Rezoning Application and Checklist



Planning and Development Customer Service Center • One Exchange Plaza, Suite 400 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2500

Please complete all sections of the form and upload via the Permit and Development Portal (permitportal.raleighnc.gov). Please see page 11 for information about who may submit a rezoning application. A rezoning application will not be considered complete until all required submittal components listed on the Rezoning Checklist have been received and approved. For questions email rezoning@raleighnc.gov.

		Rezoni	ng Request		
Rezoning Type	General	use Conditi	onal use	Master plan	OFFICE USE ONLY
	✓ Text c	nange to zoning co	onditions		Rezoning case #
Existing zoning base d	istrict: CX	Height: 5	Fron	tage: CU	Overda ()
Proposed zoning base	district: CX	Height: 5			Overlay(s):
layers.	Zoning Map to	search for the add	ress to be re	zoned then turn of	Overlay(s): on the 'Zoning' and 'Overl
If the property has been) provident				in the Zoning' and 'Overl
If the property has beer	previously re	zoned, provide the	rezoning ca	se number: Z-21-	19
		22 Sept. 10		Number	
Date: May 10,2025			nformation		
Property address: 2211,	2221 and 2231	Date amended (1):	Date ame	ended (2):
Property PIN: 173204199	5. 1722945976	and 17000 40747			
Deed reference (book/pa	ade).	anu 1722848717			
Nearest intersection: S N	NEW YORKS				
For planned developmer	. The second of		Property size	ze (acres): approx.	58.65
applications only:	<u> </u>	Total units:			are footage:
	4 - 1 -	Total parcels:			
Property owner email: OT	d address: OTI	RE LLC, PO Box 2648 S	Stafford VA 22555		lings: more Dr Apt 350 Cary NC 27518
Property owner email: OT Property owner phone: C	RE, agarrett@ g	garrettdevelopment.c	com / LoBro, w	jbj.bill@gmail.com	2/518
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	MAIL I Ohra Odo on			
Applicant name and addr	ess: Charles R	. Walker, III for EPG	275 North Pea	a Ridge Rd Pittsbord	NC 27312
Applicant email: cwalker@ Applicant phone: 919-625	. 0	com			110 21012
	/				
pplicant signature(s): (DWNER:	6			
dditional email(s):	SEC SOCIETY OF THE PROPERTY OF		The latest the second second second		않고 하지 않아야 하는 보면 이 경우 수가 없는 사람들이 하는 것이다.



Page 1 of 14

Rezoning Application and Checklist



Planning and Development Customer Service Center • One Exchange Plaza, Suite 400 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2500

Please complete all sections of the form and upload via the Permit and Development Portal (permitportal.raleighnc.gov). Please see page 11 for information about who may submit a rezoning application. A rezoning application will not be considered complete until all required submittal components listed on the Rezoning Checklist have been received and approved. For questions email rezoning@raleighnc.gov.

		Rezoning	g Reques	st		
Rezoning	General u	se Condition	nal use	Mas	ter plan	OFFICE USE ONLY
Туре	√ Text char	ange to zoning con	nditions			Rezoning case #
Existing zoning base dis	strict: CX	Height: 5	Fro	ontage: CU		Overlay(s):
Proposed zoning base district: CX Height: 5 Frontage; CU Overlay(s):						Overlay(s):
Helpful Tip : View the Z layers.	oning Map to s	earch for the addre	ess to be	rezoned, th	en turn o	n the 'Zoning' and 'Overlay'
If the property has been	previously rez	oned, provide the	rezoning	case numb	er: Z-21-	19
				1100		100000
		General In	formatio	on		
Date: May 10,2025		Date amended (1)	:		Date am	ended (2):
Property address: 2211,						
Property PIN: 173204199		and 1722848717				
Deed reference (book/pa	ige):					
Nearest intersection: S N	New Hope and R	ock Quarry Rds	Property	/ size (acre	s): approx	58 65
For planned developmen	nt	Total units:				are footage:
applications only:	applications only: Total parcels: Total buildings:					
Property owner name ar	d address: OTI	RE LLC, PO Box 2648 S	tafford VA 2	2555 / LoBro L	LC.215 Brig	ntmore Dr Apt 350 Cary NC 27518
Property owner email: 0	ΓRE, agarrett@ g	garrettdevelopment.c	com / LoBro	o. wibi.bill@d	mail com	Tamelo Bringt odd Gary NG 27516
Property owner phone: 0	OTRE, 540-226-3	3981 / Lobro, 919-60	2-2622	, , , હ	,	
Applicant name and add				Pea Ridge I	Rd Pittsho	ro NC 27312
Applicant email: cwalker@	epgrouponline.	com			111111111111111111111111111111111111111	011027312
Applicant phone: 919-625						
Applicant signature(s):		Rua Me		Du.	. 111	1
Additional email(s):	J 1 - 1 / 1 / 1	Brown, Man	ages	astor	onno	
· ·						



