**Existing Zoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>1217, 1219, &amp; 1221 Wake Forest Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>0.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>R-6 w/NCOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Zoning</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CERTIFIED RECOMMENDATION  
Raleigh Planning Commission

CASE INFORMATION Z-14-18 (MP-1-18)

| Location   | Wake Forest Road, west side, approximately 150’ south of Chestnut Street  
|            | Address: 1217, 1219, and 1221 Wake Forest Road  
|            | PIN: 1704-94-3693, 1704-94-4617, 1704-94-4741 |
| Request    | Rezone property from R-6 w/Mordecai-1 NCOD to PD |
| Area of Request | .5 acres |
| Corporate Limits | The subject site is located within the corporate limits and is surrounded by properties also within corporate limits. |
| Property Owner | Thomas C. Flynn III, Trustee, Charlie J. Griffin Revocable Trust |
| Applicant   | Molly Stuart, Daniel Robinson |
| Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) | Mordecai CAC |
| PC Recommendation Deadline | December 26, 2018 |

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY
The rezoning case is ☑ Consistent ☐ Inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

FUTURE LAND USE MAP CONSISTENCY
The rezoning case is ☐ Consistent ☑ Inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GUIDANCE

| FUTURE LAND USE | Moderate Density Residential |
| URBAN FORM | None |
| **CONSISTENT Policies** | Policy LU 5.1 Reinforcing the Urban Pattern  
Policy LU 5.2 Managing Commercial Development Impacts  
Policy LU 7.3 Single-Family Lots on Major Streets  
Policy T 2.9 Curb Cuts  
Policy ED 6.5 Lodging  
Policy HP 1.2 Cultural and Historic Resource Protection  
Policy HP 3.1 Adaptive Use  
Policy HP 3.2 Retention Over Replacement  
Policy HP 3.4 Context Sensitive Design  
Policy UD 1.1 Protecting Neighborhood Identity  
Policy UD 5.4 Neighborhood Character and Identity  
Policy UD 5.5 Areas of Strong Architectural Character |
**INCONSISTENT Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy LU 1.2 Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU 5.6 Buffering Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy UD 7.3 Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF STANDARDS (FROM CX STANDARDS)**

1) **Article 3.2 Base Dimensional Standards (setbacks).** For the south and west property lines, setbacks for the Apartment and General building types would be reduced. The PD would permit a side (south) setback consistent with the existing building, which is 5.4' for the primary building and 2' for the porch. It would permit a rear (west) setback of 1.8'.

*Existing code requirement: 0’ or 6’*

2) **Article 3.2 Base Dimensional Standards (setbacks).** For the north property line, the setback for the Open Lot building type would be reduced. The PD would permit a 3’ side setback for the existing parking canopy only.

*Existing code requirement: 10’*

3) **Article 3.2 Base Dimensional Standards (floor height).** The required floor height for the General Building type would be reduced to 7.5’ for all floors, consistent with the existing building.

*Existing code requirement: 11’ for ground floor; 9’ for upper floor*

4) **Article 3.5 Neighborhood Transitions.** These requirements would not apply to the property.

*Existing code requirement: 10’ minimum landscaped yard; 50’ transition area with no primary building, consistent with existing conditions on the property.*

5) **Article 7.1 Parking.** Vehicular spaces would be provided at a rate of .75/room. This generally reflects the existing amount of parking on the site, although the new parking would be provided in a slightly different location to the north.

*Existing code requirement: 1 space per room.*
6) **Article 7.1 Parking.** Parking lot design standards would be modified. No perimeter or interior islands would be provided. One shade tree would be provided.

*Existing code requirement: One perimeter island would be required along the north side of the parking lot. An interior island is required every 10 spaces, while the illustrations show a row of 11 spaces. As the parking area would be shifted north, this does not simply reflect existing conditions.*

7) **Section 7.3 Signs.** A minimum street frontage of 140’ would be required for a high-profile ground sign. The sign would be limited to being either the existing sign or a replica of an earlier version of the sign of a similar size.

*Existing code requirement: 200’ of street frontage required for a high-profile ground sign.*

8) **Article 8.3.5 Blocks, Lots, Access.** The development would be exempt from driveway spacing requirements. It would eliminate one of two existing driveways and include only one driveway.

*Existing code requirement: 200’ of spacing is required, although the code permits some form of access for all properties.*

9) **Article 8.5 Existing Streets.** A portion of the required sidewalk that would connect the parking area to the entrance to the main building – essentially the central portion of the site – would be constructed prior to a certificate of occupancy. The portions connecting that central portion to the properties to the north and south would be provided in the form of a fee in lieu to the city, which would make those connections as part of a future streetscape project along Wake Forest Road.

*Existing code requirement: The determination to allow a fee in lieu of construction is made through an administrative approval and typically involves the entire frontage. This provision would make this decision as part of the zoning approval.*

**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>April 4, 2018</td>
<td>Mordecai CAC 3/13/18; 5/8/18; 6/12/18 (Yes-95; No-1)</td>
<td>9/27/18 (COW) 10/9/18 (PC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

[Select one of the following and fill in details specific to the case.]

- The rezoning case is **Consistent** with the relevant policies in the Comprehensive Plan, and **Approval** of the rezoning request is reasonable and in the public interest.

- The rezoning case is **Consistent** with the relevant policies in the comprehensive Plan, but **Denial** of the rezoning request is reasonable and in the public interest.

- The rezoning is **Inconsistent** with the relevant policies in the Comprehensive Plan, and **Denial** of the rezoning request is reasonable and in the public interest.

- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasonableness and Public Interest</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Motion and Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Staff report and Transportation Impact Analysis
2. RDHC memo

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

_________________________  ____________  ____________________________  ____________  
Planning Director  Date  Planning Commission Chairperson  Date

Staff Coordinator: Jason Hardin: (919) 996-2657; jason.hardin@raleighnc.gov
**OVERVIEW**

The proposal seeks to rezone three parcels totaling 0.5 acres on the west side of Wake Forest Road, approximately a half-mile north of downtown. The site is the home of the Gables Lodge, a roadside inn that operated for several decades.

The lodge, which was a nonconforming use in the R-6 district that applies to the west side of Wake Forest Road on that block, ceased operations in recent years. Reestablishing that use would require rezoning. The proposal seeks to accommodate the lodging use and to account for the proposed use of existing buildings by rezoning the property to Planned Development. The PD zoning would use Commercial Mixed Use (CX) as a base, but prohibits all CX uses other than lodging and associated accessory uses. It would permit 19 total lodging units.

The property is part of the Mordecai Place National Register Historic District, which includes several blocks on the west side of Wake Forest Road north of downtown. The main house, which is located at 1217 Wake Forest Road, was built in the 1920s as a boarding house and is classified as a contributing building. The other site elements, including the rear building and the parking canopy, were added around 1970 and are not contributing structures.

The PD would retain and use both the main house and the rear building. Small additions of less than 800 square feet each would be constructed on the north and south sides of the rear building. CX setbacks require either a 0’ or 6’ or setback (a building can be built along the property line, but if it is not, it must be at least 6’ away in order to permit reasonable access). To accommodate the use of the existing buildings, the PD would modify the CX-required setbacks on the side and rear lot lines.

As noted above, the west side of the block is currently zoned R-6; the east side includes a mix of R-10, R-6, and OX-3-GR. NX-3-CU zoning is applied to a parcel immediately north of the block, on the north side of Chestnut Street. The area is also a part of the Mordecai Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District. The NCOD regulates lot size and width, front setbacks, and building height. The proposal would remove the NCOD, but would meet its front setback and height restrictions. The current lot configuration and site elements were in place when the NCOD was first applied.

The Future Land Use Map designates the west side of Wake Forest Road at the site and for a few blocks to the north and south as Moderate Density Residential, which would permit only a few commercial uses accommodated in RX zones. The east side, across from the subject property, is designated as Medium Density Residential. A node of Office and
Residential Mixed Use is located across the street from the southern portion of the block containing the subject property.

While the number of lodging units proposed goes beyond what would align with the Future Land Use Map, the PD proposal makes some efforts to achieve consistency with policies that address neighborhood context and commercial impacts. It limits the scale and hours of any accessory uses to the primary lodging use (specifying a maximum a 650-square-foot bar area and 100-square-foot retail area), limits overall square footage to 7,500, and relies heavily on reuse of the existing buildings. The retention of the existing buildings, particularly the main structure, provides consistency with several policies related to historic preservation and neighborhood context.

The PD zoning district permits modifications of some existing code requirements. The proposal includes several, which are outlined in the Proposed Modification of Standards section of this report.

Update for 10/9/18: A revised version of the PD submitted on September 25 addressed some issues mentioned in the previous staff report. Changes included increasing the rear setback to 2.25' and specifying that any new additions would come no closer to the rear (west) lot line than existing buildings. The revisions also addressed minor technical issues. The changes improved consistency with the Comprehensive Plan but did not lead to any specific policies being reclassified as consistent or inconsistent with the plan.

**OUTSTANDING ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


**Existing Zoning**

**Property**
1217, 1219, & 1221 Wake Forest Rd

**Size**
0.5 acres

**Existing Zoning**
R-6 w/NCOD

**Requested Zoning**
PD
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<tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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Master Plan Design Analysis

Setbacks/Build-to
The proposal would largely rely on existing buildings. Setbacks would align with existing structures to the south (side), the west (rear), and the east (front). The proposal also would allow the relocation of an existing parking canopy to within 3’ of the northern (side) lot line.

