Property | 3916 & 3920 Blue Ridge Rd
---|---
Size | 0.83 acres
Existing Zoning | R-4 & OX-5-PL-CU
Requested Zoning | R-6
TO: Ruffin L. Hall, City Manager

FROM: Ken Bowers AICP, Director
Ira Mabel AICP, Planner II

COPY: City Clerk

DEPARTMENT: City Planning

DATE: December 18, 2018

SUBJECT: City Council agenda item for January 8, 2019 –
Rezoning Public Hearing Z-27-18

On December 4, 2018, City Council authorized the public hearing for the following item:

**Z-27-18 Blue Ridge Road**, approximately 0.83 acres on the south side of Blue Ridge Rd at its intersection with Homewood Banks Dr, approximately 1/3 of a mile south of the Crabtree Valley Mall, at 3916 & 3920 Blue Ridge Road.

**Current Zoning:** Residential-4 (R-4) and Office Mixed Use-5 stories-Parking Limited-Conditional Use (OX-5-PL-CU).

**Requested Zoning:** Residential-6 (R-6).

The request is for a general use district; no zoning conditions have been offered.

The request is consistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

The request is consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

The Planning Commission recommends approval of the request (8-0).

The Northwest CAC voted in favor of the case on November 13, 2018 (10-0).

During the Report and Recommendation of the Planning Commission on December 4, 2018, Council Member Mendell requested more information about parking requirements for assisted living facilities. A corresponding memo is included in the backup material.

Attached are the Planning Commission Certified Recommendation (including Staff Report and Traffic Study Worksheet), the Zoning Conditions, the Petition for Rezoning, and the Neighborhood Meeting Report.
CERTIFIED RECOMMENDATION
Raleigh Planning Commission
CR# 11879

CASE INFORMATION: Z-27-18 BLUE RIDGE ROAD

| Location | Blue Ridge Road & Homewood Banks Drive, on the south side of Blue Ridge Rd, approximately 1/3 of a mile south of the Crabtree Valley Mall |
| Address: 3916 & 3920 Blue Ridge Road |
| PIN: 0795486280 & 0795488212 |
| iMaps, Google Maps, Directions from City Hall |
| Existing zoning | R-4 & OX-5-PL-CU |
| Requested zoning | R-6 |
| Area of Request | 0.83 acres |
| Corporate Limits | The subject site is within, and almost entirely surrounded on all sides by, the corporate limits of the city. Four lots across Blue Ridge Road that are contiguous with the boundary of the site for approximately 75 feet are unincorporated but within the city’s ETJ. |
| Property Owner | Hillcrest Raleigh at Crabtree Valley, LLC |
| Applicant | Jamie Schwedler, Parker Poe |
| Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) | Northwest CAC, Christina Jones, coll_christina@yahoo.com |
| PC Recommendation Deadline | January 21, 2019 |

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

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

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GUIDANCE

| FUTURE LAND USE | Moderate Density Residential |
| URBAN FORM | City Growth Center, Urban Thoroughfare |
| CONSISTENT Policies | Policy LU 1.2—Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency |
| | Policy LU 5.1—Reinforcing the Urban Pattern |
| | Policy LU 5.5—Transitional and Buffer Zone Districts |
| | Policy LU 9.4—Health Care Industry |
| | Policy H 1.8—Zoning for Housing |
| | Policy CS 5.3—Access to Health Care |
| INCONSISTENT Policies | Policy LU 8.6—Teardowns |
| | Policy H 1.6—Housing Preservation |
**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CONDITIONS**

- N/A

**PUBLIC MEETINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Meeting</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>City Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>The request is reasonable and in the public interest because it will provide more housing for the city's older residents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion and Vote</td>
<td>Motion: Jeffreys; Second: Lyle. In Favor: Braun, Geary, Jeffreys, Lyle, Novak, Queen, Swink, Tomasulo. Opposed: None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Opposed Vote(s)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 Chair 11/27/18

Staff Coordinator: Ira Mabel, (919) 996-2652, Ira.Mabel@raleighnc.gov
OVERVIEW

The request is to rezone approximately 0.83 acres from Residential-4 (R-4) and Office Mixed Use-5 stories-Parking Limited-Conditional Use (OX-5-PL-CU) to Residential-6 (R-6). The request is for a general use district; no zoning conditions have been offered.

The subject site consists of two parcels at the intersection of Blue Ridge Road and Homewood Banks Drive. The western parcel is zoned R-4; the eastern is in the same OX-5-PL-CU zoning district as the Marshall Park apartments (Z-8-2009); both are currently occupied by single-family homes with driveway access from Blue Ridge Road only.

Directly to the southwest of the site is the Hillcrest Raleigh short-term rehabilitation facility, which is under common ownership with the two parcels that make up the rezoning petition. Hillcrest Raleigh has recently requested a Sketch Plan Review from the city for a planned expansion which includes the two parcels of the rezoning site to be used for surface parking.

In order for a parking lot to count toward the UDO’s required parking for a specific use, that parking lot must be in the same contiguous zoning district as the use itself (UDO 6.4.7). In other words, if the applicant intends for a parking lot on the rezoning site to satisfy Hillcrest Raleigh’s parking requirement, it must be in an R-6 zoning district. There is currently no guarantee included in this request that there must be parking or, conversely, that there will only be parking on the rezoning site.

The original Hillcrest Raleigh facility was built in 1987 and currently has a 134-bed capacity. Any increase in the number of beds permitted would have to go through the state’s Certificate of Need process. Hillcrest Raleigh has indicated during the Sketch Plan Review and at CAC meetings that they are not planning to seek an increase in the number of beds in the facility, but would like to expand their physical space in order to convert many of their double-occupancy rooms to single-occupancy. This physical expansion would likely displace some amount of the parking available on the site today.

