**Existing Zoning**

**Property**
4200, 4208, & 4210 Pearl Rd

**Size**
8.3 acres

**Existing Zoning**
R-4

**Requested Zoning**
R-10-CU

Map by Raleigh Department of City Planning (reckhowh): 6/11/2018
## Case Information

**Z-17-18 4200, 4208, 4210 Pearl Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pearl Road, east and north of Auburn Church Road, west of Rock Quarry Road and south of Jones Sausage Road. Address: 4200, 4208, 4210 Pearl Road PINs: 1721989838, 1721987943, 1721992011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Rezone property from R-4 to R-10-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Request</td>
<td>8.30 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Limits</td>
<td>The site is located inside the ETJ, but outside and contiguous to Corporate City limits. An annexation will be required for City services to be provided to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Linda Alston &amp; Edith Alvin 285 NW 51ST ST Miami, FL 33127-2158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Michael Birch Longleaf Law Partners 2235 Gateway Access Point, Suite 201 Raleigh, NC 27607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advisory Council (CAC)</td>
<td>South CAC, meets the second Monday of each month. Pam Adderley, Community Relations Analyst 919.996.5716, <a href="mailto:pam.adderley@raleighnc.gov">pam.adderley@raleighnc.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comprehensive Plan Consistency

The rezoning case is ☒ Consistent ☐ Inconsistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

### Future Land Use Map Consistency

The rezoning case is ☒ Consistent ☐ Inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map.

### Comprehensive Plan Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
<th>Moderate Density Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENT Policies</td>
<td>Policy LU 1.2 Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency Policy LU 1.3 Conditional Use District Consistency Policy LU 2.2 Compact Development Policy LU 8.5 Conservation of Single Family Neighborhoods Policy H 1.8 Zoning for Housing Policy LU 3.4 Infrastructure Concurrency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCONSISTENT Policies</td>
<td>Policy PR 3.8 Pedestrian Links to Greenways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CONDITIONS**

1. The apartment building type shall be prohibited.

**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>05/02/2018</td>
<td>6/11/18, 7/9/18 (Y-26, N-5)</td>
<td>8/14/2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION**

☐ 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>Change(s) in Circumstances [if applicable]</th>
<th>Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan [if applicable]</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Motion and Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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ATTACHMENTS

1. Staff report

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

______________________________  ________________________________
Planning Director  Date  Planning Commission Chairperson  Date

Staff Coordinator: Sara Ellis: (919) 996-2234; Sara.Ellis@raleighnc.gov
OVERVIEW

The rezoning site is composed of three parcels located west of Pearl Road (State Road 2550), east of Auburn Church road, north of Princess Anna Marie Lane and south of Landreaux Drive. The site is approximately one and one-half miles southeast of the intersection of Rock Quarry and Jones Sausage Road, and approximately three miles east of the intersection of I-40 and Jones Sausage Road.

The site is predominately vacant, with heavy forestation that includes a number of mature hardwood trees and some newer growth, with a mobile home present on the middle parcel. The three parcels are flag lots, oriented from east to west with access to Pearl Road along the northern edge, and Queen Pierrette Street stubbing at the westernmost parcel. The Capitol Area Greenway (CAG) Corridor Master Plan has a planned greenway collector loop just west of the site, which will connect to the Walnut Creek and Neuse River Trail.

The topography of the site slopes downward from east to west, with a branch of the Big Branch Stream terminating on the rear, westernmost parcel, which also contains a floodplain and utility easement. Due to the presence of the floodplain and overhead utility easement the total buildable land of the three parcels is approximately 5.46 acres of the total 8.30 acres.

The area surrounding the rezoning site is primarily residential, consisting mostly of detached single-family homes, mobile homes and vacant, heavily forested parcels. The parcels immediately surrounding the rezoning site contain scattered single-family and mobile homes. The larger area surrounding the site is characterized by primarily low density, detached single-family homes. Homes in the area tend to be two stories and less than 1,600 square feet of heated space.