Height
The Apartment building would be limited to a maximum of 33 feet 6 inches in height, and all other structures would be limited to a maximum height of 23 feet, 10 inches.

Parking
The proposal would modify parking standards to require .75 spaces per lodging unit, rather than the one space per unit required for lodging uses.

Development Intensity
- Maximum of 7,500 square feet/19 lodging units.
- Maximum of 900 square feet of space accessory to lodging use (650 sf bar; 150 sf office; 100 sf retail). Any accessory space would count toward overall total.

Pedestrian Circulation
Sidewalks currently do not exist along the west side of Wake Forest Road in this area. A sidewalk would be added along the central portion of the property along the street. A fee in lieu would be provided for the remainder of the sidewalk, which would be provided as part of a future city project. ADA-compliant walkways would connect the sidewalk and parking lot with buildings on the site.

Phasing
The project would involve only one phase.

Open Space
A minimum of 10 percent of the overall development will remain as open space/amenity area.

Street Typology
Not applicable. The development would not include any new streets.

Building Types
The development would include one Apartment and one General Building, both of which are existing buildings.
**Common Signage Plan**
The proposal would allow one high-profile ground sign, which would either be the existing sign or a replica of the previous sign on the site. The only modification to CX standards related to signage is to allow the single existing or replica replacement high-profile ground sign on a site with less than 200’ of street frontage.

**Use of Existing Buildings**
The existing main building, garage, and canopy would be restored and preserved to the extent commercially reasonable and consistent with life safety, structural stability, and the lodge operations.

**Other Provisions: Music and Hours of Operation**
Live amplified music will not be permitted at any time.
No outdoor music is permitted after 9 p.m. Sunday through Thursday and 10 p.m. on Friday and Saturday.
Hours of operation for any accessory bar use will not exceed 11 p.m. on Sunday through Thursday and 1 a.m. on Friday and Saturday.

**Analysis of Master Plan Responses to General Design Principles**

*UDO Section 4.7.5. A-N provides a set of design principles that are to be used to evaluate PD rezoning applications.*

It should be noted that PD zoning is typically, though not always, applied to much larger sites. The small (.5 acre) site involved in this rezoning means that many of the principles are less applicable.

A. When at least 20 residential units are proposed, the project includes a variety of housing stock that serves a range of incomes and age groups, and may include detached houses, attached houses, townhouses, apartments and dwelling units above first floor commercial spaces.

*The proposal would not permit residential units; fewer than 20 lodging units would be allowed.*

B. Uses are compact and well-integrated, rather than widely separated and buffered.

*The site itself is compact (.5 acres), and is designed, through the means of retaining and reusing existing buildings, to complement adjacent structures.*
C. Compatibility among different uses is achieved through effective site planning and architectural design.

The proposal would allow only one use on a compact site.

D. A variety of business types are accommodated, from retail and professional offices to live/work. Office uses vary from space for home occupations to conventional office buildings. Retail uses range from corner stores to larger format supermarkets.

The proposal permits only one use on a compact site.

E. Special sites, such as those at a terminated vista, are reserved for public or civic buildings and spaces that serve as symbols of the community, enhancing community identity.

The plan area does not include any such sites. Instead, it seeks to blend into its context.

F. The project includes a variety of street types designed to be accessible to the pedestrian, bicycle and automobile. Streets are connected in a way that encourages walking and reduces the number and length of automobile trips.

Not applicable.

G. Bicycle circulation is accommodated on streets and on dedicated bicycle paths, greenways or trails with adequate bicycle parking facilities being provided at appropriate locations.

Not applicable.

H. Building facades spatially delineate the streets and civic spaces, and mask parking lots.

Because it relies on existing buildings that are set back from the street, the parking area will not be masked from the street. The plan could include additional provisions to screen the parking area.
I. Architecture and landscape design are based on the local climate, topography, history and building practice.

*The plan fundamentally bases its design on these factors, as it relies on the preservation and reuse of existing buildings.*

J. The project includes open space as a significant element of the project's design. Formal and informal, active and passive open spaces are included. Open spaces may include, but are not limited to, squares, plazas, greens, preserves, farmers markets, greenways and parks.

*The scale of the proposal is too small to incorporate a square or green or similar element, and the midblock context of the site makes it unsuited for such elements. The proposal does include a central open area that would be available to guests.*

K. The project is compatibly integrated into established adjacent areas, and considers existing development patterns, scale and use.

*The proposal, by relying on longstanding existing buildings and allowing the historic use of the site, clearly considers existing development patterns, scale, and use.*

L. The project is a clearly identifiable or legible place with a unique character or unique tradition.

*The small scale and the location of the site suggest that a more important consideration is for it to fit into its context rather than to stand apart from its surroundings. However, the reuse of the historic lodge building stands in contrast to many modern hotels and does, by comparison, tend to create a unique place.*

M. Public art, including but not limited to, monuments, sculpture and water features, is encouraged.

*No public art is indicated in the master plan.*

N. Entertainment facilities, including but not limited to, live music venues and theatres, are encouraged.

*The small scale of the project does not lend itself to dedicated entertainment facilities. However, unamplified live music may take place on the site.*
**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 proposal is consistent with numerous themes and policies of the plan, particularly the theme of Growing Successful Neighborhoods and Communities, which envisions that “new development will be accommodated ... through creative solutions that conserve our unique neighborhoods while allowing for growth and expanding our local businesses.” The proposal is consistent with several policies that support that theme, including policies relating to historic preservation, neighborhood identity and character, and commercial development impacts.

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

   The area is designated as Moderate Density Residential on the Future Land Use Map. That category generally translates to R-10 or RX zoning, both of which envision some overnight lodging uses. However, the number of lodging units envisioned -19 - mean the use would be classified as a Hotel, Motel, Inn, which is not a permitted use in RX and which, on a lot of this size, requires CX zoning.

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?

   As noted above, the use is not specifically designated on the FLUM. However, it can be established without adverse effects. Doing so would require limiting overall intensity, ensuring that buildings fit into the context, and addressing potential impacts of the use. By limiting the total number of lodging units, largely using existing buildings, and addressing other impacts, the proposal avoids adverse effects.

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

   Existing infrastructure is sufficient, as the rezoning would add little additional demand.
Future Land Use

Future Land Use designation: Moderate Density Residential

The rezoning request is:

☐ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☒ Inconsistent

The subject property is part of an area designated as Moderate Density Residential. That category does not envision commercial uses beyond the limited number of uses allowed in RX districts. While the Bed and Breakfast use, which is permitted in some circumstances in RX, is a form of overnight lodging, the number of lodging units (19) that would be permitted by the PD goes beyond what would be possible as a Bed and Breakfast use.

Urban Form

Urban Form designation: None

The rezoning request is:

☒ Not applicable

Compatibility

The proposed rezoning is:

☒ Compatible with the property and surrounding area.

The proposal would largely retain the existing built form of the site, which has existed in its current arrangement for several decades. The use reflects a historic use of the site, and the restrictions included as part of the proposal assist in achieving compatibility with adjacent properties.

Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning

- The rezoning would provide an additional lodging option in an area within close proximity to major institutions and attractions.

- The rezoning, by permitting a use that aligns with the existing buildings, provides more assurance that the historic fabric of the site would be maintained.
Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning

- The rezoning, while working to mitigate impacts from the proposed commercial use, could create greater impacts on nearby properties than would a residential use.

Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is consistent with the following policies:

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.

As the proposal largely retains existing buildings and includes only relatively small additions to a rear building, by its nature it reinforces the urban pattern now in existence.

Policy LU 5.2 Managing Commercial Development Impacts
Manage new commercial development using zoning regulations and through the conditional use zoning and development review processes so that it does not result in unreasonable and unexpected traffic, parking, litter, shadow, view obstruction, odor, noise, and vibration impacts on surrounding residential areas.

In terms of the physical impacts listed above – shadow, view obstruction and similar effects – the constraints imposed by the proposal, which essentially limits development to existing buildings, mean the impact is less than what could occur with residential zoning. Those constraints, along with limitations on noise and scale of any accessory uses, provide limits on other impacts as well.

Policy LU 7.3 Single-Family Lots on Major Streets
No new single-family residential lots should have direct vehicular access from major streets, in an effort to minimize traffic impacts and preserve the long-term viability of these residential uses when located adjacent to major streets.

Policy T 2.9 Curb Cuts
The development of curb cuts along public streets—particularly on major streets—should be minimized to reduce vehicular conflicts, increase pedestrian safety, and improve roadway capacity.
The proposal includes only one driveway and would eliminate a second curb cut. If the properties were developed as three or, in the event of a residentially-oriented rezoning, more separate detached housing units, several driveways could result, meaning that the proposal best minimizes impacts to pedestrians and vehicle operators.

**Policy ED 6.5 Lodging**
Work with developers, investors, and other local organizations to plan and provide diverse and accessible lodging and accommodations to support tourism growth.

*The proposal would add to the diversity of lodging options in an area close many of the city’s primary tourist attractions.*

**Policy HP 1.2 Cultural and Historic Resource Protection**
Identify, preserve, and protect cultural and historic resources including buildings, neighborhoods, designed and natural landscapes, cemeteries, streetscapes, view corridors, and archaeological resources.