Group living, including rest homes, congregate care, and life care communities, are permitted in R-6 districts. However, the residential density of some of these uses are calculated differently than other traditional residential uses. In rest homes, which is the UDO-defined use that most closely applies to Hillcrest Raleigh, every 4 persons count as 1 dwelling unit; this is the largest density multiplier of any group living use. This means that, if the request is approved, the rezoning site could accommodate approximately 19 persons in a rest home setting. Hillcrest Raleigh’s current 6-acre lot can accommodate 144 beds in a rest home, which is more than the current facility’s 134 beds. If Hillcrest Raleigh were to recombine their parcel with the two in the rezoning site, the total capacity of a rest home use on the site would be approximately 164 beds.
The rezoning site sits at a maximum elevation of 316 feet, above the 296 feet of Hillcrest Raleigh, and well above the 250 feet of the floodplain which follows the House Creek branch of Crabtree Creek parallel to I-440 in this area. Both parcels have significant tree cover but are not as heavily screened from the street as the single-family homes further south on Blue Ridge Road directly across from Hillcrest Raleigh.

To the north of the site is the Marq at Crabtree, consisting of 293 apartments, and the Crabtree Lakeside Residences, currently under construction and approved for 221 apartments. To the east is the 360-unit Marshall Park multi-family development mentioned previously. To the west across Blue Ridge Road is an unincorporated pocket of five single-family homes. The general area has relatively intense commercial uses along Glenwood Avenue, anchored by the mall. Uses transition to somewhat less intense moving southward, from office and multi-family to ultimately single-family neighborhoods. I-440 creates a strong neighborhood boundary in the southeast.

The subject site is designated as Moderate Density Residential on the Future Land Use Map, as are Hillcrest Raleigh and the Marshall Park townhouses to the south, and Crabtree Lakeside Residences to the northwest. The Marq at Crabtree to the northeast is Regional Mixed Use. The properties to the east including Marshall Park apartments are designated as High Density Residential, and those to the west are Low Density Residential. Crabtree Creek and its tributaries, including House Creek, are all designated as Public Parks & Open Space. This combination of future land use designations represents a wide range of anticipated uses and intensity envisioned as appropriate in the area.

The Urban Form Map locates one of the two parcels included in the subject site within a City Growth Center of over 600 acres in size. City Growth Centers are anticipated for significant infill and redevelopment. The potential use of this site by Hillcrest Raleigh as essentially infill in nature is consistent with a City Growth Center.

A frontage can only be attached to mixed-use zoning districts, and as such is not applicable to this request for a residential district. Blue Ridge Road is an Urban Thoroughfare, although this classification does not extend south past the rezoning site. Urban Thoroughfares are planned or programmed for public investment in facilities such as bike lanes and pedestrian-oriented streetscapes that encourage multiple modes of transportation. Both the City Growth Center and Urban Thoroughfare designations suggest an urban or hybrid approach to frontage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>1. None.</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
<th>1. None.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OUTSTANDING ISSUES
Existing Zoning

Z-27-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>3916 &amp; 3920 Blue Ridge Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>0.83 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>R-4 &amp; OX-5-PL-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Zoning</td>
<td>R-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map by Raleigh Department of City Planning (Digitex) 9/26/2018
Property | 3916 & 3920 Blue Ridge Rd
Size | 0.83 acres
Existing Zoning | R-4 & OX-5-PL-CU
Requested Zoning | R-6

Map by Raleigh Department of City Planning (Intake) 9/26/2016
Urban Form Z-27-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>3916 &amp; 3920 Blue Ridge Rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>0.83 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>R-4 &amp; OX-5-PL-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Zoning</td>
<td>R-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map by Raleigh Department of City Planning (lattek) 9/26/2018
**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?**

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

If the site were redeveloped as individual lots, the request is consistent with the **Expanding Housing Choices** vision theme, which encourages expanding the supply and diversity of housing opportunities for all segments of the population. Rezoning from R-4 to R-6 relaxes the dimensional standards of the UDO, making it easier to redevelop the western parcel. While rezoning the eastern parcel from OX would limit the type and size of residential uses permitted today, it would also remove a zoning condition requiring a transition yard, thus making small-scale redevelopment easier.

If the site were integrated and/or recombined with Hillcrest Raleigh, the request is consistent with the **Growing Successful Neighborhoods and Communities** vision theme, which encourages careful infill that complements the existing character of the area and creates diverse, walkable neighborhoods providing convenient access to open space, community services, retail, and employment. If approved, the adjacent rest home could utilize the rezoning site for its expansion, allowing it to continue to meet a need in the community. In addition, larger multi-family and civic buildings such as Hillcrest Raleigh are now more typical of the character of this portion of Blue Ridge Road, rather than the existing single-family development.

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 considered is specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM).

The subject site is designated as Moderate Density Residential on the FLUM. This category applies to some of the city’s older single family residential neighborhoods, along with newer small lot single family subdivisions and patio home developments. Gross density in these areas should be 6 to 14 units per acre. The request is for a general use R-6 district, which is a closely corresponding zoning district to this FLUM category.
Group living, including rest homes, congregate care, and life care communities, are permitted in R-6 districts. Hillcrest Raleigh most likely falls under the rest home definition in the UDO, and therefore is consistent with the FLUM designation.

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 being considered is specifically designated on the FLUM.

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

Community facilities and streets appear to be sufficient to serve the proposed use.

**Future Land Use**

**Future Land Use designation:** Moderate Density Residential

**The rezoning request is:**

☑ **Consistent** with the Future Land Use Map.

☐ **Inconsistent.**

- The request is consistent with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The subject site is designated as Moderate Density Residential on the FLUM, which envisions densities of 6 to 14 units per acre. An R-6 district is compatible with Moderate Density Residential.

- It should be noted that rest homes, which is the UDO-defined use that most closely applies to Hillcrest Raleigh, count every 4 persons as 1 dwelling unit. This means that this site could accommodate approximately 19 persons in a rest home setting.

**Urban Form**

**Urban Form designation:** City Growth Center, Urban Thoroughfare

**The rezoning request is:**

☑ **Not applicable.**

☐ **Consistent** with the Urban Form Map.
Inconsistent.

