Request:

12.56 acres from TD-CUD w/PDD to OX-7-PL-CU

Submittal Date

5/18/2015
Case Information: Z-19-15 – TW Alexander Drive

| Location         | TW Alexander Drive, south side, from Brier Creek Parkway to ACC Boulevard  
|                  | Addresses: 7801 TW Alexander Drive and 7950 ACC Boulevard  
|                  | PINs: 0768497410 & 0768593520  
| Request          | Rezone property from Thoroughfare District Conditional Use District with Planned Development District (TD CUD w/ PDD) to Office Mixed Use-7 Stories-Parking Limited-Conditional Use (OX-7-PL-CU)  
| Area of Request  | 12.56 acres  
| Property Owner   | SLF Ruby Jones LLC c/o Ryan LLC  
|                  | P.O. Box 56607  
|                  | Atlanta, GA 30343-0907  
| Applicant        | David L. York  
|                  | Smith Moore Leatherwood LLP  
|                  | 434 Fayetteville Street, Suite 2800  
|                  | Raleigh, NC 27601  
| Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) | Northwest—  
|                  | Jay Gudeman, Chair: (919) 789-9884; jay@kilpatrickgutemancom  
| PC Recommendation Deadline | December 7, 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 | Office & Residential Mixed Use  
| URBAN FORM      | Center: City Growth  
|                 | Corridor: (none designated)  
| CONSISTENT Policies | Policy LU 1.2 – Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency  
|                  | Policy LU 1.3 – Conditional Use District Consistency  
|                  | Policy LU 2.6 – Zoning and Infrastructure Impacts  
|                  | Policy LU 6.4 — Bus Stop Dedication  
|                  | Policy LU 8.11 – Development of Vacant Sites  
|                  | Policy T 4.15 – Enhanced Rider Amenities  
|                  | Policy EP 2.5 – Protection of Water Features  
|                  | Policy UD 1.10 – Frontage  
|                  | Policy UD 7.3 – Design Guidelines  
| INCONSISTENT Policies | (None identified.)  

Summary of Proposed Conditions

1. Certain uses prohibited.
2. Transit easement offered.
3. Intensity of site development limited to one of three scenarios.
4. Allocation covenant required.

Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbor Meeting</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>City Council</th>
<th>Public Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

☐ Valid Statutory Protest Petition

Attachments
1. Staff report
2. Traffic Study Worksheet

Planning Commission Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Approve with conditions. City Council may now schedule this proposal for Public Hearing, or refer it to committee for further study and discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Findings & Reasons | 1. The proposal is consistent with the Future Land Use Map, Urban Form Map, and pertinent policies of the Comprehensive Plan.  
2. The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest. The request supports a mixture of office and residential uses in close proximity to existing goods and services, within an area of the City designated for economic development.  
3. The proposal is compatible with the surrounding area. Conditions prohibit certain uses, offer transit easement, limit development intensity, and provide for allocation covenant for future uses. |
| Motion and Vote | Motion: Swink  
Second: Buxton  
In Favor: Alcine, Braun, Buxton, Fluhrer, Hicks, Lyle, Schuster, Swink, Terando and Whitsett  
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.

9/8/15

Planning Director Date Planning Commission Chairperson Date
Staff Coordinator: Doug Hill: (919) 996-2622; Doug.Hill@raleighnc.gov
Case Summary

Overview
The proposal seeks to rezone the site to allow greater flexibility of site development. Currently the site is subject to the provisions of the Master Plan of the Alexander Place Planned Development District (PDD). The site comprises of Tract 112 and Tract 8 of the Master Plan area; Tract 112 is approximately 6.36 acres; Tract 8, 6.2 acres. Both are platted as corner properties, sharing northern frontage on a partially completed section of T. W Alexander Drive. Tract 112 also fronts ACC Boulevard on the southwest, and Tract 8 fronts Brier Creek Parkway on the east. The Planning Commission approved a request to begin proceedings for the termination of the PDD zoning of the site on February 24, 2015.