**Policy HP 3.1 Adaptive Use**
Encourage adaptive use of historic properties to preserve cultural resources and conserve natural resources.

**Policy HP 3.2 Retention Over Replacement**
Encourage the preservation and rehabilitation of significant or contributing existing structures, favoring retention over replacement, especially in areas where other historic resources are present.

**Policy HP 3.4 Context Sensitive Design**
Use the existing architectural and historical character within an area as a guide for new construction.

*The proposal is consistent with these Historic Preservation policies and to a degree relies on them for overall consistency. The primary building is a contributing structure in a National Register district. By specifying that the building would be retained and that the small additions would not alter the context, the proposal meets the goals of retaining historic structures and achieving context-sensitive design.*

*Just as significantly, the proposal would allow a use – lodging – that aligns with the historic use of the property and that likely would not involve removal of at least some of the existing historic structure. Other uses, such as low-density residential uses permitted under current zoning, would be less likely to retain the entire structure.*
Policy UD 1.1 Protecting Neighborhood Identity
Use Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Districts (NCOD), Historic Overlay Districts (HOD), or rezonings to retain the character of Raleigh's existing neighborhoods and strengthen the sense of visual order and stability.

Policy UD 5.4 Neighborhood Character and Identity
Strengthen the defining visual qualities of Raleigh's neighborhoods. This should be achieved in part by relating the scale of infill development, alterations, renovations, and additions to existing neighborhood context.

Policy UD 5.5 Areas of Strong Architectural Character
Preserve the architectural continuity and design integrity of historic districts and other areas of strong architectural character. New development within such areas does not need to replicate prevailing architectural styles exactly but should be complementary in form, height, and bulk.

The proposal achieves consistency with these policies through its approach of retaining existing structures and including only small additions to the rear building.

The proposal would remove the existing Mordecai-1 overlay, which includes the following provisions:

Minimum lot size: 7,260 square feet.
Maximum lot size: 14,520 square feet.
Minimum lot width: 50 feet.
Maximum lot width: 100 feet.
Front yard setback: Minimum of 35 feet.
Maximum building height: 35 feet.

Depending on if and how any lot recombination occurs, the rezoning would not necessarily lead to the violation of any of those provisions, although the lot width and size provisions would be difficult to meet. The proposal would limit height to below the NCOD limit, and, by not allowing additions other than to the rear building, would meet the setback as well. More broadly, however, given that the proposal relies on existing buildings and small additions, it tends to meet the intent of this policy and the NCOD, which is to preserve the existing built environment and character of a neighborhood.
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 subject property is part of an area designated as Moderate Density Residential. That category does not envision commercial uses beyond the limited number of uses allowed in RX districts. While the Bed and Breakfast use, which is permitted in some circumstances in RX, is a form of overnight lodging, the number of lodging units (19) that would be permitted by the PD goes beyond what would be possible as a Bed and Breakfast use.*

**Policy LU 5.6 Buffering Requirements**
New development adjacent to areas of lower intensity should provide effective physical buffers to avoid adverse effects. Buffers may include larger setbacks, landscaped or forested strips, transition zones, fencing, screening, height and/or density step downs, and other architectural and site planning measures that avoid potential conflicts.

*The proposal is partly consistent with this policy in that it largely relies on existing buildings and limits uses in a manner that removes the need for significant transitions. Following the completion of the previous staff report, revisions to the PD application specified that buildings would not come closer to property lines than do the existing buildings, improving consistency with the policy. As the strength of the application lies in its use of existing buildings and general physical compatibility with its residential context, consistency with the policy could be achieved by addressing lighting by limiting it in a manner that more closely reflects typical lighting for residential properties in the area.*

**Policy UD 7.3 Design Guidelines (particularly #14)**
Parking lots should not dominate the frontage of pedestrian-oriented streets, interrupt pedestrian routes, or negatively impact surrounding developments.

*While this portion of the west side of Wake Forest Road currently lacks a sidewalk and may be difficult to currently categorize as a “pedestrian-oriented street,” plans call to install the missing sidewalk links. The site’s proximity to downtown and Person Street businesses suggests much higher degrees of future walkability. Given that, Design Guideline policies that support pedestrian activity by minimizing the presence or appearance of parking area along streets are relevant.*
In this case, the location of existing buildings prevents parking from being placed behind buildings. However, greater attention to screening the parking area would create consistency with this policy.

**Area Plan Policy Guidance**

The subject site is part of the area included in the Blount Street/Person Street Corridor Plan, which was approved in 2013. The plan did not contain land use policies relevant to the study area. It did include transportation-related policy and actions, which are discussed in the following section.

**Impact Analysis**

**Transportation**

The Z-14-2018 site is located within the beltline, northeast of downtown. The site is bounded by Wake Forest Road on the east and single-family houses on the other three sides. It is on the west side of the block between Chestnut Street and Poplar Street.

**Area Plans**

The Z-14-2018 site is located within the Mordecai neighborhood. The site is also within the Blount Street - Person Street Corridor Plan study area. The Blount Street - Person Street Corridor plan is a phased approach to balance a variety of land uses in the area and provide a safe and attractive corridor to motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. The study aims to manage vehicular speed and behavior along the corridor, which provides access to Downtown and other major regional destinations. There is an existing City of Raleigh project to implement the first phase of the Blount Street – Person Street Corridor Study. It will repave and restripe Wake Forest Road into a two-lane, divided avenue with a center turn lane and bike lanes. This project will be completed in 2018. Other future improvements to Wake Forest Road near the site are not funded at this time.

**Existing and Planned Infrastructure**

**Streets**

The Raleigh Street Plan shows Wake Forest Road as a two-lane, divided avenue.
In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for PD zoning is 4,000 feet. The block perimeter for Z-14-2018, as defined by public rights-of-way for Wake Forest Road, Chestnut Street, Mordecai Drive, and Poplar Street is approximately 2,200 feet.

Pedestrian Facilities

Sidewalks are currently located only on the east side of Wake Forest Road near the site. There has been a pedestrian crash near the site across Wake Forest Road in recent years. Development of this property will require construction of a sidewalk along the property frontage on the west side of Wake Forest Road. Additional amenities that should be considered for inclusion in the master plan include a pedestrian refuge crossing of Wake Forest Road at an appropriate location near the site.

Bicycle Facilities

Wake Forest Road is being improved to have bike lanes via the phased Blount Street – Person Street Corridor project.

Greenways

There are no existing or proposed greenways near the site.

Access

Site access will be provided via Wake Forest Road. The subject parcels have a combined road frontage of approximately 150 feet. According the Raleigh Street Design Manual, driveways accessing two-lane divided avenues must be spaced at least 100 feet apart. The Z-14-2018 site would be restricted to one access point, and the distance to adjoining properties' driveways would also need to be considered, unless a design exception is granted.

Other Projects in the Area

As previously discussed, there are improvements planned by the City of Raleigh for Wake Forest Road.
TIA Determination

Approval of case Z-14-2018 would increase average peak hour trip volumes by approximately 21 vehicles/hour in the AM peak and by approximately 21 vehicles/hour in the PM peak; daily trip volume will increase by about 226 vehicles/day. The site is proposed to be rezoned a Planned Development and thus as defined by the Raleigh Street Design Manual, a traffic study is required and has been completed for Z-14-2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-14-18 Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Lodging - Not Currently in Operation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-14-18 Current Zoning Entitlements</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-14-18 Proposed Zoning Maximums</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Development – Residential, Office, Overnight Lodging</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-14-18 Trip Volume Change (Proposed Maximums minus Current Entitlements)</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Identified: Small number of increased trips

Transit

The Z-14-2018 parcel is served by GoRaleigh Route 1, which provides frequent service on Wake Forest Road. GoRaleigh Route 3 is also nearby, with buses running every 30 minutes during peak travel periods. The lack of sidewalks on the west side of Wake Forest Road make safe and comfortable access to inbound transit a challenge.

In addition to a pedestrian refuge crossing of Wake Forest Road, transit stop infrastructure such as a shelter and/or a transit easement may also be considered. These improvements would serve as amenities to the site and the surrounding neighborhood while helping to reduce the number of vehicle trips into and out of the site. The proposed land use intensities do not meet the thresholds required by UDO section 8.11.2 for the provision of transit infrastructure, but may be considered as a way to increase the proposed Planned Development's consistency with adopted transportation plans.

Impact Identified: Increased transit demand
**Hydrology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floodplain</th>
<th>No FEMA Floodplain present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Basin</td>
<td>Pigeon House</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 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>1,250 gpd</td>
<td>13,229 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>0 gpd</td>
<td>1,250 gpd</td>
<td>13,229 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The proposed rezoning would add approximately 13,229 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.

Impact Identified: Increased demand for water and sewer

**Parks and Recreation**

1. This site is not impacted by any existing or proposed greenway trails, corridors, or connectors.
2. Nearest existing park access is provided by Mordecai Square Park (0.3 miles) and Mordecai Park (0.4 miles).
3. Nearest existing greenway trail access if provided by Little Rock Greenway Trail (1.4 miles).
4. Park access level of service in this area is considered to be above average.
5. This area is not considered a high priority for park land acquisition.

**Impact Identified: None**

**Urban Forestry**

Street tree determination will be made upon plan submittal to Development Services. Either street trees will be provided in the right of way, if allowed by NCDOT, or a C2 yard will be provided.