- The Urban Form Map locates the subject site partially within a City Growth Center and along an Urban Thoroughfare, which both suggest an urban (Green, Urban Limited, Urban General, and Shopfront) or hybrid (Parking Limited) approach to frontage. However, since a frontage designation can only be applied to a mixed-use zoning district and the request is for a residential district, the policy guidance associated with the Urban Form Map is not applicable.

Compatibility

The proposed rezoning is:

☑ Compatible with the property and surrounding area.

☐ Incompatible.

- The request is compatible with the property and the surrounding area. Nearby zoning districts abutting the site include R-4, R-6, RX-3, OX-5, and PD, with building types including single-family, multi-family, and civic. The potential expansion of Hillcrest Raleigh onto this site would not be out of character for the area.

Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning

- The request would allow for the physical expansion, although not necessarily an expansion of occupancy, of a short-term, after-hospital rehabilitation facility. This is an important, long-established community service in a convenient location with good access to transportation, retail, and a major regional hospital.

Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning

- Approval of the rezoning would allow Hillcrest Raleigh to incorporate the site into their facility, including use as surface parking. This scenario would likely result in the demolition of the two existing single-family homes on the 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 request is consistent with the recommendations of the Future Land Use Map of Moderate Density Residential, which envisions densities of 6 to 14 units per acre. The request for an R-6 district is closely corresponding to this FLUM category.

Policy LU 5.1—Reinforcing the Urban Pattern

New development should be visually integrated with adjacent buildings, and more generally with the surrounding area. Quality design and site planning is required so that new development opportunities within the existing urban fabric of Raleigh are implemented without adverse impacts on local character and appearance.

- If approved, the adjacent rest home could utilize the rezoning site for its expansion. Larger multi-family and civic buildings such as Hillcrest Raleigh, Marshall Park, Marq at Crabtree, and Crabtree Lakeside Residences are now more typical of the character of this portion of Blue Ridge Road, rather than the existing single-family development.

Policy LU 9.4—Health Care Industry

Support the continued growth and expansion of the City’s health care providers to serve the needs of Raleigh’s residents.

Policy CS 5.3—Access to Health Care

Support the siting of health care facilities and services in appropriate and accessible locations.

- Approval of this request will permit Hillcrest Raleigh to utilize the rezoning site for its expansion. This will allow a long-established health care institution to continue to meet a need of the community, in a convenient location with good access to transportation, retail, and a major regional hospital.

Policy LU 5.5—Transitional and Buffer Zone Districts

Maintain and enhance zoning districts which serve as transitional or buffer areas between residential and commercial districts and which also may contain institutional, non-profit, and office-type uses. Zoning regulations and conditions for these areas should ensure that development achieves appropriate height and density transitions, and protects neighborhood character.

- The existing single-lot R-4 district is an inappropriate transition between the much larger adjacent R-6 and OX-5 districts. Approving the request will expand the R-6
district and an institutional use that is currently serving as a transition between single-family neighborhoods and the more intense multifamily uses further north.

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.

- Rezoning from R-4 to R-6 relaxes the dimensional standards of the UDO, making it easier to redevelop the western parcel of the rezoning site. While rezoning the eastern parcel from OX would limit the type and size of residential uses permitted today, it would also remove a zoning condition requiring a transition yard, making small-scale redevelopment easier.

The rezoning request is inconsistent with the following policies:

Policy LU 8.6—Teardowns

Discourage the replacement of quality homes in good physical condition with new homes that are substantially larger, taller, and bulkier than the prevailing building stock.

Policy H 1.6—Housing Preservation

Encourage the preservation of existing housing units whenever feasible, especially structures of historic or architectural significance.

- Approval of the rezoning would allow Hillcrest Raleigh to incorporate the site into their facility, including use as surface parking. This scenario would likely result in the demolition of the two existing single-family homes on the site.

Area Plan Policy Guidance

There are no specific Area Plan policies that strongly apply to this request.
**IMPACT ANALYSIS**

*Transportation*

1. **Area Plans:** The Z-27-18 site is located within the Crabtree Valley Area Plan, which includes Crabtree Valley Mall and surrounding properties. The plan goal is for a walkable, urban community with enhanced transit services and pedestrian amenities. The plan specifies that interconnectivity should be encouraged wherever feasible.

2. **Other Projects in the Area:** The Z-27-18 site is located near the NCDOT Project I-5870, which plans to improve the Glenwood Avenue interchange with I-440 and may impact the Crabtree Valley Ave / Blue Ridge Road / Summit Park Lane / Crabtree View Place intersection. Crabtree Valley Avenue is planned to be extended to I-440. The subject site is approximately a quarter mile south of these planned improvements. The extent of changes and corresponding impact to this development are not yet defined.

   The city has a Capital Improvement Project (CIP) to widen Blue Ridge Road, improving sidewalks and adding bike facilities, from Duraleigh Road to Crabtree Valley Ave. This project will involve impacts to the Z-27-18 site frontage. Improvements may also include changes to the intersection of Homewood Banks Drive and Blue Ridge Road.

3. **Existing and Planned Streets:** The subject property fronts Blue Ridge Road, which is specified as a 2-lane divided avenue in the Raleigh Street Plan. Blue Ridge Road is maintained by NCDOT at this location.

   In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for R-6 zoning districts with an average lot size of 0.4 ac is 5,000 feet. The existing block perimeter for Z-27-18 is not defined due to its proximity to I-440.

4. **Existing and Planned Pedestrian Facilities:** There are no existing sidewalks on Blue Ridge Road along the frontage of the site. They will be added as a part of the city’s CIP as described above.

5. **Existing and Planned Bicycle Facilities:** There are no existing bicycle facilities on Blue Ridge Road along the frontage of the site. They will be added as a part of the city’s CIP as described above. There was a bicycle crash along the frontage of the site approximately 10 years ago. It is anticipated that the CIP project will improve conditions for bicyclists in this location.