	Conditional Use District Zoning Condition	ons
Zoning case #: Z-14-25	Date submitted: May 7, 2025	OFFICE USE ONLY
Existing zoning: CX-5-CU	Proposed zoning: CX-5-CU	Rezoning case #

Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

- 1.The following uses shall be prohibited in this CX zoning district: office; boardinghouse; dormitory, fraternity, sorority; adult establishment; outdoor sports or entertainment facility of any size, passenger terminal; vehicular sales; detention center, jail; prison; light manufacturing; bed and breakfast; research and development; light industrial; golf course; rest home; cemetery.
- 2. Residential development shall be limited up to 650 total units and limited to the apartment building type and single-family attached (townhomes) building type. There will be no restrictions of number of bedrooms per units.
- Non-residential uses shall be limited up to 285,000 square feet.
- 4. The total gross floor area of buildings containing exclusively non-residential uses shall be no greater than 285,000 square feet on sections of 2221 and 2231 South New Hope Rd. Once a total of 75,000 square feet of non-residential uses has been constructed no other new non-residential construction will be permitted on the remaining lots until the property owner submits and receives approval for a site plan that contains a grocery store.
- There shall be no more than 9 buildings totaling no more than 75,000 SF that exclusively contain restaurant uses on 2231
- 6. Allowing for step-backs, any portion of a perimeter building height shall be limited to 4 stories when it is less than 150 ft from a structure on tracts 1732052612, 1732057095,1732045344, and 1722945353. Otherwise, maximum height within this proposal shall be five stories.
- All required Canopy trees within this proposal will be planted with a minimum caliper of 3.5".
- 8. Buildings that contain a bar/nightclub/tavern/lounge as the primary use shall be located no closer than 250 ft from a residential structure on tracts 1732052612, 1732057095,1732045344, and 1722945353
- 9. No more than 450 residential units can be developed prior to the Owners submitting for a site plan to the City of Raleigh containing a grocery store.

The property owner(s) hereby offers, consents to, and agrees to abide, if the rezoning request is approved, the conditions written above. All property owners must sign each condition page. This page may be photocopied if additional space is needed.

Property Owner(s) Signature:

Printed Name: OTRE LLC Andy Garrett / Lobro LLC Lois Brown

RECEIVED MAY 2 7 2025

REVISION 11.08.24

raleighnc.gov

	Conditional Use District Zoning Condition	ons
Z-14-25	Date submitted: May 7, 2025	OFFICE USE ONLY
Existing zoning: CX-5-CU	Proposed zoning: CX-5-CU	Rezoning case #

Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

- 1. The following uses shall be prohibited in this CX zoning district: office; boardinghouse; dormitory, fraternity, sorority; adult establishment; outdoor sports or entertainment facility of any size, passenger terminal; vehicular sales; detention center, jail; prison; light manufacturing; bed and breakfast; research and development; light industrial; golf course; rest home; cemetery.
- Residential development shall be limited up to 650 total units and limited to the apartment building type and single-family attached (townhomes) building type. There will be no restrictions of number of bedrooms per units.
- Non-residential uses shall be limited up to 285,000 square feet. 3.
- 4. The total gross floor area of buildings containing exclusively non-residential uses shall be no greater than 285,000 square feet on sections of 2221 and 2231 South New Hope Rd. Once a total of 75,000 square feet of non-residential uses has been constructed no other new non-residential construction will be permitted on the remaining lots until the property owner submits and receives approval for a site plan that contains a grocery store.
- There shall be no more than 9 buildings totaling no more than 75,000 SF that exclusively contain restaurant uses on 2231 North Hope Rd
- Allowing for step-backs, any portion of a perimeter building height shall be limited to 4 stories when it is less than 150 ft from a structure on tracts 1732052612, 1732057095,1732045344, and 1722945353. Otherwise, maximum height within this proposal shall
- All required Canopy trees within this proposal will be planted with a minimum caliper of 3.5". 7.
- Buildings that contain a bar/nightclub/tavern/lounge as the primary use shall be located no closer than 250 ft from a residential structure on tracts 1732052612, 1732057095,1732045344, and 1722945353
- No more than 450 residential units can be developed prior to the Owners submitting for a site plan to the City of Raleigh containing a grocery store.

