Request:

4.17 acres from
O&I-1-CUD
to OX-3-CU
Case Information Z-18-15 Donald Ross Drive

| Location               | Donald Ross Drive, south side, at its intersection with New Bern Avenue  
|                       | Address: 101 Donald Ross Drive  
|                       | PIN: 1723192900  
| Request               | Rezone property from Office & Institution-1 Conditional Use District (CUD O&I-1) to Office Mixed Use-3 stories-Conditional Use (OX-3-CU)  
| Area of Request       | 4.17 acres  
| Property Owner        | Alliance Medical Ministry, Inc.  
|                       | 101 Donald Ross Drive  
|                       | Raleigh, NC 27610  
| Applicant             | Megg Rader  
|                       | Alliance Medical Ministry, Inc.  
|                       | 101 Donald Ross Drive  
|                       | Raleigh, NC 27610  
|                       | and  
|                       | Lacy H. Reaves  
|                       | Smith Anderson Law Firm  
|                       | P.O. Box 2611  
|                       | Raleigh, NC 27602  
| Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) | East – Deborah Ford, Chairperson  
|                       | dialmeupford3@ymail.com  
| PC Recommendation Deadline | September 21, 2015  

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

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

Comprehensive Plan Guidance

| FUTURE LAND USE   | Institutional (Inst.)  
| URBAN FORM        | City Growth Center and Transit Emphasis Corridor (New Bern Avenue) and Urban Thoroughfare (Luther Road)  
| CONSISTENT Policies | Policy LU 1.2—Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency  
|                    | Policy LU 5.4—Density Transitions  
|                    | Policy LU 6.4—Bus Stop Dedication  
| INCONSISTENT Policies | Policy UD 1.10—Frontage  
|                    | Policy UD 7.3—Design Guidelines  
|                    | Objective FT.1 Frontage Typologies (New Bern Avenue Corridor)  
|
Summary of Proposed Conditions

1. Prohibits certain uses.
2. Limits type of outdoor area and parking lot lighting.
3. Restricts hours of waste service.
4. Offers a transit easement along New Bern Avenue.
5. Restricts hours of operation for any business establishment.
6. Limits total building square footage and offers provisions for building design and materials.
7. Requires a development allocation covenant.

Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Meeting</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>City Council</th>
<th>Public Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/20/15</td>
<td>5/18/15 15 to 1 in favor</td>
<td>6/23/15</td>
<td>7/7/15</td>
<td>8/4/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☑ Valid Statutory Protest Petition

Attachments

1. Staff report

Planning Commission Recommendation

| Recommendation | Approve with conditions. City Council may now schedule this proposal for Public Hearing, or refer it to committee for further study and discussion. |
|               | 1. While the proposal is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Urban Form Map, it is consistent with the Future Land Use Map and permits development of comparable scale as that currently possible on the site. The applicant has also stated a willingness to accept a frontage designation at a later date as part of the citywide UDO Zoning Remapping process. |
|               | 2. The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest. The proposal will enhance an important community-focused use of the property and allow for compatible mixed-use opportunities that will serve the surrounding neighborhood. |
|               | 3. The proposal is compatible with the surrounding area. Permitted development would be of height and form similar to those nearby. The proposal also includes conditions that prohibit certain uses and address light and noise impacts. |
| Motion and Vote | Motion: Buxton Second: Braun In Favor: Alcine, Braun, Buxton, Fluhrer, Hicks, Lyle, Schuster and Swink Opposed |
This document is a true and accurate statement of the findings and recommendations of the Planning Commission. Approval of this document incorporates all of the findings of the attached Staff Report.

Planning Director ___________________________ Date ____________ 6/23/15
Planning Commission Chairperson ___________________________ Date ____________

Staff Coordinator: Vivian Ekstrom: (919) 996-2657; vivian.ekstrom@raleighnc.gov
Case Summary

Overview
The site is located in east Raleigh in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of New Bern Avenue and Donald Ross Drive. The WakeMed Hospital center is less than a quarter mile to the northeast of the site.