The lots are separated internally by stream courses, which the respective tract boundaries follow. The site high points are located at the two street intersections; the lowest point, located in Tract 112 at ACC Boulevard, is some 45 feet lower. Riparian areas line either side of the streams, but no floodplain is identified.

Both properties are undeveloped and heavily wooded. Tract 9 of the Master Plan, south of the site, lies at the intersection of ACC Boulevard and Brier Creek Parkway, and is built out in two office buildings, of 3 and 4 stories, respectively (the latter built into the grade). Directly across ACC Boulevard from Tract 112 is the 2-story WakeMed Brier Creek Medical Center; eastward across Brier Creek Parkway from Tract 8 is another undeveloped, wooded lot (Tract 14), for which a separate rezoning request has been filed (Z-22-15). To the northeast, across the TW Alexander/ Brier Creek intersection, stands the Clairmont at Brier Creek, a 432-unit apartment complex situated on approximately 24 acres. The 415,000 square-foot Alexander Promenade shopping center lies to the southeast, across Brier Creek Parkway, with more than 350 apartment and townhouse units bordering it on the north.

The Master Plan designates Tract 112 for 110,000 square feet of offices, and Tract 8 for 73,000 square feet of offices. The lot to the south of both, Tract 9, is designated for “High Density Residential/ Office” development in the Master Plan, allowing up to 160 dwelling units or 100,000 square feet of offices, but has been built out solely with offices. Under the Master Plan, buildings the subject tracts could be up to 300 feet in height; however, the rezoning proposes a height of 7 stories/ 90 feet. Conditioned build-out scenarios decrease possible impacts further.

Outstanding Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sewer and fire flow matters may need to be addressed upon development.</td>
<td>1. Address sewer and fire flow capacities at the site plan stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request: 12.56 acres from TD-CUD w/PDD to OX-7-PL-CU
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>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>Thoroughfare Conditional Use</td>
<td>Thoroughfare Conditional Use</td>
<td>Thoroughfare Conditional Use</td>
<td>Thoroughfare Conditional Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>Planned Development</td>
<td>Planned Development</td>
<td>Planned Development</td>
<td>Planned Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
<td>Office &amp; Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>Office &amp; Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>Office &amp; Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>Office &amp; Residential Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant (wooded)</td>
<td>Vacant (wooded)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Vacant (wooded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form (if applicable)</td>
<td>City Growth Center</td>
<td>City Growth Center</td>
<td>City Growth Center</td>
<td>City Growth Center</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>Residential Density:</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>25.15 DUs/ acre (316 DUs total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td>Per Master Plan, if Office: 10’ on ACC Blvd.; 15’ on TW Alexander &amp; Brier Creek</td>
<td>Parking Limited Frontage: 50% w/ n 0’-100’ build-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td>15’ on TW Alexander &amp; Brier Creek</td>
<td>25% w/ n 0’-100’ build-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side:</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>If Mixed Use building type: 0’ or 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Intensity Permitted:</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Intensity Permitted:</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>201,300</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>Total Acreage</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>12.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>TD CUD w/ PDD</td>
<td>OX-7-PL-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Building SF</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>201,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. # of Residential Units</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Office SF</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>201,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Retail SF</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential F.A.R.</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.37</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?

The proposal is consistent with the vision, themes, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan; permitted site uses and built form are commensurate with existing build-out and anticipated future build-out and land uses nearby.

The Future Land Use map places the site within an Office and Residential Mixed Use area, in which the Comprehensive Plan “encourages a mix of residential and office,” adding that “OX is the closest corresponding zoning district.” OX is the zoning requested by the rezoning proposal.

The Urban Form Map of the Comprehensive Plan shows the subject property to be within a City Growth Center. The Comprehensive Plan describes such areas as being “where significant infill development and redevelopment are anticipated in the future.” The subject Growth Center encompasses some 3,000 acres, with the tallest buildings, defining the “Core” of the mixed-use area, located on the south side of Glenwood Avenue (at Arco Corporate Drive). However, no low- to moderate-density residential areas, which would define the “Edge” of the greater mixed-use area, are located within 150 feet of the subject site. The site can thereby be considered within the “General” range for determining appropriate building height, for which a height of 5 stories is the recommended maximum for offices in Office and Residential Mixed Use areas; however, the Plan also provides that “In employment areas, taller buildings may also be contemplated on large sites with adequate buffers from lowsacle areas, such as Highwoods.” The rezoning proposal may be considered consistent with that guidance.

