN SUZANNE  
LYONS, BRITTANY MICHELE  
4432 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

OSBORNE, SAMUEL A III  
SAMUEL OSBORNE III  
4436 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

ADAMS, MICHELLE A  
4440 LYMAN AVE  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

BRENCE, THOMAS JOSEPH  
BRENCE, LAUREN E  
3724 ALTHORP DR  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8456

JONES, ERIC D  
JONES, EMILY D  
3728 ALTHORP DR  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8456

HIGHLAND CREEK MASTER ASSN INC  
1225 CRESCENT GRN STE 250  
CARY NC 27518-8119

CHAPMAN, GLENN  
3902 TRESKO XING  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8469

WELLS, DIONNE M  
3806 TRESKO XING  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8475

COX, MEREDITH K  
COX, TRAVIS  
3808 TRESKO XING  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8475

THOMPSON, KYLE  
THOMPSON, CAROLYN  
3810 TRESKO XING  
RALEIGH NC 27616-8475
TOLAT, DHAIRYA K
TOLAT, NIPA D
422 WINDY PEAK LOOP
CARY NC 27519-1883

POON, SZE CHUNG
CHAN, CHI CHUNG
205 SUNSTONE DR
CARY NC 27519-7024

YU, JENNIFER O
YU, KRYSRALT
14039 34TH AVE APT 2R
FLUSHING NY 11354-3014

POJAWA, ANNA B
POJAWA, SLAVIC
25726 AVENIDA PEDRIGAL
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO CA 92675-4422

MAANV LLC
840 RIVER SONG PL
CARY NC 27519-0878

PANCHAL, AMAR M
1455 HUNTERS RUN DR
BOURBONNAIS IL 60914-4521

VICTORY BUILDING LLC
817 CALCOT DR
COPPELL TX 75019-6610

JEGLINSKI, MELISSA A
4005 Tresco Xing
RALEIGH NC 27616-8473

SAMS PROPERTIES LLC
501 GRAY MARBLE RD
MORRISVILLE NC 27560-6752

PATEL, KRUNAL
PATEL, RUSHIKABEN
83 SWEETBERRY CT
ALPHARETTA GA 30005-6449

KUNAMNENI, NAGESHWARA R
KUNAMNENI, BHARAMAMBA
42427 CHAMOIS CT
STERLING VA 20166-2239

THE TOWNHOMES AT HIGHLAND CREEK
ASSN, INC
PO BOX 97243
RALEIGH NC 27624-7243
EXHIBIT B

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTICE

To: Neighboring Property Owners

From: Chad W. Essick

Date: February 20, 2019

Re: Notice of meeting to discuss potential annexation and zoning of property located at 8211 and 8225 Louisburg Road, containing approximately 4.49 acres, having PIN Nos. of 1747295817 and 1747298944 (the “Property”)

Dear Neighboring Property Owner:

A neighborhood meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 6, 2019 at 5:30 PM at the Anne Gordon Center for Active Adults at Millbrook Exchange Park, 1901 Spring Forest Road, Raleigh, NC 27615. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the potential annexation and zoning of approximately 4.49 acres located at 8211 and 8225 Louisburg Road. The Property is currently located in Wake County’s jurisdiction and is zoned Highway District under Wake County’s zoning regulations. The rezoning would seek to change the zoning from the County’s Highway District to the City of Raleigh’s Residential Mixed Use (RX) District. Essentially, the primary purpose of the annexation and zoning request would be to allow more residential units to be developed on the Property while limiting the commercial development that could be developed under the existing County zoning. At the meeting, the nature of the rezoning request will be discussed and questions and comments will be received.

The City of Raleigh requires a neighborhood meeting involving the owners of property within 500 feet of the Property prior to filing a rezoning application. You are not required to attend, but are certainly welcome if you would like to learn more about the proposed rezoning.