6. **Access:** Access to the subject site will be via Blue Ridge Road. The Homewood Banks Drive and Blue Ridge Road intersection may affect allowable access locations. Offers of cross access to adjacent parcels shall be made in accordance with the Raleigh UDO section 8.3.5.D.
7. **TIA Determination:** Approval of case Z-27-18 may result in fewer trips generated. The city’s CIP project will have impacts on the site’s frontage. However, there are no other site context triggers that require a TIA. Thus, a traffic study is not required for case Z-27-18.

   **Impact Identified:** None.

---

**Transit**

1. Subject property is located on an existing transit route. GoRaleigh route #16 Oberlin operates between UNC Rex Hospital on Blue Ridge Road, Crabtree Valley Mall, and GoRaleigh Station in downtown Raleigh. The service operates 30 minute headways during peak travel periods and 60 minute headways mid-day, evenings, and weekends.

2. The Wake Transit Plan envisions Crabtree Valley Mall and UNC Rex Hospital as being part of the proposed frequent network of bus services – routes which operate roughly every 15 minutes up to 18 hours per day 7 days per week. Final route alignments and implementation timelines are still under development by the plan’s consultant team.

   **Impact Identified:** None.

---

**Hydrology**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floodplain</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage Basin</strong></td>
<td>House Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater Management</strong></td>
<td>9.2 UDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overlay District</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Currently the lots may claim an exemption under 9.2.2.A if limiting impervious to that allowed by the current or the proposed R-6 zoning designation. However, the rezoning application indicates a desire to recombine the 2 lots with the larger 6 acre parcel to the southwest for future parking expansion. When recombined, any future proposed work will be subject to runoff and nitrogen regulations under 9.2 of the UDO.

2. No documented cases of downstream flooding have been identified.

   **Impact Identified:** None.
**Public Utilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Demand (current use)</th>
<th>Maximum Demand (current zoning)</th>
<th>Maximum Demand (proposed zoning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>1,250 gpd</td>
<td>6,811 gpd</td>
<td>2,500 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Water</strong></td>
<td>1,250 gpd</td>
<td>6,811 gpd</td>
<td>2,500 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The proposed rezoning would add approximately 1,250 gpd to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the city.

2. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the proposed rezoning area.

3. At the time of development plan submittal, a Downstream Sewer Capacity Study may be required to determine adequate capacity to support the proposed development. Any improvements identified by the study would be required to be permitted prior to the issuance of Building Permit & constructed prior to release of a Certificate of Occupancy.

4. Verification of water available for fire flow is required as part of the Building Permit process. Any water system improvements recommended by the analysis to meet fire flow requirements will also be required of the developer.

**Impact Identified:** None.

**Parks and Recreation**

1. This site is not directly impacted by any existing or proposed greenway trails, corridors, or connectors.

2. Nearest existing park access is provided by Lt. Col. George F. Marshall Memorial Park (0.5 mile) and Glen Eden Park (1 mile).

3. Nearest existing greenway trail access is provided by House Creek Greenway Trail (0.2 miles).

4. Park access level of service in this area is considered to be above average.

5. This area is not considered a priority for park land acquisition.

**Impact Identified:** None.
**Urban Forestry**

1. The properties separately or combined are not 2 acres in size and therefore would not be subject to UDO 9.1 (Tree Conservation). The proposed rezoning does not have an impact on Urban Forestry.

   **Impact Identified:** None.

**Designated Historic Resources**

1. The site is not located within or adjacent to a National Register Historic District or Raleigh Historic Overlay District. It does not include nor is adjacent to any National Register individually-listed properties or Raleigh Historic Landmarks.

   **Impact Identified:** None.

**Impacts Summary**

No significant impacts of the rezoning have been identified.

**Mitigation of Impacts**

No mitigation of impacts is recommended.
CONCLUSION

The request is to rezone approximately 0.83 acres from Residential-4 (R-4) and Office Mixed Use-5 stories-Parking Limited-Conditional Use (OX-5-PL-CU) to Residential-6 (R-6). The request is for a general use district; no additional conditions would apply.

The request is consistent with the Future Land Use Map and consistent with Comprehensive Plan overall. Regardless of whether the site is redeveloped with small-scale residential infill or if Hillcrest Raleigh uses the site to expand its current footprint, the requested zoning district is unlikely to adversely affect the community.

The request is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies regarding infill development, transitional zoning, access to and siting of health care and institutional uses, and specific recommendations for the Crabtree Area. The request is inconsistent with policies advocating against the demolition of existing housing stock.

The request would support the Vision Themes of Expanding Housing Choices and Growing Successful Neighborhoods and Communities.

Since frontages cannot be attached to residential zoning district, the request is consistent with the Urban Form map.

CASE TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/25/18</td>
<td>Submitted application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/18</td>
<td>Planning Commission first review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>Northwest CAC vote</td>
<td>10-0 in favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/18</td>
<td>Planning Commission second review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX

### Surrounding Area Land Use/ Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-4, OX-5-PL-CU</td>
<td>RX-3-PL-CU, PD</td>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>OX-5-PL-CU</td>
<td>R-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SHOD-1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Land Use**
- Moderate Density Residential
- Moderate Density Residential, Regional Mixed Use
- Moderate Density Residential
- High Density Residential
- Low Density Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Land Use</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family homes</td>
<td>Multi-family apartments</td>
<td>Skilled nursing facility</td>
<td>Multi-family apartments</td>
<td>Single-family homes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Form (if applicable)</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Growth Center, Urban Thoroughfare</td>
<td>City Growth Center, Urban Thoroughfare</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>City Growth Center, Urban Thoroughfare</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current vs. Proposed Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>OX-5-PL-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acreage</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td>(single-family)</td>
<td>(general building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side:</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>0' or 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>0' or 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density:</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. # of Residential Units</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19 persons in a rest home)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Building SF (if applicable)</td>
<td>10,871</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Office SF</td>
<td>6,908</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Retail SF</td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Gross Industrial SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential F.A.R</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.24</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.*
### Z-27-18 Trips Generated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z-27-18 Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Daily Trips (vpd)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Trips (vph)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Trips (vph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-27-18 Current Zoning Entitlements</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Houses &amp; Office Mixed Use</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z-27-18 Proposed Zoning Maximums</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Z-27-18 Traffic Study Worksheet