Zoning districts in the area are predominately R-4, R-6-CU and R-10-CU, with approximately 1,000 acres of land zoned for industrial uses directly west of the site. The majority of the R-10-CU (zoning cases Z-42-2016 & Z-24-2006) parcels within one half a mile of the site are currently undeveloped. Zoning conditions on the R-6-CU (Z-35-2003) parcels, to the south of the site, limit density to approximately 4.54 units per acre (or a maximum of 211 units on 46.4 acres), and prohibit the apartment building type. Conditions on the parcels zoned R-6-CU (Z-35-2000) to the east of the subject site prohibit apartments, and prohibit more than ten acres of the total 88-acre site to be developed as townhomes.
The Future Land Use Map designates the rezoning site for Moderate Density Residential, which recommends a density of up to 14 units per acre. There is no Urban Form guidance for the site. Rock Quarry Road, approximately one half a mile to the northeast, is a Transit Emphasis Corridor. The Rock Quarry Battle Bridge Neighborhood Center is approximately three-fourths a mile to the east. The Rock Quarry Battle Bridge Neighborhood Center area plan provides guidance to create a pedestrian-oriented street system that is connected to surrounding and future residential neighborhoods. There is approximately one-half acre of undeveloped land zoned for neighborhood mixed-use with conditions (Z-35-2003) approximately a quarter mile south of the site.

The rezoning site is located in an economic development target area, which is defined as an area in which at least 40% or more of census block groups are zoned for nonresidential uses; and that are considered “high poverty” or adjacent to “high poverty block groups”. It also includes areas in which 40% of more of the block group is zoned for industrial uses. The request would allow for ten units per acre, an increase from the current entitlement of four units per acre. In addition to the increase in density, the requested Residential-10 (R-10) zoning district would allow the apartment and townhouse building type, however the proposed conditions would prohibit apartments.

**Outstanding Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Existing Zoning

**Z-17-2018**

#### Map

- **IX-3 CU**
- **IH-CU**
- **R-4**
- **R-6-CU**
- **R-10-CU**
- **NX-3 CU**

#### Property Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>4200, 4208, &amp; 4210 Pearl Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>8.3 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>R-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Zoning</td>
<td>R-10-CU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Land Use

Z-17-2018

Property: 4200, 4208, & 4210 Pearl Rd

Size: 8.3 acres

Existing Zoning: R-4

Requested Zoning: R-10-CU
## Urban Form

**Z-17-2018**

### Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>4200, 4208, &amp; 4210 Pearl Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Size

- **Size**: 8.3 acres

### Existing Zoning

- **Existing Zoning**: R-4

### Requested Zoning

- **Requested Zoning**: R-10-CU

---

*Map by Raleigh Department of City Planning (Redshow); 6/11/2018*
**Comprehensive Plan**

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

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

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

This proposal is consistent with the **Expanding Housing Choices** vision theme, which encourages expanding the supply of affordable housing choices. Under the current R-4 zoning, townhomes are not permitted, the proposal to rezone to R-10 would allow them. Additionally, the R-10 zoning district has a minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet, which may allow for smaller, more moderately priced homes, including townhomes, than the current R-4 district which has a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. If the proposal is approved, housing developed in the area would likely be more affordable than housing developed under the current zoning, as the minimum lot size would be reduced by 6,000 square feet.

This proposal is consistent with the **Growing Successful Neighborhoods and Communities** vision theme. This theme encourages infill development that complements existing character, the subject property is located in a “donut hole”; a small, predominately undeveloped land area that is located in between developed parcels. This theme also encourages developed areas be convenient to open space, community services, retail and employment. The site is located less than one mile from the Rock Quarry Battle Bridge Mixed-Use Center, which could provide nearby access to retail.

*The request is not inconsistent with any of the other vision theme statements.*

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

*Yes, the use being requested will allow for a density of ten residential units per acre, in an area where the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) suggests a density of six to fourteen units per acre. The corresponding zoning districts for this FLUM designation include R-10, which is the requested 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?

*The use requested is specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map.*
D. Will community facilities and streets be available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property?

Yes, the rezoning site is in an urbanized area with sufficient infrastructure to serve development allowed by the proposed zoning.

**Future Land Use**

**Future Land Use designation:**

The rezoning request is:

☑ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☐ Inconsistent

**Analysis of consistency:** The use and density permitted by the proposed zoning are consistent with the recommendation of the Moderate Density Residential designation for the area, which suggests a residential density of six to fourteen units per acre. The proposal would allow up to ten units per acre.

**Urban Form**

**Urban Form designation:**

The rezoning request is:

☑ Not applicable (no Urban Form designation)

☐ Consistent with the Urban Form Map.

☐ Inconsistent

**Not Applicable:** There is no Urban Form Map designation for this site.

**Compatibility**

The proposed rezoning is:

☑ Compatible with the property and surrounding area.

☐ Incompatible

**Analysis of Compatibility:** The density and building types allowed by the requested zoning are compatible with the surrounding development pattern. Overall density of the site could be up to ten units per acre, and the zoning category would allow townhomes. This is compatible with the similar density of surrounding residential developments.
**Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning**

The request would increase the number and range of housing types allowed on the site, potentially increasing the affordability of housing units.

**Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning**

Traffic may increase in the area surrounding the rezoning site.

**Policy Guidance**

The rezoning request is consistent with the following policies:

**Policy LU 1.2 Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency**

*The Future Land Use Map shall be used in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan policies to evaluate zoning consistency including proposed zoning map amendments and zoning text changes.*

The Future Land Use Map designates areas identified for Moderate Density Residential to have a density of six to fourteen units per acre, the request will allow for up to ten units per acre, which is consistent with the FLUM designation.

**Policy LU 1.3 Conditional Use District Consistency**

*All conditions proposed as part of a conditional use district (CUD) should be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.*

The request includes a condition that prohibits apartment building types, this is compatible with the surrounding developments which are of a similar type and density. The area within half a mile of the site contains townhomes and single family detached homes, the condition is consistent with this policy.

**Policy LU 2.2 Compact Development**

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

If approved, this request will increase the permitted density of the site from the currently permitted four units per acre density to a maximum allowable ten units per acre, an increase in six units per acre from the current entitlement. The request also has the potential to allow for improved street connectivity by encouraging the redevelopment of a flag lot that would require the Queen Pierrette Street stub to continue north and form a new street connection.

**Policy LU 8.5 Conservation of Single Family Neighborhoods**

*Protect and conserve the City's single-family neighborhoods and ensure that their zoning reflects their established low-density character. Carefully manage the development of vacant*
land and the alteration of existing structures in and adjacent to single-family neighborhoods to protect low density character, preserve open space, and maintain neighborhood scale.

The surrounding subdivisions have a density that is slightly less than that of the requested rezoning, but it is minor at just under four units per acre for single family detached home developments. Per staff analysis, the rezoning request can yield up to 7.02 units per acre, a minimal increase in density that is consistent with Policy LU 8.5 as it would permit a similar low-density character and retain the neighborhood scale. The condition to prohibit apartments would maintain the existing neighborhood scale.

Policy H 1.8 Zoning for Housing
Ensure that zoning policy continues to provide ample opportunity for developers to build a variety of housing types, ranging from single-family to dense multi-family. Keeping the market well supplied with housing will moderate the costs of owning and renting, lessening affordability problems, and lowering the level of subsidy necessary to produce affordable housing.

The proposal would increase the permitted residential density of the site, and allow for a greater range of housing types than is permitted under the current Residential-4 (R-4) zoning. In R-4 zoning districts, only detached homes (and attached homes as part of a conservation development option) are permitted. The requested Residential-10 (R-10) zoning would allow for attached, detached and town homes (apartment building types are permitted in R-10 district; however, the conditions would prohibit them for this case).

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

The site is located within Raleigh’s ETJ, directly adjacent to corporate City limits and is surrounded by residential subdivisions, the majority of which were annexed in 2008. The site has sufficient transportation, water, stormwater and watershed infrastructure in place to support the increased density the rezoning will allow.

Potential inconsistent policies:

Policy PR 3.8 Pedestrian Links to Greenways
Improve pedestrian linkages to existing and proposed greenway corridors. Development adjacent to a greenway trail should link their internal pedestrian network to the greenway trail where appropriate.

The site is located adjacent to a planned greenway connector loop, by providing a condition specifying that pedestrian access to the planned greenway connector loop, pedestrian linkages will be greatly improved for not only future residents but the larger surrounding area, bringing the case into consistency with Policy PR 3.8.
**Area Plan Policy Guidance**

There is no area plan guidance for this site.

**Impact Analysis**

**Transportation**

*Streets*

The Raleigh Street Plan designates Pearl Road as a two-lane, undivided avenue. The Plan shows the street, which becomes Camelot Village Avenue south of the subject property, being extended to the south to connect to Auburn Church Road at the intersection with Wall Store Road. It is maintained by NCDOT. Queen Pierrette Street stubs at the Z-17-2018 site from the south. Haverty Drive and Grandover Drive both stub at properties just north of the Z-17-2018 site, but would eventually continue through to the parcel with development of the intervening parcels.

In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for R-10 zoning districts is 2,500 feet. Due to surrounding, undeveloped land, the block perimeter currently exceeds this maximum allowed. Stubbing public streets will be required with subdivision of the site.

*Pedestrian Facilities*

There are currently only sidewalks on Pearl Road for a short portion to the south of the Z-17-2018 site. Upon development, sidewalks shall be added along the site’s frontage. Improvement of pedestrian facilities along Pearl Road would benefit the neighborhood.