The proposal is consistent with Comprehensive Plan Vision Themes “Expanding Housing Choices,” “Managing Our Growth,” and “Coordinating Land Use and Transportation.” Existing community facilities and streets appear sufficient to accommodate the redevelopment possible under the proposed rezoning.

2.2 Future Land Use

Future Land Use designation: Office and Residential Mixed Use

The rezoning request is:

☑ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:
2.3 Urban Form

Urban Form designation:  Center: City Growth; Corridor: None designated.

☐ Not applicable (no Urban Form designation)

The rezoning request is:

☒ Consistent with the Urban Form Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:

(N/ A)

2.4 Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is inconsistent with the following policies:

(None identified.)

2.5 Area Plan Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is not within a portion of the City subject to an Area Plan.

3. Public Benefit and Reasonableness Analysis

3.1 Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning

- Supports development consistent with the Future Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan.
- Encourages a mixture of office and residential in close proximity to existing goods and services.
- Helps focus development within a City Growth Center, where economic development is desired.

3.2 Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning

(None identified.)
4. **Impact Analysis**

4.1 **Transportation**
The site is located on the south side of TW Alexander Drive between ACC Boulevard and Brier Creek Parkway. TW Alexander Drive is only partially built and terminates at Del Webb Arbors Drive. Extension of TW Alexander is subject to the conditions of approval for development plan S-12-2012. There are no CIP projects planned for TW Alexander Drive, ACC Boulevard or Brier Creek Parkway. There is a state STIP project to upgrade Glenwood Avenue to improve capacity and traffic operations, including interchanges at various locations, between TW Alexander and I-540.

Offers of cross access to adjacent parcels shall be made in accordance with the Raleigh UDO section 8.3.5.D.

Site access shall be in accordance with the Raleigh Street Design Manual section 6.5.3. The block perimeter bounded by the rights-of-way for TW Alexander Drive, ACC Boulevard and Brier Creek Parkway is ~3,750 feet. In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for OX-7 zoning is 2,500 feet.

Approval of case Z-19-2015 could allow for either 201,300 square feet of office or 85,000 square feet of mixed uses with 319 congregate care units; the potential change in PM peak hour trips is a maximum of 1,411 trips a day. The daily and hourly trip volumes changes do not require the submittal of a traffic impact analysis report for Z-19-2015 at the time of zoning, but a TIA may be required for site plan approval based on any proposal for full access from TW Alexander Drive.

**Impact Identified:** A traffic study is not required.

4.2 **Transit**
Currently GoRaleigh Route 70x serves Brier Creek Parkway from Glenwood Ave to ACC Blvd. and ACC Blvd. from Brier Creek Pkwy. to Alexander Promenade Pl. and from the exit from Wal-Mart back to Brier Creek Pkwy. Neither the City of Raleigh Short Range Transit Study nor the Wake County 2040 Transit Study recommend extending service further along Brier Creek Pkwy. or ACC Blvd. Route 70x is currently a limited stop express route; the closest stop is on Alexander Promenade Pl. beside Kohls.

**Impact Identified:** Increased development may increase transit demand but it is not expected to exceed the current capacity of the route.

4.3 **Hydrology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floodplain</th>
<th>City of Raleigh Floodplain – Flood Study #348</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Basin</td>
<td>Little Briar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Article 9.2 UDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neuse Buffer and City of Raleigh Floodplain exist on site.

**Impact Identified:** No impacts identified.

4.4 **Public Utilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Maximum Demand (current)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Maximum Demand (proposed)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>157,000 gpd</td>
<td>892,500 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Water</strong></td>
<td>157,000 gpd</td>
<td>892,500 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed rezoning would add approximately 735,500 gpd to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the City. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the properties.