#### Trip Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Peak Hour Trips ≥ 150 veh/hr</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fewer trips generated</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>Fewer trips generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C More than 100 veh/hr trips in the peak direction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fewer trips generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Daily Trips ≥ 3,000 veh/day</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Fewer trips generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Enrollment increases at public or private schools</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1.3.C Site Context</th>
<th>Meets Conditions? [Y/N]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Affects a location with a high crash history</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Takes place at a highly congested location</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Creates a fourth leg at an existing signalized intersection</td>
<td>No</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Access is to/from a Major Street as defined by the City's Street Plan Map (Major street - boulevard or avenue with 4 or more lanes)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Proposed access is within 1,000 feet of an interchange</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Involves an existing or proposed median crossover</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Involves an active roadway construction project</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Involves a break in controlled access along a corridor</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Miscellaneous Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1.3.D Miscellaneous Applications</th>
<th>Meets Conditions? [Y/N]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Planned Development Districts</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B In response to Raleigh Planning Commission or Raleigh City Council resolutions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Study Required: **No**  
Reason: Although there are impacts anticipated from the Blue Ridge Road Widening CIP Project, there are no other triggers being met.

Completed By: TH  
Date: 10/4/2018  
Checked By: JM  
Date: 10/5/2018
# Rezoning Application

Department of City Planning | 1 Exchange Plaza, Suite 300 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2682

## REZONING REQUEST

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

Existing Zoning Base District: R-4  Height: N/A  Frontage: N/A  Overlay: N/A

Proposed Zoning Base District: R-6  Height: N/A  Frontage: N/A  Overlay: N/A

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: N/A

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

568966

## GENERAL INFORMATION

**Date** 09-25-2018  **Date Amended (1)**  **Date Amended (2)**

Property Address: 3916 Blue Ridge RD

Property PIN: 0795486280  **Deed Reference (book/page)** Book 016644 Page 00616

Nearest Intersection: Homewood Banks Drive and Blue Ridge Road

Property Size (acres): .42  (For PD Applications Only) Total Units  Total Square Feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner/Address</th>
<th>Phone 919-286-7705 ex 1123</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest Raleigh at Crabtree Valley, LLC 1417 W PETTIGREW ST DURHAM NC 27705-4820</td>
<td>Email <a href="mailto:ted.smith@hillcrestnc.com">ted.smith@hillcrestnc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact Person/Address</th>
<th>Phone 9198354529</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Schwedler 301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1400 Raleigh, NC 27601</td>
<td>Email <a href="mailto:jamieschwedler@parkerpoe.com">jamieschwedler@parkerpoe.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Owner/Agent Signature | Email bahatimutisya@parkerpoe.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 REQUEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Use</th>
<th>Conditional Use</th>
<th>Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Existing Zoning Base District**
- Ox Height: 5
- Frontage: PL
- Overlay(s): N/A

**Proposed Zoning Base District**
- R-6 Height: N/A
- Frontage: N/A
- Overlay(s): N/A

*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-8-09**

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

- 568966

### GENERAL INFORMATION

- **Date:** 09-25-2018
- **Date Amended (1):**
- **Date Amended (2):**

**Property Address:** 3920 Blue Ridge Rd, Raleigh, NC

**Property PIN:** 0795488212

**Deed Reference (book/page):** Book 016644 Page 00621

**Nearest Intersection:** Homewood Banks Dr and Blue Ridge Rd

**Property Size (acres):** 0.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(For PD Applications Only) Total Units</th>
<th>Total Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Property Owner/Address**

Hillcrest Raleigh at Crabtree Valley, LLC
1417 W PETTIGREW ST
DURHAM NC 27705-4820

**Project Contact Person/Address**

Jamie Schwedler
301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1400
Raleigh, NC 27601

**Owner/Agent Signature:**

- Phone 919-286-7705 ex 1123
- Fax

**Email:** ted.smith@hillcrestnc.com

- **Phone:** 9198354529
- Fax

**Email:** jamieschwedler@parkerpoe.com

**Email:** bahatimutisya@parkerpoe.com

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>N/A</td>
<td>Transaction #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rezoning Case #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Zoning

### Proposed Zoning

### Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

1. N/A

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 ___________________________ Print Name ___________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REZONING APPLICATION ADDENDUM #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Plan Analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICE USE ONLY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning Case #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See Addendum

2.

3.

4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC BENEFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide brief statements regarding the public benefits derived as a result of the rezoning request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See Addendum

2.

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>

**INVENTORY OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

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

N/A

**PROPOSED MITIGATION**

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

N/A
**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: City Growth Center**

*Click here to view the Urban Form Map.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td>See Addendum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **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:** |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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 14-18 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 Addendum  
3916 Blue Ridge Rd & 3920 Blue Ridge Rd  
Transaction #: 568966 

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. Both the R-4 parcel (3916 Blue Ridge Rd) and the OX parcel (3920 Blue Ridge Rd) are designated as Moderate Density Residential ("MDR") in the Future Land Use Map ("FLUM"). R-6 is a corresponding zoning district for this designation. See 2030 Comprehensive Plan, Amended February 2018 ("Comp Plan") p. 33. Therefore, the proposed rezoning of both parcels to R-6 is consistent with the FLUM designation.