**Impact Identified: None**

**Designated Historic Resources**

The site is within the Mordecai Place National Register Historic District. The main house at 1217 Wake Forest Road is classified as a contributing structure. The other structures are noncontributing. Additional detail and analysis are contained in the attached memo from the Raleigh Historic District Commission.

The RHDC unanimously supported the rezoning proposal with accompanying comments, including:

- Strongly encouraging a careful and judicious approach to renovations to ensure the integrity of historic resources.
- Supporting the continuation of the site’s historic use as a lodging facility that is a part of an established neighborhood.

Other comments are included in the attached memo.

**Impact Identified: The proposal would preserve the existing structures and maintain the historic use of the property**

**Impacts Summary**

None that require mitigation.

**Mitigation of Impacts: N/A**
**Conclusion**

The proposal would permit a longstanding use at the site and reuse existing buildings. While it is not strictly consistent with the Future Land Use Map, the fact that it limits total development, includes provisions that would limit noise and accessory uses, and relies heavily on existing buildings brings the proposal into consistency with policies that encourage contextual development and minimizing impacts from commercial activity.

The reuse of the existing historic building and other structures associated with the historic use of the site help it tell a story of the property and align it with several historic preservation properties. Other uses for the site, including those possible under current zoning such as detached houses, would both likely mean the loss of at least some of the historic elements of the site, such as the rear of the main building, and would change the appearance of the area more than would the proposal. The proposal would remove the NCOD, but its provisions would essentially maintain the appearance of the site as it was at the time of the creation of the NCOD.

The proposal could achieve greater consistency with a few policies related to transitions and urban design with a few small changes, such as not permitting the rear building to extend closer to the west lot line, limiting lighting, and adding additional screening of the parking area. The proposal is consistent with many other policies, however, and on balance, it is consistent overall with the Comprehensive Plan.

**Case Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2018</td>
<td>Original submittal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 2018</td>
<td>Resubmittal</td>
<td>Added information about building types, eliminated all CX uses other than lodging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 2018</td>
<td>Resubmittal</td>
<td>Addressed outstanding completeness issues; added restrictions on accessory uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25, 2018</td>
<td>Resubmittal</td>
<td>Enlarged rear setback; addressed technical issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix

### Surrounding Area Land Use/ Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT PROPERTY</th>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>WEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>Mordecai-1 NCOD</td>
<td>Mordecai-1 NCOD</td>
<td>Mordecai-1 NCOD</td>
<td>Mordecai-2 NCOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant/ Multifamily</td>
<td>Single-unit living</td>
<td>Multifamily apartment</td>
<td>Single-unit living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form (if applicable)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current vs. Proposed Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks: Front:</td>
<td>35' (per NCOD)</td>
<td>Existing buildings (approx. 40')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South side:</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5' building/2' porch (per existing building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side:</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>3' for parking canopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>2.25' (existing building)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Residential Density: | 6 units/acre | - |
| Max. # of Residential Units | 3 units | - |
| Max. # of Lodging Units | 5 units | 19 units |
| Max. Gross Office SF | - | - |
| Max. Gross Retail SF | - | - |
| Max. Gross Industrial SF | - | - |

*The development intensities for proposed zoning districts were estimated using an impact analysis tool. The estimates presented are only to provide guidance for analysis.*
# 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>
<th>Existing Zoning Base District</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Overlay(s)</th>
<th>Mordecai NCOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Zoning Base District</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Overlay(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ExPD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></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, please provide the rezoning case number: **N/A**

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

- Pre-application meeting: 542401

## General Information

**Date**: May 8, 2018  
**Date Amended (1)**: July 25, 2018  
**Date Amended (2)**: September 7, 2018

**Property Address**: 1217, 1219, and 1221 Wake Forest Road

**Property PIN**: 1704-94-3693; 1704-94-4617; 1704-94-4741

**Deed Reference** (book/page): BK16-E PG2882

**Nearest Intersection**: Wake Forest Road and Chestnut Street

**Property Size (acres)**: 0.5

**Property Owner/Address**: Thomas C. Flynn, III, Trustee  
Charlie J. Griffin Revocable Trust  
510 Glenwood Ave, Apt. 605  
Raleigh, NC 27603

**Project Contact Person/Address**:  
Molly Staat, Staat Moreday Law Group  
421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 120  
Raleigh, NC 27601  
Dana Robinson  
229 Fleming Drive,  
Durham, NC 27712

**Owner/Agent Signature**:  
Email: fcs.tfllynn@gmail.com

**Phone**: 919-801-8878  
**Fax**: N/A

**Email**: drobinson@arcfl.com  
**Phone**: 919-890-3318  
**Fax**: N/A

**Email**: mstuart@morningstarlawgroup.com; drobinson@arcfl.com

---

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.

#### 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 FLUM recommends the properties be developed as Moderate Density Housing under the R-6, R-10, and RX districts. While the FLUM-recommended districts do not accommodate an overnight lodging use, the properties were developed as a boarding house around 1926, shortly after the 1922 subdivision of the majority of the surrounding neighborhood, which continued initial development through the early 1950s. The motor lodge operated on the site for decades and continued to be operated as such at the time of its 1998 designation as part of the Monticello Plaza Historic District (National Register of Historic Places). The neighborhood grew up around the motor lodge - a strong indicator of its compatibility.

The proposed rezoning is supported by numerous policies in the Comprehensive Plan, including LU 8.4 (Rehabilitation Before Demolition); ED 6.5 (Lodging); UD 1.1 (Protecting Neighborhood Identity); HP 1.2 (Cultural and Historic Resource Preservation); HP 2.4 (Protecting Historic Neighborhoods); HP 3.1 (Adaptive Use); and HP 3.2 (Retention Over Replacement).

#### PUBLIC BENEFITS

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

Because the original lodge is incompatible with more recent zoning on the property, the proposed rezoning promotes preservation of the site's original structures for their original use and prevent another tear down in one of the city's older neighborhoods.

Preservation of the Gables Lodge represents an opportunity for the city to retain an authentic Raleigh institution, adding interest and diversity for residents and visitors alike.
## Impact on Historic Resources

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

### INVENTORY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Resource Description</th>
<th>Impact of Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Gables Lodge property is located in the heart of the Mordecai Place Historic District as designated in the National Register of Historic Places. While existing zoning virtually assures the structures will be demolished and new, single-family, detached houses built in their place, the proposed zoning would permit preservation of the original structures as well as their previous use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSED MITIGATION

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

The proposed rezoning would have no negative impact on historic resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Requirements – Master Plan</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have referenced the Master Plan Checklist and by using this as a guide, it will ensure that I receive a complete and thorough first review by the City of Raleigh</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total number of units and square feet</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 12 sets of plans</td>
<td>x</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>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vicinity Map</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Existing Conditions Map</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Street and Block Layout Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General Layout Map/Height and Frontage Map</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Description of Modification to Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Development Plan (location of building types)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pedestrian Circulation Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Parking Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Open Space Plan</td>
<td>x</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>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Major Utilities Plan/Utilities Service Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Generalized Stormwater Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Phasing Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Three-Dimensional Model/renderings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Common Signage Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Neighboring Property Owner
From: Gables Lodge, LLC (Catherine Merritt and Daniel Robinson)
Date: March 21, 2018
Re: Notice of meeting to discuss potential rezoning of three parcels located south and west of the intersection of Wake Forest Road and Chestnut Street, containing approximately 0.50 acres, with an address of 1217-1221 Wake Forest Road, and having Wake County Parcel Identification Numbers 1704-94-3693, 1704-94-4617, and 1704-94-4741 (the “Property”)

Dear Neighbor,

We are Gables Lodge, LLC ("Gables Lodge"), the contract purchaser of the above-captioned Property - the Gables Motel Lodge on Wake Forest Road. Currently, the Property is zoned R-6 with a neighborhood conservation overlay district (NCOD). Gables Lodge is considering rezoning the Property to a Planned Development (PD) district. The purpose of the rezoning is to bring the historic hotel use of the property and existing building layout into conformity with the City's code.

As you may be aware, prior to our filing of a rezoning application, the City of Raleigh requires a neighborhood meeting inviting owners of property within 500 feet of the site. You are invited to attend this meeting to discuss the potential rezoning and ask any questions you may have about the process or our tentative plans. Our goal is to gather comments through your appearance at this neighborhood meeting or, alternatively, through your written comments to the City of Raleigh Planning Director. After the meeting, we will prepare a report for the Raleigh Planning Department regarding the items discussed.

We have scheduled this meeting with surrounding property owners for April 4th, 2018, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Historic Mordecai Visitors Center classroom located at 1101 Wake Forest Road in Raleigh.

Please do not hesitate to contact us directly should you have any questions or wish to discuss any issues. We can be reached at info@gableslodgemercial.com. Also, for more information about rezoning, you may visit www.raleighnc.gov or contact the Raleigh City Planning Department at 919-996-2682 or rezoning@raleighnc.gov.

We look forward to seeing you on April 4th.