**Impact Identified:** 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**
No greenway, proposed or existing impacts are associated with this site plan. Closest trail is 6.3 miles (Hare Snipe). Recreation services are provided by Strickland Park, 4.6 miles away, and Brier Creek Park, 2.5 miles.

**Impact Identified:** None.

**4.6 Urban Forestry**
The Tree Conservation Areas for the PDD have been recorded with Wake County Register of Deeds in BM2014, PG 0155. Build-out under the requested Parking Limited frontage must observe the TCAs, or pursue re-recording.

**Impact Identified:** None, provided development is consistent with recorded TCAs.

**4.7 Designated Historic Resources**
The site is not located within or adjacent to a National Register Historic District and/or Raleigh Historic Overlay District or Raleigh Historic Landmarks.

**Impact Identified:** None.

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

**Impact Identified:** None.

**4.9 Impacts Summary**
Sewer and fire flow matters may need to be addressed upon redevelopment.

**4.10 Mitigation of Impacts**
Address sewer and fire flow capacities at the site plan stage.

**5. Conclusions**
The proposed rezoning would permit greater flexibility in site development, of a scale and intensity consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and compatible with the surrounding area.
Rezoning Application

### Rezoning Request

- **Conditional Use**
- **Property Address**
  - 7801 TW Alexander Drive and 7950 ACC Boulevard
- **Property PIN**
  - 0768497410 and 0768593520
- **Nearest Intersection**
  - TW Alexander Drive and ACC Blvd/TW Alexander Dr and Brier Creek Pkwy
- **Property Owner/Address**
  - SLF Ruby Jones LLC c/o Ryan LLC
  - P.O. Box 56607
  - Atlanta, GA 30343-0607
- **Project Contact Person/Address**
  - David L York, Attorney
  - Smith Moore Leatherwood LLP
  - 434 Fayetteville Rd, Suite 2800
  - Raleigh, NC 27601
- **Owner/Agent Signature**
  - SLF RUBY JONES, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company
  - By: STRATFORD LAND ADVISORS, LP, a Texas Limited Partnership
  - its Manager
  - BY: STRATFORD ADVISORS, LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Company/its General Partner
  - By: Phillip F. Wiggins, Manager

### General Information

- **Property Address**
  - 7801 TW Alexander Drive and 7950 ACC Boulevard
- **Property PIN**
  - 0768497410 and 0768593520
- **Nearest Intersection**
  - TW Alexander Drive and ACC Blvd/TW Alexander Dr and Brier Creek Pkwy
- **Property Owner/Address**
  - SLF Ruby Jones LLC c/o Ryan LLC
  - P.O. Box 56607
  - Atlanta, GA 30343-0607
- **Project Contact Person/Address**
  - David L York, Attorney
  - Smith Moore Leatherwood LLP
  - 434 Fayetteville Rd, Suite 2800
  - Raleigh, NC 27601
- **Owner/Agent Signature**
  - SLF RUBY JONES, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company
  - By: STRATFORD LAND ADVISORS, LP, a Texas Limited Partnership
  - its Manager
  - BY: STRATFORD ADVISORS, LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Company/its General Partner
  - By: Phillip F. Wiggins, Manager

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

Zoning Case Number Z-19-15

Date Submitted: 14 July 2016

Existing Zoning: TD CUD w/ PDD

Proposed Zoning: OX-7-PL-CU

OFFICE USE ONLY

Transaction Number

NARRATIVE OF ZONING CONDITIONS OFFERED

1. The following principal uses shall be prohibited: detention center, jail, prison.

2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for new development or recording of a subdivision plat, whichever occurs first, if requested by the City of Raleigh, a transit easement shall be deeded to the City and recorded in the Wake County Registry. Prior to recordation of the transit easement, the dimensions (not to exceed 15 feet in depth and 20 feet in width) and location of the easement shall be agreed to by the Public Works Department and the Property Owner, and the easement deed approved as to form by the City Attorney’s Office.