*Bicycle Facilities*

None of the roads in the surrounding area currently have bike lanes or other bike facilities. The Long-Term Bikeway Plan includes bicycle lanes on Pearl Road, and a separated bikeway on Rock Quarry Road.

*Greenways*

In the Greenway Corridor Master Plan, there is a greenway collector loop planned just west of the Z-17-2018 parcel, which intends to connect the neighborhoods to the Walnut Creek Trail and the Neuse River Trail.

*Transit*

The Z-17-2018 site is not currently served by transit. Transit service will be added to Rock Quarry Road in FY2019.
Access

Offers of cross access to adjacent parcels shall be made in accordance with the Raleigh UDO section 8.3.5.D. Site access will be provided via Pearl Road. The subject site has a road frontage of approximately 250 feet on Pearl Road. According the Raleigh Street Design Manual, for an R-10 zoning district with 150 units or less, one access point along a public street is required. The Z-17-2018 site would be restricted to one access point on Pearl Road, unless a design adjustment is granted. Access may also be provided via an extension of Queen Pierrette Street.

Other Projects in the Area

Construction of single-family homes is planned to the south. There are three city and state transportation projects programmed for the area:

- **Barwell Road – South**: This project will improve Barwell Road between Rock Quarry and Berkeley Lake Road by implementing a 2-lane divided avenue on the street, with a possible center turn lane, rather than a median. Road improvements will also include sidewalks and bicycle facilities, and will also realign Pearl Road to intersect Rock Quarry Road at Barwell Road. Construction is anticipated to start as early as late 2020, and should be complete before 2022.

- **I-40 Widening Southeast Raleigh to Clayton**: The project will replace and widen the Rock Quarry Road overpass of I-40 between 3109 Rock Quarry and 3301 Rock Quarry Road. Construction is likely to start later this year, and has an anticipated completion data of 2022.

- **Rock Quarry Road – Part C**: The project will complete the gap in Rock Quarry Road so it is a 5-lane road between Jones Sausage and Raleigh Boulevard, and will include a sidewalk on the north side and a shared use path on the south. The City of Raleigh currently has a consultant completing environmental documentation for the project, however the timeline of the project is uncertain at this time.
• **TIA Determination**

There was a severe crash in the last three years at the intersection of Pearl Road and Rock Quarry Road. Approval of case Z-17-2018 would increase peak hour and daily trip volumes marginally. A traffic study is not required for case Z-17-2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-17-18 Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Partially Undeveloped</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-17-18 Current Zoning Entitlements</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-17-18 Proposed Zoning Maximums</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-17-18 Trip Volume Change (Proposed Maximums minus Current Entitlements)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Identified: None.**

**Transit**

The nearest existing bus stop is located more than three miles to the north and west of the site, on Rock Quarry Road. The Wake Transit Plan may expand bus service as far south as Rock Quarry and Pearl Road, which would place a bus stop as close as one-half mile from the site.

UDO Section 8.11 Transit Infrastructure, requires the provision of certain bus-stop related amenities when the site is located on an existing or planned transit route, and will generate at least 500 average weekday vehicle trips. Based on the rezoning proposal, this property would not be subject to the requirements of UDO section 8.11.

**Impact Identified: None.**
**Hydrology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floodplain</th>
<th>Minor FEMA Floodplain present at far western edge of property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Basin</td>
<td>Big Branch - S</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.

**Public Utilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Demand</th>
<th>Maximum Demand</th>
<th>Maximum Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(current use)</td>
<td>(current zoning)</td>
<td>(proposed zoning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0 gpd</td>
<td>4,750 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>0 gpd</td>
<td>4,750 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The proposed rezoning would add approximately 10,250 gallons per day to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the City. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the proposed rezoning area.

2. 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 a building permit and constructed prior to release of a certificate of occupancy.

3. 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.

**Parks and Recreation**

1. Providing public access across the site, connecting the Pearl Road right-of-way with the future Big Branch Greenway Corridor to the west, would create valuable connectivity and access to the greenway network for the future residents of the site and the general public.

2. This area is not considered a high priority for parkland acquisition. A 155-acre undeveloped property owned by the City of Raleigh is 0.3 miles away, on Pearl Road, and will serve the future residents.
3. Nearest existing park access is provided by Barwell Road Park (0.9 miles) and Walnut Creek South Park (3.7 miles).

4. Nearest existing greenway trail access is provided by Neuse River Greenway Trail (2.6 miles).

**Impact Identified: None.**

**Urban Forestry**

1. The proposed rezoning does not have any effect on the Urban Forestry requirements.

**Impact Identified: None.**

**Designated Historic Resources**

There are no known historic resources on the property.