The subject property is currently occupied by two buildings. One is a converted church now used as a medical clinic that provides services to working, uninsured adults, and the other is a gymnasium. Surrounding uses are a mix of medical offices to the north and east and single family residential uses to the south and west.

The subject property is classified as Institutional on the Future Land Use Map, as are the WakeMed complex properties to the northeast. Properties to the south, north, and west are designated as Office & Residential Mixed Use; properties to the northwest across New Bern Avenue are designated as Low Density Residential.

Zoning designations in the area are a mix of various Office & Institution districts (CUD O&I-1, O&I-2, O&I-1) and Residential districts (R-10, R-6, and R-4 with NCOD). The King Charles Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District is to the northwest across New Bern Avenue and to the southwest across Donald Ross Drive.

Proposed conditions prohibit certain uses, address outdoor area and parking lot lighting fixtures, restrict hours for waste service, require a transit easement along New Bern Avenue, limit the hours of operation for any business establishment, restrict the square footage of buildings on the property, offers provisions for building design, and provides a development allocation covenant.

Outstanding Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of frontage designation as supported by Comprehensive Plan policies</td>
<td>1. Provide frontage designation or equivalent conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Rezoning Case Evaluation

### 1. Compatibility Analysis

#### 1.1 Surrounding Area Land Use/ Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Property</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Zoning</strong></td>
<td>CUD O&amp;I-1</td>
<td>O&amp;I-2 and R-10</td>
<td>R-4, CUD O&amp;I-2, R-6</td>
<td>O&amp;I-1, R-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Overlay</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District (King Charles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Institutional, Office &amp; Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>Office &amp; Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Medical clinic and gymnasium</td>
<td>Medical offices</td>
<td>Single family residences</td>
<td>Hospital (WakeMed) and medical offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Form (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>City Growth Center, Transit Emphasis Corridor, and Urban Thoroughfare</td>
<td>City Growth Center, Transit Emphasis Corridor</td>
<td>City Growth Center, Urban Thoroughfare</td>
<td>City Growth Center, Urban Thoroughfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.2 Current vs. Proposed Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Density:</strong></td>
<td>9.4 DUs/acre</td>
<td>6 DUs/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 total units</td>
<td>25 total units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>If General Building Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side:</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>0' or 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail Intensity Permitted:</strong></td>
<td>4,100 sf</td>
<td>6,100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Intensity Permitted:</strong></td>
<td>40,900 sf</td>
<td>40,900 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3 Estimated Development Intensities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
<td>CUD O&amp;I-1</td>
<td>OX-3-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Building SF (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>40,900</td>
<td>40,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. # of Residential Units</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Office SF</strong></td>
<td>40,900</td>
<td>40,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Retail SF</strong></td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>6,100</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</strong></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The proposed rezoning is:

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

☐ **Incompatible.**

Analysis of Incompatibility:

```
 n/a
```
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2. Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis

2.1 Comprehensive Plan

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

- Is the proposal consistent with the vision, themes, and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the use being considered specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map in the area where its location is proposed?
- 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?
- Will community facilities and streets be available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property?

While the use being considered is specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map and community facilities and streets will be available to City standards to serve the proposed use, it is inconsistent with the Urban Form Map, policies relating to frontage, and specific area plan guidance and is therefore inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

2.2 Future Land Use

Future Land Use designation:

The rezoning request is:

☑ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:


n/a

2.3 Urban Form

Urban Form designation:

☐ Not applicable (no Urban Form designation)

The rezoning request is:

☐ Consistent with the Urban Form Map.

☒ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:
The proposed zoning is inconsistent with the Urban Form Map. The Urban Form Map shows the site within a City Growth Center and adjacent to a Transit Emphasis Corridor (New Bern Avenue) and Urban Thoroughfare (Luther Road). In this case, the Comprehensive Plan recommends an urban or hybrid frontage to enhance urban design, the pedestrian realm, and walkability. Equivalent conditions that approximate a Frontage defined in the Unified Development Ordinance could also bring the proposal into consistency, while avoiding the potential for creation of a nonconformity. Note that a text change to the Unified Development Ordinance that would address the potential for creation of a nonconformity is currently in process and pending at Planning Commission's Text Change Committee.