The property owner(s) hereby offers, consents to, and agrees to abide, if the rezoning request is approved, the conditions written above. All property owners must sign each condition page. This page may be photocopied if additional space is needed.

Property Owner(s) Signature:

for OTRE

Printed Name: OTRE LLC Andy Garrett / Lobro LLC Lois Brown

REVISION 11.08.24

raleighnc.gov

Rezoning Application Addendum #1 Comprehensive Plan Analysis

The applicant is asked to analyze the impact of the rezoning request and its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is also asked

its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is also asked to explain how the rezoning request is reasonable and in the public interest.

OFFICE USE ONLY Rezoning case #

Statement of Consistency

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

These tracts were last rezoned in 2019. The area was designated as a "Community Mixed Use". As it was in the past compliant with applicable Policies and Plans, the proposed revisions will not change that. Since then, the surrounding tracts have been developed as townhomes.

Public Benefits

Provide brief statements explaining how the rezoning request is reasonable and in the public interest.

The proposed new zoning case asks the modify a few conditions from the Z-21-19 case. Some new conditions ask for the maximum unit count to be increased by 200 units from 450 to 650 and the maximum non-residential SF to be decreased from 360,000 to 285,000. The much-needed shopping center is still a part of the new case.

We have added the ability to allow medical uses as requested by the neighbors. Given the new townhome construction, we have modified the minimum distance between residential and bars from 100 ft to 250 ft.

We have also placed a new cap on non-residential uses to be built prior to addition of a grocery store. We have also added a cap tied to residential development maximums prior to the addition of the grocery store.

Finally, we have added to ability to develop townhomes as part of this project as well as removing the restriction on no more than two-bedroom units for the apartments. These two revisions help widen the potential markets available for new construction on these tracts.

OFFICE USE ONLY Rezoning case #
oned. For each resource, indicate
gative impacts listed above.

Urban Design Guidelines

The applicant must respond to the Urban Design Guidelines contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan if:

- a) The property to be rezoned is within a "City Growth Center" or "Mixed-Use Center", OR:
- b) The property to be rezoned is located along a "Main Street" or "Transit Emphasis Corridor" as shown on the Urban Form Map in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Urban form designation: Community Mixed Use

Click here to view the Urban Form Map.

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

Response:

1

This application follows that guide. It will include Grocery, dwelling units, restaurants, retail all within walking distance within this approximate 60 AC site

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

2 Response:

The current case allows up to 5 stories within the project except on the perimeter where the heights are limited to 4 stories as described in the conditions.

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

Response:

The proposal is currently surrounded by four public streets. We believe future development will add at least two more to help disperse traffic through the larger development limits.

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

Response:

This proposal will at the very least extend all existing public street stubs.

New development should be comprised of blocks of public and/or private streets (including sidewalks). Block faces should have a length generally not exceeding 660 feet. Where commercial driveways are used to create block structure, they should include the same pedestrian amenities as public or private streets.

5 Response

The proposed case does nothing to prevent that general goal.

A primary task of all urban architecture and landscape design is the physical definition of streets and public spaces as places of shared use. Streets should be lined by buildings rather than parking lots and should provide interest especially for pedestrians. Garage entrances and/or loading areas should be located at the side or rear of a property.

Response:

A site plan is not a part of this case; however, buildings shall be intergrated with the street network.