**Impact Identified: None.**

**Impacts Summary**

The increase in density on the subject site has a minimal impact on the infrastructure in the area.

**Mitigation of Impacts**

None.

**Conclusion**

The request is to rezone approximately 8.30 acres from Residential-4 (R-4) to Residential-10 with conditions (R-10-CU). The proposed conditions would prohibit apartments.

The request is **consistent** with the Future Land Use Map and **consistent** with the Comprehensive Plan overall. The type of development proposed exists in the area, and can be established without adversely affecting the community. It would provide a benefit of increased housing stock and type in an undeveloped area contiguous to City limits and similar development.

The request is **consistent** with the Comprehensive Plan policies regarding compact development, conservation of single family neighborhoods, and zoning for housing. The request would support the vision themes of *Expanding Housing Choices* and *Growing Successful Neighborhood and Communities.*
**Case Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/08/2018</td>
<td>Application submitted with conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/2018</td>
<td>CAC Vote, Y (26) N (5)</td>
<td>The opposition vote was due to concerns about increases in traffic, and stormwater catchment design and management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix**

### Surrounding Area Land Use/ Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>R-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
<td>Moderate Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant &amp; Mobile Home</td>
<td>Vacant, Single Family, Mobile</td>
<td>Mobile &amp; Vacant</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subject**

**Property**

**North**

**South**

**East**

**West**

---
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**Current vs. Proposed Zoning Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td>8.30 (5.46 Buildable Acres)</td>
<td>8.30 (5.46 Buildable Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>Front: 10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side:</td>
<td>15’</td>
<td>Side: 10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>30’</td>
<td>Rear: 20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Density (net site area):</strong></td>
<td>3.33 u/acre</td>
<td>7.02 u/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. # of Residential Units</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Building SF (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Office SF</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Retail SF</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Industrial SF</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential F.A.R (net site area):</strong></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

** The site has a non-buildable area of approximately 2.84 acres due to the floodplain and utility easement, this estimate was derived using the buildable area of 5.46 acres.
OVERVIEW
[Generally describe the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that may be necessary for approval of the rezoning request.]

LIST OF AMENDMENTS
1. Numbered list: Insert blackline-formatted amendments to the Comprehensive Plan which should accompany approval of this case in order to resolve inconsistency. Provide an explanation for each amendment based on the circumstances of this case.

AMENDED MAPS
[Insert images of amendments to policy maps which may need to accompany approval of this case in order to resolve inconsistency.]

IMPACT ANALYSIS
[Describe citywide impacts of amendments listed above.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-17-18 Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Daily Trips (vpd)</th>
<th>AM peak trips (vph)</th>
<th>PM peak trips (vph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential, Partially Undeveloped</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-17-18 Current Zoning Entitlements</th>
<th>Daily Trips (vpd)</th>
<th>AM peak trips (vph)</th>
<th>PM peak trips (vph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-17-18 Proposed Zoning Maximums</th>
<th>Daily Trips (vpd)</th>
<th>AM peak trips (vph)</th>
<th>PM peak trips (vph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-17-18 Trip Volume Change</th>
<th>Daily Trips (vpd)</th>
<th>AM peak trips (vph)</th>
<th>PM peak trips (vph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Proposed Maximums minus Current Entitlements)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.23.4 Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Meets TIA Conditions? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Peak Hour Trips ≥ 150 veh/hr</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The expected increase in AM peak hour trips is 16 vph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Peak Hour Trips ≥ 100 veh/hr if primary access is on a 2-lane street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The expected increase in AM peak hour trips is 21 vph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C More than 100 veh/hr trips in the peak direction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The expected increase in AM peak direction trips is 12 vph and in PM peak direction trips is 14 vph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Daily Trips ≥ 3,000 veh/day</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The expected increase in Daily trips is 200 vph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Enrollment increases at public or private schools</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.23.5 Site Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Meets TIA Conditions? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Affects a location with a high crash history</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There was one fatal or disabling crash at Pearl Road and Rock Quarry Road. The severity index is less than 8.4, so the TIA is waived or not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Takes place at a highly congested location</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Creates a fourth leg at an existing signalized intersection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Exacerbates an already difficult situation such as a RR Crossing, Fire Station Access, School Access, etc.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Access is to/from a Major Street as defined by the City's Street Plan Map Major street - avenue with more than 4 lanes or boulevard</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Access is on a two lane street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Proposed access is within 1,000 feet of an interchange</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Involves an existing or proposed median crossover</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Involves an active roadway construction project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Involves a break in controlled access along a corridor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.23.6 Miscellaneous Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Meets TIA Conditions? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Planned Development Districts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not a PD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B In response to Raleigh Planning Commission or Raleigh City Council resolutions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None noted as of 6/13/18.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Application Conference
(this form must be provided at the time of formal submittal)