Please do not hesitate to contact me directly should you have any questions. I can be reached at (919) 783-2896 or cessick@poynerspruill.com. Also, for more information about rezoning, you may visit www.raleighnc.gov or contact the Raleigh Department of City Planning at (919) 996-2180 or rezoning@raleighnc.gov.
EXHIBIT C

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING ATTENDEES

1. Jessica Colopy
2. Beverly Baucom
3. Deborah Wilson
4. Joanne Braman
5. Janet Casteen
EXHIBIT D

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ITEMS

On Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 5:30 p.m., the applicant held a neighborhood meeting for property owners adjacent to the parcels subject to the proposed rezoning. The following items were discussed:

1. Existing County zoning for both properties
2. Proposed base zoning districts for both properties
3. Differences allowed between existing County zoning and proposed base City zoning districts
4. Issues related to traffic on Louisburg Road
5. Duration and steps in the rezoning process
### Conditional Use District Zoning Conditions

**Zoning Case Number**

**Date Submitted**

**Existing Zoning:** HD - Wake County  **Proposed Zoning:** RX-3-CU

### Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

1. The following principal uses listed in Allowed Principal Use Table (UDO Sec. 6.1.4) shall be prohibited: boardinghouse, dormitory, fraternity, emergency shelter type B and overnight lodging - all types

2. The maximum number of dwelling units on the property shall not exceed 15 dwelling units per acre.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

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: [Signature]  
Print Name: [Name]

Samir J. Patel, Manager of VBBSS Group, LLC
Mr. Belk,

I am writing to share my concerns about the proposed rezoning of 8211 and 8225 Louisburg Road. Louisburg Road is already a parking lot in the mornings and afternoons. It's my understanding that people living in these proposed apartments will only have the option of turning right onto Louisburg Road upon exit. When proposed residents come home in the evenings (north on Louisburg), it appears they will have to do u-turns at the Leland/Louisburg Rd intersection to get back to their apartments. This intersection was poorly designed from the beginning and adding this additional traffic will only result in more wrecks and congestion.

I am opposed to the rezoning.

Thanks,
Melissa Thomas
8305 Yaxley Hall Drive
Raleigh, NC 27616
Hi Donald,

I'm not sure if you are the person to contact but I got your information off a rezoning application that was sent from our HOA. I live in Highland Creek, off Lyman Avenue and received notification that someone is trying to put up apartments behind our house. We as well as our neighbors were told when we purchased our house that nothing was going to be built behind us. To find out this is in talks of happening is disappointing and upsetting. My husband and I are completely against the rezoning for apartments. Not only is it going to make our property value decrease but it is going to be a total eye sore to look out our back windows and see apartments. Traffic is already bad enough on 401 so it would only cause more issues with traffic. I know there is a meeting scheduled for Tuesday June 11th but we will be unable to attend. If there is someone else I need to send my concerns to I would be happy to email them as well.

Thank you,
Sarah Slaczka
PROPOSED REZONING

+- 4.28 Acres – 8211 Louisburg Road and 8225 Louisburg Road

REPORT OF MARCH 6, 2019 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

In accordance with Section 10.2.4 of the Unified Development Ordinance, a neighborhood meeting was held with respect to this proposed rezoning case at 5:30 p.m. on March 6, 2019, at the Anne Gordon Center for Active Adults at Millbrook Exchange Park, 1901 Spring Forest Road, Raleigh, NC 27615. Attached as Exhibit A is a list of those persons and organizations contacted about the meeting. Those persons and organizations were mailed a letter of invitation concerning the meeting, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B. The letters were mailed on or about February 22, 2019, via first class mail.

Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a list of individuals who attended the meeting on March 6, 2019. A summary of the items discussed at the meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

Respectfully submitted this the 10th day of April, 2019.