## SUMMARY OF ISSUES

A neighborhood meeting was held on **April 4, 2018** to discuss a potential rezoning located at **1217, 1219, and 1221 Wake Forest Road**. The neighborhood meeting was held at **1101 Wake Forest Road** (location). There were approximately **28** neighbors in attendance. The general issues discussed were:

### Summary of Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food service</td>
<td>Food service was discussed, and the applicant clarified that while the lodge will not contain a restaurant, limited prepared food and beverages, such as pastries and coffee, will be available, and a kitchen will be available for events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room rates</td>
<td>Room rates were discussed and will vary by season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign conversion and sight distances</td>
<td>The current plan is to keep the existing sign, and the applicant is open to moving or raising the sign to improve sight distances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD zoning</td>
<td>The effect of PD zoning was discussed, in particular the difference between the PD district and a simple CX district and the types of project details than can be governed through a master plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overflow parking</td>
<td>Overflow parking was discussed, and the applicant indicated he is working with nearby property owners to provide additional parking. The issue of an existing problem with people parking on Chestnut Street too close to Wake Forest road was also noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
<td>Building height was discussed, and nothing to be constructed will exceed the max. existing building height on the site. Screening will be provided, in the form of fencing, hedging, and/or window frosting, to prevent upper floor guests from seeing into the back yard to the south of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage issues</td>
<td>Neighbors noted the existence of drainage issues in the area and expressed a desire to work collaboratively with the applicant to address the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Neighbors questioned the plan for lighting, and the applicant promised to work to minimize impact on neighboring properties, including landscaping and directed lighting, while meeting code requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Jcobson</td>
<td>1212 Courtland Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Hayes</td>
<td>215 Glassco St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Thompson</td>
<td>1405 Sycamore Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Menzies</td>
<td>1211 Courtland Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Connors</td>
<td>1227 Montecal Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Hagg</td>
<td>1221 Wake Forest Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brown</td>
<td>1214 Montecal Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Harrison</td>
<td>1222 Montecal Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hayes</td>
<td>1216 Courtland Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Bailey</td>
<td>1211 Wake Forest Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Liggan</td>
<td>1224 Montecal Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Lewis</td>
<td>1229 Courtland Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Smith</td>
<td>1210 Horaceai Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Alexander</td>
<td>409 Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Broughton</td>
<td>301 Poplar St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Putz</td>
<td>1302 Courtland Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew &amp; Renee Fox</td>
<td>1215 Wake Forest Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Sterling Lewis</td>
<td>1229 Courtland Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley D'Levy</td>
<td>415 Frank St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Alvaran</td>
<td>13201 Mordecai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Armanasco</td>
<td>1209 Wake Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP BERNARD</td>
<td>221 GLASCOCK ST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth Tobin</td>
<td>1227 Mordecai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Smith* Jeff Kirby</td>
<td>1218 Mordecai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Aber</td>
<td>1222 Mordecai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Leftol</td>
<td>1224 Mordecai Dr. 27604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Catherine Nicolay</td>
<td>1301 Courtland Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Fox</td>
<td>1426 Mordecai Dr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

This document and the accompanying exhibits submitted herewith (collectively, the “Master Plan”) are provided pursuant to provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance (the “UDO”) associated with the Planned Development (“PD”) District for the Gables Lodge the (“Project”). The development occupies 0.517 acres on the west side of Wake Forest Road, south of Chestnut Street. The property was developed in the 1920s, initially as a boarding house and later converted to a motor lodge serving the US 1 corridor. The contract purchaser, Gables Lodge, LLC, is proposing to retain the existing structures, with the addition of two additional smaller structures, and preserve the lodge use on the site. All commercially reasonable efforts will be made to relocate and retain the existing parking canopy on site.

The City is in the process of making two phases of improvements to the adjoining section of Wake Forest Road. In 2018, the area will be restriped as part of a road diet project, which will add a central turn lane and bike lanes. An as-yet-unscheduled future phase of the project will add sidewalks and a landscaped median in the vicinity of the Project. A traffic impact analysis prepared in connection with the Project\(^1\) indicates that the “traffic expected to be generated by the proposed development is not anticipated to cause significant negative impacts on the surrounding roadway network.”

Although the Project site is currently comprised of three separate tax parcels, these will be recombined into a single parcel prior to construction. The proposed project will be completed in a single phase except as otherwise described herein in connection with the proposed sidewalk.

The drawings attached to this Master Plan are intended to indicate the location and maximum footprint of all buildings but shall not otherwise be considered a literal depiction of the Project, which shall be bound by the requirements of the CX district and the UDO, as modified by the terms of Sections 5, 6, and 7 below.

The Project team has made every effort to reflect in its petition all comments received from members of the public as well as city staff and officials, including by making our best efforts to resolve the occasional tensions between the comments received.

2. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The purpose of this rezoning and Master Plan is to permit the economically sustainable preservation of the original lodge buildings as well as the previous lodge use in an area where the only viable alternative use would be to construct new single-family detached houses, requiring demolition of the original buildings, in conformance with the Moderate Density Housing use suggested by the Comprehensive Plan.

\(^1\) Prepared by Ramey Kemp & Associates, Inc. and dated July 23, 2018
The PD supports many goals of the Comprehensive Plan, in particular by preventing immediate demolition of the existing lodge buildings. By retaining these structures and the longtime use of the site, the project will protect the existing neighborhood identity and preserve an important link to the city’s past while providing a unique and authentic Raleigh lodging option for visitors.

3. INTENT FOR PD DISTRICTS

The Project meets the intent of the PD District in several ways, including by providing relief from the strict application of the requirements of the R-6 district zoning, which would, for all practical purposes, require demolition of the existing structures. PD zoning permits preservation of a key piece of Mordecai and Raleigh history and invites neighbors and visitors to connect with that history. The original buildings were constructed prior to the requirements of the UDO, and their preservation requires us to apply the PD District for its intended purpose as a relief valve from prescriptive zoning.

One technical requirement of the Planned Development district is that at least two building types be included in the Project. While this provision is likely needed to discourage large developments of undifferentiated buildings, this risk is not present for a small preservation project such as the Gables Lodge. Nonetheless, two building types are present. The main building on the site, the “house” structure on the southern portion of the property, was constructed as a boarding house providing long-term dwellings for residents and therefore falls into the “Apartment” type building, which provides for a building “constructed to accommodate 3 or more dwelling units that are vertically or horizontally integrated. A common kitchen is allowed.” The existing garage building on the site was, as required by the UDO, “constructed to accommodate nonresidential uses on all floors” and therefore represents a “General” building type.

4. GENERAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

The project meets the General Design Principles for Planned Districts through preservation of existing structures and providing open space, a water feature, a design adapted to history and climate, compatibility with surroundings, and by providing a low-key live music amenity. The Gables Lodge will preserve the original structures and longstanding use of the site as a small lodge, and either the current iconic sign will be preserved or an earlier version previously in place on the site will be recreated and installed. Beyond preservation, the landscaped areas of the site will add a lush, perennial, native Piedmont garden adapted to the local climate and natural history, and required street trees will be installed, if permitted by the North Carolina Department of Transportation, or, alternatively, a Type C2 street protective yard will be installed. A system of pedestrian circulation will be provided, compliant with all provisions of Section 8.3.5.B of the UDO, to connect the parking area, garden, and building entrances. The
open space will constitute the centerpiece of the site and offer a water feature and passive recreation within the central garden. The project will modestly update structures and uses that have been part of the surrounding neighborhood for decades, even predating much of the surrounding development. Non-amplified live music will be a part of the operation of the lodge, during limited hours compatible with the lodge’s residential setting.

Despite its small size and minimal new structures, the project also incorporates certain elements of the Design Guidelines for Mixed-Use Developments. Although the project will contain a single principal use on its small site, as a lodge for visitors, accessory uses will add to the mixed-use feel of the site, with limited retail, lounge, and occasional food service uses to be housed within structures that are either existing or of lower height. All structures will be compatible with the height and massing of the surrounding neighborhood.

While Policy UD 7.3, and in particular Design Guideline 15, encourages location of parking behind buildings, countervailing policies exist in favor of the proposed placement of the parking along the northern property line of the project. In particular, Policy HP 3.2 supports retention of the existing structures on the site. Since those structures are located toward the rear of the lot, there is no opportunity to offer parking behind them. In addition, although new development in the city is generally encouraged to limit the visual impact of parking, this approach is inconsistent with retaining the existing structures and allowing them to tell the story of their historic motor lodge use during the golden age of automobile travel.

5. LAND USES AND INTENSITIES

The Project will be limited to a maximum of the proposed uses and intensities listed below:

Uses

Permitted principal uses: This Planned District selects Commercial Mixed Use (CX) as its base district, in order to permit restoration of the previous use of the site as a lodge. All permitted, limited, and special principal uses of the CX district shall be prohibited, except overnight lodging.

Intensities

Maximum 7,500 square feet, including:

- Apartment-type building: 4,500 square feet
- General-type buildings: 3,000 square feet
- A maximum of 19 lodging units shall be permitted within the Project.

6. MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED PURSUANT TO UDO SECTION 4.7.2
This Planned District requires certain modifications to the UDO pursuant to the UDO Section 4.7.2. They are as follows:

a. Base dimensional standards:
   i. Structure setbacks: The existing buildings on the site were built prior to the setback requirements, and the two small new additions to the existing garage building extend its rear wall in a straight line. Accordingly, the building setback requirements shall be modified as follows:
      1. Side:
         a. South lot line (3.2.4): Setback shall be consistent with the existing main building structure and porch, which are shown on that certain survey prepared by Bohler Engineering NC, PLLC and dated as of 4/2/18 (the “Survey”), which depicts the following setbacks:
            i. Building: 5.4 feet
            ii. Porch: 2 feet
         b. North lot line (3.2.8): In the event the existing parking canopy on the site is either relocated or reconstructed and placed along the northern property line of the Project, it shall be subject to a 3-foot side setback.
      2. Rear (3.2.4 and 3.2.5): 2.25 feet from the west lot line, to accommodate the proposed addition to the existing garage structure. No building shall be closer to the rear property line than the existing garage structure, including in the event that structure is more than 2.25 feet from the rear property line.
   ii. Floor heights (3.2.5): For the “General” building type, the following floor heights shall be required in conformance with the requirements of Section 1.5.7.C of the UDO:
      1. Ground floor: Min. 7 feet 6 inches
      2. Upper floor: Min. 7 feet 6 inches
   iii. Building Heights (3.2.4 and 3.2.5): The apartment-type building shall be limited to a maximum of 33 feet 6 inches in height, and all other structures shall be limited to a maximum height of 23 feet, 10 inches, reduced from the 50 feet permitted in the CX district.

b. Transition zones:
   i. Article 3.5 of the UDO shall not be applicable.

c. Parking
   i. 7.1.1: The parking spaces shall comply with the requirements of the Raleigh Street Design Manual, except that the parking area may be paved in gravel, excluding the driveway area and ADA-compliant parking space, which shall be concrete and as otherwise set forth herein.
   ii. 7.1.2: An on-site automobile parking ratio of 0.75 spaces per guest room shall be provided.
   iii. 7.1.7: No landscape perimeter island shall be provided.
   iv. 7.1.7: No landscape interior island shall be provided.
v. 7.1.7: One shade tree shall be required for the parking area.

d. Walls and Fences (7.2.8): Walls and fences within the building setbacks may of a maximum height as set forth below:
   i. Along the north property line: 6 feet
   ii. Along the west property line: 8 feet
   iii. Along the south property line: 6 feet

e. Signs
   i. 7.3.10: Sign copy will be a maximum of 12 inches tall consistent with the existing sign on the site.
   ii. 7.3.10: A minimum street frontage of 140 feet shall be required in connection with a high-profile ground sign.

f. Driveways
   i. 8.3.5: The driveway spacing shall not meet the requirements of a mixed-use district of 200 feet between driveways.

g. Existing Streets (8.3.5): The UDO requires that the approved streetscape be constructed at the time of development, subject to the possibility of administrative approval for payment of a fee in lieu of such construction. Due to the topography of the Project site and the as-yet-unscheduled work to be completed by the City in the vicinity of the Project to install a sidewalk on the west side of Wake Forest Road, a combination of both approaches will be applicable within the Project. Immediate installation of the full sidewalk provided in the Street Design Manual would necessitate that each end of the sidewalk segment be secured with a retaining wall and safety barrier until the connecting sidewalks are installed. This would increase the cost of the overall sidewalk installation without providing any additional benefit, since the segment would not connect to any other sidewalk until such installation is complete. It would also pose a danger to guests unfamiliar with the area by encouraging attempts to walk along Wake Forest Road—eventually requiring them to circumvent the safety barrier and walk unprotected within the travel lane. For this reason, a sidewalk will be installed, as shown on the Development Plan, in a location connecting the parking area to the entrance to the main lodge building. Sidewalk installation and connection would proceed in two phases:
   i. Phase 1: The sidewalk to be provided along Wake Forest Road shall be installed as provided on the Development Plan, and the applicant shall deliver to the City a fee in lieu of constructing Phase 2 of the streetscape improvements. Phase 1 shall be completed prior to issuance of any final certificate of occupancy for the apartment-type building on the Project site.
   ii. Phase 2: Final connection of the sidewalk along the Project frontage to the sidewalk to be newly installed along Wake Forest Road shall be completed by the City at the time the adjoining portions of the sidewalk are constructed.

7. BINDING CONDITIONS

In addition to the provisions of Section 5 and 6 above, the following conditions will be binding on the Project:
a. No amplified, live music shall be permitted at any time, and no outdoor music shall be permitted after:
   i. Sundays through Thursdays, excluding evenings before any bank holiday, 9 p.m.
   ii. Fridays, Saturdays, and the evenings before any bank holiday, 10 p.m.
b. Accessory retail use shall be limited to a maximum of 100 square feet.
c. Accessory bar/lounge use shall be limited to a maximum of 650 square feet of interior space and 400 square feet of outdoor space.
d. Accessory office space shall be limited to 150 square feet.
e. Each accessory use on the site shall be of the type incidental to an overnight lodging use and customarily found in connection with that use. Each shall contribute to the comfort, convenience, or needs of the guests and staff by providing for comfortable and complete guest experience and efficient handling of guest-related business needs of the lodging operation.
f. The existing main building, garage, and canopy shall be restored and preserved to the extent commercially reasonable and consistent with life safety, structural stability, and the lodge operations described in this petition.
g. The following Common Signage Plan shall be applicable:
   i. Script type: Any non-serif script type may be used.
   ii. Minimum letter height:
      1. High-profile ground sign: 4 inches
      2. Other signs: 1 inch
   iii. Maximum letter height: 12 inches
   iv. Permitted sign types:
      1. High-profile ground sign, limited to the existing such sign (as may be restored) or an approximate replica of the earlier sign depicted on page 3 of the Master Plan. No changeable copy sign shall be permitted.
      2. Directory signs
      3. Miscellaneous signs
      4. Information signs
      5. Temporary signs
      6. Unit numbering identification
   v. Sign placement: With respect to the high-profile ground sign, as shown on page 3 of the Master Plan. All other signs shall be permitted in all locations otherwise complying with UDO requirements or as required by law.
   vi. Permitted colors: Black, white, any color matching the dominant exterior color of the structures on the site, and two shades of red, one shade of green, two shades of gray, and two shades of blue shall be permitted.
h. Advertised and posted hours of operation shall be limited as follows in connection with the accessory bar operation:
   i. For Sundays through Thursdays, excluding evenings before any bank holiday, advertised and posted hours shall not extend past 11 p.m.
   ii. For Fridays, Saturdays, and the evenings before any bank holiday, advertised and posted hours shall not extend past 1 a.m.
NCOD Conservation District
Minimum / Maximum lot size: 7,260 SF / 14,520 SF
Minimum / Maximum lot width 50' / 100'
Front yard setback min. 35'
Maximum building height: 35'
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Note:
Street and block Plan: No new streets are proposed through or near our existing block in connection with this half-acre project located on a block already meeting block size requirements (bounded by Wake Forest Road, Mordecai Drive, Chestnut Street, and Poplar Street)
To: Planning Commission  

From: Jimmy Thiem, RHDC  

CC: Ken Bowers, Director, Department of City Planning  
    Jason Hardin, Planner II, Department of City Planning  
    Tania Tully, Senior Planner, Department of City Planning  

Date: August 21, 2018  

RE: Rezoning case Z-14-18 (1217, 1219, 1221 Wake Forest Rd)  

The Raleigh Historic Development Commission (RHDC) would like to comment on the proposed rezoning case Z-14-18 located at 1217, 1219, 1221 Wake Forest Road. The current zoning is R-6 with Mordecai-1 NCOD. The application requests a change to PD.

The RHDC can support this rezoning, as demonstrated by the summary of our analysis below.

The site is within the Mordecai Place National Register Historic District, a large historic district that is roughly bounded by N Blount Street, Courtland Drive, Wake Forest Road Mordecai Drive. The district has significance in the areas of architecture and community planning and development, and has a period of significance of between 1785 and 1824 and between 1916 and 1947. The house at 1217 Wake Forest Road was constructed ca. 1925 and is classified as a Contributing building. The rear addition and parking canopy were constructed ca. 1970, and are classified as Noncontributing resources. It is described as a two-story, stone, gable-roofed Tudor Revival-style building with steep gabled dormers; two-story rear extension; exterior stone chimney stacks; and 9-over-1 windows. It was built by William and Ella Johnson as a boarding house/motel to take advantage of the increasing tourist traffic on the former U.S. Route 1 (now Wake Forest Rd.). Mrs. Johnson operated the inn into the 1940s. The nearby Mordecai House, the central component of the Mordecai Historic Park, is a Raleigh Historic Landmark. The Mordecai Place Historic District, like Raleigh’s other early twentieth-century suburbs, occupies land that had been part of the antebellum Mordecai plantation.

The proposed rezoning is located within the area included in the Blount Street - Person Street Corridor Plan study area. The plan includes a statement about the public benefit: “Because the original lodge is incompatible with more recent zoning on the property, the proposed rezoning promotes preservation of the site's original structures for their original use and prevent another tear down in one of the city's older neighborhoods.” In addition, there are several relevant Comprehensive Plan Policies that we find applies to this rezoning. They include:

- Policy HP 1.2: Cultural and Historic Resources Protection: Identify, preserve and protect cultural and historic resources including buildings, neighborhoods, designed
and natural landscapes, cemeteries, streetscapes, view corridors and archaeological resources.

- **Policy HP 3.1: Adaptive Use**: Encourage adaptive use of historic properties to preserve cultural resources and conserve natural resources.

- **Policy HP 3.2: Retention Over Replacement**: Encourage the preservation and rehabilitation of significant or contributing existing structures, favoring retention over replacement, especially in areas where other historic resources are present.