2.4 Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is inconsistent with the following policies:

**Policy UD 1.10 – Frontage**
Coordinate frontage across multiple sites to create cohesive places. Encourage consistency with the designations on the Urban Form Map. Development in centers and along corridors targeted for public investment in transit and walkability should use a compatible urban form.

**Policy UD 7.3—Design Guidelines**
The design guidelines in Table UD-1 shall be used to review rezoning petitions and development applications for mixed-use developments; or rezoning petitions and development applications along Main Street and Transit Emphasis corridors; or in City Growth, TOD and Mixed-Use centers, including preliminary site and development plans, petitions for the application of the Pedestrian Business or Downtown Overlay Districts, Planned Development districts, and Conditional Use zoning petitions.

The Urban Form Map shows the site within a City Growth Center and adjacent to a Transit Emphasis Corridor (New Bern Avenue) and Urban Thoroughfare (Luther Road). In this case, the Comprehensive Plan recommends an urban or hybrid frontage to enhance urban design, the pedestrian realm, and walkability. A Parking Limited frontage would be most appropriate given the suburban context of the area. Alternatively, equivalent conditions that approximate Parking Limited could be considered appropriate.

The lack of an urban or hybrid frontage designation also creates inconsistencies with the Comprehensive Plan’s Design Guidelines, specifically those related to building placement, parking lots, and the pedestrian realm.

2.5 Area Plan Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is inconsistent with the following Area Plan policies:

**New Bern Avenue Corridor Study – Objective FT.1 Frontage Typologies**
Define corridor frontage typologies and development standards for the space between the public right-of-way and building facades in order to create a safe, convenient and transit supportive pedestrian environment.

The New Bern Corridor Study recommends a Parking Limited frontage for the subject property to enhance the pedestrian realm and support transit service in the area.
3. Public Benefit and Reasonableness Analysis

3.1 Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning

- Would provide greater flexibility regarding future site use.
- Could allow compatible office mixed use in proximity to nearby residential land uses.

3.2 Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning

- Lack of designated frontage could result in a development pattern with limited walkability among adjacent and nearby parcels.
- No surety of primary street-facing entrances and direct pedestrian access to these entrances from the sidewalk.
- Could result in limited or incomplete built environment support for transit service in the area.

4. Impact Analysis

4.1 Transportation
The site is located at the intersection of New Bern Avenue and Donald Ross Drive. New Bern Avenue is classified as Avenue, 6-lane, divided. Donald Ross Drive is classified as Avenue, 2-lane, Undivided. There is a CIP project to widen New Bern Avenue and install curb, gutter, sidewalks, and bike lanes from Tarboro Road to Sunnybrook Road.

The block perimeter bounded by the rights-of-way for New Bern Avenue, Donald Ross Drive and Luther Road is ~2,920 feet. In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for OX-3 zoning is 3,000 feet. Case Z-18-2015 is consistent with the block perimeter standard. Offers of cross access to adjacent parcels shall be made in accordance with the Raleigh UDO section 8.3.5.D. A traffic impact analysis report is not required for Z-18-2015.

Impact Identified: None.

4.2 Transit
Potential increased development will increase demand for transit in this area. Proposed Condition 4 will mitigate this impact.

Impact Identified: None, provided suggested condition language is included.

4.3 Hydrology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floodplain</th>
<th>No FEMA Floodplain present.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Basin</td>
<td>Crabtree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Subject to Part 10, Chapter 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Identified: None.

4.4 Public Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Demand (current)</th>
<th>Maximum Demand (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>13,553 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Identified: The proposed rezoning would add approximately 2,072 gpd to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the City. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the properties.

The developer may be required to submit a downstream sanitary sewer capacity study and those required improvements identified by the study must be permitted and constructed in conjunction with and prior to the proposed development being constructed. Verification of available capacity for water fire flow is required as part of the building permit process. Any water system improvements required to meet fire flow requirements will also be required.