2. The subject parcels are associated with the Crabtree Area Plan ("AP-C") of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and are labeled as part of the "Crabtree Study Area." See Comp Plan p. 395. This study area designation indicates that the subject parcels were a part of a traffic study in response to the growth in this area, but they are not directly connected to any Crabtree Valley Mall development. See Comp Plan p. 68.1. As a result of the study, the City of Raleigh will widen the existing two-lane Blue Ridge Road to a four-lane street along the subject parcels. The proposed rezoning complies with the following applicable AP-C policies:

   a. Policy AP-C 1, Crabtree Parking Structures: New parking structures in the Crabtree area should be designed with careful attention given to their street faces. See Comp Plan p. 393. The subject parcels face Blue Ridge Road. The applicant plans to rezone the subject parcels to match the zoning of the adjacent parcel containing an existing rest home facility and to place surface parking on both parcels to serve the facility. There are no parking structures planned for this development.

   b. Policy AP-C 2, Crabtree Area Hillsides: Hillsides in the Crabtree area should be retained and not graded down for incongruous, large-footprint buildings. New structures on hillsides and hilltops should fit into the terrain. See Comp Plan p. 393. The applicant with work with the City during site plan to maintain grading as much as possible and fit the development into the terrain. Grading will further be impacted by the Blue Ridge Road project.

   c. Policy AP-C 3, Crabtree Creek: Crabtree Creek and its tributaries should be left in a natural state with floodways, water quality, and steep slopes protected from further environmental degradation. See Comp Plan p. 393. The development will not affect Crabtree Creek nor its tributaries.

The proposed rezoning is also consistent with the following general policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

   d. Policy LU 4.5 Connectivity, New development and redevelopment should provide pedestrian and vehicular connectivity between individual development sites to provide
alternative means of access along corridors. See Comp Plan p.48. The applicant will work with the City at site plan to address any cross access to adjacent parcels to prevent excessive driveway cuts on Blue Ridge Road.

e. **Policy LU 5.4, Density Transition**, Low-to medium-density residential development and/or low-impact office uses should serve as transitional densities between lower-density neighborhoods and more intensive commercial and residential uses. Where two areas designated for significantly different development intensity abut on the Future Land Use Map, the implementing zoning should ensure that the appropriate transition occurs on the site with the higher intensity. See Comp Plan p. 50. The proposed rezoning to R-6 corresponds with the MDR FLUM designation for these parcels, which serves as a transition between the parcels zoned OX-5-PL-CU to the east and the parcels zoned R-4 to the west.

f. **Policy LU 5.6 Buffering Requirements**, New development adjacent to areas of lower intensity should provide effective physical buffers to avoid adverse effects. Buffers may include larger setbacks, landscaped or forested strips, transition zones, fencing, screening, height and/or density step downs, and other architectural and site planning measures that avoid potential conflicts. See Comp Plan p. 51. Blue Ridge Road separates the subject parcels from the low density residential areas zoned R-4 to the west. However, the applicant will work with the City at site plan and in connection with the Blue Ridge Road expansion project to provide necessary buffering to address any adverse impacts of the development.

g. **Policy LU 8.10, Infill Development**: Encourage infill development on vacant land within the City, particularly in areas where there are vacant lots that create “gaps” in the urban fabric and detract from the character of a commercial or residential street. Such development should complement the established character of the area and should not create sharp changes in the physical development pattern. See Comp Plan p.56. The parcels are two single-family residential lots with vacant homes, surrounded by the rest home and townhome development to the south on Blue Ridge Road and apartments to the north. The applicant intends to develop the two subject parcels in connection with the existing rest home facility for a more unified treatment of all three parcels. This proposed use will be a continuation of the existing facility on the rezoned lots, and will remove the awkward gap these two lots currently cause.

h. **Policy LU 8.11, Development of Vacant Sites**: Facilitate the development of vacant lots that have historically been difficult to develop due to infrastructure or access problems, inadequate lot dimensions, fragmented or absentee ownership, or other constraints. Explore lot consolidation, acquisition, and other measures that would address these. See Comp Plan p.56. The subject parcels are vacated residential lots, and are somewhat oddly shaped. They are also located at a difficult intersection, and immediately adjacent to two recently-developed apartment complexes, which likely have little need for these parcels. Together, the parcels are only .83 acres. Their size and location near the surrounding developments make it unlikely that they will be used in the future as single-family residential or in connection with any other use aside from the rest home. The applicant acquired these parcels with the intent to recombine them with the existing rest home lot and to provide much needed parking for the rest home facility and its future expansion.
3. The OX parcel is located on the edge of the City Growth Center Designation in the Urban Form Map. It appears to be left out of a development plan related to the adjacent Marshall Apartments, which is also zoned OX-5-PL-CU. Following rezoning, it is the applicant’s intent to recombine these lots with the existing rest home facility lot for a more unified treatment. After recombination, only 6% of the future recombined parcel will be in the City Growth Center. Given that the OX parcel 1) is not a part of the neighboring apartment development, 2) will be only a small portion of the future recombined lot, and 3) is located on the edge of the City Growth Center, some of the criteria in the Urban Design Guidelines are not applicable. Please see the attached responses to the Urban Design Guidelines for statements establishing the parcel’s consistency with the majority of the goals of the City Growth Center.
PUBLIC BENEFITS

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

This zoning request relates to the applicant’s plan to expand the adjacent existing 134-bed rest home facility, which provides full-time nursing assistance to its occupants. The proposed expansion will allow the facility to turn some of the double bedrooms into single bedrooms, thus offering a more private experience without increasing the occupancy. The proposed expansion of the facility will decrease the existing number of parking spaces, thus creating a greater need for parking for visitors. The applicant’s proposed use of the R-4 parcel and the OX parcel as R-6 will allow them to combine the parcels with the existing facility, provide additional parking and access, all of which will meet the needs of the facility and allow occupants to be visited by their loved ones with ease. Because the occupancy will remain the same, this redevelopment will not increase traffic on surrounding roads.

The City of Raleigh is widening Blue Ridge Road to become a four-lane street with two lanes in each direction, medians or a center turn lane, and varying limitations on driveway access. See Comp Plan p. 68.1. The applicant will work with the City during site plan to accommodate this project and provide better circulation and access along Blue Ridge Road.

In addition, the parcels currently have no existing on-site stormwater control measures. Any development pursuant to the proposed rezoning will be done in compliance with the UDO and will include measures to treat runoff consistent with UDO requirements, which will benefit this property and surrounding properties during storm events. Finally, as mentioned above, this rezoning request is also consistent with the FLUM and its goals.
URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Criteria #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: This criteria does not apply because this will not be a mixed use development and one does not currently exist on this site.

Criteria #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: This criteria does not apply because there will not be a mixed use building, and one does not currently exist on this site.