- **Policy HP 3.4: Context Sensitive Design**: Use the existing architectural and historical character within an area as a guide for new construction.

The proposed rezoning and development at 1217, 1219 and 1221 Wake Forest Road will preserve the historic buildings on the property, add two smaller buildings, and preserve the historic use of the property. The existing parking canopy will be retained if commercially possible. The project complies with the four Comprehensive Plan Policies listed above (Cultural and Historic Resources Protection, Adaptive Use, Retention over Replacement, and Context Sensitive Design.)

The RHDC offers additional comments on the proposal below:

**General Comments:**

- We strongly encourage the applicants to be judicious in their renovation and improvements such that the opportunities for future historic designations not be compromised, and encourage the applicants to take the following into consideration throughout the development process;
  - a recognition of the significant historic architectural, social and cultural value of the property and its role in Raleigh’s history,
  - the commitment voiced by the applicants to preserve the property in form and character,
  - the high potential for the property to qualify for individual listing on the National Register of Historic Places,
  - the high potential for the property to qualify for individual listing as a Raleigh Landmark, and the value of such designation in real estate tax deferrals.

- Responses are based on initial rezoning submission and an interview with applicants July 6, 2018.

- We gratefully acknowledge the applicants’ appreciation for the significance of the Gables Motel Lodge as a part of the history of Raleigh. Their rezoning proposal reflects their recognition of the importance of preserving and enhancing the Gables’ architectural and landscape character.

- We are excited that, in addition to preserving key historic physical facilities, the applicants also propose that the Gables continues to serve in its traditional role as a neighborhood scale, short-term lodging facility sympathetically integrated into an established neighborhood.
RHDC has supported the applicants since the early stages of their due diligence investigation, and look forward to serving as a resource, technically and procedurally, as the project moves forward. We are aware that the applicants have contacted the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding additional support.

- The applicant is aware of possible historic preservation tax credit programs. We encourage them to consider them as the project proceeds when they might prove of benefit toward the project’s economic success and preservation of its historic character.

Buildings:
- Building preservation - We acknowledge and support saving all existing structures on site as proposed by the applicants.
- Existing buildings improvements - We understand that certain architectural features will be removed and/or replaced
- Certain features (such as railings and steps on the rear addition to the main house) were found to be not in character with the main house. Replacement of these elements should be sympathetic to the property’s architectural character.
- It is important that original, character-defining features of the existing buildings, especially the main house, be preserved, and modifications be kept to a minimum.
- One important example is windows, which we understand the applicants are considering for removal and replacement. Repair should be considered as a first option. The following regarding windows is offered for reference: https://www.forbes.com/sites/regnacole/2018/07/17/dont-buy-replacement-windows-for-your-old-house/#50bc886c62c0
- Building Additions - The proposed two 2-story additions to the existing 2-story garage/residence are in keeping with the scale and character of the existing facilities. The applicants are encouraged to consider architectural detailing which reflect the contemporary nature of the additions, distinguishing them from the original buildings.

Site Plan:
- Retaining existing buildings maintains the existing, primary spatial-defining elements of the original site.
- Locating the new 2-story additions alongside the garage/residence building further complements the original site layout.
- Relocating the parking lot to the north side of the site allows the landscape area framed by the main house and garage/residence to be developed as a pedestrian open space with amenities (such as sitting areas and gardens) as proposed on the plan. We see this as a positive contribution toward the enhancement of the motel tradition of providing outdoor leisure opportunities for guests.
- Wake Forest Road frontage - The plan suggests that the existing open visibility from Wake Forest Road into the property will be maintained. We support this, with one
recommendation that some low screening plantings along the perimeter of the parking lot may be appropriate.

- Perimeter fence - A fence 8’-10’ in height is proposed around three sides of the property. Typically, in local Raleigh Historic Districts, especially ones of residential character, a 6’ fence is considered maximum height. With the existing buildings to remain, and the proposed use being short-term lodging, the site’s historic use, we recommend that taller fences not be permitted. The site plan does not show a specific location or heights for the fence. We recommend that the fences 6’ in height not extend beyond the main building’s front facade (not including porches) into the “front yard” areas. If there is need to extend fences into front yard areas, we recommend they be limited to 42”, and be “open”, such as picket fences.

- Front yard of the main building - The plan suggests that the elevation of the front yard is to be filled with soil to bring the finish grade of the landscape area up to the same level as the front porch floor. We understand that this is proposed to address handicap accessibility to the main building. We see that the raising of grade at this location to be a substantial and undesirable change to the property’s character. We would suggest that other options (ex: ramp) be investigated. Both RHDC and SHPO are excellent resources for identifying solutions with lower impacts to the historic resources.

- Canopy - We support keeping the parking canopy which had been moved from Johnny’s Drive-In Grill. The applicants have suggested incorporating it into the new parking lot. We think this is most appropriate.

- Property ID Sign - We understand the applicant is considering either keeping the existing sign or installing a new sign which replicates an earlier sign (documented in a photograph). We support either of these options as may be permitted under the City’s applicable regulations.
August 7, 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: Daniel King, PE
Engineering Supervisor

FROM: Eric J. Lamb, PE
Transportation Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Traffic Study Review
Z-14-2018
1217, 1219, 1221 Wake Forest Road
Gables Motor Lodge

I have reviewed the Traffic Study prepared by Ramey Kemp & Associates (RKA) for the proposed development at 1217, 1219, and 1221 Wake Forest Road (Case Z-14-2018), known as the Gables Motor Lodge.

The site is located just northeast of downtown Raleigh, along Wake Forest Road in the block between Poplar Street and Chestnut Street. A single site access is proposed directly across from where Clover Lane intersects Wake Forest Road. The site is currently not being used as a motel. It is zoned R-6 with NCOD and is proposed to be a Planned Development with a 19-room motel and one apartment unit. Build-out is assumed to be complete in 2020.

Study Area

The following intersections were studied as part of this Traffic Study:

1. Wake Forest Road and Clove Lane / Site Drive (Unsignalized, TWSC)
2. Wake Forest Road and Chestnut Street (Unsignalized, TWSC)

A Site Location Map is attached as Figure 1 and a preliminary site plan is attached as Figure 2.

Trip Generation

Approval of Case Z-14-2018 would lead to a nominal increase in potential daily and peak hour trips. Table 1 summarizes the estimated vehicle volumes generated by the proposed Gables Motor Lodge using the 10th edition ITE Trip Generation Manual.
Table 1: Trip Generation Current Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gables Motor Lodge</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Daily Trips (vpd)</th>
<th>AM Peak (vph)</th>
<th>PM Peak (vph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached (210)</td>
<td>3 dwellings</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Trip Generation Proposed Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gables Motor Lodge</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Daily Trips (vpd)</th>
<th>AM Peak (vph)</th>
<th>PM Peak (vph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motel (310)</td>
<td>19 rooms</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Housing (Low-Rise) (220)</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RKA assumes a 1% annual growth rate.

Site Traffic Distribution

Trips generated by the proposed Gables Motor Lodge are distributed as follows.

- 60% to/from the north via Wake Forest Road
- 40% to/from the south via Wake Forest Road

RKA estimates the trip distribution based on a combination of existing traffic patterns, population centers adjacent to the study area, and engineering judgement.

Refer to Figure 3 for the anticipated Site Trip Distribution and to Figure 4 for the anticipated Site Trip Assignment.

Results and Impacts

RKA analyzed multi-modal level of service for the study area under existing conditions. Wake Forest Road between the two nearest signalized intersections is proposed to have Bike LOS-D, Pedestrian LOS-C, and Bus LOS-B. RKA makes no recommendation for improvements.

RKA has not provided Crash Data Analysis and will do so upon receiving pertinent information from NCDOT. RKA indicates that at that time, analysis will be performed and mitigation recommended if applicable.

RKA provided the following tables documenting the Maximum Queue Length (in feet), the Lane Level-of-Service (LOS), and the Delay (in seconds) for each direction in the AM peak hour and in the PM peak hour for each of the studied intersections.
### Table 3: Analysis Summary of Wake Forest Road and Clover Lane / Site Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYSIS SCENARIO</th>
<th>LANE GROUP</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Queue (ft)</td>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2018) Conditions</td>
<td>EBL/T/R</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL/T/R</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBL NBT/R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBL SBT/R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out Current Zoning (2020) Conditions</td>
<td>EBL/T/R</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL/T/R</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBL NBT/R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBL SBT/R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out Proposed Zoning (2020) Conditions</td>
<td>EBL/T/R</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WBL/T/R</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBL NBT/R</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBL SBT/R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Analysis Summary of Wake Forest Road and Chestnut Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYSIS SCENARIO</th>
<th>LANE GROUP</th>
<th>Weekday AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Queue (ft)</td>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2018) Conditions</td>
<td>EBL/R</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBL NBT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBT/R</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out Current Zoning (2020) Conditions</td>
<td>EBL/R</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBL NBT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBT/R</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out Proposed Zoning (2020) Conditions</td>
<td>EBL/R</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBL NBT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBT/R</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3, which includes the results for the intersection of Wake Forest Road and Clover Lane / the Site Drive, shows that traffic in both the north and southbound direction on Wake Forest Road is expected to operate at LOS B or better under existing and proposed conditions. There is no increase in delay nor queue length on Wake Forest Road caused by the proposed planned development.