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

PROCESS TYPE

☐ Board of Adjustment
☐ Comprehensive Plan Amendment
☐ Rezoning
☐ Site Review*
☐ Subdivision
☐ Subdivision (Exempt)
☐ Text Change
* Optional conference

GENERAL INFORMATION

Date Submitted February 20, 2018

Applicant(s) Name Michael Birch; Morris, Russell, Eagle & Worley, PLLC

Applicant's Mailing Address 2235 Gateway Access Point, Suite 201, Raleigh, NC 27607

Phone 919-645-4317

Email mbirch@morrisrussell.com

Property PIN #1721-99-2011, 1721-98-7943, 1721-98-9838

Site Address / Location 4200, 4208 and 4210 Pearl Road

Current Zoning R-4

Additional Information (if needed):

OFFICE USE ONLY

Transaction #: 547-471 Date of Pre-Application Conference: 3/6/18 3/9/18

Staff Signature
## REZONING REQUEST

- **General Use**: [ ]
- **Conditional Use**: [ ]
- **Master Plan**: [ ]

**Existing Zoning Base District**: R-4  
**Height**:  
**Frontage**:  
**Overlay(s)**: 

**Proposed Zoning Base District**: R-10  
**Height**:  
**Frontage**:  
**Overlay(s)**: 

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

If the property has been previously rezoned, provide the rezoning case number: **Z-36-1989**

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

- 547471

## GENERAL INFORMATION

**Date**: 6/8/19  
**Date Amended (1)**:  
**Date Amended (2)**:  

**Property Address**: 4200, 4208, 4210 Pearl Road  
**Property PIN**: 1721-99-2011, 1721-98-7943, 1721-98-9838  
**Deed Reference (book/page)**: See attached

**Nearest Intersection**: Pearl Road and Princess Anna Marie Lane

**Property Size (acres)**: 8.3

**Property Owner/Address**
See attached

**Project Contact Person/Address**
Michael Birch  
Morris, Russell, Eagle & Worley, PLLC  
2235 Gateway Access Point, Suite 201  
Raleigh, NC 27607

**Phone**: 919.645.4317  
**Fax**: 
**Email**: mbirch@morrisrussell.com

**Owner/Agent Signature**: Linda Alston

**Email**: Linda.H201Alistor@gmail.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

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

REZONING REQUEST

☐ General Use  ☐ Conditional Use  ☐ Master Plan

Existing Zoning Base District: R-4  Height  Frontage  Overlay(s) ____________

Proposed Zoning Base District: R-10  Height  Frontage  Overlay(s) ____________

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

If the property has been previously rezoned, provide the rezoning case number: Z-36-1989

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

547471

GENERAL INFORMATION

Date 6/8/18  Date Amended (1)  Date Amended (2)

Property Address 4200, 4208, 4210 Pearl Road


Nearest Intersection Pearl Road and Princess Anna Marie Lane

Property Size (acres) 8.3  (For PD Applications Only) Total Units  Total Square Feet

Property Owner/Address See attached

Phone

Fax

Email

Project Contact Person/Address

Michael Birch
Morris, Russell, Eagle & Worley, PLLC
2235 Gateway Access Point, Suite 201
Raleigh, NC 27607

Phone 919.645.4317  Fax

Email mbirch@morrisrussell.com

Owner/Agent Signature

Email

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Case Number</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transaction #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rezoning Case #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Submitted:** 6/8/18

**Existing Zoning:** R-4

**Proposed Zoning:** R-10-CU

### Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

1. The Apartment building type shall be prohibited.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

These zoning conditions have been voluntarily offered by the property owner. All property owners must sign each condition page. This page may be photocopied if additional space is needed.

Owner/Agent Signature: [Signature]

Print Name: [Print Name]
### Conditional Use District Zoning Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Case Number</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Submitted</td>
<td>6/8/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>R-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>R-10-CU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Narrative Of Zoning Conditions Offered**

1. The Apartment building type shall be prohibited.

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

6. 

7. 

8. 

9. 

10. 

These zoning conditions have been voluntarily offered by the property owner. All property owners must sign each condition page. This page may be photocopied if additional space is needed.