4.5 Parks and Recreation
The site is not adjacent to existing or proposed greenway corridor, trail or connector. Nearest trail is Crabtree Creek Trail (0.6 miles). Recreation services are provided by Longview Park (1.6 miles).

Impact Identified: None.

4.6 Urban Forestry
UDO Article 9.1 applies to subdivisions or site plans for parcels 2 acres or greater in size.

Impact Identified: None.

4.7 Designated Historic Resources
The site does not include and is not within 1,000 feet of any Raleigh Historic Landmarks or local historic districts. It is across the street from the Longview Gardens National Register Historic District.

Impact Identified: None.

4.8 Community Development
This site is not located within a redevelopment area.

Impact Identified: None.

4.9 Impacts Summary
- Lack of designated frontage could result in a development pattern with limited walkability among adjacent and nearby parcels and no surety of primary street-facing entrances and direct pedestrian access to these entrances from the sidewalk.
- The developer may be required to submit a downstream sanitary sewer capacity study and those required improvements identified by the study must be permitted and constructed in conjunction with and prior to the proposed development being constructed.
- Verification of available capacity for water fire flow is required as part of the building permit process. Any water system improvements required to meet fire flow requirements will also be required.
4.10 Mitigation of Impacts

- Application of an urban or hybrid frontage or equivalent conditions to enhance urban design, the pedestrian realm, and walkability.
- Downstream sanitary sewer capacity study and any required improvements.
- Any water system improvements required to meet fire flow requirements.

5. Conclusions

The proposal is inconsistent with the Urban Form Map, policies relating to frontage, and specific area plan guidance, therefore it is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This inconsistency could be resolved with designation of a Frontage defined in the Unified Development Ordinance or equivalent conditions.
## Rezoning Application

### Rezoning Request

- General Use
- Conditional Use
- Master Plan

Existing Zoning Classification: O&I-1 CUD
Proposed Zoning Classification: Base District: Office Mixed Use Height: 3

If the property has been previously rezoned, provide the rezoning case number. Z-47-05

Provide all previous transaction numbers for Coordinated Team Reviews, Due Diligence Sessions or Pre-Submittal Conferences: 428138

### GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101 Donald Ross Drive, Raleigh, NC 27610</td>
<td>May ____ , 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property PIN</th>
<th>Deed Reference (Book/Page)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1723-19-2900</td>
<td>Book 12341, Page 2624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nearest Intersection</th>
<th>Property size (in acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Bern Avenue and Donald Ross Drive</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner/Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Medical Ministry, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Donald Ross Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact Person/Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacy H. Reaves and Smith Anderson Law Firm</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lreaves@smithlaw.com">lreaves@smithlaw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Donald Ross Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27602-2611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attorneys for Applicant | |
|------------------------||
| Lacy H. Reaves and Smith Anderson Law Firm | |
| 101 Donald Ross Drive | |
| Raleigh, NC 27602-2611 | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner/Agent Signature</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lreaves@smithlaw.com">lreaves@smithlaw.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Development Services
Customer Service Center
One Exchange Plaza
1 Exchange Plaza, Suite 400
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601
Phone 919-996-2495
Fax 919-516-2685

Conditional Use District Zoning Conditions

Zoning Case Number: Z-18-15

Date Submitted: June 25, 2015
Existing Zoning: O&I-1 CUD
Proposed Zoning: OX-3 CUD

NARRATIVE OF ZONING CONDITIONS OFFERED: For purposes of the following conditions, tax parcel PIN 1723-19-2900 shall be referred to as the “Property.”

1. The following uses shall be prohibited upon the Property: multi-unit living; group living; boardinghouse; dormitory, fraternity, sorority; life care community; rest home; Emergency Shelter A; Emergency Shelter B; cemetery; college, community college; university; telecommunication tower (< 250 feet); telecommunication tower (250 feet); overnight lodging; bed and breakfast; hospitality house; heliport, serving hospitals; heliport, all others; beauty/hair salon; copy center; optometrist; eating establishment; detention center, jail, prison; animal care; catering establishment; drycleaner; funeral home; locksmith; palmist; post office; appliance repair; tailor; tattoo parlor; taxidermist.