7	Buildings should be located close to the pedestrian-oriented street (within 25 feet of the curb), with off-street parking behind and/or beside the buildings. When a development plan is located along a high-volume corridor without on-street parking, one bay of parking separating the building frontage along the corridor is a preferred option. Response: We agree with this goal.
8	If the site is located at a street intersection, the main building or main part of the building should be placed at the corner. Parking, loading or service should not be located at an intersection. Response: The corner of S New Hope Rd and Anamosa Drive is under a Progress Energy, therefore the uses will be highly limited.
9	To ensure that urban open space is well-used, it is essential to locate and design it carefully. The space should be located where it is visible and easily accessible from public areas (building entrances, sidewalks). Take views and sun exposure into account as well. Response: Agreed.
10	New urban spaces should contain direct access from the adjacent streets. They should be open along the adjacent sidewalks and allow for multiple points of entry. They should also be visually permeable from the sidewalk, allowing passersby to see directly into the space. Response: Agreed.
11	The perimeter of urban open spaces should consist of active uses that provide pedestrian traffic for the space including retail, cafés, and restaurants and higher-density residential. Response: Agreed in the non-residential areas of this proposal.
12	A properly defined urban open space is visually enclosed by the fronting of buildings to create an outdoor "room" that is comfortable to users. Response: Agreed in the non-residential areas of this proposal.
13	New public spaces should provide seating opportunities. Response: Agreed. Seating opportunities will be distributed throughout the Project.

	Parking lots should not dominate the frontage of pedestrian-oriented streets, interrupt pedestrian routes, or negatively impact surrounding developments.
14	Response: Agreed.
15	Parking lots should be located behind or in the interior of a block whenever possible. Parking lots should not occupy more than 1/3 of the frontage of the adjacent building or not more than 64 feet, whichever is less. Response: The proposed shopping center parking will be broken up with buffers and plantings as much as
16	Parking structures are clearly an important and necessary element of the overall urban infrastructure but, given their utilitarian elements, can give serious negative visual effects. New structures should merit the same level of materials and finishes as that a principal building would, care in the use of basic design elements cane make a significant improvement. Response: None are planned at this time.
17	Higher building densities and more intensive land uses should be within walking distance of transit stops, permitting public transit to become a viable alternative to the automobile. Response: Agreed.
18	Convenient, comfortable pedestrian access between the transit stop and the building entrance should be planned as part of the overall pedestrian network. Response: Agreed.
19	All development should respect natural resources as an essential component of the human environment. The most sensitive landscape areas, both environmentally and visually, are steep slopes greater than 15 percent, watercourses, and floodplains. Any development in these areas should minimize intervention and maintain the natural condition except under extreme circumstances. Where practical, these features should be conserved as open space amenities and incorporated in the overall site design. Response: None of those conditions are on these tracts.
20	It is the intent of these guidelines to build streets that are integral components of community design. Public and private streets, as well as commercial driveways that serve as primary pedestrian pathways to building entrances, should be designed as the main public spaces of the City and should be scaled for pedestrians. Response: S. New Hope Rd, Rock Quarry Rd and Anamosa Drive all have pedestrian paths. This proposal will connect where possible.

21	Sidewalks should be 5-8 feet wide in residential areas and located on both sides of the street. Sidewalks in commercial areas and Pedestrian Business Overlays should be a minimum of 14-18 feet wide to accommodate sidewalk uses such as vendors, merchandising and outdoor seating. Response: Agreed.
22	Streets should be designed with street trees planted in a manner appropriate to their function. Commercial streets should have trees which complement the face of the buildings and which shade the sidewalk. Residential streets should provide for an appropriate canopy, which shadows both the street and sidewalk, and serves as a visual buffer between the street and the home. The typical width of the street landscape strip is 6-8 feet. This width ensures healthy street trees, precludes tree roots from breaking the sidewalk, and provides adequate pedestrian buffering. Street trees should be at least 6 1/4" caliper and should be consistent with the City's landscaping, lighting and street sight distance requirements. Response: Agreed.
23	Buildings should define the streets spatially. Proper spatial definition should be achieved with buildings or other architectural elements (including certain tree plantings) that make up the street edges aligned in a disciplined manner with an appropriate ratio of height to width. Response: Agreed.
24	The primary entrance should be both architecturally and functionally on the front facade of any building facing the primary public street. Such entrances shall be designed to convey their prominence on the fronting facade. Response: Agreed.
25	The ground level of the building should offer pedestrian interest along sidewalks. This includes windows entrances, and architectural details. Signage, awnings, and ornamentation are encouraged. Response: Agreed.
26	The sidewalks should be the principal place of pedestrian movement and casual social interaction. Designs and uses should be complementary to that function. Response: Agreed.