Criteria #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: This will not be a mixed-use development with an internal road network. However, to address connectivity, the applicant will work with the City at site plan to provide cross-access to adjacent parcels.

Criteria #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: There are no streets running through this development. For the portion of Blue Ridge Road along the subject parcels that is designated as an Urban Thoroughfares, an “urban or hybrid frontage approach is recommended, based on context.” See Comp Plan p. 236. Providing a frontage condition at zoning is inappropriate because this is a residential district, to which frontage provisions do not apply, and because the Blue Ridge Road project plans will impact the frontage but have not been solidified.
Criteria #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: Block face will be determined at site plan, in connection with the NCDOT’s plans for access and driveways along Blue Ridge Road due to the expansion project.

Criteria #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: For the City Growth Center, while “an urban and/or hybrid approach to frontage is recommended to encourage walkability, built conditions and site constraints may require alternative approaches.” See Comp. Plan p. 235. Frontage requirements of the City Growth Center are not applicable here because this is a residential district. Further, the frontage of the parcels abutting Blue Ridge Road will be significantly impacted by the City’s planned road expansion, and has significant topography changes along that frontage. The project will include sidewalks and the applicant will work with the City at site plan to provide an appropriate street treatment. The recombined lot will not contain a mixed use commercial development aimed at inviting pedestrians. The applicant does not anticipate the construction of garage entrances or loading areas on the front of the facility or on these parcels.

Criteria #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: The applicant will be expanding of the existing facility that is centrally located within the adjoining parcel. The purpose of the proposed rezoning is to allow improvements specific to the subject parcels for parking areas associated with the facility expansion. The plan for Blue Ridge Road does not include on-street parking. Based on the existing conditions of the future recombined lot, the topography challenges adjacent to Blue Ridge, the proposed expansion of the facility, and the loss of land to the widening of Blue Ridge Road, the buildings will need to be pulled back significantly from the road. This can be accomplished at site plan, when the widening project is more certain.
Criteria #8: If the site is located at a street intersection, the main building or main part of the building should be placed at the corner. Parking, loading or service should not be located at an intersection.

Response: The parcels are not corner lots, but to the extent this criteria applies, buildings cannot be located on the corner based on existing topography, the proposed expansion of the facility, and the loss of land to the widening of Blue Ridge Road.

Criteria #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: The subject parcels are associated with a residential development, not an urban space. The associated existing facility already provides open space areas.

Criteria #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: This subject parcels are associated with a residential development, not an urban space. The development will be adjacent to sidewalks in connection with the Blue Ridge Road project.

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

Response: The associated existing facility already provides open space areas. Further, the subject parcels have a MDR FLUM designation, not a high density residential, making this criteria inapplicable.

Criteria #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: The associated existing facility already provides open space areas.

Criteria #13: New public spaces should provide seating opportunities.

Response: The associated existing facility already provides open space areas.

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

Response: For City Growth Centers, while "an urban and/or hybrid approach to frontage is recommended to encourage walkability, built conditions and site constraints may require alternative approaches." See Comp. Plan p. 235. For the portion of Blue
Ridge Road along the subject parcels that is designated as an Urban Thoroughfare, an “urban or hybrid frontage approach is recommended, based on context.” See Comp Plan p. 236. Looking at the context for these parcels, the OX-parcel is going to be recombined to become one large parcel. The portion of the recombined lot that will be subject to the frontage requirements will be approximately 6%. The OX parcel is a small portion of the lot located at the edge of the City Growth Center area.

**Criteria #15:** Parking lots should be located behind or in the interior of a block whenever possible. Parking lots should not occupy more than 1/3 of the frontage of the adjacent building or not more than 64 feet, whichever is less.

**Response:** The applicant will provide landscaping to lessen any visual impact of parking on the parcels. The existing development on the rest home parcel makes parking locations difficult to place on the interior of the lot.

**Criteria #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:** There are no parking structures planned for this development.

**Criteria #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:** A bus stop currently exists on Blue Ridge Road in front of the facility. If it remains after the completion of the Blue Ridge Road project, the applicant will work with the City on placement.

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

**Response:** The applicant will work with the City to address pedestrian access from the bus stop if it remains.

**Criteria #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:** The area adjacent to Blue Ridge Road has significant slopes, some of which will be affected by the Blue Ridge Road project. There are no significant
watercourses or floodplains on the site. The applicant will provide the necessary tree conservation areas at site plan.

Criteria #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: The City will provide sidewalks along Blue Ridge Road in connection with the widening project. The applicant will work with the City at site plan to provide reasonable pedestrian access.

Criteria #21: *Sidewalks should be 5-8 feet wide in residential areas and located on both sides of the street. Sidewalks in commercial areas and Pedestrian Business Overlays should be a minimum of 14-18 feet wide to accommodate sidewalk uses such as vendors, merchandising and outdoor seating.*

Response: The City will provide sidewalks along Blue Ridge Road in connection with the widening project. The applicant will work with the City at site plan to provide reasonable pedestrian access.

Criteria #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: The applicant will work with the City and NCDOT during site plan review to determine the appropriate landscaping and buffering.

Criteria #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: No buildings are planned for these parcels.

Criteria #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: No buildings are planned for these parcels.
Criteria #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: No buildings are planned for these parcels.