2. Light fixtures within parking and vehicular areas can be no higher than 20 feet and will be full cutoff in design. Light fixtures within protective yards can be no higher than 12 feet and will be full cutoff in design.

3. Outside dumpsters, compactors and other waste equipment shall only be emptied between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. Monday through Friday or 10 a.m. through 7 p.m. on Saturday.

4. Prior to subdivision approval or the issuance of any building permit, whichever shall first occur, the owner of the Property shall deed to the City a transit easement measuring 20 feet long adjacent to New Bern Avenue by 15 feet wide to support a bus stop for transit services in the area. The location of the transit easement shall be approved by the Transit Division of the City and the City Attorney shall approve the transit easement deed prior to recordation.

5. Any business establishment upon the Property shall be closed to the public between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. The term “business establishment” shall not include churches and places of worship and their related uses.

6. Buildings upon the Property shall not exceed a total size of 40,832 square feet floor area gross. Any new building constructed upon the Property shall have a pitched roof with a minimum pitch ratio of 3:12. With the exception of windows, doors, soffits, and trim, exterior building facades will be clad only with brick, stone masonry, or lap siding.

7. Prior to recordation of a subdivision plat or recombination plat or the issuance of a building permit, whichever shall first occur, the owner of the Property shall cause to be recorded in the Wake County Registry a restrictive covenant that allocates the allowable floor area and residential dwelling units permitted upon the Property to all lots of record comprising the Property. Such restrictive covenants shall be approved by the City Attorney or his designee prior to recordation of the restrictive covenant. Such restrictive covenant shall provide that it may be amended or terminated only with the prior written consent of the City Attorney or his designee.

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: Alliance Medical Ministry, Inc.
By: Margaret P. Rader
Print Name: Margaret P. Rader
President/Executive Director
Rezoning Application Addendum

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.

1. The Property is designated Institutional in the Future Land Use Map ("FLUM"). As noted in the FLUM, institutional uses are permitted in a number of districts. Almost all “Public & Institutional” uses in the Use Table of Section 6.1.4 of the UDO are allowed in the OX District. Many uses which are allowed in the OX District but that are not institutional in character are prohibited by the foregoing condition 1.

2. The Property is within an area designated a City Growth Center in the Urban Form Map. New Bern Avenue is designated a Transit Emphasis Corridor and Luther Road is designated an Urban Thoroughfare.

3. A Frontage is not requested because no new improvements are planned for the Property. The existing improvements do not meet the requirements of any Frontage. The designation of a Frontage would render the Property non-conforming.

4. 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 3.2 – Location of Growth; LU 5.3 – Institutional Uses; Lu 6.4 – Bus Stop Dedication.

PUBLIC BENEFITS

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

1. The proposed rezoning will eliminate zoning conditions that prohibit institutional uses and are inconsistent with the designation of the Property for Institutional Uses in the FLUM.

2.

3.

4.
### URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

If the property to be rezoned is shown as a "mixed use center" or located along a Main Street or Transit Emphasis Corridor as shown on the Urban Form Map in the Comprehensive Plan, the applicant must respond to the Urban Design Guidelines contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

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.**
   - Retail uses are not appropriate at this location adjacent to a single family neighborhood.

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.**
   - The height of the proposed development is limited to three stories.

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.**
   - All streets are currently in place.

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.
   - All streets are currently in place.

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.**
   - Block faces are existing.

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.
   - No new development is proposed.

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.
   - Existing buildings have proximity to Donald Ross Drive and Luther Road.

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.**
   - No new development is proposed.

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.
   - No new development is proposed.

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.**
    - No new development is proposed.

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.**
    - No new development is proposed.

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.**
    - No new development is proposed.

13. **New public spaces should provide seating opportunities.**
    - No new development is proposed.