Rezoning Checklist (Submittal Requir	ements)				
To be completed by Applicant		Transfer (1995)	To be	comple staff	ted by
General Requirements – General Use or Conditional Use Rezoning	Yes	No	N/A		
I have referenced this Rezoning Checklist and by using this as a guide, it will ensure that I receive a complete and thorough first review by the City of Raleigh	V				
2. Pre-application conference.	V				
Neighborhood meeting notice and report	V				
4. Rezoning application review fee (see Fee Guide for rates).					
Completed application submitted through Permit and Development Portal	√				
6. Completed Comprehensive Plan consistency analysis	√				
7. Completed response to the urban design guidelines	V	П			
8. Two sets of stamped envelopes addressed to all property owners and tenants of the rezoning site(s) and within 500 feet of area to be rezoned.	√				
9. Trip generation study		✓			
10. Traffic impact analysis		✓			
For properties requesting a Conditional Use District:					43
11. Completed zoning conditions, signed by property owner(s).	√				
If applicable, see page 11:					
12. Proof of Power of Attorney					
For properties requesting a Planned Development or Campus District:					
13. Master plan (see Master Plan submittal requirements).					
For properties requesting a text change to zoning conditions:					
14. Redline copy of zoning conditions with proposed changes.					
15. Proposed conditions signed by property owner(s).					

Master Plan (Submittal Requirements)						
To be completed by Applicant			To be	complet staff	ted by	
General Requirements – Master Plan Yes N/A			Yes No		N/A	
1. I have referenced this 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.						
2. Total number of units and square feet						
3. 12 sets of plans		П				
4. Completed application; submitted through Permit & Development Portal						
5. Vicinity Map						
6. Existing Conditions Map						
7. Street and Block Layout Plan						
8. General Layout Map/Height and Frontage Map						
9. Description of Modification to Standards, 12 sets						
10. Development Plan (location of building types)						
11. Pedestrian Circulation Plan						
12. Parking Plan						
13. Open Space Plan						
14. Tree Conservation Plan (if site is 2 acres or more)						
15. Major Utilities Plan/Utilities Service Plan						
16. Generalized Stormwater Plan						
17. Phasing Plan						
18. Three-Dimensional Model/renderings						
19. Common Signage Plan						

SUMMARY OF ISSUES

A neighborhood meeting was held on	(date) to discuss a potential rezoning
	(property address). The
	(location).
	(number) neighbors in attendance. The general issues discussed
were:	
	Summary of Issues:
See attached	



LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

LAND PLANNING

LAND USE CONSULTING

ENTITLEMENTS

DIRECT LINE: (919) 625-9760

EMAIL: CWALKER@EPGROUPONLINE.COM

DATE: MAY 7, 2025

OLDE TOWNE NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING MINUTES FOR OLDE TOWNE VILLAGE 04/24/25 6:30 PM TO 8:00 PM BARWELL ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GOT STARTED OFFICIALLY AT 6:30. APPROXIMATELY 60 NEIGHBORS ATTENDED AND SIGNED IN. EMAIL ADDRESSES WERE COLLECTED. LLOYD INMAN, A COMMUNITY CONNECTOR FROM THE CITY OF RALEIGH WAS ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

INTRODUCTIONS. CHUCK WALKER LED THE MEETING SUPPORTED BY ANGIE WALKER TAKING MINUTES.

CHUCK EXPLAINED THE NEED FOR ANOTHER MEETING SO SOON. EXPLAINING COR JUDGED THE FIRST MEETING TO BE INVALID. REGARDLESS, REVISED CONDITIONS WERE ATTACHED IN THE NOTIFICATION OF THIS MEETING FROM THE INPUT FROM THE ATTENDEES OF THE ORIGINAL MEETING.