3. The maximum development intensities for the property shall be one of the following scenarios, at the election of the property owner:
   1. 201,300 square feet of office and medical land uses; or
   2. 28,000 square feet of office and medical land uses and a Congregate Care Facility with up to 316 units and 43,000 square feet of retail sales land uses (retail sales is a limited use pursuant to UDO Section 6.4.11.C.2); or
   3. Any land use or mix of land uses permitted on the property so long as the overall development does not exceed 335 AM peak hour trips and 304 PM peak hour trips.

References to land uses in this condition shall have the meaning as ascribed in the Allowed Principal Use Table (UDO Section 6.1.4). Election of the specific scenario will occur prior to the issuance of the first building permit, or the recording of a subdivision plat, whichever occurs first. However, this shall not preclude the subsequent election of another scenario so long as it complies with this condition. The election and any amendment thereto will be in writing and recorded with the Wake County Register of Deeds. Any amendment to the initial election requires the consent of the City Planning Director, as evidenced by the signature of the City Planning Director on the recorded instrument, and which consent shall be given if the subsequent election complies with this condition.

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

Owner/Agent Signature

Print Name: SLF RUBY JONES, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company
By: STRATFORD LAND ADVISORS, LP, a Texas Limited Partnership
BY: STRATFORD ADVISORS, LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Company General Partner
By: Phillip F. Wiggins, Manager
NARRATIVE OF ZONING CONDITIONS OFFERED

4. Within thirty (30) days following the approval of the form and substance of the restrictive covenant hereinafter mentioned by the City Attorney or his or her deputy, the owner of the Property shall cause to be recorded in the Wake County Registry a restrictive covenant that allocates the allowable development upon the Property as provided in foregoing Zoning Condition 3 among all existing lots comprising the Property. Such restrictive covenant shall be submitted to the City Attorney within thirty (30) days following approval of this rezoning case by the City Council and shall be approved by the City Attorney or his or her deputy prior to recordation. The restrictive covenant and the allocation of development set forth therein may be amended from time to time following recordation. Any such amendment shall require the written concurrence of the City Attorney or his or her deputy and the owners of all portions of the Property affected by the amendment and shall be at the sole discretion of such owner(s). Following recordation, a copy of each amendment shall be mailed to the Planning director at P.O. Box 590, Raleigh, NC 27602 with a reference to zoning case Z-19-15.

5.

6.

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

Owner/Agent Signature

Print Name  SLF RUBY JONES, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company

By: STRATFORD LAND ADVISORS, LP, a Texas Limited Partnership

BY: STRATFORD ADVISORS, LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Company General Partner

By: Phillip F. Wiggins, Manager
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 for “Office and Residential Mixed Use” on the Future Land Use Map. This land use category encourages a mix of moderate to medium density residential and office uses. The closest corresponding zoning district per the category description is OX. Accordingly, the rezoning request for OX is consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

2. The Property is located in a city growth center. As such an urban or hybrid approach to frontage is recommended to encourage walkability. The Parking Limited frontage is a hybrid frontage to encourage walkability. Accordingly, the rezoning request for PL is consistent with the Urban Form Map.

3. Because the Property is located in an area designated for Office and Residential Mixed Use within a City Growth area along major streets in the heart of a mixed use development, it should be considered part of the Core area of the mixed use development. As such, 7-story building heights are consistent with Core areas according to Table LU-2.

4. The rezoning is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan Policies: LU1.2 (Future Land use Map and Zoning Consistency), LU 1.3 (Conditional Use District Consistency), LU 3.2 (Location of Growth), LU 6.1 (Composition of Mixed-Use Centers).

PUBLIC BENEFITS

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

1. This rezoning request provides a public benefit by rezoning the Property and allowing for its development consistent with the Future Land Use Map and Comprehensive Plan.

2. This rezoning request provides a public benefit by encouraging that the Property be developed with a mixture of office and moderate density residential near the commercial development closer to the US 70 Corridor.

3. This rezoning provides a public benefit by enabling the Property to be developed within a City Growth Center where economic development is desired.