Chad W. Essick
Attorney for Petitioner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESTMORELAND, ROOSEVELT III</td>
<td>3300 VENTURA CIR</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTMORELAND, MYRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUERRIERO, JOHN M</td>
<td>3412 VENTURA CIR</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAGG, ERIKA CHRISTINE</td>
<td>3404 VENTURA CIR</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAGG, TYLER BRANDON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDOUT, JAMES DEAN</td>
<td>3416 VENTURA CIR</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDOUT, TERECA J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>815 STADIUM DR</td>
<td>DURHAM</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEVEDO, ALEXANDRA</td>
<td>3417 VENTURA CIR</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART, GERALD B</td>
<td>3409 VENTURA CIR</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART, JEANNE C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL-AWAR, SHADY</td>
<td>4512 SANDY WOODS DR</td>
<td>WAKE FOREST</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>27587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL ROSARIO SANCHEZ, RONNY RAMON</td>
<td>8181 COHOSH CT</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL ROSARIO, INELLIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA, VICK</td>
<td>5505 PEAKTON DR</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURMAN, MICHAEL S</td>
<td>8186 COHOSH CT</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURMAN, SHARMON S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLET ON, GLORIA D</td>
<td>8178 COHOSH CT</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUKIDI, NZINGA</td>
<td>8174 COHOSH CT</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADIAMBA, VUNDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBBSS GROUP LLC</td>
<td>8156 SOMMERWELL ST</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC</td>
<td>RS FINCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>APEX</td>
<td>27502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO BOX 1117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINES, ALTON L</td>
<td>8177 COHOSH CT</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RABURN, MICHAEL</td>
<td>8173 COHOSH CT</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTEVES, LIS</td>
<td>8170 COHOSH CT</td>
<td>RA LIE NC</td>
<td>27616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WALTON, PAMELA
8166 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

SMALLWOOD, WILLIAM
8162 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

RYAN, SEAN C
18333 HATTERAS ST UNIT 86
TARZANA CA 91356-1622

PROGRESS RESIDENTIAL BORROWER 4 LLC
PO BOX 4090
SCOTTSDALE AZ 85261-4090

SALTARES, RICHARD M
SALTARES, JESSICA
8161 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343

COLEMAN, COTTIE C
8157 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343

VASQUEZ, KELVIN
8158 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

TALIAFERRO, JOCELYN D
8154 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

LETH, STEPHANIE A
8153 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343

LONGACRE, JESSE
LONGACRE, JOLANDA
8147 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343

BOIS, JANNIE ELIZABETH
8150 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

AMH 2014-2 BORROWER LLC
AMERICAN HOMES 4 RENT
30601 AGOURA RD STE 200
AGOURA HILLS CA 91301-2148

SABILLON, OMARY MELISA
PAZ DEL, ROSARIO IVAN
8142 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

VBBSS GROUP LLC
8156 SOMMERWELL ST
RALEIGH NC 27613-6975

ALSTON, SHERICE M
8143 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343

BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC
RS FINCHER & COMPANY LLC
PO BOX 1117
APEX NC 27502-3117

HOLNESS, VELEAN
8138 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

BEKELE, SEBLEWENGEL
FRANKS, CHRIS EDWARD
8134 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3347

BRIGHTON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC
RS FINCHER
PO BOX 1117
APEX NC 27502-3117

OLIVERO, RAMON A JR
OLIVERO, JOANN CALES
8123 COHOŠ CT
RALEIGH NC 27616-3343
LOGAN, WILLIAM JOSEPH
4364 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8459

WOODMEN PROPERTIES LLC
2249 THE CIR
RALEIGH NC 27608-1447

CRUSO, DAVID
CRUSO, SILVIA
4368 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8459

SHIRUMALLA, SHRAVAN K
SHIRUMALLA, MEENA
107 WILLIAM HENRY WAY
CARY NC 27519-9368

LEDFORD, DEREK A JR
LEDFORD, ASHLEY M
4361 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8460

BOUZAFFOUR, ADIL
BOUIRANE, SOUKaina
4367 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8460

MALMBERG, DION JOSEPH
COLOPY, JESSICA
3401 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

RICHARDSON, MARKEISHA R
4376 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8459

CARLSON, KEVIN A
CARLSON, NICOLE S
4400 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

KAHEEL, MAMDOUH MASSIH
TOUMAS, MARI GAD ABDEL
4373 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8460

ZILLIOUX, MATTHEW
ZILLIOUX, DANIELLE
4401 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8462

BASU, DEEpra
CHAKRABORTY, PAROMITA
4216 CLAVA DR
RALEIGH NC 27616-8464

MEYER, NANCY E
3405 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

MALMBERG, DION JOSEPH
COLOPY, JESSICA
3401 VENTURA CIR
WAKE FOREST NC 27587-9390

KIRNER, ANDREW M
4404 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

MOSTOVYy, RUSLAN
BORUG, OLHA
4408 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8461