NEIGHBORS WERE CONCERNED ABOUT THE REDUCTION IN SC SIZE. THEY DID NOT LIKE THE IDEA OF THE CENTER GETTING SMALLER. CHUCK EXPLAINED THE REDUCTION IN THE CENTER SIZE WAS TO TRY AND MINIMIZE THE TRAFFIC IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED HIGHER RESIDENTIAL UNIT COUNT. ONCE AGAIN, HE EXPLAINED, CURRENT APPROVAL FOR 450 UNITS OF RESIDENTIAL AND 360,000 SF COMMERCIAL SPACE IS STILL CURRENTLY IN PLACE. HE STATED INCREASING THE RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO A MAXIMUM OF 650 UNITS WHILE CUTTING THE APPROVED SC SPACE IN HALF WAS AN ATTEMPT TO A ZERO-SUM GAIN ACCORDING TO TRAFFIC ENGINEERS. NEIGHBORS ASKED FOR A TIA AND THE DEVELOPERS COMMIT TO PERFORM ONE GIVEN THE FACT THE COR WOULD PROBABLY REQUIRE ONE.

HE REMINDED THE GROUP THERE ARE CURRENTLY FOUR STREET STUBS BUILT TO THE PROJECTS BOUNDARY THAT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO BE EXTENDED INTO ANY DEVELOPMENT, AND THE CURRENT OWNERS ARE CONSIDERING AT LEAST ANOTHER TWO OR THREE CONNECTIONS TO THE EXISTING STREET NETWORK TO HELP DISPERSE TRAFFIC IMPACT.

NEIGHBORS WERE CONCERNED ABOUT GRADING AND STORMWATER IMPACT. CHUCK STATED THAT THE SITE WOULD BE MASS-GRADED AND FUTURE STORMWATER AMOUNTS HAD BEEN DESIGNED INTO THE SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS. BOTH TREE PRESERVATION AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT WILL BE DONE OFF-SITE.

NEIGHBORS WERE CONCERNED ABOUT WHETHER SIT-DOWN RESTAURANTS WERE STILL PART OF THE PLANS. THEY WERE INFORMED THE COMMITMENT HAS NOT CHANGED AND IS STILL SHOWN IN THE CONDITIONS.

NEIGHBORS WERE CONCERNED ABOUT RISING CRIME IN THE AREA. THEY FELT THAT WAS CAUSED BY RENTERS OF THE APARTMENTS AND SOME INVESTOR-OWNED TOWNHOMES. WE DID CONFIRM WITH RPD AND ARE TRYING TO ADDRESS CLEAR ISSUES IN THE CONDITIONS IF POSSIBLE. DISCUSSION FOR A POLICE SUBSTATION OR THE POSSIBILITY OF PRIVATE SECURITY FOR SOME TIME.

NEIGHBORS WERE STILL CONCERNED ABOUT VAPE SHOPS AND DID NOT WANT THEM AS PART OF THE PROJECT. THEY WERE TOLD THE DEVELOPERS WOULD SEE IF THAT WAS A POSSIBLE EXCLUSION IN FUTURE CONDITIONS.

NEIGHBORS ARE STILL CONCERNED ABOUT ADEQUATE PARKING. THEY WERE TOLD EACH OF THE FUTURE USES WOULD HAVE ENOUGH SUPPORT PARKING ON-SITE.

NEIGHBORS WERE CONCERNED ABOUT TRAFFIC SPEEDS WITHIN THE NEIGHBORHOODS. THEY WERE TOLD THAT THEY COULD CONTACT THE CITY OF RALEIGH TRAFFIC AND ENGINEERING DEPARTMENTS TO SEE IF PEDESTRIAN TABLES MAY BE ADDED TO THE EXISTING STREETS. THEY WERE ALSO TOLD THE DEVELOPERS WILL TRY TO ADD THEM TO THE FUTURE STREETS OF THE PROJECT.

NEIGHBORS ASKED IF "MEDICAL" USE COULD BE ALLOWED IN THE NEW PROJECT. THEY WERE SHOWN IT HAD BEEN REMOVED FROM THE EXCLUSION LIST IN THE CONDITIONS.

NEIGHBORS HAVE APPARENTLY BEEN GIVEN SOME RUMORED NEGATIVE INFORMATION FROM THE "HOA". CHUCK STATED THAT THE ONLY INFORMATION THEY COULD DEEM CORRECT WAS FROM HIS OFFICE.

NEIGHBORS WERE INFORMED THAT THE DEVELOPERS WERE TRYING TO GET A NEW REGIONAL LIBRARY ADDED TO THE SITE. ALL THOSE IN ATTENDANCE WERE IN SUPPORT.