14. **Parking lots should not dominate the frontage of pedestrian-oriented streets, interrupt pedestrian routes, or negatively impact surrounding developments.**
    - No new development is proposed.

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.**
    - No new development is proposed.
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. Now 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.

A parking structure is not planned for this property.

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.

The Property is located on an established transit route.

18. Convenient, comfortable pedestrian access between the transit stop and the building entrance should be planned as part of the overall pedestrian network.

Provisions of the UDO will assure convenient pedestrian access between the transit stop and the building entrances.

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.

There are no environmentally sensitive areas on the Property.

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.

The streets fronting the Property are existing.

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.

No new improvements are proposed.

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.

Streets are currently in place.

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.

No new improvements are proposed.

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.

No new improvements are proposed.

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.

No new improvements are proposed.

26. The sidewalks should be the principal place of pedestrian movement and casual social interaction. Designs and uses should be complementary to that function.

No new improvements are proposed.
PROPOSED REZONING OF PIN NOS. 1723192900
(THE “PROPOSED ZONING CASE”)

Approximately 4.17 Acres – 101 Donald Ross Drive, Raleigh, NC 27610

REPORT OF APRIL 20, 2015 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

In accordance with Section 10.2.4.D of the Unified Development Ordinance, a neighborhood meeting was held with respect to the Proposed Zoning Case at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 20, 2015 at Alliance Medical Ministry located at 101 Donald Ross Drive. Attached as Exhibit A is a list of those persons and organizations contacted about the meeting. Those persons and organizations were mailed a letter of invitation concerning the meeting, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B. The letters were mailed on or about April 8, 2015 via First Class U.S. Mail.

Attached as Exhibit C is a list of the persons in attendance at the meeting. Megg Rader, Executive Director, Alliance Medical Ministry began the meeting by welcoming neighbors and guests and identifying the property proposed for rezoning (the “Property”). She explained that Alliance Medical Ministry would like to rezone our property from Office and Institutional-Conditional Use (O&I-1 CUD) to Office Mixed Use-3 (OX-3). The reason for wanting to do this is to sell the gymnasium property and use that money to further enhance the work of Alliance Medical Ministry. The current zoning conditions, which were placed on the property in 2006, do not appear to permit church and recreational uses for the gym building, even though that is how the building has always been used. She explained that the only way to change those conditions is through a rezoning.

Individuals present at the meeting asked questions concerning the current and future property uses; and also expressed concern about new uses such as group housing. One individual expressed that Alliance has been a good neighbor and that he would support the rezoning efforts.

At the time of the meeting the zoning petition had not been prepared or submitted, but based on the meeting, the Applicant has included a prohibition against group housing in its subsequent submittal.

A copy of this report will be provided to the Planning Department upon the filing of the petition for the Proposed Zoning Case.

Respectfully submitted, this ___ day of MAY, 2015.

Megg Rader, President & Executive Director
Alliance Medical Ministry
OWNER

RALEIGH COUNTRY CLUB ACQUISITION LLC | 1400 DONALD ROSS DR | RALEIGH NC 27610-2814

TAYLOR, SIDNEY J TAYLOR, JOYCE S | 106 DONALD ROSS DR | RALEIGH NC 27610-1806

RALEIGH COUNTRY CLUB ACQUISITION LLC | 1400 DONALD ROSS DR | RALEIGH NC 27610-2814

HINTON, WILBERT L HINTON, DONNIE D | 119 DONALD ROSS DR | RALEIGH NC 27610-1805

HICKS, WALTER M HEIRS | PEARL E HICKS | 115 DONALD ROSS DR | RALEIGH NC 27610-1805

BETHEA, PRESTON JR | 142 LUTHER RD | RALEIGH NC 27610-1804

OBAME, MALISSA B | 136 LUTHER RD | RALEIGH NC 27610-1804

GAITHER, RONALD S | 130 LUTHER RD | RALEIGH NC 27610-1804

KEEYS, SUZANNE D | 105 N PEARTREE LN | RALEIGH NC 27610-1823

ATWATER, CLARICE D ATWATER, HAROLD E | PO BOX 942 | APEX NC 27502-0942

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS | 100 N PEARTREE LN | RALEIGH NC 27610-1824