Owner/Agent Signature: Edith Alvin 6/6/2015
Print Name: Edith Alvin
# 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 Future Land Use Map designates these three properties as "Moderate Density Residential", which encourages 1. residential density between 6 to 14 units per acre and suggests townhouse development is appropriate. The rezoning request for ten units per acre and allowing townhouse development is consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan policies: LU 1.2 "Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency", LU 1.3 "Conditional Use District Consistency", LU 2.2 "Compact Development", and LU 4.5 "Connectivity".

3.

4.

## PUBLIC BENEFITS

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

The proposed rezoning benefits the public by providing additional housing types and opportunities 1. in this area of the city.

The proposed rezoning benefits the public by rezoning land consistent with the Future Land Use Map and for uses and density compatible with the surrounding area.

3.

4.
**REZONING APPLICATION ADDENDUM #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Historic Resources</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The applicant is asked to analyze the impact of the rezoning request on historic resources. For the purposes of this section, a historic resource is defined as any site, structure, sign, or other feature of the property to be rezoned that is listed in the National Register of Historic Places or designated by the City of Raleigh as a landmark or contributing to a Historic Overlay District.</td>
<td>Transaction #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rezoning Case #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVENTORY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no known historic resources located on the property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED MITIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide brief statements describing actions that will be taken to mitigate all negative impacts listed above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

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

a) The property to be rezoned is within a "City Growth Center" or "Mixed-Use Center"; or

b) The property to be rezoned is located along a "Main Street" or "Transit Emphasis Corridor"
as shown on the Urban Form Map in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

**Urban Form Designation:** N/A

[Click here to view the Urban Form Map.](#)

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

   **Response:**

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

   **Response:**

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

   **Response:**

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

   **Response:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

21. Sidewalks should be 5-8 feet wide in residential areas and located on both sides of the street. Sidewalks in commercial areas and Pedestrian Business Overlays should be a minimum of 14-16 feet wide to accommodate sidewalk uses such as vendors, merchandising and outdoor seating.
Response:

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

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

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

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

26. The sidewalks should be the principal place of pedestrian movement and casual social interaction. Designs and uses should be complementary to that function.
Response:
## REZONING APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS ("Rezoning Checklist")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Requirements – General Use or Conditional Use Rezoning</th>
<th>TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT</th>
<th>COMPLETED BY CITY STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I have referenced this Rezoning Checklist and by using this as a guide, it will ensure that I receive a complete and thorough first review by the City of Raleigh</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rezoning application review fee (see Fee Schedule for rate)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Completed application; Include electronic version via CD or flash drive</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Two sets of stamped envelopes addressed to all property owners within 100 feet of property to be rezoned</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pre-Application Conference</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Neighborhood Meeting notice and report</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trip Generation Study</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Traffic Impact Analysis</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Completed and signed zoning conditions</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Completed Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Completed Response to the Urban Design Guidelines</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. For applications filed by a third party, proof of actual notice to the property owner</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Master Plan (for properties requesting Planned Development or Campus District)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursuant to applicable provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance, a meeting was held with respect to a potential rezoning with adjacent property owners on Wednesday, May 2, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. The property considered for this potential rezoning total approximately 8.3 acres, and is located west of Pearl Road, north of Princess Anna Marie Lane, in the City of Raleigh, having Wake County Parcel Identification Numbers 1721-99-2011, 1721-98-7943 and 1721-98-9838. This meeting was held at the Barwell Road Community Center, located at 5857 Barwell Park Drive, Raleigh, NC 27610. All owners of property within 500 feet of the subject property were invited to attend the meeting. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a copy of the neighborhood meeting notice. A copy of the required mailing list for the meeting invitations is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**. A summary of the items discussed at the meeting is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**. Attached hereto as **Exhibit D** is a list of individuals who attended the meeting.
EXHIBIT A – NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTICE

To: Neighboring Property Owner

From: Michael Birch

Date: April 12, 2018

Re: Neighborhood Meeting for Potential Rezoning of 4200, 4208 and 4210 Pearl Road

We are counsel for a developer that is considering rezoning three vacant parcels of land totaling 8.3 acres on the west side of Pearl Road, north of Princess Anna Marie Lane, with addresses of 4200, 4208 and 4210 Pearl Road and Parcel Identification Numbers 1721-99-2011, 1721-98-7943 and 1721-98-9838 (the “Properties”). The Properties are currently zoned R-4, and the developer is considering rezoning the Properties to R-10. The purpose of the rezoning is to provide additional housing and a variety of housing options in the area.