NEIGHBORS WERE STILL CONCERNED THAT THE EXISTING WATER AND SEWER SYSTEMS WERE ADEQUATE FOR THE PROPOSAL. THEY WERE INFORMED THE SURROUNDING SYSTEMS WERE DESIGNED TO HANDLE THE NEW AMOUNTS SINCE THIS AREA WAS ALWAYS DESIGNED AS A HIGHER-DENSITY AND RETAIL CENTER.

NEIGHBORS WERE CONCERNED ABOUT STAND-ALONE BARS. THEY WERE TOLD BARS ARE CURRENTLY ALLOWED IN THE PROJECT. REVISED CONDITIONS MOVE THE POSSIBILITY OF A BAR FURTHER AWAY FROM THE CURRENT NEIGHBORHOOD FROM 100 FT TO 250 FT AWAY FROM OPEN SPACE THAT IS ON THE PERIMETER OF THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD.

NEIGHBORS WERE CONCERNED HOURS AND DAYS AVAILABLE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT. THEY WERE TOLD IT WAS TOO EARLY IN THE PROCESS TO DEFINE LIMITATIONS YET, BUT THE DEVELOPERS WILL INVESTIGATE FURTHER AND HAVE OFFERS BEFORE PUBLIC HEARINGS.

OVERALL NEIGHBORS WERE NOT GENERALLY SUPPORTIVE OF THE CURRENT CONDITIONS. THEY VOICED CONCERN ABOUT GETTING A "TOO SMALL" SHOPPING CENTER WITH NO GROCERY STORE AND MORE RENTALS. THEY REQUESTED TO SC REDUCTION BE REVIEWED AS WELL AS LIMITING ALL RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO BE OWNER-OCCUPIED CONDOMINIUMS. THEY WERE TOLD THE DEVELOPERS WOULD LOOK AT REVISING THE SHOPPING CENTER SIZE REQUEST, BUT THAT RESIDENTIAL LIMITATION WAS NOT POSSIBLE.

ATTENDEES WERE GIVEN CONTACT INFORMATION FOR EPG AND WERE TOLD A MASS MAILING LIST WOULD BE CREATED USING THE EMAILS GATHERED AT THE MEETING.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT APPROXIMATELY 8:10.

ATTENDEE SIGN IN SHEETS ARE ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT.

NEIGHBORI	HOOD MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET		•
Project:	Olde Towne Village Rezoning	Meeting Date:	(April 0.4 2005 1
Facilitators:	Charles Walker and Angela Walker, EPG	Place/Room:	April 24, 2025
	\	r iace/Room:	Barwell Rd Elementary School

Printed Name	· Cranada Anno		Daniel IX Elementary School
	Signature	Phone	E-Mail
· Brian Fowler		919-673-4549	betweeler 2190 gment
· Jeff Kirshanbaum	Jeffy Ka-		sefficial enlarge 123122
· Gary Pysz	Laylyn	919-995-1569	Pysze bell south. net
· Zainab Alidina	A	984-215-8088	
· Dev Mashruwala		704-564-9195	DEVMASHRUMALARIA @ COMALLICOM
ashrey onced	aen	336-460-0765	ashley. Creed Lagmail. com
Pertie tre	5	443 521 C347	K Scarlettice @ omail. com
KARL HUDSON	Jan	9192643387	KARL HUDS-NC FOUNDRY COMMERCIAL. CON
Sharmaine Cormichael	12	919 673 6720	escamichael a hotmail. com
Tyra Beatty	Am Brass	767 272 8660	beattytyra@yaboo.com
Yashwarth Gutti	A	904200 8265	YGUTTIRGMAIL. COM
BIKIRAN GUHA	Ben	8-03-450-3412	BIKIRANGUMA(a) GMA'L. COM
Nilasree Dutle	Warke.	3127096963	nilasreedulla OS @gmail. um
Page 1 of 2			

. admitatol3.	Charles Walker and Angela Walker, EPG	Place/Room:	Barwell Rd Elementary School
Facilitators:	Charles Weller and A. J. W. II	morning Date.	7411 24, 2020
Project:	Olde Towne Village Rezoning	Meeting Date:	April 24, 2025
	OOD MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET		