MASK FAMILY LIMITED LIABILITY CO | 2600 NEW BERN AVE | RALEIGH NC 27610-1821

CAP ALT DELTA INVESTMENTS LLC | 2925 SALZEDO ST | CORAL GABLES FL 33134-6614

GLEN SUMMIT PROPERTIES LLC KORNEGAY, RAYMOND DEWITT | 1736 FARMINGTON GROVE DR | RALEIGH NC 27614-7727

WAKEMED | CORPORATE ACCOUNTING | 3000 NEW BERN AVE | RALEIGH NC 27610-1231

EDWIN R and MARY B. SWANN, 2501 NEW BERN AVE, RALEIGH NC 27610-1818
Dear Neighbors of Alliance Medical Ministry:

I hope your spring is getting off to a great start. First let me thank you all for embracing our ministry as part of your neighborhood. We recently celebrated our seventh year on Donald Ross Drive and this has proved to be an ideal location for us to provide needed health services to so many people who work hard for a living but fall in that scary gap between Medicaid eligibility and private insurance affordability. We have enjoyed our outreach efforts to encourage more of our nearby neighbors to come and participate in our medical services, wellness programs, and our wonderful community garden. Please come by anytime to learn more about all the great services Alliance Medical Ministry is providing! We would welcome each of you to become involved as a client, supporter or volunteer.

My purpose in writing you today is to invite you to meet with us on April 20 to discuss the potential rezoning of our property from Office and Institutional-1 Conditional Use (O&I-1 CUD) to Office Mixed Use-3 (OX-3). Our reason for wanting to do this is so we can sell our gymnasiunm property and use that money to further enhance our ministry. The current zoning conditions, which were placed on the property in 2006, do not appear to permit church and recreational uses for the gym building, even though that is how the building has always been used. The only way to change those conditions is through a rezoning.

So our request is that you will make the time to come meet with us and share your input. Our hope is to develop a zoning petition that will have the full support of our neighbors from the very beginning.

So please, come visit with us on Monday, April 20 at 7 p.m. in our sanctuary building located at 101 Donald Ross Drive. (Refreshments and childcare will be provided.) We will also be available between 6:30 and 7 p.m. to show you around our clinic and community garden and share with you all the exciting work our ministry is involved in. We look forward to seeing you on the 20th.

If you have any questions about this rezoning project or are not able to attend the meeting, please feel free to give me a call at 919-250-3394 or e-mail at mrader@alliancemedicalministry.org anytime and I will make time to visit with you and share our plans.

I look forward to meeting with you!

Sincerely,

Megg Rader
Executive Director
Alliance Medical Ministry

101 Donald Ross Drive • Raleigh, NC 27610 • Main phone (919) 250-3320 • Main fax (919) 250-3322
# MEETING ATTENDANCE

Alliance Medical Ministry
Rezoning Neighborhood Meeting
Monday, April 20, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>phone/e-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Garrett</td>
<td>115 Donald Pass Dr</td>
<td>919.802.6772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Clayton</td>
<td>2610/2620 New Bern Ave</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jacet.clayton@hayw.serve.com">jacet.clayton@hayw.serve.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney/Joan Taylor</td>
<td>106 Donald Res &amp; Dr, Raleigh</td>
<td>jaylsonyoung.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher/Avantias N. Dowd Pass Ross Drive Raleigh, NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reanna &amp; Maximi Better</td>
<td>143/144 Ross Drive Raleigh, NC, NC</td>
<td>919.264.8304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Van Wormer</td>
<td>202 Cameron Ave, Cary, NC</td>
<td>919.791.2101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Osborne</td>
<td>136 Luther Rd, Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>919-673-5997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney/Joan Taylor</td>
<td>106 Donald Res &amp; Dr, Raleigh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sidney.mt@hotmaile.com">sidney.mt@hotmaile.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>919-264-8523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrishow@raleighbnc.com">chrishow@raleighbnc.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>