The results indicate that vehicles on Clover Lane currently experience delays turning onto Wake Forest Road with lane LOS F at peak hours. Those delays are anticipated to persist, but not worsen due to the new motel traffic. Similarly, delays are anticipated on the proposed Site Drive, which is also expected to operate at LOS F during peak hours. The delay is anticipated to increase on the site drive with the new motel traffic. RKA reasons that these types of delays on minor, stop controlled streets are typical.

Table 4 summarizes the results that RKA derived for the intersection of Wake Forest Road and Chestnut Street under existing and proposed conditions. Chestnut Street is located just north of the subject property. The results show that traffic traveling eastbound on Chestnut Street may experience lane LOS D during the AM peak hour in both existing and proposed conditions. The results indicate that under the proposed conditions, the delay in seconds is not anticipated to increase, but the maximum queue length on Chestnut Street may nearly double from approximately 2 vehicles to 4 vehicles.

Northbound traffic on Wake Forest Road is estimated to operate at LOS B or better in all scenarios with no changes to the delay nor the queue lengths under the proposed conditions.

Conclusions

Based on the results of this Traffic Impact Analysis, RKA determines that the proposed conditions do not cause any significant negative impacts to the surrounding roadway network. RKA makes no recommendation for mitigation.

City Staff agrees with the analysis performed and corresponding findings in the Traffic Impact Analysis Report for the Gables Motor Lodge, Case Z-14-2018 prepared by Ramey Kemp & Associates. City Staff agrees with the findings and makes no further recommendation.
Figure 1: Site Location

![Site Location Map]

**LEGEND**
- Proposed Site Location
- Study Intersection
- Study Area
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Figure 2: Existing Lane Configurations
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Figure 3: Site Trip Distribution
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Office of Transportation Planning • 222 W. Hargett Street, Suite 400
Post Office Box 590 • Raleigh, North Carolina 27601 • (919) 996-3030
To: Neighboring Property Owner
From: Gables Lodge, LLC (Catherine Merritt and Daniel Robinson)
Date: March 21, 2018
Re: Notice of meeting to discuss potential rezoning of three parcels located south and west of the intersection of Wake Forest Road and Chestnut Street, containing approximately 0.50 acres, with an address of 1217-1221 Wake Forest Road, and having Wake County Parcel Identification Numbers 1704-94-3693, 1704-94-4617, and 1704-94-4741 (the "Property")

Dear Neighbor,

We are Gables Lodge, LLC ("Gables Lodge"), the contract purchaser of the above-captioned Property - the Gables Motel Lodge on Wake Forest Road. Currently, the Property is zoned R-6 with a neighborhood conservation overlay district (NCOD). Gables Lodge is considering rezoning the Property to a Planned Development (PD) district. The purpose of the rezoning is to bring the historic hotel use of the property and existing building layout into conformity with the City's code.

As you may be aware, prior to our filing of a rezoning application, the City of Raleigh requires a neighborhood meeting inviting owners of property within 500 feet of the site. You are invited to attend this meeting to discuss the potential rezoning and ask any questions you may have about the process or our tentative plans. Our goal is to gather comments through your appearance at this neighborhood meeting or, alternatively, through your written comments to the City of Raleigh Planning Director. After the meeting, we will prepare a report for the Raleigh Planning Department regarding the items discussed.

We have scheduled this meeting with surrounding property owners for April 4th, 2018, from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Historic Mordecai Visitors Center classroom located at 1101 Wake Forest Road in Raleigh.

Please do not hesitate to contact us directly should you have any questions or wish to discuss any issues. We can be reached at info@gableslodge.com. Also, for more information about rezoning, you may visit www.raleighnc.gov or contact the Raleigh City Planning Department at 919-996-2682 or rezoning@raleighnc.gov.

We look forward to seeing you on April 4th.
SUMMARY OF ISSUES

A neighborhood meeting was held on **April 4, 2018** (date) to discuss a potential rezoning located at **1217, 1219, and 1221 Wake Forest Road** (property address). The neighborhood meeting was held at **1101 Wake Forest Road** (location). There were approximately **28** (number) neighbors in attendance. The general issues discussed were:

**Summary of Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food service was discussed, and the applicant clarified that while the lodge will not contain a restaurant, limited prepared food and beverages, such as pastries and coffee, will be available, and a kitchen will be available for events.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room rates were discussed and will vary by season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current plan is to keep the existing sign, and the applicant is open to moving or raising the sign to improve sight distances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effect of PD zoning was discussed, in particular the difference between the PD district and a simple CX district and the types of project details than can be governed through a master plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overflow parking was discussed, and the applicant indicated he is working with nearby property owners to provide additional parking. The issue of an existing problem with people parking on Chestnut Street too close to Wake Forest road was also noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height was discussed, and nothing to be constructed will exceed the max. existing building height on the site. Screening will be provided, in the form of fencing, hedging, and/or window frosting, to prevent upper floor guests from seeing into the back yard to the south of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors noted the existence of drainage issues in the area and expressed a desire to work collaboratively with the applicant to address the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors questioned the plan for lighting, and the applicant promised to work to minimize impact on neighboring properties, including landscaping and directed lighting, while meeting code requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Menzies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Connors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Hopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blane Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Layton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Putz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew &amp; Renae Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Sterling Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micay D'Angy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Armanasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Armanasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILIP BERNARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth Tobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Smith &amp; Jeff Kirby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heid. &amp; Joe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Kohl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Catherine Nicolaiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Fox</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 19, 2018

TO: Members of the Planning Commission: Committee of the Whole

Through: Jason Hardin, AICP
Department of City Planning
Comprehensive Planning

From: Sarah Roholt & Joe Layton
Property Owners & Residents of 1224 Mordecai Drive

Re: Z-14-2018 (1217, 1219, & 1221 Wake Forest Rd – Gables Motor Lodge)

As we are not able to attend your September 27, 2018 meeting, we are submitting a written communication for your consideration. We live directly behind the properties requested for rezoning from R-6 w/NCOD to PD.

The rezoning Applicants have worked closely with the neighborhood in general and the neighbors bordering the property specifically for several months. They have done a good job of addressing the many concerns raised by neighbors about having a revitalized commercial property located within a residential neighborhood. The two revisions to their original January 2018 rezoning application reflect their commitment of the Applicants to address issues raised by city staff as well as by neighbors.

There are three issues however, that we are requesting be considered in your review.

**Rear property set-backs:** The application states a “1.8 feet setback from the west lot line, to accommodate the proposed addition to the existing garage structure.” For a variety of reason, we felt strongly that this setback was inadequate. We met with the Applicants in May 2018 to discuss this issue at which time we came to an agreement that the rear set-back would be compatible with those of the existing garage on their property. Recent discussions with the applicants indicated that it was an oversight that the final application had not been updated to reflect the agreed upon rear setbacks. It is our understanding from the applicants that a change will be made as follows:

The minimum required setback will be required to meet both of the standards below:
- A minimum of 27” (2.25’) from the property line; and
- No closer than the current building setback along that property line.

**Lighting:** Lighting from a commercial (non-residential) property impacting surrounding residential properties was mentioned as a concern by several neighbors and by staff in their initial review of the application. The applicants have shared some of their ideas and assured us that every effort will be made to mitigate the impact of lighting on neighbors while still meeting requirements to assure the safety of their guests. We understand and respect that position, but it was our hope that lighting could be addressed within the list of “Binding Conditions”. We
know the issue of lighting has been discussed within the committees working on the text change for accessory structures with suggestions being made for possibly requiring such things as downcast or shielded lighting. Perhaps a binding condition could be added to this rezoning application; for example; “Exterior lighting on the property will meet the requirements to assure safety of guests but will use techniques such as, but not limited to, downcast or shielded lighting to mitigate the impact of non-residential lighting on neighboring residential properties.”

**Noise:** From the beginning, there has been concern about the potential impact for (daily) noise on what is currently a relatively quiet residential neighborhood. Therefore, we appreciate that binding conditions were added to the application related to amplified live music, hours for acoustic music, and hours for bar operation. As challenging as it might be, we would like to see some clarification added to this binding condition that addresses amplified non-live music in case there are speakers in the bar area which can be moved or aimed outside and which are hooked into a “jukebox”, computer or other such device.

Finally, we know that this property will be subject to stormwater regulations. As the Applicants have learned from several neighboring property owners, stormwater run-off and flooding on this downhill block is a major problem. As the Applicants move forward in their efforts, we look forward to meeting with them, stormwater staff, and other impacted property owners to resolve these problems.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

cc:  Molly Stuart, Morningstar Law Group  
Daniel Robinson  
Tift Merritt
Dear Mr. Hardin:

As per my conversation with you on 9-21, the property known as Gables is to advise you that I have no problem with the rezoning which is scheduled for a public hearing on 9-27. As I advised, I have a doctor’s appointment and will be able to attend the public meeting on the 27th.

I bought my property (1226 Mordecai Drive) on 1-1-1976. As you can see, I have been a long-term homeowner. As I informed you, my property backs up to the Gables. This is to advise you again that I have never had any problems with any of the previous people living on the property in question. I have talked with the lady who wants to buy this property in question. She wants to make the property an asset and assured me that she will be a good neighbor in the Mordecai community. She was very sincere and believe her.

I hope the people attending the meeting will vote for the rezoning.

Sincerely,

Mona M. Keech