Printed Name	Signature	Phone	
	^	Phone	E-Mail
Ovshanda Johnson	Cottshands offine	704-408-9800	Shonda LT@ prodigy.net
Davon Munay		919 520 8372	
PATHANTAGE CHINULULA	els	408-628-25X	PATHANDALI 12818 GMAIL-60M
TREKA SPRAGGINS	St pragus	919-710-0071	mamerisa minas-v. com
GABRIEL DROZ GOKULA KRISHWAN RAJENDRAN	1	954.651.3842	
GOKULA KRISHN AN RAJENDRAN	Rox.	919 449 1040	BGNPD @PROTONMAIL, com gokulsagoz Egmail.com
Vishom preye sakthivel	P	919210 3328	Vishnusa Kthe 38 agnail. com
Shanna Allen	SPM	361-257-1684	alben. Shennaj P gmail. com
Mahash Verma	Meron	919-454-5448	maheshverma 70 Qgmail.com
RAJAN AMVJA	Oku	910-273-7165	RINAMUSA O Yehoo. com
Phoni Rudra	The state of the s	7372021227	Phanikumar 2023 @gnail.com
Ronald Jarical	Pn -	98429144 33	nilesh 1@ iitj.ac.in
Monanki Jaiswal	Monants.	919-337-3495	monajais1049@gmail:com
Page 1 of 2			J June 2011

Olde Towne Village Rezoning Meeting Date: April 24, 2025	

Prireted Name	Signature	Phone	E-Mail
Snantal Dunn	Shanty Quina	919-539-9773	Shantald 007 Agmail.com
		,	
pera 1 of 2			

NEIGHBORH	OOD MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET		
Project:	Olde Towne Village Rezoning	Meeting Date:	April 24, 2025
Facilitators:	Charles Walker and Angela Walker, EPG	 	
<u> </u>		Place/Room:	Barwell Rd Elementary School

Printed Name	Signature	Phone	Ewal
John Verion	That	614-597-7579	John. Herion 5 @gmail
Tyler Williams	TY R	843-338-8557	Tyler. T. Williams@outlook.com
Jacque Ginffin (Sport of	919-539-2307	
Jacque Gniffin (aliyah Curry	Mysh Eins	(919)7493845	liaaa976@gmail.com
	0 0		
Page 1 of 2			

Project: Olde Towne Village Rezoning Meeting Date: April 6	
Meeting Date: April 2	4, 2025
Facilitators: Charles Walker and Angels Walker EDG	Rd Elementary School

	Printed Name	Signature	Phone	E-Mail
•	Shawn Williams	LShul	919-520-8518	Shawwilliam 2012 Ganoile
•	Pamlawillan	Aul	919-271-3074	
•	Chris Mirabelli	Wohner	609-694-2177	offis mirabelli 660 gmail.com
	CASE Mirabelli	0	968-635-6727	cgnurph11@gnil.com
D	guigsses J. Lane	Wyse Ilmen	0 919.247-0938	ulane 6 @ NCIRR COO
	James Ti Buie	Jan Duis	919-594-7969	munchee 1967 e. emil. com
	Whitperpullians	when	609-613-1131	wwillia4@gmail.com
	Josh Mutthews	m	252-751-8331	; oshua, maifhows 20 gmuil. ca
-	Neerau Dharsa	Sho	585-729-4888	neeraviduarra Qgmail.com.
-	Tony Goda	Guynely	240-906-0145	forgreddy 369@ gmail.com
	LA TONIO Williams	H. Deller		
Dr	age 1 of 2			

	Olde Towne Village Rezoning	Meeting Date:	April 24, 2025
Facilitators: (Charles Walker and Angela Walker, EPG		Barwell Rd Elementary School

Printed Name	Signature	Phone	E-Mail
Tejas Zinzuwadija	Binzuwaslizza	475-289-8714	tejas. zinenwadi ya 10) gmail.com
Suryanarayanan PS	P. Shya	8456614392	PBASS_DOQYAhoo.Lom
Rajasekhar Asynum	Brelly	919-459-7766	RADUNURI @gonas 1-6m
Maged As Kandar		781-708-6167	mages as Kandar & Hot mail a
Yousting Gahem	Youth	781-742-3437	
Jake Walten	gad Walle	757-277-5367	waltonja94@gnail.com
Larry Mallow	LOGI	919-656 -6375	box 20 o icloudion
Por Mc Alpin	hylled	917-743-9685	DONNAMONAM O AND
Borna McAlpin	Sua Malle	845-555-3677	DONALDMCALPIN DAOL, COM
Page 1 of 2			