Criteria #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: The applicant will work with the City at site plan to meet this requirement.
### REZONING APPLICATION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS ("Rezoning Checklist")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Requirements – General Use or Conditional Use Rezoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rezoning application review fee (see Fee Schedule for rate)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Completed application; Include electronic version via CD or flash drive</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Two sets of stamped envelopes addressed to all property owners within 500 feet of property to be rezoned</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pre-Application Conference</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Neighborhood Meeting notice and report</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trip Generation Study</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Traffic Impact Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Completed and signed zoning conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Completed Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Completed Response to the Urban Design Guidelines</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Master Plan (for properties requesting Planned Development or Campus District)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 7, 2018

Re: 3916 Blue Ridge Rd and 3920 Blue Ridge Rd Notice of Neighborhood Meeting

Neighboring Property Owners:

A neighborhood meeting will be held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, September 19th at Hillcrest Raleigh at Crabtree Valley located at 3830 Blue Ridge Rd, Raleigh, NC 27612. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss an upcoming application to rezone two parcels of land located at 3916 Blue Ridge Rd (PIN: 0795486280, “Parcel 1”) and 3920 Blue Ridge Rd (PIN: 0795488212, “Parcel 2”). Attached is a vicinity map outlining the location of the parcels. Parcel 1 is currently zoned R-4 and Parcel 2 is currently zoned OX-5-PL-CU. We propose to rezone both parcels to R-6. The applicant will describe the nature of this rezoning request and field any questions from the public. The City of Raleigh requires a neighborhood meeting involving the property owners within 500 feet of the area requested for rezoning prior to the submittal of any rezoning application. Any landowner who is interested in learning more about this project is invited to attend.

If you have any questions, please contact Jamie Schwedler at (919) 835-4529 or via email at jamieschwedler@parkerpoe.com or Bahati Mutilia (919) 835-4686 or via email at bahatimutilia@parkerpoe.com. You may also contact the Raleigh Department of City Planning at (919) 996-2682, via email at rezoning@raleighnc.gov, or visit the City’s web portal at https://www.raleighnc.gov.

Thank you,

Jamie Schwedler
SUMMARY OF ISSUES

A neighborhood meeting was held on September 19, 2018 (date) to discuss a potential rezoning located at 3916 & 3920 Blue Ridge Road, Raleigh, NC 27612 (property address).

The neighborhood meeting was held at 3830 Blue Ridge Road, Raleigh, NC 27612 (location).

There were approximately 2 (number) neighbors in attendance. The general issues discussed were:

Summary of Issues:

- General discussion of the Blue Ridge Road project and its impact on the two parcels.
- General discussion of the development's affect on the visibility of the Marshall Apartments.
- General discussion of whether R-6 zoning allows the rest home to increase occupancy.
- General discussion regarding process and timeline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol Trajek</td>
<td>3909 Blue Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cardham1@gmail.com">cardham1@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol E. Humphries</td>
<td>3909 Blue Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Michael Landreth, Jr.</td>
<td>3901 Blue Ridge Road</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 | August 22, 2018 |
| Applicant(s) Name | Jamie Schwedler |
| Applicant's Mailing Address | Post Office Box 389 Raleigh, NC 27602-0389 |
| Phone | (919) 835-4529 |
| Email | jamieschwedler@parkerpoe.com |
| Property PIN # | PIN# 0795486280 and PIN# 0795488212 |
| Site Address / Location | 3916 Blue Ridge Road, Raleigh, NC and 3920 Blue Ridge Rd, Raleigh, NC |
| Current Zoning | R-4 and OX-5-PL-CU |
| Additional Information (if needed) : | Proposed rezoning of both parcels to R-6. |

### OFFICE USE ONLY

| Transaction # | 568966 |
| Date of Pre-Application Conference | |
| Staff Signature | |
Pre-Application Conference
Meeting Record

Transaction #: 568966  Meeting Date & Time: 9/7/18 10 am

Location: One Exchange Plaza

Attendees: Jamie Shedler, Sabahi Mutisya, Brian Parry,
           Rick Slater, Hannah Reckhow, John Anagnost,
           Jason Myers

Parcels discussed (address and/or PIN): 3916 & 3920 Blue Ridge Rd

Current Zoning: R-4, OX-5-PL-CU

Potential Re-Zoning: R-6

CAC Chair/Contact Information: Northwest CAC aracelys.torrez@raleighnc.gov 919-996-5817

General Notes: Applicant interested in rezoning parcels for parking to
               support adjacent assisted living facility. Future land use designation
               is Moderate Density Residential, which supports 1-4 unit peracre.
               An option is to request an Rx district and include a condition that
               would development to avoid a T1A. When Form guidance exists for a
               portion of site. Drainage basin ridge line is close to site, will not
               drain to neighborhood to the north. Canal has been dredged in
               Department & Staff | Notes
               | Neighbors have expressed concern about NC DOT Knightdale
               | 440 interchange.

Development Services
  Justin Rametta
  Justin.Rametta@raleighnc.gov
  919-996-2665
  Mike Walters
  Michael.Walters@raleighnc.gov
  919-996-2636
  Walt Fulcher
  Walt.Fulcher@raleighnc.gov
  919-996-3517

UDO Sections:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Historic Preservation            | _Melissa Robb  
Melissa.Robb@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-2632  
_Collette Kinane  
Collette.Kinane@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-2649 |
| Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources | _Thomas "Tj" McCourt  
Thomas.McCourt@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-6079  
_Emma Liles  
Emma.Liles@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-4871 |
| Public Utilities                 | _John Sorrell  
John.Sorrell@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-3485  
_Patrick Paine  
Patrick.Paine@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-3481  
_Eric Haugaard  
Eric.Haugaard@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-3492 |
| Stormwater                       | _Ben Brown  
Ben.Brown@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-3515  
_Gary Morton  
Gary.Morton@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-3517  
_Ashley Rodgers  
Ashley.Rodgers@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-3970  
_Lisa Booze  
Lisa.Booze@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-3518 |
| Transportation                   | _Tara Hofferth  
Tara.Hofferth@raleighnc.gov  
919-996-2661 |
| UDO Sections:                    |                                                                                     |
AGENDA ITEM (C): OLD BUSINESS

AGENDA ITEM (C) 1: Z-27-18 – 3916 & 3920 Blue Ridge Road

This site is located approximately 0.3 miles from the intersection of Garner Road and Tryon Road.

This is a rezone property from R-4 to R-6.

Planner Mabel gave a brief of the case regarding the CAC vote being favorable 10-0 and consistent policy regarding removal or demolition of two houses.

There was brief discussion regarding frontage and sloping hill and whether the frontage will be maintained in the future.

Ms. Jeffreys made a motion to approve the case. Mr. Lyle seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous, 8-0.