4. This rezoning provides a public benefit with a corresponding increase in the tax base.
**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. The rezoning request pertains to two of several parcels in the mixed use development. The parcels at issue are designated in the mixed use development for office and residential uses. Although OX zoning will allow a limited amount of retail, the majority of retail is being provided on other parcels within the mixed use development.

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.** There are no low density developments adjacent to the properties in question; accordingly, this guideline is not applicable.

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. The mixed use developments street layout and design accomplishing the goals of this guideline was approved via prior rezoning petition[s]. The proposed request will not change or frustrate fulfilling this guideline.

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.** No new public streets are anticipated with the development of the subject property.

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.**

   The subject property is bordered on the west, north and east by previously dedicated public streets, and consists of 2 of 3 parcels making up an entire block. Existing development and topographic features (streams and recorded TCA) prohibit strict compliance with this guideline.

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 public spaces are anticipated with the development of the subject property.

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.**

   With the street frontage requested herein, it is anticipated that buildings will be placed in close proximity to the 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.** It is anticipated that buildings will be placed in close proximity to the two (2) public street intersections abutting the subject property.

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. Outdoor amenity areas will be provided in compliance with the UDO which satisfies this guideline.**

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.**

    Outdoor amenity areas will be provided in compliance with the UDO which satisfies this guideline.

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.**

    Outdoor amenity areas will be provided in compliance with the UDO which satisfies this guideline.

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. Outdoor amenity areas will be provided in compliance with the UDO which satisfies this guideline.**

13. **New public spaces should provide seating opportunities.**

    Outdoor amenity areas will be provided in compliance with the UDO which satisfies this guideline.

14. **Parking lots should not dominate the frontage of pedestrian-oriented streets, interrupt pedestrian routes, or negatively impact surrounding developments.**

    With the street frontage requested herein, it is anticipated that buildings will be placed in close proximity to the road, with parking behind or beside buildings.

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.**

    With the street frontage requested herein, it is anticipated that buildings will be placed in close proximity to the road, with parking...
behind or beside buildings.

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.
   **No parking structure is anticipated with the development of the subject 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.
   Although no transit stop requests have been made; the applicant has included a zoning condition providing for same if requested by the City.

18. Convenient, comfortable pedestrian access between the transit stop and the building entrance should be planned as part of the overall pedestrian network.
   Sidewalks will be provided from buildings to public sidewalks (in public street rights-of-way) which will lead to transit stops in the mixed use development.

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.
   **Tree conservation areas have been and will be provided on the subject 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.
   **No new public streets are anticipated with the development of the subject property.**

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.
   **Sidewalks will be provided in compliance with the UDO which satisfies this guideline.**

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.
   **Street trees will be provided in compliance with the UDO which satisfies this guideline.**

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.
   With the street frontage requested herein, it is anticipated that buildings will be placed in close proximity to the road which along with street trees should satisfy the special definition described in this guideline.

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.
   With the street frontage requested herein, it is anticipated that buildings will be placed in close proximity to the road. Building entrances will obviously be determined at site plan in accordance with UDO standards.

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.
   **Pedestrian interest will be created along sidewalks as required by the UDO which satisfies this guideline.**

26. The sidewalks should be the principal place of pedestrian movement and casual social interaction. Designs and uses should be complementary to that function.
   **Pedestrian interest will be created along sidewalks as required by the UDO which satisfies this guideline.**
SUMMARY OF ISSUES

A neighborhood meeting was held on March 11, 2015 to discuss a potential rezoning located at 7801 TW Alexander Drive and 7950 ACC Boulevard in Raleigh. The neighborhood meeting was held at the offices of Cambridge Village Development LLC, located at 6736 Falls of Neuse Rd – Suite 210 in Raleigh. There were approximately no neighbors in attendance. The general issues discussed were:

Summary of Issues:

None. Developer representatives waited approximately 30 to 45 minute and no neighboring property owner attended.
## Attendance Roster:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David York</td>
<td>434 Fayetteville St, Raleigh, NC 27601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lasley</td>
<td>8522-204 Six Forks Rd, Raleigh, NC 27615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wilson</td>
<td>6736 Falls of Neuse Rd, Raleigh, NC 27601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>