You are invited to attend a meeting to discuss the potential rezoning. We have scheduled a meeting with surrounding property owners on Wednesday, May 2, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. This meeting will be held in the Multipurpose Room at the Barwell Road Park Community Center, located at 5857 Barwell Park Drive, Raleigh, NC 27610.

The City of Raleigh requires a neighborhood meeting involving the owners of property within 500 feet of the Property prior to filing a rezoning application. After the meeting, we will prepare a report for the Planning Department regarding the items discussed at the meeting.

Please do not hesitate to contact me directly if you have any questions or wish to discuss any issues. I can be reached at 919.645.4317 and mbirch@morrisrussell.com. Also, for more information about rezoning, you may visit www.raleighnc.gov or contact the Raleigh City Planning Department at 919.996.2626 or rezoning@raleighnc.gov.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT B – NOTICE LIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1721962011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALVIN, EDITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 NW 51ST ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI FL 33127-2158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721894943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANE, GLORIA B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2406 KENNINGTON RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27510-1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721897421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRINIVASAIH, MAHESH Srinivasalu, SANGEETHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>908 3RD AVE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSAQWAH WA 98209-5406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721897601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAS PROPERTIES LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 WOLFS BANE DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEX NC 27539-7902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721897704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGUYEN, SON K NGUYEN, TAM M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2506 DAWN RIDGE CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEX NC 27523-6231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721899407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGERS, CARRIE MUHAMMAD, VERNELL N SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4361 HAERTY DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27510-6386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721995006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELSON, JOAN ALLYN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605 S BEND DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURHAM NC 27713-6177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721980702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMELOT DEVELOPMENT LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO BOX 20867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27510-0687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721895804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTS, ANGELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7305 MILL RIDGE RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27513-3517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721985552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISEMAN, MEGAN LEIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4708 PRINCESS ANNA MARIE LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27510-8700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1731080338    | CAMELLOT DEVELOPMENT LLC  
PO BOX 20467  
RALEIGH NC 27610-0667 | 1731080229    | HOUSING AUTHORITY CITY OF RALEIGH  
900 WAYNES ST  
RALEIGH NC 27604-1462 | 1731088827    | ABBINGTON RIDGE COMMUNITY ASSOC INC  
HRW INC  
4700 HOMWOOD CT STE 380  
RALEIGH NC 27609-5732 |
| 1731090351    | STRICKLAND, ORADY E. STRICKLAND,  
FAYE W.  
6920 BATTLE BRIDGE RD  
RALEIGH NC 27610-6214 | 1731092042    | NUNN, JOSEPH W. NUNN, LINDA Y  
4201 PEARL RD  
RALEIGH NC 27613-8111 | 1731092198    | STRICKLAND, ORADY E. STRICKLAND,  
FAYE W.  
6920 BATTLE BRIDGE RD  
RALEIGH NC 27610-6214 |
| 1731092304    | SMITH PREP LLC  
6022 FORDLAND DR  
RALEIGH NC 27606-4475 | 1731094025    | NUNN, JOSEPH W. NUNN, LINDA Y  
4201 PEARL RD  
RALEIGH NC 27613-8111 | 1731095150    | WHITAKER, FELICIA  
5701 FOREST POINT RD  
RALEIGH NC 27609-0353 |
| 1731098114    | KILMER, EDWARD J. III KILMER, AMALIA C  
5705 FOREST POINT RD  
RALEIGH NC 27609-0253 | 1731098228    | ABBINGTON RIDGE COMMUNITY ASSOC INC  
HRW INC  
4700 HOMWOOD CT STE 380  
RALEIGH NC 27609-5732 |
EXHIBIT C – ITEMS DISCUSSED

1. The traffic on Pearl Road; specifically, the curvature of the road as it relates to children and school busing
2. The residential development south of the property
3. Questions about amenity sites on the property
4. Lack of sidewalks along Pearl Road
5. Fence on the back side of the property
6. The proposed number of units
7. The proposed price of the units
8. Neighbors were in agreement that the development would increase their property values
9. The possibility of a traffic signal and Pearl Road and Rock Quarry Road
10. Connection to street stubs
11. The timeline for completion of the development
12. Neighbors wanted notification of the CAC meeting

EXHIBIT D – MEETING ATTENDEES
1. Robert and Dorothy Branch
2. Clarence Evans
3. James Hyatt
4. Anna Watkins
5. Josephine Freites
6. Elia Nunn
7. Linda Alston
8. Rene Ramirez
9. Blanchie Hubbard