HIGHLAND CREEK MASTER ASSOCIATION INC
CHARLESTON MANAGEMENT CORP
PO BOX 97243
RALEIGH NC 27624-7243

RANDAZZO, PHILIP
RANDAZZO, MlA M
4409 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8462

BRUCE, SUSAN D
4419 LYMAN AVE
RALEIGH NC 27616-8462

WILLIAMS, BRAD M
WILLIAMS, ERIN
4220 CLAVA DR
RALEIGH NC 27616-8464
EXHIBIT B

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTICE

Poyner Spruill

To: Neighboring Property Owners

From: Chad W. Essick

Date: February 20, 2019

Re: Notice of meeting to discuss potential annexation and zoning of property located at 8211 and 8225 Louisburg Road, containing approximately 4.49 acres, having PIN Nos. of 1747295817 and 1747298944 (the “Property”)

Neighboring Property Owner:

A neighborhood meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 6, 2019 at 5:30 PM at the Anne Gordon Center for Active Adults at Millbrook Exchange Park, 1901 Spring Forest Road, Raleigh, NC 27615. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the potential annexation and zoning of approximately 4.49 acres located at 8211 and 8225 Louisburg Road. The Property is currently located in Wake County's jurisdiction and is zoned Highway District under Wake County's zoning regulations. The rezoning would seek to change the zoning from the County’s Highway District to the City of Raleigh’s Residential Mixed Use (RX) District. Essentially, the primary purpose of the annexation and zoning request would be to allow more residential units to be developed on the Property while limiting the commercial development that could be developed under the existing County zoning. At the meeting, the nature of the rezoning request will be discussed and questions and comments will be received.

The City of Raleigh requires a neighborhood meeting involving the owners of property within 500 feet of the Property prior to filing a rezoning application. You are not required to attend, but are certainly welcome if you would like to learn more about the proposed rezoning.

Please do not hesitate to contact me directly should you have any questions. I can be reached at (919) 783-2896 or cessick@poynerspruill.com. Also, for more information about rezoning, you may visit www.raleighnc.gov or contact the Raleigh Department of City Planning at (919) 996-2180 or rezoning@raleighnc.gov.
EXHIBIT C

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING ATTENDEES

1. Jessica Colopy
2. Beverly Baucom
3. Deborah Wilson
4. Joanne Braman
5. Janet Casteen
EXHIBIT D

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ITEMS

On Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 5:30 p.m., the applicant held a neighborhood meeting for property owners adjacent to the parcels subject to the proposed rezoning. The following items were discussed:

1. Existing County zoning for both properties
2. Proposed base zoning districts for both properties
3. Differences allowed between existing County zoning and proposed base City zoning districts
4. Issues related to traffic on Louisburg Road
5. Duration and steps in the rezoning process
Pre-Application Conference
Meeting Record

Transaction #: 583147  Meeting Date & Time: 1/25/19 1/25/19 10:30 AM

Location: One Exchange Plaza

Attendees: Jason Harlin, Kyle Little, Chad Erick

Parcels discussed (address and/or PIN): 8225, 8211 Louisburg Rd

Current Zoning: Wake County Highway District
Potential Re-Zoning: RX-3, R-10

CAC Chair/Contact Information: Forestville CAC

General Notes: Applicant would like to do multi-family with possibility of some retail. The site is outside city ETJ but it is contiguous and there is access to sewer and water. The future land use map designates the site as Low Density Residential which supports up to 1-6 units per acre. Property could be conditioned to limit the number of units on site. Would go to the Forestville CAC.

Department & Staff

Development Services
Justin Rametta
Justin.Rametta@raleighnc.gov
919-996-2665
Mike Walters
Michael.Walters@raleighnc.gov
919-996-2636
Walt Fulcher
Walt.Fulcher@raleighnc.gov
919-996-3517

Notes: For a vote, annexation will be concurrent with the rezoning. Must notify all property within 1000 ft of a neighborhood meeting.

UDO Sections: