Request: 84.19 acres from PD, OX-3-GR w/SHOD-2 & CM to PD w/ SHOD-2

Submittal Date
9/2/2016
Certified Recommendation
Raleigh Planning Commission

Case Information: Z-28-16 / MP-3-16

| Location | General location: northeastern quadrant of the intersection of Six Forks Road and I-440, bounded by St. Albans Drive  
| Address: See Rezoning Petition  
| PINs: See Rezoning Petition |
| Request | Rezone property from Planned Development (PD) and Office Mixed Use-3 Stories-Green Frontage with Special Highway Overlay District 2 (OX-3-GR w/ SHOD-2) and Conservation Management (CM) to Planned Development (PD) |
| Area of Request | 84.29 acres |
| Property Owners | Multiple Property Owners (See Rezoning Petition) |
| Applicant | Kane Realty Corporation  
c/o Greg Kuruc  
4321 Lassiter at North Hills Avenue  
Suite 250  
Raleigh, NC 27609  
919.719.5430  
gkuruc@kanerealtycorp.com  
Mack Paul  
Morningstar Law Group, L.L.P.  
630 Davis Drive  
Suite 200  
Morrisville, NC 27560  
919.590.0377  
mpaul@morningstarlawgroup.com |
| Citizens Advisory Council | Midtown  
Chair: Patrick Martin, acemar@aol.com |
| PC Recommendation Deadline | June 5, 2017 |

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 URBAN FORM | Policy LU 1.2 – Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency  
| Policy LU 2.4 – Large Site Development  
| Policy LU 2.6 – Zoning and Infrastructure Impacts  
| Policy LU 4.5 – Connectivity  
| Policy LU 4.7 – Capitalizing on Transit Access  
| Policy LU 5.1 – Reinforcing the Urban Pattern  
| Policy LU 6.1 – Composition of Mixed Use Centers  
| Policy LU 6.4 – Bus Stop Dedication  
| Policy LU 7.4 – Scale and Design of New Commercial Uses  
| Policy LU 7.6 – Pedestrian-Friendly Development |

CONSISTENT Policies
Policy LU 10.5 – Regional Retail and Residential Areas
Policy T 2.5 – Multi-Modal Grids
Policy T 2.6 – Preserving the Grid
Policy T 2.9 – Curb Cuts
Policy T 5.2 – Incorporating Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
Policy T 5.5 – Sidewalk Requirements
Policy T 5.9 – Pedestrian Networks
Policy T 5.10 – Building Orientation
Policy EP 2.5 – Protection of Water Features
Policy EP 3.12 – Mitigating Stormwater Impacts
Policy EP 4.2 – Floodplain Conservation
Policy UD 1.10 – Frontage
Policy UD 2.1 – Building Orientation
Policy UD 2.2 – Multi-Modal Design
Policy UD 2.3 – Activating the Street
Policy UD 2.5 – Greenway Access
Policy UD 2.7 – Public Open Space
Policy UD 6.1 – Encouraging Pedestrian-Oriented Uses
Policy UD 7.3 – Design Guidelines

INCONSISTENT Policies
Policy T 1.6 – Transportation Impacts

Proposed Modification of Standards

1. Chapter 2. Residential Districts; - Modification of Setbacks, Heights – Modification of setbacks for Townhome Building type to 0’. Heights as set by Master Plan
2. Chapter 3. Mixed Use Districts; - Modification of Setbacks, Heights – Modification of setbacks for all Building types to 0’. Heights as set by Master Plan
3. Chapter 7. General Development Standards – Parking Standards – Mixed Use Parking reduction of 34%
4. Article 8.4. New Streets – Street Sections as Provided in Master Plan.

Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Meeting</th>
<th>CAC</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>City Council</th>
<th>Public Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 8, 2016</td>
<td>January 23, 2017</td>
<td>March 7, 2017 (COW): Recommended for Approval (7-0)</td>
<td>March 14, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes – 109; No – 37*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Midtown CAC Attachments

Attachments
1. Staff report
2. Planned Development
3. Master Plan
4. Petition
5. Urban Design Guidelines
6. Midtown CAC Minutes from January 23, 2017
7. Midtown CAC Report of Conditions  
8. Neighborhood Meeting  
9. Trip Generation Worksheet  
10. Traffic Impact Analysis Memos

### Planning Commission Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Findings &amp; Reasons</th>
<th>Motion and Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Motion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Favor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opposed:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Planning Commission Chairperson</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sophie Huemer: (919) 996-2652; <a href="mailto:Sophie.Huemer@raleighnc.gov">Sophie.Huemer@raleighnc.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justin Rametta: (919) 996-2665; <a href="mailto:Justin.Rametta@raleighnc.gov">Justin.Rametta@raleighnc.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Summary

Overview

The subject properties are situated at the northeast quadrant of Six Forks Road and I-440. The proposed Planned Development is a total of 84.19 acres bound by Dartmouth Road, Six Forks road, St. Albans Drive, I-440 and the Big Branch tributary. This area has is characterized by growth and the emergence of several mixed use centers. Since 2009, the existing PD has been developed or is under development. To the west, across Six Forks Road is North Hills, a mixed-use center redeveloped in 2003. The greater I-440 and Six Forks road area has undergone significant growth over the past two decades. To the North of the proposed rezoning are single family neighborhoods constructed in the 1960’s. The eastern border of the proposed PD is the Big Branch Tributary. East of Big Branch is a combination of office buildings and multifamily residential buildings.

The proposed rezoning seeks to amend the existing Planned Development District, North Hills East (MP-4-09) and add an additional 33.54 acres bringing the total PD acreage to 84.19. The additional acreage is currently zoned Office Mixed Use-3 Stories-Green Frontage with a Special Highway Overlay District-2 and Conservation Management. The requested rezoning will increase the development potential for residential development and lodging units. The rezoning also decreases the minimum building setbacks to zero with the exception of two tracts, S and U, that front St. Albans. Those tracts will provide a 32 foot setback for buildings and parking from back of curb along St. Albans. Tract W of the PD is not designated for development, as it is the former Conservation Management (CM) zoning district, and has existing wetlands and Neuse Riparian Buffers on the tract.

The subject property is classified as Regional Mixed Use on the Future Land Use Map, as are the properties to the east and west. Properties to the south across I-440 are classified as Office and Residential Mixed use and properties to the north are existing single family residential neighborhoods that have a Low Density Residential classification.

The proposed rezoning has several Urban Form Map designations. The proposed rezoning and the properties to the east, west, and south are all located in a City Growth Center. St. Albans is classified as an Urban Thoroughfare. Six Forks road is classified as a Transit Emphasis Corridor, and I-440 is classified as a Parkway.

Outstanding Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. None</td>
<td>1. N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rezoning Case Evaluation

1. Compatibility Analysis

1.1 Surrounding Area Land Use/ Zoning Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Property</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>Planned Development, Office Mixed Use-3 Stories - Green Frontage, Conservation Management</td>
<td>Residential-4; Office Mixed Use-12 Stories</td>
<td>Residential Mixed Use-3 Stories - Conditional Use; Commercial Mixed Use-7 Stories-Parking Limited - Conditional Use; Office Mixed Use-3 Stories-Green Frontage</td>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use-12 Stories-Urban Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>Special Highway Overlay District-2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Special Highway Overlay District-2</td>
<td>Special Highway Overlay District-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
<td>Regional Mixed Use</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>Office and Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>Regional Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Commercial, Office, and Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>Office and Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>Multi-family Residential, Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form (if applicable)</td>
<td>City Growth Center; Corridor: Parkway (I-440), Transit Emphasis (Six Forks Road), Urban Thoroughfare (St. Albans Drive)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>City Growth Center; Corridor: Parkway (I-440), Transit Emphasis (Six Forks Road), Urban Thoroughfare (St. Albans Drive)</td>
<td>City Growth Center; Corridor: Parkway (I-440), Transit Emphasis (Six Forks Road), Urban Thoroughfare (Lassiter Mill Rd)</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>34.84</td>
<td>45.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td>Existing PD: 0'</td>
<td>OX-3-GR: 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side:</td>
<td>0'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>0'</td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0' (32' on Tracts S&amp;U)</td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Retail Intensity Permitted:** 742,319 450,000

**Office Intensity Permitted:** 2,286,823 2,014,479

**Industrial Intensity Permitted** Not Permitted Not Permitted

### 1.3 Estimated Development Intensities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td>84.19</td>
<td>84.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
<td>PD, OX-3-GR w/ SHOD-2, CM</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Building SF</strong></td>
<td>6,097,800</td>
<td>7,866,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. # of Residential Units</strong></td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Office SF</strong></td>
<td>1,503,500</td>
<td>2,014,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Retail SF</strong></td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Industrial SF</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential F.A.R.</strong></td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The development intensities 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:

The proposed rezoning is compatible with the surrounding properties and the surrounding area. The east, west, and south sides of the property are all mixed-use centers with varying heights and characterized by growth over the past two decades. Along St. Albans Drive, the heights of the development are limited to 90' to reduce the visual impact to the single family neighborhoods. The Master Plan also calls for adequate pedestrian circulation and amenities to serve residents of the community.
2. Master Plan Design Analysis

SETBACKS/ HEIGHT:

**Setbacks**
There shall also be no minimum side or rear yard building setback required for buildings located on a private street or public street. Further, no minimum side or rear yard building setbacks shall be required as part of this Master Plan unless required by the State Building Code. Provided, however, no building shall be placed within a sight distance triangle easement. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any buildings situated on Tracts S and U shall have a minimum setback of 32’ from the existing back of curb of St. Alban’s Drive as of the date of this master plan approval.

**Height**
Specifically, maximum building heights have been located such that there is a clear transition from the taller buildings along Six Forks Road to the shorter buildings along St. Albans Drive. Moreover, Tracts M and P create additional transition areas between the shortest buildings and the existing residences along the western edge of the project by providing a large public open space, where only recreational activities and associated structures can be built which do not exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height.

PARKING:

Given the urban mixed-use, pedestrian friendly concepts of the Development, the parking requirements applicable to this Master Plan shall be reduced by 34% of required parking as set forth in the UDO. This reduction is justified in part because there will be public transportation available within the Development. Additionally, horizontal and vertical mixing of uses reduces the demand for parking in such developments. For additional justification, please refer to the Reduced Parking Scenario Matrix attached to this Master Plan, along with two letters submitted with this Master Plan from Kimley-Horn and Associates, dated May 31, 2006 and February 12, 2009, analyzing the justification for this parking reduction.

Off-street parking shall be as provided for in the Master Plan using a mixture of surface and structured parking; provided, however, at least fifty-one percent (51%) of the required parking shall be located in structured parking facilities. Reduced parking is justified under this Master Plan because of the urban mixed-use nature of the Development. The design of the Development will foster pedestrian circulation that will reduce the need for parking when combined with the mixed-use aspects of the Development.

DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office (including institution/civic/service)</td>
<td>2,014,479 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/retail</td>
<td>450,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1,100 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>3,800 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACT</td>
<td>ACREAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(#)* – indicates the maximum number of townhome units allowed within the subject tract.
PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION:
The Pedestrian Circulation Plan calls for 10’ multimodal pathways along all public streets. Pedestrian pathways will be provided from the street to the parking area between buildings, as necessary to ensure the reasonably safe, direct, and conveniently access to building entrances and off street parking. To aid pedestrian navigation and comfort the following elements will be used along pathways: landscape, pedestrian scaled lighting, pedestrian way-finding, and special paving. Pedestrian paths are designed to be as direct as possible to minimize conflict with vehicular traffic.

PHASING:
North Hills East will be developed in phases primarily determined by market conditions, economic considerations, and matters determined as field engineering and surveying progress. A Preliminary Phasing Plan is attached to this Master Plan showing the general location of preliminary development phases for North Hills East. Notwithstanding this Preliminary Phasing Plan, including plan sheet P-3, any tract or phase within this Master Plan may be developed or reconfigured at any time subject to the provisions of the Code, and provided that all necessary infrastructure is in place to serve such development. Further, retail phasing shall be determined based upon the requirements of TC-15-06 (73-TC-291).

OPEN SPACE:
A minimum of fifteen percent (15%) of the Development will be preserved as open space, which will include green spaces, Tree Conservation areas and plazas. Open space totals may, with the consent of the City Administration, be shifted or reallocated between Tracts within the Development.

Tree Conservation:
As shown on plan sheets TC-1 and TC-2 (in reference to MP-4-08) and P-7 and P-8, a minimum of ten percent (10%) tree conservation will be provided. The Tree Conservation standards as set out in Article 9.1 of the UDO shall be applied to the Property as a whole rather than on a Tract by Tract or lot by lot basis. All shifting of tree conservation areas will be shown on recorded subdivision plats. Perimeter tree preservation areas shall be defined with metes and bounds legal descriptions.

The TCA proposed exceeds what would be required by the UDO under existing zoning.

STREET TYPOLOGY:
Due to the pedestrian oriented, urban mixed use character of North Hills East, the Applicant is seeking to utilize street sections as shown on the Street Section Plan and Street and Block Plan submitted with this Master Plan. These street sections will require the placement of plantings within the public right of way subject to entering into appropriate encroachment agreements with the City. Except as noted in C-4 and P-4, no reduction to standard street and sidewalk widths are being requested.

BUILDING TYPES:
All building types permitted by CX zoning are used within this PD.

COMMON SIGNAGE PLAN:
Uniform sign code per MP-4-08.
Master Plan Responses to General Design Principles *(UDO Sec. 4.7.5. A-N)*

See Urban Design Guidelines Response attached to this staff report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Housing</th>
<th>(Master Plan page 2, P-2) development allows for a range of residential building types including townhome, apartment, and mixed use building types.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Compactness</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 2, P-2) uses and open space are carefully planned throughout the development. The pedestrian circulation plan and street network allow for walkability and safe connections throughout the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Compatibility</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 7-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Variety of non-residential uses</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 7-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Special sites</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 7-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Street types</td>
<td>(Master Plan page P-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Bicycle circulation</td>
<td>(Master Plan page P-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Spatial delineation</td>
<td>(Master Plan page P-1 through 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Locally-based design</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Open space</td>
<td>(Master Plan page P-7 through 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Contextual compatibility</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Character</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Public art</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Entertainment facilities</td>
<td>(Master Plan page 14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis

3.1 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?
B. Is the use being considered specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map in the area where its location is proposed?
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?
D. Will community facilities and streets be available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property?

- A. The proposed zoning is consistent with the themes and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, including Coordinating Land Use and Transportation and Growing Successful Neighborhoods and Communities.
- B. The Regional Mixed Use designation calls for “high-density housing, office development, hotels, and region-serving retail uses such as department stores and specialty stores”. Uses permitted in the North Hills East PD include a wide range of uses and services that will serve the region.
- C. N/A
- D. Existing community facilities appear to be sufficient to accommodate the development possible under the proposed rezoning. The Traffic Impact Analysis indicates that Six Forks Road currently operates at LOS–F at some peak times and development of North Hills east with the proposed improvements will not improve the LOS of this corridor.

3.2 Future Land Use

Future Land Use designation:

The rezoning request is:

☑ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Regional Mixed Use classification. The Comprehensive Plan states: “These areas may include high-density housing, office development, hotels, and region-serving retail uses such as department stores and specialty stores. These areas would typically be zoned CX. Heights could be as tall as 12 to 20 stories in core locations, but should taper down to meet the context of surrounding development. As in other mixed-use areas, taller buildings should be accompanied by enhanced pedestrian amenities.” The Master Plan and PD are stepping down the heights of building located across from Single family residences. North Hills East is located in a core location, allowing for heights up to 20 stories. Those building heights are primarily reserved for tracts that are adjacent to the I-440 corridor. The PD also has a base zoning district of Commercial Mixed Use (CX), allowing for a range of uses to serve the region.
3.3 Urban Form

Urban Form designation:

☐ Not applicable (no Urban Form designation)

The rezoning request is:

☒ Consistent with the Urban Form Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:

The proposed rezoning has several Urban Form Map designations. The proposed rezoning and the properties to the east, west, and south are all located in a City Growth Center. St. Albans is classified as an Urban Thoroughfare. Six Forks road is classified as a Transit Emphasis Corridor, and I-440 is classified as a Parkway.

As part of a City Growth Center, the development intensity and height are appropriate for this area. The heights of the proposed development step down as they transition north towards the single family development.

3.4 Policy Guidance

Policy T 1.6 – Transportation Impacts
Identify and address transportation impacts before a development is implemented.

Per the Transportation Impact Analysis, delay and travel time for motorists traversing the street network bounded by Six Forks, Millbrook, Wake Forest and I-440 are predicted to increase by roughly 20%. The applicant has committed to build an exclusive right-turn lane on the I-440 westbound off ramp at Six Forks Road and Exclusive turn lanes on each approach at the intersection of St Albans Drive and Hardimont Road. However, it is noted that the overall impact of the development will degrade the traffic network in this area. There are recommended Improvements detailed in the TIA Review, Part 3, which should be considered.

3.5 Area Plan Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is not subject to an Area Plan.

4. Public Benefit and Reasonableness Analysis

4.1 Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning

- The proposed rezoning will allow 2 additional parcels of the existing PD and Master Plan. By incorporating these parcels into the existing mixed use development, the parcels will be able to be developed cohesively and in character and context with North Hills East.

- The proposed rezoning benefits the public by permitting the landowner to pursue mixed-use development that can provide the community with amenities, additional housing opportunities, and private employment opportunities.
The proposed rezoning will provide opportunities for a coordinated development in the area while providing an appropriate transition to the surrounding residential properties.

The proposed rezoning provides significant expansion to the community's open space, greenway network, parks, and other outdoor amenities.

### 4.2 Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning

- Even with the priority treatment for north-south thru movements, levels of service for Six Forks Road at the I-440 ramps will degrade from LOS-D to LOS-E upon approval of Z-28-16. Staff notes that for portions of the PM peak hour, Six Forks Road operates at LOS-F currently. Delays will increase as North Hills East is developed.

- Delay and travel time for motorists traversing the street network bounded by Six Forks, Millbrook, Wake Forest and I-440 are predicted to increase by roughly 20%.

### 5. Impact Analysis

#### 5.1 Transportation

1. The preliminary TIA review for Z-28-2016 is finished.
3. Approval of case Z-28-2016 will lead to an increase in trip volumes of approximately 10,000 vehicles per day on the adjacent street network.
4. Delay and travel time for motorists traversing the street network bounded by Six Forks, Millbrook, Wake Forest and I-440 are predicted to increase by roughly 20%.
5. All signalized intersections within the North Hill East study area operate at LOS-E or better overall in the Build-Out (Z-28-16 approved) scenario.
6. The rezoning applicant has committed to build the following street network improvements: A) An exclusive right-turn lane on the I-440 westbound off ramp at Six Forks Road, B) Exclusive turn lanes on each approach at the intersection of St Albans Drive and Hardimont Road.
7. Addition information on Z-28-2016 traffic impacts will be provided upon request of City staff or other stakeholders.

#### 5.2 Transit

1. This section of St Albans St is not currently served by transit
   a. The City or Raleigh Short Range Transit Plan calls for bi-directional transit on St Albans St
   b. The Wake County Transit Plan calls for bi-directional transit on St Albans St.
2. To advance policy LU 6.4
   a. Please provide a 15x20’ transit easement on eastbound St Albans St
      i. This has been noted in MP-3-16 sheets P-2 & P-3 note 20 and P-4 note 6
3. To advance policy T 4.15 - if transit has been instituted on St Albans St and if requested by the Transportation Department, improve the transit easements with
   a. 15x20’ cement pad with a sleeve for a 2” pole
   b. 30’ cement landing zone between the back of curb and sidewalk
   c. ADA accessible shelter
   d. Litter container

**Impact Identified: None**
5.3 Hydrology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floodplain</th>
<th>FEMA Floodplain is present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Basin</td>
<td>Big Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>Subject to Stormwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>regulations under Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District</td>
<td>9 of UDO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Identified: Neuse Riparian Buffers

5.4 Public Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Demand (current)</th>
<th>Maximum Demand (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>2,686,750 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>2,686,750 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Identified:
1. The proposed rezoning would add approximately 2,686,750 gpd to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the City. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the proposed rezoning area.
2. At the time of the development plan submittal, a downstream sewer capacity study may be required to determine adequate capacity to support the proposed development. Any improvements would be required to be permitted prior to the issuance of building permits & constructed prior to release of the Certificate of occupancy.
3. Verification of water available for fire flow is required as part of the building permit process. Any water system improvements recommended by this analysis to meet fire flow requirements will also be required by the developer.

5.5 Parks and Recreation

4. Site requires greenway dedication of 75’ width greenway easement extending from TOB within the property along Big Branch as defined in section 8.1.6 of the UDO. Easement is shown correctly.
5. 50’ Greenway Easement dedication also required along western tributary, extending from the primary Big Branch stem as defined in section 8.1.6 of the UDO. Easement is shown correctly.
6. Nearest trail access is Crabtree Creek Trail, 2.0 miles.
7. Easement dedication adjacent to 440, along southern boundary of site (in addition to standard greenway easement dedication), has been provided. This dedication may facilitate potential future construction of pedestrian bridge over 440. Bridge would provide connectivity into Crabtree Creek corridor and downtown. No plan or funding has been allocated by the City of Raleigh for this section of trail.
8. The multi-use path along St. Albans and Church at North Hills, if developed according to the Capital Area Greenway Planning and Design Guidelines, can serve as an important extension and connection to the proposed greenway corridors located within the site. No plan or funding has been allocated by the City of Raleigh for this section of trail.
9. All park, recreation, and greenway facilities proposed that are intended for public use shall conform with the design standards and guidelines of the City of Raleigh Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Department.

Impact Identified: None

5.6 Urban Forestry
1. This site is greater than two acres, wooded and is required to provide a minimum 10% tree conservation area.
2. Tree Conservation Plan is provided on plan sheets P-6 and P-7.
3. The TCA proposed exceeds what would be required by the UDO under existing zoning.

Impact Identified: None

5.7 Designed Historic Resources
There are no historic properties within 1,000 feet of the site.

Impact Identified: None

5.8 Community Development
The site is not located within a designated Redevelopment Plan area.

Impact Identified:

5.9 Impacts Summary
None

5.10 Mitigation of Impacts
N/A

6. Conditions of Approval

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

City Council Actions:
N/A at this time.

Administrative Actions:
Prior to Planning Department authorization to record lots:
1) N/A at this time.

7. Conclusions

The proposed rezoning seeks to amend the existing Planned Development District, North Hills East (MP-4-09) and add an additional 33.54 acres bringing the total PD acreage to 84.19. The proposed Planned Development is a total of 84.19 acres bound by Dartmouth Road, Six Forks road, St. Albans Drive, I-440 and the Big Brach tributary. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Regional Mixed Use future land use classification and the Urban Form Map. The Master Plan and PD are stepping down the heights of building located across from Single family residences. North Hills East is located in a core location, allowing for heights up to 20 stories. Those building heights are primarily reserved for tracts that are adjacent to the I-440 corridor. The PD also has a base zoning district of Commercial Mixed Use (CX),
allowing for a range of uses to serve the region. The subject properties are situated at the northeast quadrant of Six Forks Road and I-440.

The most significant impact of the proposed zoning is on the surrounding traffic network. The applicant has committed to several public improvements to mitigate that impact; however, it is noted that the overall impact of the development will degrade the traffic network in this area. There are recommended Improvements detailed in the TIA Review, Part 3, which should be considered. In addition to being consistent with the Future Land Use Map and the Comprehensive Plan, the proposed rezoning benefits the public by permitting the landowner to pursue mixed-use development that can provide the community with amenities, additional housing opportunities, and private employment opportunities. The proposed rezoning contributes to the community's open space, greenway network, parks, and other outdoor amenities.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

This document and the accompanying exhibits submitted herewith (collectively, the "Master Plan") are provided pursuant to provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance (the "UDO") dealing with the Planned Development District ("PD") for North Hills East, a mixed-use community (the "Development") proposed by Kane Realty Corporation, the developer of the revitalized North Hills (the "Developer"). The Development will be a pedestrian-oriented, urban development with complementary residential, recreation, open space, office, retail and other commercial land uses (as those terms are utilized in the UDO) at densities appropriate to the location of the Development, market conditions, the nature of land uses in the vicinity, and the City's investment in existing infrastructure. Accordingly, subject to the express provisions of this Master Plan, uses proposed for this Development as described herein may be altered or eliminated.

2. **LOCATION AND CONTEXT**

The Master Plan for the Development addresses the development and redevelopment of approximately 84.29 acres located at the northeastern quadrant of the intersection of Six Forks Road and the 440 Beltline, bounded generally on the east by an existing water feature and St. Albans Drive (the "Property"). For a graphic depiction of the area to be rezoned, please refer to the existing conditions exhibit submitted with this Master Plan (the “Existing Conditions”). The Property is currently the site of a mixed use development under construction pursuant to an approved Rezoning (Z-16-06 and as amended by Z-22-09) and Master Plan (MP-6-05 and as amended by MP-4-08). The purpose of this Rezoning and Master Plan is to add additional land to the project (Tract Q, R, S, T, U, V and W), as well as to refine and clarify certain aspects of the previously approved Master Plan. The overall Trip Generation Budget contained in the original Master Plan is being converted into maximum build-out scenarios reflected in an updated traffic impact analysis.

The Property is within a City Growth Center. City Growth Centers provide significant opportunities for new residential and economic development and redevelopment. According to these aspects of the Comprehensive Plan, this area is targeted for high intensity urban development along the Six Forks Road non-residential thoroughfare.

To further these elements of the City's Comprehensive Plan, North Hills East will be a pedestrian oriented, mixed-use development providing a true live, work and shop environment. The Development will establish an urban character that will help foster an integrated community, linking urban residential and retail uses with conveniently located employment opportunities.

3. **THE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT**

North Hills East will consist of twenty (20) development tracts and three (3) open space tracts. These tracts will be developed in a pedestrian friendly, mixed-use fashion designed to complement established commercial development in the vicinity, while also seeking to preserve the character of the adjacent Farrior Hills neighborhood located on the eastern side of St. Albans Drive. The proposed open space along the eastern boundary of the Property will serve as a convenient pedestrian connection to the Development, while also providing an effective transition between Farrior Hills and the more intense land uses proposed along the Six Forks Road thoroughfare. In addition, this transitional open space will provide an opportunity for a connection to the City of Raleigh Greenway System.
The Development will be served by an internal street network which will reduce the number of existing connections to Six Forks Road. At least fifty-one percent (51%) of the parking for the Development will be provided by parking structures to allow for higher intensity land uses on a more compact footprint.

A proposed Land Use Plan ("Land Use Plan" or "Development Plan") has been submitted with this Master Plan. It is intended to provide a general idea as to the development concept proposed by the Master Plan, but shall not be considered a literal depiction of the Development. Subject to open space areas and tree conservation areas, and the express limitations of this Master Plan, building dimensions (excluding heights) and orientation of structures to be built in the Development can be modified by the Developer.

4. LAND USES

In order to implement this Master Plan, all residential, public and institutional, office, and commercial land uses (as those terms are utilized in the UDO) will be permitted within the Development at densities appropriate to the location of the Development, the nature of adjoining and nearby land uses, and the City and State’s investment in existing infrastructure. Further, all references to "retail" uses, as reflected in the Tract descriptions below and elsewhere in this Master Plan, shall include all commercial uses (as that term is used in the UDO), excluding office and hotel uses, which shall be treated separately for purposes of this Master Plan.

5. LAND USE DENSITY AND DESIGN CONTROL

Land use intensities for the Development are described in this Section 5 and in the North Hills East Maximum Height and Use Chart submitted with this Master Plan. Tract sizes, general building locations, along with maximum permitted building heights are shown on the Land Use Plan submitted with this Master Plan.

To guarantee the mixed use character of the Development, at full build-out, there shall be at least: (1) 200,000 square feet of office; (2) 120,000 square feet of retail; and (3) 400 residential dwelling units constructed within the Property subject to this Master Plan (the "Minimum Land Uses"). Compliance with this Minimum Land Use requirement shall be determined as follows: (1) certificates of occupancy for no more than 150,000 square feet of retail shall be issued prior to the issuance of building permits for development of one-third of the Minimum Land Uses; (2) certificates of occupancy for no more than 250,000 square feet of retail shall be issued prior to the issuance of building permits for development of two-thirds of the Minimum Land Uses; and (3) certificates of occupancy for no more than 350,000 square feet of retail shall be issued prior to the issuance of building permits for the development of the balance of the Minimum Land Uses.

The maximum development intensity for each Tract shown on the Land Use Plan shall be:

A. Tract A
   1. Uses and Density. Tract A may be developed for up to 70,000 square feet of retail and 250 lodging units and either: (i) 350,000 square feet of office; (ii) 500 residential dwelling units; or (iii) 250 residential dwelling units and 200,000 square feet of office. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted.
2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract A shall be limited to 300 feet in height.

B. **Tract B**
1. **Uses and Density.** Tract B may be developed for up to: 50,000 square feet of retail, 200 lodging units and 200 residential dwelling units. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract B shall be limited to 260 feet in height.

C. **Tract C**
1. **Uses and Density.** Tract C may be developed for up to: 40,000 square feet of retail; 100 residential dwelling units; and 300,000 square feet of office. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract C shall be limited to 305 feet in height.

D. **Tract D**
1. **Uses and Density.** Tract D may be developed for up to: 50,000 square feet of retail and 400 residential dwelling units. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located within Tract D shall be limited to 270 feet in height.

E. **Tract E**
1. **Uses and Density.** Tract E may be developed for up to 100,000 square feet of retail and 325 lodging units and either: (i) 350 residential dwelling units and 500,000 square feet of office; (ii) 1,800 residential dwelling units; or (iii) 800 residential dwelling units and 300,000 square feet of office. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract E shall be limited to 365 feet in height.

F. **Tract F**
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract F may be developed for up to 70,000 square feet of retail, 325 lodging units and either: (i) 900 residential dwelling units; (ii) 350,000 square feet of office; or (iii) 600 residential dwelling units and 250,000 square feet of office. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract F shall be limited to 295 feet in height.

G. **Tract G**
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract G may be developed for up to 20,000 square feet of retail and up to 325 lodging units and either: (i) 750 residential dwelling units; (ii) 350,000 square feet of office; or (iii) 300 residential dwelling units and 250,000 square feet of office. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted.
2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract G shall be limited to 350 feet in height.

H. **Tract H**
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract H may be developed for up to 10,000 square feet of retail and 100 residential dwelling units. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted. Buildings fronting along St. Albans Drive shall have residential facades.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract H shall be limited to 100 feet in height.

I. **Tract I**
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract I may be developed for up to 10,000 square feet of retail and 100 residential dwelling units. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted. Buildings fronting along St. Albans Drive shall have residential facades.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract I shall be limited to 100 feet in height.

J. **Tract J**
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract J may be developed for up to 80,000 square feet of retail and 150 residential dwelling units. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted. Buildings fronting along St. Albans Drive shall have residential facades.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract J shall be limited to 100 feet in height.

K. **Tract K**
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract K may be developed for up to 50,000 square feet of retail and up to 325 lodging units and 325 multifamily units. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted. Buildings fronting along St. Albans Drive shall have residential facades.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract K shall be limited to 105 feet in height.

L. **Tract L**
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract L may be developed for up to either: (i) 20,000 square feet of retail and a congregate care facility containing 350 congregate units or (ii) 50,000 square feet of retail and 1,500 residential dwelling units or (iii) 50,000 square feet of retail and 1,500 congregate units. Open space and/or recreational uses shall also be permitted.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located in Tract L shall be limited to 225 feet in height.
M. Tract M
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract M shall be developed for those uses permitted within a City greenway, including without limitation, paved or unpaved greenway trails, picnic shelters, refuse containers and benches. Stormwater facilities may be located within City Greenways with the City's consent.

2. **Building Height.** Permitted structures shall not exceed 35 feet in height.

N. Tract N
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract N may be developed for up to (i) 75,000 square feet of office, or (ii) 100,000 square feet of church use, or (iii) 100 residential units and 10,000 square feet of retail uses.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located on Tract N shall be limited to 85 feet in height, except that a church steeple may be up to 200 feet in height.

O. Tract O
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract O may be developed for up to 25,000 square feet of retail and either: (i) 100,000 square feet of office, (ii) 100,000 square feet of church use, (iii) 100 residential dwelling units, or (iv) 225 lodging units.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located on Tract O shall be limited to 115 feet in height.

P. Tract P
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract P shall be developed for uses permitted in a City Greenway and may also be used without limitation for paved or unpaved greenway trails, picnic shelters, refuse containers and benches. Stormwater facilities may be located within City Greenways with the City's consent.

2. **Building Height.** Permitted structures shall not exceed 45 feet in height.

Q. Tract Q
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract Q may be developed for up to 15,000 square feet of retail and 200 residential dwelling units, and 225 lodging units.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located on Tract Q shall be limited to 105 feet in height.

R. Tract R
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract R may be developed for up to (i) 50,000 square feet of retail, 500 residential units and 300 lodging units, or (ii) 25,000 square feet of retail, 500 residential units, 200,000 square feet of office and 300 lodging units, or (iii) 500 residential dwelling units, 500,000 square feet of office and 300 lodging units.

2. **Building Height.** Building located on Tract R shall be limited to 165 feet in height.
S. Tract S
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract S may be developed for up to (i) 20,000 square feet of retail, 200 residential units and 200 congregate care, or (ii) 20,000 square feet of civic.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located on Tract S shall be limited to 75 feet in height.

T. Tract T
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract T may be developed for up to (i) 525 residential units, 400,000 square feet of office and 225 lodging units, or (ii) 20,000 square feet of retail, 350 residential units, 400,000 square feet of office, and 225 lodging units, or (iii) 45,000 square feet of retail, 275 residential units, 400,000 square feet of office and 225 lodging units.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located on Tract T shall be limited to 265 feet in height.

U. Tract U
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract U may be developed for up to 25,000 square feet of retail, 300 residential units and 250 congregate care.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located on Tract U shall be limited to 75 feet in height.

V. Tract V
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract V may be developed for up to (i) 15,000 square feet of retail, 600 residential units, 425,000 square feet of office, and 200 lodging units, or (ii) 35,000 square feet of retail, 400 residential units, 425,000 square feet of office, and 200 lodging units or (iii) 50,000 square feet of retail, 275 residential units, 425,000 square feet of office and 200 lodging units.

2. **Building Height.** Buildings located on Tract V shall be limited to 265 feet in height.

W. Tract W
1. **Uses and Densities.** Tract W shall be developed for uses permitted in a City Greenway and may also be used without limitation for paved or unpaved greenway trails, picnic shelters, refuse containers and benches. Stormwater facilities may be located within City Greenways with the City's consent.

2. **Building Height.** Permitted structures shall not exceed 45 feet in height.
The final development intensity for this Master Plan shall not: (a) result in traffic generation that exceeds the total number of peak P.M. vehicle trips for the overall Development as reflected in the Trip Impact Analysis submitted with this Master Plan; (b) shall not violate the UDO; or (c) violate any term or condition of this Master Plan. In no event shall retail square footage permitted under this Master Plan exceed 450,000 square feet. The Maximum Intensity Per Use Chart shown on Plan Sheets C-3, P-2 and P-3 is attached as an exhibit to this Master Plan and incorporated herein.

6. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA APPLICABLE TO NORTH HILLS EAST

A. Building Height Justification

The building heights are reasonable and justified because this area is designated a City Growth Center within the Comprehensive Plan. Higher intensity land uses and a more urban form are called for within City Growth Centers. Further, given the development in the immediate area, including the First Citizens Building (formerly BTI Building), the proposed heights are consistent with the existing conditions. In addition, to achieve true urban densities, while providing adequate open space and a pedestrian-friendly environment, maximizing verticality is essential. Moreover, the proposed verticality will be compatible with existing development and provide an effective sound barrier for workers in the proposed office buildings, as well as residents in and around the Development by reducing the impact of traffic noise emanating from the I-440 Beltline and Six Forks Road.

Specifically, maximum building heights have been located such that there is a clear transition from the taller buildings along Six Forks Road to the shorter buildings along St. Albans Drive. Moreover, Tracts M and P create additional transition areas between the shortest buildings and the existing residences along the western edge of the project by providing a large public open space, where only recreational activities and associated structures can be built which do not exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height.

B. Protective Yards

1. Transitional Protective Yards.
No Transitional Protective Yards shall be required.

2. Street Protective Yards.
No Street Protective Yards shall be required.

C. Building Types and Setbacks

As shown in this Master Plan and accompanying plan sheets, and in furtherance of Urban Design Guidelines, the Developer shall be authorized to build structures, adjacent to public rights of way, rather than complying with the typical setback requirements of the UDO. There shall also be no minimum side or rear yard building setback required for buildings located on a private street or public street. Further, no minimum side or rear yard building setbacks shall be required as part of this Master Plan unless required by the State Building Code. Provided, however, no building shall be placed within a sight distance triangle easement. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any buildings situated on Tracts S and U shall have a minimum setback of 32’ from the existing back of curb of St. Alban’s Drive as of the date of this master plan approval.

D. Building Separation

Building separation shall be provided in compliance with the State Building Code.
E. Transportation


Please refer to the Traffic Impact Analysis submitted with this Master Plan and incorporated herein.


Please refer to the circulation plan submitted with this Master Plan (the "Preliminary Circulation Plan" and "Street and Block Plan"). An Access Point or Driveway is defined as a point of ingress and egress which may be a private driveway or public or private street. Separated points of ingress and egress are considered a single Access Point or Driveway when serving the same destination. The Applicant reserves the right to relocate and/or re-designate all public and private rights-of-way and Access Points shown on the Preliminary Circulation Plan, subject to the approval of the City of Raleigh Public Works Department, Planning Department and Development Services Department. Access to and from the public street system shall be limited to one Access Point on Six Forks Road, three Access Points on Dartmouth Road, 15 Access Points on St. Albans Drive, 11 Access Points on the public street segment of Church at North Hills Street and four Access Points on Hardimont Road Extension. Subject to the approval of the City of Raleigh, the Applicant reserves the right to increase or decrease the number of Access Points to the public street system shown on the Preliminary Circulation Plan. Any additional access points shall meet the minimum spacing requirements of the UDO.

At-grade pedestrian access to the development will be provided across Six Forks Road at the intersections of Six Forks Road and Dartmouth Road and Six Forks Road and Street A. Pedestrian push-buttons/signal heads and crosswalk striping will be provided at a minimum. Detailed crossing design and the potential for pedestrian refuges in the proposed median will be subject to the approval of all applicable governing bodies.

As an alternative to providing at-grade pedestrian crossings across and a median within Six Forks Road, the Applicant reserves the right to install a pedestrian bridge over Six Forks Road. The location, design and installation of this pedestrian bridge shall be subject to the approval of all applicable governing bodies. If the Applicant chooses to install a pedestrian bridge over Six Forks Road, then no at-grade crossings along Six Forks Road shall be required to be installed by the Applicant.

A pedestrian crossing will be constructed over the stream to allow for pedestrian access from Farrior Hills to the proposed development. This pedestrian crossing shall be constructed prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for 250,000 square feet of retail land uses permitted under this Master Plan.

Either an at-grade pedestrian crossing across Six Forks Road or a pedestrian bridge across Six Forks Road will be provided prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for 300,000 square feet of land uses permitted under this Master Plan.

3. Transit Easements and Transit Stops.

Please refer to Master Plan sheets C-4 and C-5 for dimensions and locations of existing transit easements and transit stops provided under this Master Plan. Further, a transit easement meeting City of Raleigh standards shall be provided along eastbound St. Alban’s Drive east of the intersection at Church at North Hills Street. The final location of the easement shall be determined at the time of site review. The transit easement shall be improved per City of Raleigh standards.
Construction of any and all transportation improvements shown on the Preliminary Circulation Plan are expressly contingent upon the Applicant receiving all necessary approvals from any governing body having jurisdiction thereof.

F. Public Utilities
All public water and sewer facilities are available to the Development. The location of public water and sewer mains are shown on the preliminary utility plan submitted with this Master Plan ("Preliminary Utility Plan").

G. Open Space and Tree Conservation
1. Open Space.
A minimum of fifteen percent (15%) of the Development will be reserved as open space, which will include green spaces, Tree Conservation areas and plazas. Open space totals may, with the consent of the City Administration, be shifted or reallocated between Tracts within the Development.

2. Tree Conservation.
As shown on plan sheets TC-1 and TC-2 (in reference to MP-4-08) and P-7 and P-8, a minimum of ten percent (10%) tree conservation will be provided. The Tree Conservation standards as set out in Article 9.1 of the UDO shall be applied to the Property as a whole rather than on a Tract by Tract or lot by lot basis. All shifting of tree conservation areas will be shown on recorded subdivision plats. Perimeter tree preservation areas shall be defined with metes and bounds legal descriptions except as noted in UDO Sections 9.1.5.B and 9.1.5.C.

H. Vehicular Parking
Given the urban mixed-use, pedestrian friendly concepts of the Development, the parking requirements applicable to this Master Plan shall be reduced by 34% of required parking as set forth in the UDO. This reduction is justified in part because there will be public transportation available within the Development. Additionally, horizontal and vertical mixing of uses reduces the demand for parking in such developments. For additional justification, please refer to the Reduced Parking Scenario Matrix attached to this Master Plan, along with two letters submitted with this Master Plan from Kimley-Horn and Associates, dated May 31, 2006 and February 12, 2009, analyzing the justification for this parking reduction.

I. Compliance with Urban Design Guidelines
Please refer to the Urban Design Compliance Chart submitted with this Master Plan addressing the City's Urban Design Guidelines.

J. Phasing
North Hills East will be developed in phases primarily determined by market conditions, economic considerations, and matters determined as field engineering and surveying progress. A Preliminary Phasing Plan is attached to this Master Plan showing the general location of preliminary development phases for North Hills East. Notwithstanding this Preliminary Phasing Plan, including plan sheet P-3, any tract or phase within this Master Plan may be developed or reconfigured at any time subject to the provisions of the Code, and provided that all necessary infrastructure is in place to serve
such development. Further, retail phasing shall be determined based upon the requirements of TC-15-06 (73-TC-291).

K. Development Intensity

Developer shall provide a table showing overall North Hills East development intensity as a condition of building permit issuance. Once any one of the land uses reaches the intensity defined in Section 5 of this Master Plan, the Developer shall provide a trip assessment for staff to review. The trip assessment shall be signed and sealed by a professional engineer who is licensed to practice in North Carolina. The trip assessment shall include the following data:

I. Total volume of PM peak hour external trips permitted under master plan MP-4-2008 for North Hills East Revised (691 vehicles per hour entering, 1277 vehicles per hour exiting, or as amended by the Raleigh Planning Commission)
II. Total PM peak hour external trips resulting from Building Permits issued to date
III. Total PM peak hour external tips resulting from the Building Permit(s) under application
IV. Remainder of PM peak hour external trips permitted under master plan MP-4-2008

The trip assessment shall provide all information necessary for staff to conduct a thorough review including, but not limited to, classification of proposed land use, size of proposed land use, ITE Land Use Code, Internal Capture trips, Pass-by Capture trips, and New External trips. The Developer shall provide detailed calculations for all items listed above and for any other items requested by staff to complete its review. Building permits will not be issued until staff completes its review.

The development intensity for this Master Plan shall not exceed the land use intensities reflected in the maximum build-out scenarios located within the Traffic Impact Analysis submitted with Master Plan.

L. SHOD Yard

In lieu of the SHOD Yard along the 440 Beltline, a ten (10) foot high closed wall made of concrete, masonry or equivalent material shall be constructed in the general location shown on the Land Use Plan. Between this wall and the Interstate 440 right-of-way, and contingent upon a viability assessment by a certified arborist retained by the Developer and subsequent City of Raleigh concurrence that the plantings can be installed and survive within this given area, the Developer shall plant at least one (1) two-inch caliper tree per fifty (50) linear feet and at least four (4) shrubs per fifty (50) linear feet. The construction of this wall and the installation of this landscape material shall be contingent upon securing all necessary encroachment agreements and/or variances from the appropriate governing bodies when necessary. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the plan sheets related to Tracts R, T, V and W may prescribe an alternative treatment for the areas within Tracts R and T that replace the SHOD Yard along the 440 Beltline.

Upon redevelopment of Tract N, the following plantings shall be required within the public right-of-way of Church at North Hills Street where adjacent to Tract N and the Interstate 440 right-of-way. The required plantings are at least 3 shade trees, 2 understory trees and 8 shrubs meeting the characteristics of the UDO per 100 linear feet. These plantings shall be located solely adjacent to the Interstate 440 right-of-way and within the public right-of-way of Church at North Hills Street. The installation of this landscape material shall be (a) contingent upon securing all necessary encroachment agreements from the appropriate governing bodies, and (b) subject to the determination of a certified
arborist retained by the Developer and subsequent City of Raleigh concurrence that the required plantings can be installed and survive within the designated area. In order to satisfy the plantings required by this paragraph, the Developer may receive credit for the street plantings located on Tract N, and within the public right-of-way of Church at North Hills Street adjacent to Tract N.

M. Commercial Mixed Use District as Default and Impact of Future Code Amendments
   To the extent this Master Plan and related Plan Sheets do not address a design standard or other regulated matter specifically, the standards and requirements for the City’s Commercial Mixed Use (“CX”) Zoning District in effect as of the date of final adoption of this Master Plan shall control. Further, after the date of final adoption of this Master Plan, should any provision of the Code applicable to the Development be revised such that said revision is less restrictive than what is permitted under this Master Plan, then, in that event, the Code shall control over this Master Plan.

N. Residential Density Transfer
   The transfer of residential density among lots subject to the Master Plan shall be permitted subject to overall development maximums.

7. ALTERNATES REQUESTED PURSUANT TO UDO SECTION 4.7.2 AND REQUIRED ENCROACHMENTS
   The elements of this Master Plan proposed as alternative means of compliance with respect to the provisions of the UDO, are as follows:

   A. Street Section Designs
      Due to the pedestrian oriented, urban mixed use character of North Hills East, the Applicant is seeking to utilize street sections as shown on the Street Section Plan and Street and Block Plan submitted with this Master Plan. These street sections will require the placement of plantings within the public right of way subject to entering into appropriate encroachment agreements with the City. Except as noted in C-4 and P-4, no reduction to standard street and sidewalk widths are being requested. Therefore, there shall be no impact to traffic flow of anticipated level of service.

   B. Off-Street Parking Requirements
      Off-street parking shall be as provided for in the Master Plan using a mixture of surface and structured parking; provided, however, at least fifty-one percent (51%) of the required parking shall be located in structured parking facilities. Reduced parking is justified under this Master Plan because of the urban mixed-use nature of the Development. The design of the Development will foster pedestrian circulation that will reduce the need for parking when combined with the mixed-use aspects of the Development. As further justification for the parking as provided in this Master Plan, please refer to the Reduced Parking Scenario Matrix attached to this Master Plan, along with two letters from Kimley-Horn and Associates, dated May 31, 2006 and February 12, 2009. The letters and the Reduced Parking Scenario Matrix justify a reduction of thirty-four (34) percent to the parking required by the UDO for the targeted intensities.

   C. Vehicular Surface Areas
      Due to the urban nature of the Development, the minimum planting area requirements in UDO Section 7.1.7 for interior islands and tree coverage required for vehicular surface areas shall not apply. The required tree plantings may be installed within irrigated planting areas that are less than 6’ x 6’ in size if the Developer uses structural soils in an area at least 36 square feet in size. Shrub plantings required for vehicular surface areas may be relocated throughout the Development.
D. **Signage**

The Sign Criteria submitted with this Master Plan are hereby established for this Development. Further, signs shall be permitted within the Development pursuant to this Master Plan regardless of setbacks and parcel size, provided that all other applicable UDO provisions are met.

E. **SHOD**

A ten (10) foot high closed wall, proposed in Section 6.L. above, may be located on either private property or within the public right-of-way, subject to securing all necessary encroachment agreements and/or variances from the appropriate governing bodies when necessary. Between this wall and Interstate 440, and contingent upon a viability assessment by a certified arborist retained by the Developer and subsequent City of Raleigh concurrence that the plantings can be installed and survive within this given area, the Developer shall plant at least one (1) two-inch caliper tree per fifty (50) linear feet and at least four (4) shrubs per fifty (50) linear feet. The installation of this landscape material shall be contingent upon securing all necessary encroachment agreements from the appropriate governing bodies when necessary. The areas within Tracts R, T, V and W that replace the SHOD Yard along the 440 Beltline will contain a minimum twenty (20) foot landscape buffer with at least 3 shade trees, 2 understory trees and 8 shrubs meeting the characteristics of the UDO per 100 linear feet.

Upon redevelopment of Tract N for any use other than a church use, the following plantings shall be required within the public right-of-way of Church at North Hills Street where adjacent to Tract N and the Interstate 440 right-of-way. The required plantings are at least 3 shade trees, 2 understory trees and 8 shrubs meeting the characteristics of the UDO per 100 linear feet. These plantings shall be located solely adjacent to the Interstate 440 right-of-way and within the public right-of-way of Church at North Hills Street. The installation of this landscape material shall be (a) contingent upon securing all necessary encroachment agreements from the appropriate governing bodies, and (b) subject to the determination of a certified arborist retained by the Developer and subsequent City of Raleigh concurrence that the required plantings can be installed and survive within the designated area. In order to satisfy the plantings required by this paragraph, the Developer may receive credit for the street plantings located on Tract N, and within the public right-of-way of Church at North Hills Street adjacent to Tract N.

F. **Floor Plate Size**

Given the built environment, building floor plate size above the 12th story shall have a maximum square footage of 35,000 within Tracts A, B, C, D, E, F, G, L, R, T, and V.

G. **Building Step-back**

Given the built environment and location of the development along I-440 freeway and a major thoroughfare, building step-back requirements shall only apply to buildings within Tracts, Q, S, U, and W, which are situated along St. Alban’s Road. Building step-back requirements shall not apply to other tracts within the development.

H. **Blank Wall Area**

I. Transparency

Given the built environment, minimum ground story and upper story transparency requirements shall not apply to Tracts A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O and P. In addition, minimum ground story and upper story transparency requirements shall not apply to townhomes or apartment buildings within all tracts of the development. Minimum ground story and upper story transparency requirements shall apply to general buildings and mixed-use buildings only within Tracts Q, R, S, T, U, V, and W.

J. Ground Story Height

Given the built environment and topographical features, minimum ground floor story height shall be nine feet (9') for General Buildings and Mixed Use Buildings for all tracts in the development.

K. Ground Floor Elevation

Given the built environment and topographic features, there shall be no minimum ground floor elevation required by building type within all tracts of the development.

L. Outdoor Amenity Area

Given the built environment, there shall be no minimum outdoor amenity area for Tracts A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, and P. Given the natural features of the site and amount of passive open space, there shall be a minimum 5% outdoor amenity area for Tracts Q, R, S, T, U, V and W.

M. Block Perimeter

Steep slopes, a freeway, waterways, preexisting development, tree conservation areas, stream buffers, and floodplain all exist within and adjacent to the project area. Accordingly, block perimeter standards shall be satisfied for the development based upon the existing and proposed (as conceptually shown on P-4) public and private street network. All private streets have a recorded public access easement.

8. AMENDMENTS AND REVISIONS

The Master Association or Declarant (during the Declarant Control Period) as set forth in the Master Declaration recorded in Book 12692, Page 209 of the Wake County Register of Deeds shall be authorized to unilaterally request an amendment or revision of the Master Plan and Exhibits thereto pursuant to this Paragraph 8.
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**REZONING REQUEST**

- **Existing Zoning Classification:** PD - North Hills East, OX-3-GR, & CM
- **Proposed Zoning Classification:** Base District PD - North Hills East

If the property has been previously rezoned, provide the rezoning case number: **Z-72-1984 & Z-22-2009**

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

| Transaction # | 462270 |

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>See attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property PIN</td>
<td>See attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Intersection</td>
<td>Six Forks Road @ Dartmouth Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner/Address</td>
<td>See attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contact Person/Address</td>
<td>Greg Kuruc - Applicant; Mack Paul - Attorney for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner/Agent Signature</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact Information**

- **Phone:** 919-719-5438
- **Email:** gkuruc@kanerealtycorp.com
- **Phone:** 919-590-0377
- **Email:** mpaul@morningstarlawgroup.com

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

Comprehensive Plan Analysis

The applicant is asked to analyze the impact of the rezoning request. State Statutes require that the rezoning either be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan, or that the request be reasonable and in the public interest.

STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY

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

The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designates this area for Regional Mixed Use. The Comprehensive Plan provides that areas with a FLUM designation for Regional Mixed Use are appropriately developed with high-density housing, office, hotels, and region-serving retail uses. Moreover, the Comprehensive Plan suggests that, where necessary, heights should taper down to meet the context of surrounding areas. The proposed rezoning, which extends the existing North Hills East PD, is consistent with the FLUM designation. Moreover, the master plan provides design guidelines to help ensure the appropriateness of the transition from the mixed-use development to adjacent, less intense uses.

The Urban Form Map designates this area as a City Growth Center. City Growth Centers provide significant opportunities for new residential and economic development and redevelopment. The proposed rezoning represents the addition of parcels to an existing mixed-use development. The master plan for this area includes many elements that help ensure a consistent approach to development throughout the mixed-use development. Moreover, the master plan incorporates many of the elements of the urban design guidelines which help ensure the quality of mixed-use development in Raleigh. The proposed rezoning facilitates an infill development that will follow the urban pattern of development in this area as set forth in the following Comprehensive Plan Policies: LU 6.1 - Composition of Mixed-Use Centers; LU 6.2 - Reinforcing the Urban Pattern; LU 6.2 - Complementary Uses and Urban Vitality; LU 6.10 Infill Development; UD 4.2 - Streets as Public Spaces; UD 4.3 - Strip Shopping Centers; T 4.14 - Growth Centers; and UD 7.2 - Promoting Quality Design.

Infrastructure in this area has been designed for growth consistent with the City Growth Center concept. Thus, infrastructure in the area was and still is anticipated to support growth. The proposed rezoning would facilitate growth in an area that has been planned for it and ensures that infrastructure will be provided in a manner in line with the following Comprehensive Plan Policies: T 3.2 - Accommodating Multiple Users; T 4.9 - Sidewalk Improvements Near Transit; T 4.9 - Sidewalk Improvements Near Transit; T 5.5 - Minimum Parking Standards; LU 4.2 - Transportation in Support of Walkable Neighborhoods; LU 7.6 - Pedestrian-Friendly Development; and T 5.13 - Pedestrian Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BENEFITS

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

The proposed rezoning will allow 2 additional parcels to be added to the existing PD and Master Plan. By incorporating these parcels into the existing mixed use development, the parcels will be able to be developed cohesively and in character and context with North Hills East.

The proposed rezoning benefits the public by permitting the landowner to pursue mixed-use, infill development that can provide the community with amenities, additional housing opportunities, and private employment opportunities.

The proposed rezoning will provide opportunities for a coordinated development in the area while providing an appropriate transition to the surrounding residential properties.

The proposed rezoning provides significant expansion to the community's open space, greenway network, parks, and other outdoor amenities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Pedestrian-friendly Sidewalk Guidelines</th>
<th>East of Six Parks Road, North Hills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.3.2 - Transition will be accomplished by the methods listed above. Residential neighborhoods surrounding the transition area and
| neighboring single-family dwellings are intended to provide natural blurring between the transition area and
| pedestrian-friendly sidewalks and the central greenway and do track M as
| provided between Parcels H, I, J, and K (transition area uses are predominant
| between the Core and Transition areas (tracks H, I, J, K will not exceed 100 feet
| in height), (b) Only residential (100 feet) small front yards along the proposed
| residential neighborhoods will be accomplished through (c) dimensioned setbacks
| the designated edge area. Transition between the proposed development and
| Key Element: Significant effort is being made to provide a seamless transition to
| specifically planned as this whole
| 2.2.3 - Civic/Institutional uses are welcome in the development, but not
| distance of each other.
| as institutional mix of uses on approx. 50 feet site, all uses are within sidewalk
| Key Element: As a pedestrian-oriented development featuring a vertical as well

### Compliances with Urban Design Guidelines

East of Six Parks Road, North Hills
The landscape concept is a significant element of the development need.

Provide additional light fixtures.
Interior of the development: landscape, and landscape lighting will not be used as sole or primary light sources. Secondary covering all areas of the project to provide uniform illumination.

Low intensity, light is desired, throughout the project, to provide uniform and

Plan, but not specifically planned at this point.

Public art is desired within the development and is an element of the long term plan.

In public spaces to allow for flexibility of use.

Scenic public art will be provided for viewing, accessible from streets.

Public spaces will provide as many seating opportunities as possible.

Landscape will create the feel of outdoor rooms.

Vertical facades. Layout of open space. Surrounding buildings, landscape and
design by access to pedestrian from adjacent areas, which also buffered from
areas of the development, which also consider the sun exposure. Open space is

Open space is designed so that it is visible and easily accessible from public

designed to create a main view corridor of building fronts, parks and open space.

Provide for traffic and streets. The layout will provide access to streets.

Buildings will be located close to the pedestrian spine, which is the street parking

Key elements are: 2.4.1. The proposed development will provide for

COMPLIANCE WITH URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

NORTH HILLS

2.4.5

2.4.3

2.4.2

2.4.1

The block, the Street...
### North Hills

**Compliance with Urban Design Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.10.2</td>
<td>3.10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10.3</td>
<td>3.10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.2</td>
<td>3.7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.3</td>
<td>3.7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.4</td>
<td>3.7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Throughout most of the development, street parking is and will be utilized.
- The majority of street parking here will be within parking structures.
- Significant public streets.
- Specification of public streets.
- Additional public streets.
- Specification of public streets.
- Additional public streets.
- Pedestrian connection to adjacent office uses, pedestrian and bicycle links.
- Proposed.
- Proposed.
- Proposed.
- Compliance with urban design guidelines.

---

**Best of Six Forks Road**

**North Hills**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Special Delegation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design Principles

- **General Street**

| 4.1      | 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3 |

### Environmental Protection

| 3.13     | 3.13.3             |

### Traffic


### Sidewalks

| 3.11     | 3.11.1, 3.11.2, 3.11.3 |

### Compliance with Urban Design Guidelines

**East of Six Poles Road**

**North Hills**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development as Proposed</th>
<th>Compliances with Urban Design Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The developer of the site is committed to establishing internal building connections.</td>
<td>Each building as part of a larger composition for this site is designed with an approach sensitive to the surrounding urban built and natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of feature and horizontal module variations. The base is defined by L-shaped buildings in the urban core will be ecologically broken down in scale by relationship to public streets, and overall design articulation.</td>
<td>Compliances with Urban Design Guidelines East of Six Forks Road North Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green technologies are sensibly building types for LEPD Silver designation. Future buildings will incorporate 5.1.6 - Phase 1 incorporates many Green building technologies, with the office building volume for LEPD Silver designation. Part of the site's infrastructure will be defined through the use of feature and horizontal module variations. The base is defined by L-shaped buildings in the urban core will be ecologically broken down in scale by relationship to public streets, and overall design articulation.</td>
<td>5.1.6 - Phase 1 incorporates many Green building technologies, with the office building volume for LEPD Silver designation. Part of the site's infrastructure will be defined through the use of feature and horizontal module variations. The base is defined by L-shaped buildings in the urban core will be ecologically broken down in scale by relationship to public streets, and overall design articulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Street Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1, 5.4.2</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3, 5.4.4, 5.4.5</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.6</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retail will add to the vibrancy of the overall design of the development and attract more pedestrian activity. The development is committed to creation of a successful pedestrian activity. Urban space is incorporated at appropriate locations.

A key element of the design is the ground level of the parking within structures is available and uses to the pedestrian activity of the urban core. As the project transitions to neighboring residential, greenways and parks will create the street level activity.

awnings and ornamentation will be used.

The primary entrance will be architecturally and functionally designed on the primary street face. These entrances will be used as the primary role of the building face the primary street. These entrances will be designed to convey their important role in the building's face. The ground level of the buildings will be architecturally and functionally designed on the primary street face.

Three major entrance will be architecturally and functionally designed, and a significant amount of space will be provided within both the pedestrian plane and vehicular plane.

The six parks will serve to create the pedestrian and vehicular network in order to break down the pedestrian, vehicular, and pedestrian movement within the project.

North Hills is a retail shopping center that will be provided with retail, as retail shops. Pedestrian and vehicular movement will be provided through open, retail shops.

The creation of multifunctional and mixed-use environments will be enhanced through retail and development. The creation of mixed-use and retail environments will provide to the property buildings within the North Hills East development are to be built in the property.

**Compliance with Urban Design Guidelines**

**East of Six Parks Road**

**North Hills**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility and Service Wall</th>
<th>All Elements</th>
<th>All Elements</th>
<th>All Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Compliance with Urban Design Guidelines**

East of Six Forks Road

**North Hills**
Welcome and Review of Minutes from the January 23, 2017 MCAC Meeting.

Chair Patrick Martin began by waiving the typical introduction of each resident because of the large number of attendees and the lengthy agenda. First time attendees were asked to raise their hands. He also announced that there has been a lot of dialogue between CAC members, the developers (Kane Realty and DeWitt/Carolinas) as well as representatives of the developers. The agenda includes time for a summary of those meetings and their results.

Chair Martin asked that residents take time to read the minutes from the January 3, 2017 meeting and thereafter a motion to accept the minutes as written was made, seconded and approved by a voice vote.

Present: 150 residents, 4 City staff members, 4 City Council members (Dickie Thompson, Bonner Gaylord, Russ Stephenson, David Cox), 7 Kane Realty/Morningstar Law representatives, and 3 DeWitt/Carolinas/Morningstar Law representatives for a total of 168 attendees.

Raleigh Police Department Report – Crime Prevention Officer Jeff Burgess: North District

The new Captain of the North District is expected to start work on February 4, 2017. Officer Burgess then addressed concerns of residents regarding the relatively newly installed stop signs on Hardimont and St. Albans and the fact that some people do not stop. There has been an undercover officer who observed violations. Since about 60 to 90 days with the new signage have passed, Police traffic units will be out monitoring soon, and this area will be front and center in terms of police patrols.

Q: When will there be patrols on Millbrook and Sweetbriar? or on Millbrook between Falls of Neuse and Six Forks Roads? People are just flying through.
A: I can get someone out to that area soon.

Raleigh Parks & Recreation Report – Susan Adams, Optimist Community Center

Ms. Adams expressed her thanks to the Five Points Center for Active Adults for hosting the MCAC in this beautiful facility. Attendees were encouraged to look at the brochure rack in the lobby to find information about classes and activities throughout Raleigh’s park system. Athletic registrations come up in February. She highlighted “Paint Your heART Out at Pullen Arts Center” on February 24, 2017 from 10:30 to 2:00 pm.

Community Engagement Report – Luis Olivieri-Robert

Mr. Olivieri-Robert reported that the Spring (March) classes for Raleigh Neighborhood College and Citizen’s Leadership Academy are full. Residents were encouraged to apply online for admission next Fall semester.

Planning - Sophie Huemer, Planner – Ms. Huemer explained that she was available to answer questions about the CofR rezoning process both tonight and at subsequent MCAC meetings.

Old and New Business – Chair Patrick Martin – Mr. Martin announced the topics for upcoming meetings: February 27th – “Where do we go from here?” This is not the end of this rezoning process. We need to follow these rezoning proposals as they move to the Planning Commission and then to the City Council. For March, representatives from the Atlantic CAC (on our East side) have been invited to our meeting to discuss funding of State projects and I-440 and Wake Forest Road. For April, our State Representatives John Alexander, Grier Martin, and Cynthia Ball have been invited.

Chair Martin also highlighted upcoming community meetings: Tomorrow in Room 305, Traffic and Transit from 3 to 5 p.m. Thursday, January 26th from 5:00 to 7:00, Short Term Rentals (Airbnb) also in room 305. And on Thursday, January 26th at 7:00 p.m., County Commissioner Jessica Holmes, will be speaking at the Wake Up/Wake County meeting at the Raleigh Women’s Club about affordable housing.

Leaf collection is scheduled for Zone 3 now. Zone 7 is delayed because of snow and ice.
Chair Martin provided an update and a thank you to the rezoning sub-committee (working group) that formed after the November MCAC meeting and met nine times (including once at DeWitt Carolinas and twice at Kane Realty). Members were requested to stand to be acknowledged.

For tonight, residents will be asked to vote to “endorse, endorse with conditions, or not endorse” each of the proposals. Only residents of the MCAC area are eligible to vote. The boundary of MCAC is Millbrook Rd. from Falls of Neuse/Wake Forest to Leadmine Rd.; Leadmine Rd. from Millbrook to Glenwood and Crabtree Creek; Crabtree Creek from Leadmine to where the creek flows under Wake Forest Rd.; and Wake Forest/Falls of Neuse from Crabtree Creek to Millbrook Rd.

Martin also thanked John Kane and staff; DeWitt Carolinas principles and their staff, and attorneys Mack Paul and Michael Birch of Morningstar. They too were invited to stand.

He mentioned Ms. Sue Ledford, Wake County Public Health Director who has researched the public health impacts of rezoning including mental health (noise and increased traffic) and physical, especially breathing, problems (vehicle exhaust as well as the loss of green space) associated with increased development.

Ms. Carolyn Sexton, Midtown resident, was introduced to speak about affordable housing. Chair Martin described her as our MCAC “point person” as concerns workforce housing and affordable housing for people with fixed incomes. She explained how those residents are being priced out of Raleigh and are moving further out in the county or into Johnston County, rather than having the option of being able to live where they work. She introduced John Kane who spoke briefly about the Transit Plan Committee of which he had been a part and whose structure he recommends for tackling the affordable housing issue. The Transit Comm. included approximately 70 members from throughout Wake County who worked under the guidance of a professional facilitator. The fact that voters approved the Transit Plan is evidence that it was a success! He would be pleased to be a part of an Affordable Housing committee, and Ms. Sexton promised she would pursue the idea with others who have Affordable Housing expertise.

Chair Martin introduced the Council Members in attendance: Russ Stephenson (at-large rep), Bonner Gaylord (our District E rep), David Cox (District B) and Dickie Thompson (our District A rep). Martin spoke about how important traffic management is to the residents of MCAC and the impact of the two current rezoning requests as well as future rezoning in the same area requires CofR infrastructure BEFORE the building can proceed.

Chair Martin explained that there would be an update, discussion and a VOTE held tonight whether MCAC “endorses,” “endorses with further conditions,” or “does not endorse.”

Chair Martin stated that the requester for Z-13-16 has proposed to the City that there be no Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) required for this project because the rezoned density and corresponding vehicular traffic generated will be limited to the density and traffic generation which would be allowed given the existing zoning. Petitioners plan to build a smaller number of higher height buildings rather than a larger number of lower height buildings, assuming the MCAC accepts their conditions which they propose and have discussed with the MCAC volunteer rezoning review committee.

Chair Martin remarked that the volunteer committee recommends that several infrastructure improvements immediately surrounding the parcels of land subject to the proposed rezonings Z-13-16 and Z-28-16 could significantly address the traffic increases on St. Albans, I-440 and Wake Forest Road which will occur as a result of development enabled by rezoning requests Z-13-16 and Z-28-16. The actions to initiate such infrastructure improvements need to be addressed first by the CofR. To that end, Chair Martin read aloud to the attendees two detailed conditions recommended by the volunteer committee which, if approved by the MCAC vote, would be required of and become part of both the Z-13-16 and Z-28-16 rezoning requests. Residents were advised to listen carefully as he read them, because they would be asked to vote after the conditions were read.
1. “The city must execute a significant and urgent traffic management plan to address the issue of preventing cut-through and speeding traffic within the geographic area bounded by and including Wake Forest/Falls of Neuse, Millbrook, Six Forks, and St. Albans.”

2. "The MCAC support of both rezonings is conditional on the city, county, state and developers completing a comprehensive design and funding plan for infrastructure improvements sufficient to serve all the new buildings and auto/bus/bicycle/pedestrian traffic to be generated by the developments, and timed for infrastructure completions to coincide with the completion of the developments. Such infrastructure includes but is not limited to: The state DOT construction of improvements to the Wake Forest/I-440 interchange, the city and/or state improvements to Wake Forest Road, the city and/or state improvements to the St. Albans/Wake Forest intersection, the developer and/or city linkage of Navaho Drive to the "Perimeter Road along the I-440 wall" which is an integral part of the Z-28-16 development plan, the city linkage of Benson Drive north stub to Benson Drive south stub, the city improvements and signalization of St. Albans Drive, the developer and/or city and/or county and/or state improvements to mass transit facilities in and surrounding the two developments, the city completion of sidewalks along significant streets nearby the developments such as the completion of sidewalk on the northwest side of Hardimont to connect Converse and St. Albans, and all required water, sewage, drainage, storm water runoff control, and flood prevention facilities. It is incumbent on the City of Raleigh as the primary governing body for management of infrastructure to lead the effort to put this design and funding plan into place conjoining all participants into one coordinated plan."

It was moved and seconded to accept the two conditions as read. By a show of hands there were 93 “for” votes and 20 “against” votes.

**Q:** What are the next steps in the rezoning process and when?

**A:** Sophie Huemer explained that the Planning Dept. would not be done reviewing the TIA for Z-28-16 until the end of January and that the Planning Commission would most likely have a public hearing on the proposal at a Tuesday morning meeting in March. Then, the request would go to City Council for an additional public hearing on the first or third Tuesday of the month. Be sure to call and write/email the City Council representatives with your thoughts and/or concerns.

**Rezoning request – Z-13-16: Todd Saieed and Everett Daniels, Dewitt/Carolinias; Michael Birch, Attorney, Morningstar Law Group**

A copy of the presentation made by Mr. Birch is attached, including both a map of the property parcels subject to Z-13-16 and a text listing of 17 conditions agreed to by D/C. (Addendum 1 below). These two documents were distributed to the attendees for their review.

**Q:** What is the penalty for non-compliance with the conditions such as the plantings?

**A:** There are standards to be applied at the site plan stage which includes the building permit. There are ongoing requirements and there would be a civil penalty.

**Q:** Does that property fall off toward the back?

**A:** It has a pretty level slope toward the western end.

**Q:** What about the small bit of Quail Hollow Drive on the south side of the map? Will it be connected?

**A:** The section of Quail Hollow Dr. south of St. Albans which connects to Navaho Dr. will be extended northward to connect to St. Albans. However, Chair Martin reminded everyone that at the November 28, 2016 MCAC meeting, the CofR Transportation Director Eric Lamb said there is NO City plan to extend the northern section of Quail Hollow Dr. southward from its intersection with Hardimont to cross over the floodplain there to connect with St. Albans Dr.

Mr. Birch could not give specifics on the number of stories 12 or 20 story buildings, but the total build out volume/intensity would be similar to the current 7 story and 3 story maximums. The
taller buildings would exist toward Navaho Drive and Benson Drive -- thus farther from the homeowners north of St Albans -- and the lower buildings would exist toward the frontage along St. Albans.

**Q:** How tall is the Renaissance Building?
**A:** 6 stories

Chair Martin: According to the UDO and Future Land Use Map (FLUM) this is designated as a high density regional use center. The building heights must “step down” as they approach the neighboring properties with other types of buildings, and the building heights must be similar to the building heights on the neighboring properties.

**Will Yadusky, co-chair of the Working Committee was asked to report on the Committee’s progress specifically on rezoning Z-13-16.**

The Committee spent some serious hours reviewing Z-13-16 and Z-28-16. We looked at issues such as screening, right of way, signs, lights, and work hours. This development will likely increase property values, but it will also affect our quality of life. We set parameters with Dewitt’s Z-13-16, and they responded with “spot on” conditions except for the rate of transition of building heights with respect to the residential neighborhoods north of St. Albans. The committee recommends pushing the 20 story building heights toward the beltline so that 20 story height would not be attained until 600 feet south of St. Albans. The lower height buildings would be in front (with respect to St. Albans) of the taller ones.

The Committee recommends the lower (12, 6, 5 story) heights be extended to the eastern property line of the Andrews Trust parcel recently acquired by Dewitt Carolinas.

A drawing of the Dewitt Carolinas current proposal as projected on screen for the attendees to review has two areas where 20 story buildings could be built. The committee recommended redrawing of the “height zones” as described in its proposal below:

**Committee Proposal regarding building heights:**

The Committee proposal eliminates the area of 20 stories height limits on the newly acquired Andrews Trust parcel, and substitutes therein a 12 story maximum area with stepped down heights of 6 stories and 5 stories approaching St Albans Dr. A picture of the committee recommended layout is not available for the minutes, but can be described in words as was discussed during the meeting as follows:

The entire “L-shaped” parcel having been owned by Dewitt Carolinas outright for several years would be “zoned and conditioned” to accommodate buildings up to 20 stories in height. This includes the corner of St. Albans and Benson.

However, the entire Andrews Trust parcel newly acquired by D/C would be “zoned and conditioned” to reflect “stepped down” heights in multiple parallel curvilinear bands of defined depths with respect to distance from the existing southern curb of St. Albans Dr. With any scenario of heights, there would first be required a buffered and landscaped set back, including a pedestrian sidewalk, of 30 feet in depth from the St. Albans curb. To the south of such a “curvilinear band of setback”, any surface parking desired along St. Albans Dr. and/or building heights of up to 5 stories would be permitted in a subsequent parallel curvilinear band measuring 90 feet in depth away from the southern edge of the initial 30 foot setback from the curb. Then, to the south of that 90 foot deep band, the next parallel curvilinear band would be an additional 240 feet in depth and would permit building heights up to 6 stories. The final parallel curvilinear band would be curvilinear on its northern boundary, but its southern boundary would be the straight linear southern property line of the Andrews Trust parcel. This band would thus vary in depth due to its northern edge being curvilinear while its southern edge is straight, “on average approximately” 240 feet in depth. This band would permit building heights up to 12 stories.
And, to reiterate, south of this 12 story height band lies the current Dewitt Carolinas property which can have building heights up to 20 stories.

(End of committee proposal regarding building heights.)

Q: Do we have to vote tonight?
A: Yes, we will vote tonight.

Q: If we say no tonight, can they come back next month?
A: No, we will vote tonight and that will be our vote that is reported to the Planning Commission and City Council.

It was moved and seconded that the rezoning Z-13-16 be endorsed with the Dewitt Carolinas list of 17 proposed conditions, excluding their item number 14 as written and replacing it with the condition described above in the section “Committee Proposal regarding building heights” which reshapes the heights in a “stepped down” manner.

Q: I’m confused about the traffic study and recommendations. I thought we already voted on traffic.
A: We approved two conditions that now are incorporated into both rezoning requests.

Q: The furthest section on the rectangle on the right, will a 20 story building be built there?
A: Not necessarily -- it will be allowed but is not with certainty proposed.

There being no further questions, Mr. Martin called for a show of hands regarding the Z-13-16 request for rezoning. Results were:

Yes - 63 residents
Yes with conditions described tonight - 66
No - 26

Review and Vote for Z-28-16, Rezoning along St. Albans Drive
Representatives from Kane Realty: John Kane, Greg Kuruc, Dillon Pitts, TJ Barringer, (two communications people) and Mack Paul from Morningstar Realty.

John Kane thanked Chair Martin and added that multiple meetings between MCAC and Kane Realty had resulted in finding “common ground, and we’re better off for that.” He then used the attached PowerPoint to explain Z-28-16. (Addendum 2) Thirty percent of the rezoning will be open space. There will not be the same density as in North Hills East. Stormwater will be taken care of. The development will be pedestrian oriented. There will be walking trails, a 10 foot wide multi-modal path, 1 mile fitness loop, and the development will be transit ready.

This is the fifth MCAC meeting we (Kane Realty) have attended, and there have been 12 other meetings in our office with subcommittees. We have addressed most of the issues the residents have brought including: development will be phased, construction hours will be limited, trees and greenspace will be preserved. There will be a greenway connection, car sharing, parking areas will have architectural screening and buffers. Signage is defined by the city, and lighting is OSHA regulated.

As of Saturday afternoon, we have increased the setbacks at the creek from 16 to 32 feet. (Park and Market is 12 feet.) Tall buildings will be placed along the Beltline. There will be no need to widen St. Albans. It will have a turn lane and bike lanes. If ever widening is needed, it would come from our side, not the neighborhood side. We want to be good neighbors. Along St. Albans, near the neighborhood, buildings will be 5 stories. The area from creek to creek will be 5 stories with a 100 foot buffer along the creek, 50 feet on each side of the creek. Further west on St. Albans, we are asking for 7 stories. The CofR is requiring that Hardimont be extended across St. Albans into our new development. There are many concerns about sending traffic into neighborhoods.
Chair Martin explained: “That’s why we voted on the two traffic conditions earlier in the meeting.” To repeat: residents need to call and write the City Council to request a TIA (Traffic Impact Analysis) for the whole area. And residents need to come to the Planning Commission and City Council meetings in the coming months when these two rezonings are on the agendas.

Q: If you come across a lot of wild animals, what will you do with them?  
A: We are leaving 20 – 25% open space. We did not run into this situation building NH West.

Q: I love the plan and the trails.  
A: It will be kid-friendly, with sidewalks and bike lanes.

C: With a mixed use development, a pedestrian site plan will have to be done.

Q: Concerning the greenscape, will you level what is there and put in your own plantings, or will some original plants be left as is?  
A: 25-30% will be green, other areas must be disturbed to do infrastructure, then the areas will be landscaped.

MCAC sub-committee presentation on Z-28-16– Will Yadusky, co-chair.
What you will vote on tonight will be based on the existing North Hills. We are close in principle but not in the details. One question you might ask, “Who is better at development, John Kane or the sub-committee?” With regard to screening, the committee recommends 14 more feet of setback than what Kane Realty has planned. We are really close, but not exactly in agreement.

Q: How much more buffer will there be? 12 feet – 32 feet in 5 story? 4 feet – 16 feet in 7 story?  
A: We are creating an urban atmosphere.

Q: Where will the frontage road traffic drain at top left of the map?  
A: It will go up to Allscripts, then to the Cardinal, and Market St. to Six Forks Rd.

Chair Martin pointed out that Mr. Kane has produced wonderful, well received developments to date. Then, speaking directly to the Kane Realty staff, said “The neighbors north of St. Albans are happy for you to be the developer for this land, they are simply saying to push back the frontage of the buildings just a bit more and buffer the face of this new urban atmosphere with a dense canopy of beautiful trees.” Mr. Kane replied “Trust us – we want to have a great environment.” Chair Martin, speaking directly to the attendees said, “After the vote tonight you will still be able to talk to City Council and voice your opinion of both of these proposals.”

Chair Martin stated that the sub-committee had developed four additional conditions to propose for the Kane Realty rezoning request Z-28-16 which he then read.

Everyone appreciates your enlarging the setback from the curb to 32 feet for the tracts S and U across from the nearest houses and appreciates your continued accessibility. We look forward to a continued spirit of consensus building as we work toward concluding this process. Nevertheless, remaining concerns exist for many residents as follows:

1. There remains a strong feeling among many that the houses across from the tracts R and Q, even though a bit further away from St. Albans at the cul-de-sac end of Tufts and at the end of Lambeth, will still experience a visual impact from the lesser 16 foot setback from the curb and corresponding lesser landscape buffer. Also, there is a strong feeling that if the planned apartment building is built in tract R with only a 16 foot setback, that cars emerging from North Hills East along Church Street and turning onto St. Albans will not have sufficient sightlines to see adequately the vehicles already traveling along St. Albans -- thus they also believe a 16 foot setback at that corner is insufficient and creates a traffic hazard due to limited sight lines.
2. For the buffer tree plantings along St. Albans, the committee would like a very high level of specific description incorporated in your published plan. One such description proposed is, "The minimum setback shall be planted with a polyculture of >50% evergreen trees which do not drop their lower branches." Another possible description would be: "The tree buffer area along St. Albans will be planted with a dense double row of evergreen and deciduous trees staggered to replicate natural forested spacing and including attractive tall and spreading species which at maturity will grow to heights and breadths to adequately screen the building facades fronting St. Albans. Such species should include oaks, maples, magnolias, hollies, and similar species."

3. There is agreement that the Kane Realty proposed 32 foot setback from the curb with a dense tree buffer will adequately blend in with the neighborhood if the apartment building heights for the St. Albans frontage are held to 3 stories. However, there remains a strong feeling among many that if the building heights closest to St. Albans are going to rise to 5 stories, that the setback must be a 30 foot setback from the City Right of Way. And, coupled with the concern expressed in item 1 above, in the case of 5 story buildings fronting St. Albans, this greater setback with corresponding tree buffer would need to be carried all along St. Albans from the intersection of Church Street to the crossing of Big Branch Creek.

4. Everyone understands from discussion that Kane Realty intends to screen the parking decks stringently, but just as relates to the landscape buffering discussed in item 2 above, the community would like a very high level of specific description incorporated in your published plan. One such description proposed is, “All parking structures whether close to St. Albans or close to the Beltline must be screened by contextual elements which prevent the emission of any more than 33% of the light originating from sources inside said parking structures. Such elements may include any architecturally appropriate combination of: fixture valances, tinted or mirrored glass walls, perimeter screening, perimeter lathing, perimeter semi-translucent light-diffusing panels, louvers, masonry, etc. ALSO: no parking structures on the subject property shall be visible from any residential property abutting the north/northeast side of St Albans Dr." Another description would be, "the parking structures required by the apartment buildings along St. Albans must, except for their street level entry/exit auto portals, be fully enveloped by the apartment units themselves to prevent light and noise emissions. Parking structures for buildings in the tracts along the I-440 side of the property, must be designed so that the light and noise coming from such parking structures upon their completion will be fully blocked from detection in the residential areas north of St. Albans, to prevent the 'cruise ship' appearance of multiple stacked rows of lights. This would be applicable also to the new parking deck near the Allscripts building, starting at its 4th level and continuing to the top level."

Mr. Kane replied: “We have already said we agree with you on three out of four of those conditions and we will comply. We will completely screen all the parking from view. We will work with you on the trees to establish an attractive and dense landscape buffer. But we cannot set back the buildings any further. At the corner of Church St. and St. Albans we will work with the city on assuring clear and safe sightlines for drivers to see oncoming traffic. We believe the 16 foot setback provides a safe line of sight.”

Chair Martin asked the attendees “what do you think of these conditions?” Several people interjected “we don’t need them” and “let’s vote”. No motion was made to attach the four conditions as read or modified.

A motion to endorse Z-28-16 was moved and seconded. A show of hands produced the following:

Endorse 109
Not endorse 37.

The next meeting of the MCAC will be on February 27, 2017.
Meeting Adjourned
Addendum 1: PowerPoint presentation by DeWitt Carolinas, Michael Birch Attorney
The final slide is the map previously distributed and described.

Addendum 2: PowerPoint presentation by John Kane, Kane Realty

DeWitt/Carolina Conditions number 1 through 9

DeWitt/Carolina Conditions number 10 through 17
The following two conditions were adopted by the Midtown CAC on Monday January 23, 2017 as required conditions for both rezoning requests Z-13-16 and Z-28-16, even though the requirements of fulfilling these conditions do not fall only on the developers requesting the rezonings. The residents approved these resoundingly by a vote of 95 for and 20 against. If these conditions are not acted upon to be fulfilled by all relevant stakeholders so that their complete fulfillment will coincide with the buildout of the developments envisioned in the two parcels rezoned, the approvals voted for Z-13-16 and Z-28-16 are not to be considered in force.

****   ****   ****

1. The city of Raleigh must execute a significant and urgent traffic management plan to address the issue of preventing cut-through and speeding traffic within the geographic area bounded by and including Wake Forest/FallsOfNeuse, Millbrook, Six Forks, and St. Albans.

2. The MCAC support of both rezonings is conditional on the city/county/state and developer completing a comprehensive design and funding plan for infrastructure improvements sufficient to serve all the new buildings and auto/bus/bicycle/pedestrian traffic to be generated by the developments and timed for infrastructure completions to coincide with the completion of the developments. Such infrastructure includes but is not limited to: The state DOT construction of improvements to the Wake Forest/i-440 interchange, the city and/or state improvements to Wake Forest Road, the city and/or state improvements to the St. Albans/Wake Forest intersection, the developer and/or city linkage of Navaho Drive to the "Perimeter Road along the i-440 wall" which is an integral part of the Z-28-16 development plan, the city linkage of Benson Drive north stub to Benson Drive south stub, the city improvements and signalization of St. Albans Drive, the developer and/or city and/or county and/or state improvements to mass transit facilities in and surrounding the two developments, the city completion of sidewalks along significant streets nearby the developments such as the completion of sidewalk on the northwest side of Hardimont to connect Converse and St. Albans, and all required water, sewage, drainage, storm water run off control, and flood prevention facilities. It is incumbent on the City of Raleigh as the primary governing body for management of infrastructure to lead the effort to put this design and funding plan into place conjoining all participants into one coordinated plan.

****   ****   ****

Obviously, the city of Raleigh must take the lead on the above actions. The action must be manifested in a tangible way such as written documentation from the city of the organization designated to initiate the plans and other actions, a proclamations of intent to fulfill these conditions, a "plan for a plan" including scope and start and end date goals, and other visible actions which indicate to the residents that further action is to be forthcoming during the start and continuation of actual land and building improvements construction by the two developers involved.

I will be sending this same note to several other City of Raleigh staff members and elected officials as soon as I can stop to compile address lists. Plan to do so this week, but trying to get the information to you for your records.

Thank you for all your support.

Patrick
To: Neighboring Property Owner

From: John Kane

Date: August 8, 2016

Re: Notice of meeting to discuss potential rezoning of property located on the east side of Six Forks Road, north of its intersection with I-440 Beltline, containing approximately 85 acres on Six Forks Road, and St. Alban’s Drive, having Wake County Parcel Identification Numbers; 1705695889, 1705695996, 1705697712, 1705697809, 1705790436, 1705790940, 1705792562, 1705794136, 1705794632, 1705795347, 1705796540, 1705796668, 1705798554, 1705799075, 1705799808, 1705890396, 1705894366, 1705895065, 1705897196, 1705981738, 1705989505, 1705991204, 1706604182, 1706606148, and 1706608216

These parcels (the “Property”) are outlined on the map on the back side of this notice.

You are cordially invited to attend a meeting to discuss the potential rezoning of the above-referenced properties. We have scheduled a meeting with surrounding property owners on Thursday, August 18, 2016, at 6:30 p.m. This meeting will be held at the Kane Realty Corporation office located at 4321 Lassiter at North Hills Avenue #250 in Raleigh, North Carolina 27609. (Located above Fink’s Jewelers with entrance between Fleur and Apricot Lane).

Our company, Kane Realty, has developed and will continue to develop North Hills East. This area was originally rezoned with a master plan in 2006. The master plan was amended in 2009 to add additional property along St. Alban’s Drive to the master plan. Kane Realty now proposes to add two more parcels located at 500 and 600 St. Alban’s Drive to the existing master plan. The developer would like to develop these properties consistent with the existing North Hills East development with appropriate transitions to residential areas.

This meeting is required by the City of Raleigh and is intended to afford neighbors an opportunity to ask questions about the potential rezoning and for the owners to obtain suggestions and comments you may have about it. You are not required to attend, but are certainly welcome. After the meeting, we will prepare a report for the Raleigh Planning Department regarding the items discussed at the meeting.

Please do not hesitate to contact me directly should you have any questions or wish to discuss any issues. I can be reached by email at JKane@KaneRealtyCorp.com or by phone at (919) 719-5430.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column1</th>
<th>Column2</th>
<th>Column3</th>
<th>Column4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Mail Address 1</td>
<td>Mail Address 2</td>
<td>Mail Address 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 ST ALBANS DRIVE LLC</td>
<td>4500 DORR ST</td>
<td>TOLEDO OH 43615-4040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANDY, JOHN K BANDY, ANNETTE D</td>
<td>512 TUFTS CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNETTE, MICHAEL N HOWE, BARBARA</td>
<td>306 DARTMOUTH RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALHOUN, ANN L</td>
<td>4300 CAMELOT DR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMLX PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>7320 SIX FORKS RD STE 220</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27615-7809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRABTREE, COREY REAGAN CRABTREE, TRACI RHyne</td>
<td>4113 LAMBETH DR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFT, WILLIAM D III CRAFT, LAUREN MICHELLE</td>
<td>4100 LAMBETH DR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNING, JOEL T DENNING, TONYA D</td>
<td>504 TUFTS CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRYDEN, PAUL DANIEL DRYDEN, KATHERINE MCKNIGHT</td>
<td>4109 LAMBETH DR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST CITIZEN BANK &amp; TRUST COMPANY</td>
<td>PO BOX 27131</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27611-7131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORSYTHE, HALEY R</td>
<td>PO BOX 17922</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27619-7922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROVES, JAMES D GROVES, CAROL A</td>
<td>300 DARTMOUTH RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHH INVESTMENTS LLC</td>
<td>421 FAYETTEVILLE ST STE 1100</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27601-3000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWE, APPOLONIA E</td>
<td>516 TUFTS CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWE, LAURIE ALICE HOWE, BARBARA</td>
<td>314 DARTMOUTH RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWE, ANNETTE D</td>
<td>80 SHADDOX DR</td>
<td>NEW HILL NC 27562-8800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWELL, IRENE S</td>
<td>117 WALNUT CREEK DR</td>
<td>GOLDSBORO NC 27534-8979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUDSON, BLAINE HUDSON, JENNIFER</td>
<td>4104 LAMBETH DR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANE CONCORD HOTEL EAST TWO LLC</td>
<td>11410 COMMON OAKS DR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27614-7002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KILGORE, MARY ANN</td>
<td>220 DARTMOUTH RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAIL, ALEXANDER C</td>
<td>4100 WINDSOR PL</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVIN, MELVYN G LEVIN, ELAINE A</td>
<td>812 BABCOCK CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRIOTT, MATTHEW</td>
<td>520 TUFTS CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMILLEN, ROBERT JAMES</td>
<td>3123 ETON RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27608-1113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMINIS, BERNIE R MCMINIS, RUTH R</td>
<td>4104 WINDSOR PL</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLSEN, MARY ANN</td>
<td>144 SHELL BANK RD</td>
<td>NEWPORT NC 28570-9636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIGOTT, BARRY D</td>
<td>516 TUFTS CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCTOR, JULIE ANNA</td>
<td>500 TUFTS CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADFORD, NICHOLAS T</td>
<td>832 BABCOCK CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONNING, MATTHEW K RONNING, MARYANNE DRAKE</td>
<td>4117 LAMBETH DR</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONNING, MATTHEW K RONNING, MARYANNE DRAKE</td>
<td>105 DARTMOUTH RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUST, CHRISTOPHER VAIL RUST, GRACIELA AIRES</td>
<td>200 DARTMOUTH RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFFRON, JACOB L SAFFRON, BRAUNA J</td>
<td>828 BABCOCK CT</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAFFER, SUSAN JEANETTE GLOVER, SUSAN SHAFFER</td>
<td>PO BOX 1075</td>
<td>PRINCETON NC 27569-1075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAMMAS, ABDALLAH B SHAMMAS, SHEREEN</td>
<td>206 DARTMOUTH RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST ALBANS LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 30546</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27622-0546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARR, BRADLEY D STARR, CARLA E</td>
<td>4101 WINDSOR PL</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG, DIANE S</td>
<td>604 HARDIMOND RD</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-6729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD KUANGYAO HUANG RVCELE TRUST THE</td>
<td>1605 US 64 HWY W</td>
<td>APEX NC 27523-8992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREWS, ALEX B HEIRS WACHOVIA Bnk NA TR U/W</td>
<td>PDS TAX SERVICE</td>
<td>PO BOX 13159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACHOVIA Bnk NA TR U/W FOR MABEL ANDREWS</td>
<td>PDS TAX SERVICE</td>
<td>ARLINGTON TX 76094-0159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WACHOVIA Bnk NA TR U/W FOR MABEL ANDREWS</td>
<td>PDS TAX SERVICE</td>
<td>ARLINGTON TX 76094-0159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVONDALE RALEIGH LLC</td>
<td>FEDERAL CAPITAL PARTNERS</td>
<td>5425 WISCONSIN AVE STE 202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH REALTY V PARK &amp; MARKET LLC</td>
<td>ASSET MGR - PARK &amp; MARKET</td>
<td>DALLAS TX 75219-3913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK SAPPHIRE C RALEIGH HOUSE 2014 INC</td>
<td>122 MARY ST GEORGE TOWN</td>
<td>GRAND CAYMAN KY1-1107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDTOWN GREEN REALTY COMPANY LLC</td>
<td>ATTN: ERIC D POLKOW</td>
<td>NEW YORK NY 10017-7924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH OF THE APOSTLES OF RALEIGH</td>
<td>ATTN: PATRICK DOMINGUE</td>
<td>333 CHURCH AT NORTH HILLS ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHE MIDTOWN PARK OWNER LLC</td>
<td>STE 250</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHE MIDTOWN PARK PARK LLC</td>
<td>4321 LASSITER AT NORTH HILLS AVE, STE 250</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHE OVERLOOK PARK OWNER LLC</td>
<td>4321 LASSITER AT NORTH HILLS AVE, STE 250</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHE PARK CENTRAL APARTMENTS LLC</td>
<td>4321 LASSITER AT NORTH HILLS AVE, STE 250</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHE TRACT A RESIDENTIAL LLC</td>
<td>4321 LASSITER AT NORTH HILLS AVE, STE 250</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH HILLS TOWER II LLC</td>
<td>4321 LASSITER AT NORTH HILLS AVE, STE 250</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK &amp; MARKET OWNER LLC</td>
<td>4321 LASSITER AT NORTH HILLS AVE, STE 250</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMNHC LLC</td>
<td>4321 LASSITER AT NORTH HILLS AVE, STE 250</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27609-5782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST CITIZENS B&amp;T CO</td>
<td>RWN 17, PO BOX 27131</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27611-7131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDTOWN GREEN AT NORTH HILLS CONDOMINIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHE TRACT H, LLC</td>
<td>KANE REALTY CORPORATION, PO BOX 19107</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27619-9107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDTOWN GREEN RETAIL OWNER LLC</td>
<td>KANE REALTY CORP, PO BOX 19107</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27619-9107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHE PARKING LLC</td>
<td>KANE REALITY CORPORATION, PO BOX 19107</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27619-9107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH HILLS EAST MASTER DEVELOPER LLC</td>
<td>C/O KANE REALTY CORP, PO BOX 19107</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27619-9107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK &amp; MARKET AT NORTH HILLS OWNRS ASSOC</td>
<td>KANE REALTY CORP, PO BOX 19107</td>
<td>RALEIGH NC 27619-9107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4208 SIX FORKS ROAD LLC</td>
<td>KBS REALTY ADVISORS, PO BOX 28270</td>
<td>SANTA ANA CA 92799-8270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Hoffer</td>
<td>816 Babock Ct.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Will.Hoffer@BTHS5YSU.com">Will.Hoffer@BTHS5YSU.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Groves</td>
<td>300 Dartmouth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim@1braininc.com">jim@1braininc.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack &amp; Bunny Brea</td>
<td>828 Babock Ct.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbsafron@gmail.com">jbsafron@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed &amp; Maria Timbeleke</td>
<td>521 Tafta ct</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edtimbeleke@ymail.com">edtimbeleke@ymail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert &amp; Catherine Tucker</td>
<td>600 Hardiman Rd</td>
<td>cathybt@<a href="mailto:beach@gmail.com">beach@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Hilts</td>
<td>333 Church at N. Hills Street</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lee@apostles-raleigh.org">lee@apostles-raleigh.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELVIN</td>
<td>812 Babock Ct.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lavrnMel@gmail.com">lavrnMel@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Wall</td>
<td>808 Babock Ct</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kenbwall@gmail.com">kenbwall@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dryden</td>
<td>4109 Lambeth Dr</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pauldryden@gmail.com">pauldryden@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitch Brown</td>
<td>4530 Cedardale @ N.Hills</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brown@kiscos1.com">brown@kiscos1.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert &amp; Catherine Tucker</td>
<td>600 Hardiment Rd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cathytatbeach@gmail.com">cathytatbeach@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbi Howe</td>
<td>189, 306, 310, 314 Dartmouth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barbihowe@bellsouth.net">barbihowe@bellsouth.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Hills East – Master Plan Amendment

Neighborhood Meeting: August 18, 2016, 6:30 PM
Kane Realty
4321 Lassiter at North Hills Avenue, #250, Raleigh, NC 27609

Meeting Summary:

Matters raised by people in attendance:

- Traffic

Attendees discussed traffic on Dartmouth Drive, Hardimont Road and St. Alban’s Drive. Some residents have difficulty exiting their driveways during peak hours. In addition, there have been several incidents of speeding cars causing damage and endangering neighbors. The applicant suggested neighbors collectively decide on traffic calming measures for Dartmouth Drive and Hardimont Road for consideration by City, and applicant will support the request. Further, there was discussion of the intersection of Hardimont Road and St. Alban’s Drive. Several attendees requested a signal that is well designed and does not cause light pollution in the neighborhood. There were also comments about the need for a turn lane from St. Alban’s onto Hardimont Road.

In addition, there was discussion of a traffic impact analysis (TIA). The applicant stated there will be a TIA conducted in conjunction with the master plan amendment. The City is requesting that intersections be studied over a broad geographic range.

- Other Road improvements

The proposed master plan amendment includes the proposed extension of a new street along the I-440 Beltline. It will eventually connect with Navaho Drive and will relieve traffic from St. Alban’s Drive.

- Crime

Attendees mentioned crime in the neighborhood and a lack of security. There was discussion about ways the City can enhance policing in the area, including raising issues through the CAC.

- Noise

There was discussion about noise emanating from the existing North Hills East, particularly during concerts. Others mentioned the benefits of the development because buildings can act as a sound barrier along I-440.
• Transitions/Height

The applicant discussed plans to transition building heights from I-440 to those structures along St. Alban’s Drive, replicating transitions in the existing North Hills East master plan. There was discussion of the setbacks on St. Alban’s and the amount of landscaping. An attendee inquired about potential building heights in the unfinished portion of existing North Hills East. The applicant stated that while a number of tracts allow a variety of heights, many of the existing buildings are well below their entitled heights.

• Transit

Some attendees asked about bus and other transit options for the Midtown area. The applicant mentioned the possibility of bus rapid transit to Downtown based on the new Wake County Transit plans. There was a request for better bus shelters on Wake Forest Road.

• Open Space

The applicant emphasized the substantial amount of open space, trails and natural area planned for the next phase of North Hills East. The plan shows substantial amounts of the area as open space. Also, the intent is to provide a number of walking and biking trails and other recreational amenities. There were questions about the future of the natural area north of St. Alban’s Drive. The applicant stated that area would remain natural.

• Benefits of Existing Amenities

Some attendees noted the significant amenities afforded by living in proximity to North Hills East development in terms of retail, open space, entertainment and restaurants.
December 22, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sophie Huemer  
Planner II

FROM: Bowman Kelly, PE, PTOE  
Transportation Engineer


I have begun reviewing the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) report for the proposed addition to the North Hills East Planned Development. The existing North Hills East was rezoned in 2009 (case Z-22-2009) as a Planned Development or PD. The subject parcels for rezoning case Z-28-2016 comprise 33.6 acres of land that are located along St Albans Drive between Six Forks Road and Wake Forest Road; they are currently zoned for a mix of land uses with a green frontage (OX-3-GR).

Rezoning case Z-28-2016 would add the 33.6-acre parcels to the existing North Hills East PD and increase the allowance of land uses for hotels and apartments. Build-out of the expanded North Hills East PD was assumed to be complete in 2022. Table 1 summarizes the change in development intensity for the entire 84-acre North Hills East PD, i.e., cases Z-22-2009 and Z-28-2016 combined. A zoning map for North Hills East is shown in Figure 1. Refer to Figure 2 for a map of the TIA study area.

Table 1: North Hills East Maximum Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use (units)</th>
<th>Existing North Hills East (Built as of Feb. 2016)</th>
<th>Maximum Buildout Current Zoning</th>
<th>Maximum Buildout Proposed Zoning</th>
<th>Change in Maximum Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (DU)</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>1,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Care (DU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (rooms)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>274,664</td>
<td>2,014,479</td>
<td>2,014,479</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>96,700</td>
<td>161,591</td>
<td>161,591</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>43,357</td>
<td>130,779</td>
<td>130,779</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: North Hills East Current Zoning Map
Figure 2: North Hills East Traffic Impact Study Area Map

Crash History Background
All projections indicate that traffic in the North Hills area will increase over the next five to ten years. The increased traffic will create additional impacts to the surrounding streets and neighborhoods. City staff is tasked with advising the public on ways and means to manage these impacts, either by dispersing them throughout the existing network or concentrating them onto a limited set of streets. The Raleigh UDO stipulates that, all things being equal, traffic impacts and crash risk should be dispersed throughout the surrounding street network.

A review of crash histories for street segments and intersections in the North Hills East area is a necessary first step in managing crash risk. Crash histories can be studied with a five-step process that analyzes:

1. Crash Volumes
2. Crash Rates
3. Crash Severity
4. Crash Patterns
5. Crash Countermeasures

These steps are discussed in greater detail below.

**Figure 3: North Hills East Crash History Area Map**
Crash volumes were collected and analyzed for the intersections and street segments shown in Figure 3. Crash volume data includes the number of crashes that occurred over a five year period, the geographic location of crashes, the types of crashes (rear end, sideswipe, ran off road, etc.) and other information. Crash data for intersections is compiled separately from crash data for street segments because the nature and types of crashes can vary significantly between intersections and segments. Typically, streets with the highest traffic volumes have the most crashes because of higher exposure, but that does not necessarily mean that high volume streets are more crash-prone than low volume streets.

Crash rates are a “per capita” measure of crash volume. Crash rates provide a means to normalize and compare crashes on high traffic volume streets versus low volume streets. Streets with higher crash rates have a higher potential crash risk irrespective of whether the street is a high volume arterial or a low volume local street.

Crash severity is a ratio that weighs the number of injury crashes against non-injury crashes. A property damage only crash means that no persons were injured in that crash. The equivalent property damage only (EPDO) variable is a weighting factor used to quantify crash severity. A non-injury crash is equivalent to an EPDO of 1.0. A crash with only minor injuries\(^1\) has an EPDO of 8.4 while a crash with major injuries (or a fatality) is given an EPDO of 76.8. The Severity Index of a street segment or intersection is equal to the sum of EPDO factors divided by the total number of crashes. A severity index of 1.0 would indicate that none of the crashes that occurred within the analysis period resulted in personal injuries; the only damage was to property. A severity index of 8.4, on the other hand, would signify that (on average) all crashes that occurred within the analysis period resulted in minor injuries.

Crash patterns provide a means to locate points or segments where similar types of crashes have been reported. The North Carolina Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) was set up to identify and review specific traffic safety concerns throughout the state. The HSIP uses objective criteria, known as safety warrants, to pinpoint locations where patterns of crashes can be distinguished. The HSIP is updated every year and some locations, for which patterns were observed in previous years, are dropped from the HSIP list due to an observed reduction in some types of crashes.

Once a pattern of similar crashes has been identified, crash countermeasures may be employed to reduce the risk of future crashes. Crash countermeasures can be simple or complex, expensive or inexpensive depending on circumstances surrounding a specific location. For example, countermeasures may include restriping worn pavement markings or installing a new traffic signal. The FHWA Highway Safety Information System website and the AASHTO Safety Analyst website are good sources of guidance for the types of countermeasures that may be used to reduce specific types of crashes.

**Crash History of the North Hills East Study Area**

A review of crash history for the North Hills East area showed that 2,203 crashes occurred within the study area shown in Figure 3 between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2016. There were no fatal crashes and four crashes with major injuries during this same period. Approximately 19% of all crashes resulted in minor injuries. The interchange of I-440 at Wake Forest Road had the highest volume of crashes, followed by the I-440/Six Forks Road interchange.

\(^1\) Minor injuries are treatable with basic first aid. Major injuries are serious enough to prevent a person from carrying on normal activities for at least one day. Major injuries typically require medical training for treatment.
Crash rates are a measure of risk and are independent of the actual traffic volumes that traverse an intersection or street segment. With respect to managing traffic impacts, streets with lower crash rates have a greater ability to safely absorb new trips than do streets with higher crash rates. Within the North Hills East study area segments S-4, S-5 and S-6 had the highest crash rates between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2016. These segments correspond to the interchange of I-440 at Six Forks Road and the I-440/Wake Forest Road interchange. Street segments S-12 and S-11, along St Albans Drive, had the lowest crash rates during this same period.

Crash severity information for intersections within the city limits of Raleigh is available for comparison to crash severity in the North Hills East area. The median severity index was 3.47 for the 5,683 intersections in the citywide data set. Most intersections in the North Hills East area had severity indices less than the citywide median of 3.47. The severity index for Lassiter Mill Road at Camelot Drive equaled the citywide median. Most street segments shown in Figure 3 had severity indices less than the citywide intersection median; the exception was segment S-11 (the eastern portion of St Albans Drive) which had a severity index of 3.71.

Information on crash patterns is available through the North Carolina Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Recall that the HSIP uses objective criteria, known as safety warrants, to pinpoint locations where patterns of crashes can be distinguished and that the data set is updated every year. Within the North Hills East study area, crash patterns have been identified at the following locations with relevant years shown in parentheses:

- Six Forks Road at the I-440 westbound ramps (2014)
- Wake Forest Road at the I-440 interchange (2012, 2013)
- Wake Forest Road at Bland Road (2013, 2015)

Of these three locations, Wake Forest Road at Bland Road was included in the 2016 HSIP list while the other locations were dropped. No crash patterns were observed for Six Forks Road at the I-440 westbound ramps or at Wake Forest Road at the I-440 interchange during the 2015 HSIP update.

In conclusion, streets and intersections in the North Hills East study area have similar crash characteristics. No single street or intersection stands out has having a much higher risk for crashes than neighboring streets or intersections. There were no reports of fatal crashes in the North Hills East area between September 1, 2011 and August 31, 2016; there were four crashes with major injuries during this period. While not dismissing the human cost, these crashes appear to be random events and do not indicate a systemic safety issue. There are no specific City of Raleigh or NCDOT projects to construct crash countermeasures, though the Six Forks Road Corridor study is still under review by the Raleigh City Council. Additional information on the crash history of North Hills East can be provided upon request.

There are many additional traffic impacts associated with rezoning case Z-28-2016. I will summarize my analyses and findings of those impacts in a subsequent memo.
January 18, 2018

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sophie Huemer  
Planner II

FROM: Bowman Kelly, PE, PTOE  
Transportation Engineer

SUBJECT: Traffic Impact Analysis Review for North Hills East PD (Z-28-16, MP-3-16)

I have begun reviewing the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) report for the proposed addition to the North Hills East Planned Development. The subject parcels comprise 33.6 acres of land that are located along St Albans Drive between Six Forks Road and Wake Forest Road. Refer to Figure 1 for a map of the TIA study area.

Access, mobility and safety are common themes in the City’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan. Levels of service provided to non-automobile travelers cannot be defined purely in terms of volume and capacity; bicycle volume, bus loading and sidewalk capacity are typically not at issue in areas of the City where these facilities are in place. Quality of service describes how well a transportation facility operates from the traveler’s perspective. Quality of service can be assessed in a number of ways, as shown in in the following table.

Table 1: Framework for Reviewing Multimodal Quality of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Potential Quality of Service Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pedestrian | Presence, connectivity and width of sidewalks  
Lateral separation from traffic  
Barriers and buffers from traffic  
Crossing opportunities on major streets  
Delay at intersections  
Driveway frequency and volumes |
| Bicycle  | Presence of a dedicated facility  
Network connectivity  
Number and width of motor vehicle travel lanes adjacent to the bike route  
Volume and speed of adjacent motor vehicle traffic  
Percentage of trucks and buses within the traffic stream  
Pavement condition |
| Transit  | Frequency and hours of service  
Reliability of service  
Passenger loads  
Travel times |
Figure 1: North Hills East Traffic Impact Study Area Map
Level of Service

Service measures are quantities that are either directly observable in the field or can be estimated from a set of known conditions. Level of service (LOS) is a quantitative stratification of service measures that represent quality of service. Levels of service for pedestrians, cyclists and transit rider are established by an LOS score for street segments and intersections. A separate LOS score is computed for pedestrian, bicycle and transit modes. Note that LOS scores for non-automobile modes cannot be combined with that of motor vehicles into a Total level of service score.

Pedestrian level of service is calculated from variables that relate to pedestrians’ perception of their travel experience. There is a separate LOS score for pedestrians traveling: 1) parallel to the street centerline, 2) crossing the street at a signalized intersection and 3) crossing the street between signalized intersections. Overall, pedestrian LOS is improved by the inclusion of those elements listed in Table 1. The presence or absence of a sidewalk is the single biggest factor in determining pedestrian level of service and quality of service. Higher traffic volumes, higher speeds and wider streets all tend to reduce pedestrian LOS.

Bicycle level of service is determined by environmental factors that contribute to the experience and quality of service for pedalcyclists. Bicycle facilities are divided into two types: on-street and off-street. On-street facilities include streets with shared bicycle lanes (Sharrows) and dedicated bicycle lanes. Paved shoulders, multipurpose paths and greenways are examples of off-street facilities. Bicycle level of service evaluations for North Hills East is limited to on-street bike facilities. The methodology is applied through a series of steps that account for bicycle speed and bicycle delay along a street segment. Bicycle LOS can be improved by providing the bike-specific elements found in Table 1. The presence or absence of a dedicated bicycle lane is the single biggest factor in determining bicycle level of service and quality of service.

While bicycle or pedestrian levels of service can be analyzed for any street, transit level of service is only applicable to streets along a transit route. Though transit amenities such as shelters, benches and/or a paved boarding/discharge area certainly enhance transit quality of service, the frequency and reliability of transit routes is paramount in calculating a transit LOS score. A site with buses arriving every 20 minutes would have a higher transit LOS than would a site with bus arrivals every 60 minutes.

Multimodal Level of Service in the North Hills East Study Area

The following is a summary of the existing infrastructure in the study area to accommodate people who walk, bike, and take transit:

- Sidewalks are currently provided along the majority of Six Forks Road, Wake Forest Road, St. Albans Drive, and Camelot Drive within the study area. The existing signalized intersections in the study area accommodate people who walk with crossing signals and designated crosswalks along multiple intersection approaches.
- Bicycle lanes are currently provided along portions of St. Albans Drive and Lassiter Mill Road within the study area, and shared lanes are currently designated along Camelot Drive within the study area. These roads are designated by the City of Raleigh as preferred routes for bicyclists on the BikeRaleigh Map, published in April 2016.
- GoRaleigh currently provides bus service via Routes 8, 24L, and 2 in the study area. North Hills serves as a transfer point between Routes 8 and 24L.
- A shuttle is currently provided between North Hills and North Hills East. This service is currently offered 24 hours per day and can be requested by patrons, residents, and customers.
In considering future planned improvements, the following items are being considered as a part of separate planning efforts in this area to improve bicycle facilities:

- The BikeRaleigh Plan Update includes significant improvements to bicycle facilities along Six Forks Road, Wake Forest Road, St. Albans Drive/Camelot Drive, and Hardimont Drive in the Long-Term Bike Plan.
- A greenway is proposed by the City of Raleigh on the eastern edge of the site.
- The latest draft of the Six Forks Road Corridor Plan (January 2016) recommends widening Six Forks Road to a 6-lane divided roadway within the study area. The plan also includes recommendations for improving pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Six Forks Road.
- The Recommended Wake County Transit Plan designates Six Forks Road and St. Albans Road as Frequent Network Corridors with all-day frequent service (every 15 minutes or better) from the North Hills area to downtown Raleigh, Crabtree Valley Mall, and other destinations in the region.

Multi-modal analyses were performed for the for the existing (2016) traffic condition and the projected (2022) build-out traffic conditions using ARTPLAN 2012 software to determine the levels of service for bicyclists, pedestrians, and buses. Table 2 summarizes multi-modal levels of service for the North Hills East area.

### Table 2: Multimodal Level of Service Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Bicycle LOS</th>
<th>Pedestrian LOS</th>
<th>Transit LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six Forks Road (I-440 Eastbound On-Ramp/Ramblewood Drive to Rowan Street)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2016)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out (2022) Current Zoning</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out (2022) Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wake Forest Road (I-440 Eastbound On-Ramps to Hardimont Drive/New Hope Church Road)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2016)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out (2022) Current Zoning</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out (2022) Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Albans Drive/Camelot Drive (Rowan Street to Wake Forest Road)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2016)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out (2022) Current Zoning</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out (2022) Proposed Zoning</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Pedestrian LOS results shown above are applicable to pedestrian traveling along a street, parallel to the adjacent automobile traffic stream. Crosswalk analyses were also performed at each of the study intersections for pedestrians crossing a street perpendicular to the automotive traffic stream. Pedestrian LOS for street crossings is determined by the length and frequency of gaps in the traffic stream. At signalized intersections, the controlling traffic signal provides gaps for pedestrians to cross a street. At unsignalized intersections, pedestrians must wait for naturally occurring gaps in traffic on the major street. Pedestrian delay on minor street approaches with stop sign control is typically not an issue as pedestrians have the right of way.
The analyses indicate that all crosswalks within the study area provide pedestrians with level of service LOS-D or better, with the exception of Six Forks Road at the North Hills East driveway, which operates at LOS-E. This lower quality of service at Six Forks and North Hills East is expected to occur under both current zoning and proposed zoning, in both the AM and PM peak periods. Pedestrian levels of service for crosswalks are summarized in the following maps.

The TIA reports that the proposed North Hills East development will have relatively minor impacts to bicycle, pedestrian, and bus levels of service along the study roadway segments. The development plan for North Hills East will provide improved pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity within the site as well as connectivity to existing facilities. The TIA report did not recommend any new roadway infrastructure to improve pedestrian, bicycle or transit quality of service. Infrastructure recommendations to improve automobile traffic flow are shown in Figure 5.
Figure 4a: North Hills East Level of Service Map A
Figure 4b: North Hills East Level of Service Map B
Figure 4c: North Hills East Level of Service Map C
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Figure 4d: North Hills East Level of Service Map D
Figure 5a: North Hills East Recommended Improvements Map A
Figure 5b: North Hills East Recommended Improvements Map B
January 25, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sophie Huemer
Planner II

FROM: Bowman Kelly, PE, PTOE
Transportation Engineer

SUBJECT: Traffic Impact Analysis Review for North Hills East PD (Z-28-16, MP-3-16)

I have begun reviewing the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) report for the proposed addition to North Hills East. The subject parcels comprise 33.6 acres of land that are located along St Albans Drive between Six Forks Road and Wake Forest Road. The original North Hills East was rezoned in 2009 (case Z-22-09) as a Planned Development or PD. Table 1 summarizes the change in development intensity for case Z-22-09. Trip volumes for the existing North Hills East and the maximum buildout under current zoning case Z-22-09 are shown in Table 2.

Table 1: North Hills East Maximum Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use (units)</th>
<th>Existing North Hills East (Built as of Feb. 2016)</th>
<th>Maximum Buildout Current Zoning (Z-22-09)</th>
<th>Change in Permitted Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (DU)</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>+ 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Care (DU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>+ 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (rooms)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>+ 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>274,664</td>
<td>2,014,479</td>
<td>+ 1,739,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>96,700</td>
<td>161,591</td>
<td>+ 64,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>43,357</td>
<td>130,779</td>
<td>+ 87,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: North Hills East Trip Generation for Current Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Generation</th>
<th>Existing North Hills East February 2016</th>
<th>Maximum Buildout Current Zoning (Z-22-09)</th>
<th>Change in Trip Volume</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Trips (veh/day)</td>
<td>6,928</td>
<td>14,786</td>
<td>+ 7,858</td>
<td>+ 113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Trips (veh/hr)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>+ 1,473</td>
<td>+ 191%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Trips (veh/hr)</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>+ 1,635</td>
<td>+ 229%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The basic premise upon which all trip generation estimates are based is that the number of trips entering and exiting two development sites with the same land use, size and setting will be similar. Trips estimates for North Hills East represent typical weekday traffic patterns; they do not account special conditions such as the expected increase in retail trips during the Christmas shopping season. As with all forecasts, the trip volumes shown in Table 2 are long-run averages; actual trip volumes will vary from day to day. Traffic volumes will be less than the values shown in Table 2 roughly one-half of the time. Conversely, traffic volumes will be greater than the volumes shown in Table 2 for approximately 26 out of 52 weeks each year. This principle holds true for all forecast data in the North Hills East report: delay, travel times, vehicle emissions, etc. Visually, average traffic volumes from Table 2 can be represented by the shaded area of the graph below.

**Figure 1: Distribution of Traffic Forecast Data**

![Graph showing distribution of traffic forecast data.](image)

**Traffic Impacts**

The Raleigh Comprehensive Plan calls for increased density in the North Hills/Midtown area as a major retail and service hub that draw customers from across the city. Rezoning case Z-22-09 complements this goal by allowing a substantial increase in land use intensity for North Hills East. The expected impacts to individual intersections from case Z-22-09 are shown in Figures 4a through 4d. Network traffic impacts for nodes and links within the North Hills East study area are summarized in Table 3.

**Table 3: North Hills East Traffic Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact (units)</th>
<th>Existing North Hills East February 2016</th>
<th>North Hills East Current Zoning (Z-22-09)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay (person-hours)</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>+ 46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (person hours)</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>+ 62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Consumption (gal)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>+ 33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbon Emissions (grams)</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>6,058</td>
<td>+ 12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Table 3 are based on a number of qualifying assumptions. The primary assumption is that all public street improvements shown in Figures 5a and 5b have been constructed regardless of the
outcome for rezoning case Z-28-16. Perhaps the most tentative assumption involves the construction of a third northbound travel lane on Six Forks Road, between Rowan Street and Millbrook Road. This additional travel lane was recommended as part of the Six Forks Road Corridor Study, but to date the corridor study has not been adopted by the Raleigh City Council. There is debate among City stakeholders as to the utility of an additional travel lane; its construction is not guaranteed. Without the assumed improvements shown in Figures 5a and 5b, traffic impacts arising from case Z-22-09 would be more intense but they cannot be quantified with the information that is currently available.

Figures 4a through 4d show approach levels of service for intersections along Six Forks Road and Wake Forest Road. Note that a single intersection will have many different levels of service. There is a vehicular level of service for each left turn, each thru movement, for each approach and for the entire intersection. There is also a separate level of service for pedestrians and pedalcyclists. Thus, it is important when discussing traffic impacts and level of service to distinguish between the scale (movement, approach, overall intersection) and the mode (motor vehicles, pedestrians, pedalcyclists). To avoid “information overload” I have used approach levels of service to summarize traffic impacts to Six Forks and Wake Forest Roads. I will provide other traffic impact quantities upon request from the neighbors and other stakeholders.

There are other traffic impacts associated with rezoning case Z-28-2016. I will summarize my analyses and findings of those impacts in a subsequent memo.
Figure 4a: North Hills East Level of Service Map A
Figure 4b: North Hills East Level of Service Map B
Figure 4c: North Hills East Level of Service Map C
Figure 4d: North Hills East Level of Service Map D
Figure 5b: North Hills East Recommended Improvements Map B
December 30, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sophie Huemer  
   Planner II

FROM: Bowman Kelly, PE, PTOE  
       Transportation Engineer


I have begun reviewing the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) report for the proposed addition to the North Hills East Planned Development. The existing North Hills East was rezoned in 2009 (case Z-22-2009) as a Planned Development or PD. The subject parcels for rezoning case Z-28-2016 comprise 33.6 acres of land that are located along St Albans Drive between Six Forks Road and Wake Forest Road. They were rezoned in 2014 for office mixed use with a green frontage (OX-3-GR) as part of the citywide UDO zoningmap adoption.

Rezoning case Z-28-2016 would add these 33.6-acre parcels to the existing North Hills East PD and increase the allowance of land uses for hotels and apartments. Build-out of the expanded North Hills East PD was assumed to be complete in 2022. Table 1 summarizes the change in development intensity for the entire 84-acre North Hills East PD, i.e., cases Z-22-2009 and Z-28-2016 combined. A zoning map for North Hills East is shown in Figure 1.

Table 1: North Hills East Maximum Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use (units)</th>
<th>Existing North Hills East (Built as of Feb. 2016)</th>
<th>Maximum Buildout Current Zoning</th>
<th>Maximum Buildout Proposed Zoning</th>
<th>Change in Maximum Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (DU)</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>1,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Care (DU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (rooms)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>274,664</td>
<td>2,014,479</td>
<td>2,014,479</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>96,700</td>
<td>161,591</td>
<td>161,591</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>43,357</td>
<td>130,779</td>
<td>130,779</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: North Hills East Current Zoning Map
Trip Generation Background

In technical terms, a trip is a journey with an origin and a destination at its two ends. Trips may be made in various modes of travel: as a pedestrian, bicyclist, transit patron, in a passenger car or by other modes. The key premise upon which all trip generation estimates are based is that the number of trips entering and exiting two development sites with the same land use, size, dimensions and setting will be comparable. As with all estimates, trip generation volumes represent long-run averages. The actual trip volumes generated by a development will vary from day to day.

Trip generation estimates developed for this study are based on the 9th edition of the *Trip Generation Manual* published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The ITE Trip Generation Manual is the most widely used industry resource for this type of data. Used correctly, the Trip Generation Manual provides an objective basis for estimating trips generated by a proposed development. A development may produce several different types of trips:

- Person trips
- Vehicle trips
- Internal Capture trips
- Pass-by trips

Person trips refers to trips made to or from a site by each individual person using any available mode (passenger car, bus, bicycle, walking, etc.). Two people in a passenger car counts as two person trips. Vehicle trip generation refers to the number of motor vehicles traveling to or from a site. If a vehicle has two people in it, it still counts as one vehicle trip.

Internal capture trips are made between various land uses within the confines of a mixed-use development; internal capture trips never leave the site and do not use the external public street system. Pass-by trips are made as intermediate trips on the way from an origin to a destination where the trip ends are external to a development. Pass-by trips are attracted from traffic passing the site on an adjacent street; they count as new trips at the site’s driveways, but not as new trips on the adjacent street system. Only retail sales and services such as grocery stores, convenience markets or restaurants generate pass-by trips.

For the purposes of this study, person trips were reduced by 18% to accounts for alternative travel modes: walking, bicycling, public transit and the private North Hills shuttle service. This reduction was deemed appropriate due to enhanced bus service expected with adoption of the Wake County Transit Plan and the recommendations for multimodal improvements found in the City’s Six Forks Road Corridor Study. All remaining trips were assigned as vehicle trips. No attempt was made to account for vehicle occupancy; all passenger cars were assumed to contain one person only.

The procedure for estimating trip volumes generated by North Hills East followed the guidance set forth in the ITE Trip Generation Manual. First, general land uses and land use sizes were determined. Second, trips volumes were calculated for typical weekday, AM peak and PM peak time periods. Internal capture trip volumes were then computed and removed from the “raw” trip volumes described above. Fourth, 18% of all person trips were deducted from these subtotals to account for trips using alternative travel modes (bus, bicycle, etc.). Finally, trip volumes were further reduced to account for pass-by traffic. The results obtained represent new trips that will enter and exit the expanded North Hills East site using the existing public street system.
North Hills East Trip Generation

The existing North Hills East was rezoned in 2009 as a Planned Development. The subject parcels for rezoning case Z-28-2016 currently allow for office uses with limited residential and retail uses. Referring to Table 1 above, under current zoning the expanded North Hills East would consist of over 2 million square feet of office space, approximately 290,000 square feet of retail, 1,228 apartment units and other commercial uses. Trip volumes for the existing North Hills East and maximum build-out under current zoning for the expanded North Hills East were calculated using the ITE method, with results shown in Table 2.

Table 2: North Hills East Trip Generation for Current Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Generation</th>
<th>Existing North Hills East</th>
<th>Expanded North Hills East</th>
<th>Change in Trip Volume</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Current Zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Trips (veh/day)</td>
<td>6,928</td>
<td>14,776</td>
<td>+7,858</td>
<td>+113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Trips (veh/hr)</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>+1,473</td>
<td>+191%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Trips (veh/hr)</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>+1,635</td>
<td>+229%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If rezoning case Z-28-2016 is approved, conditions of the case would permit an addition of roughly 1,200 apartments and more than 800 hotel rooms. Trip volumes would grow by the amounts shown in Table 3.

Table 3: North Hills East Trip Generation for Proposed Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Generation</th>
<th>Expanded North Hills East</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
<th>Change in Trip Volume</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Trips (veh/day)</td>
<td>14,786</td>
<td>24,792</td>
<td>+10,006</td>
<td>+68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Trips (veh/hr)</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>+744</td>
<td>+33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Trips (veh/hr)</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>+781</td>
<td>+33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New trips generated by further development of North Hills East would disperse and travel to other activity centers or residential neighborhoods via the adjacent public streets. Refer to Figure 2 for the directional distribution of trips. This distribution was based on existing population densities and land uses in the study area, and on existing traffic counts within the vicinity of the site. Daily trip volumes shown in tables 2 and 3 were assigned to the adjacent public streets using the directional distribution of Figure 2 and were plotted in Figure 3 through Figure 5. Note that these figures only show trips to or from North Hills East, they do not include traffic traveling to other destinations. Additional information on the expected trip volumes generated by North Hills East can be provided upon request.

There are many other traffic impacts associated with rezoning case Z-28-2016. I will summarize my analyses and findings of those impacts in a subsequent memo.
Figure 2: North Hills East Trip Distribution Map
Figure 3: North Hills East Daily Trip Distribution Map: February 2016
Table 5: North Hills East Daily Trip Distribution Map: Proposed Zoning 2022
February 24, 2017

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sophie Huemer  
Planner II

FROM: Bowman Kelly, PE, PTOE  
Transportation Engineer

SUBJECT: Traffic Impact Analysis Review for North Hills East PD (Z-28-16, MP-3-16)

I have reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) report for the proposed addition to North Hills East Planned development (PD). The subject parcels comprise 33.6 acres of land that are located along St Albans Drive between Six Forks Road and Wake Forest Road. North Hills East was previously rezoned in 2009. Table 1 summarizes the change in development intensity for case Z-28-16. Trip volumes for the buildout of North Hills East under current zoning case Z-22-09 and for buildout under proposed zoning case Z-28-16 are shown in Table 2.

Table 1: North Hills East Maximum Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use (units)</th>
<th>Maximum Buildout Current Zoning (Z-22-09)</th>
<th>Maximum Buildout Proposed Zoning (Z-28-16)</th>
<th>Change in Permitted Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment (DU)</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>+ 1,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Care (DU)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (rooms)</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>+ 828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>2,014,479</td>
<td>2,014,479</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>161,591</td>
<td>161,591</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>130,779</td>
<td>130,779</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: North Hills East Trip Generation for Proposed Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Trips (veh/day)</td>
<td>14,786</td>
<td>24,792</td>
<td>+ 10,006</td>
<td>+ 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Trips (veh/hr)</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>+ 744</td>
<td>+ 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Trips (veh/hr)</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>+ 781</td>
<td>+ 33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic Impacts

The Raleigh Comprehensive Plan calls for increased density in the North Hills/Midtown area as a major retail and service hub that will draw customers from across the city. Network traffic impacts for nodes and links within the North Hills East study area are summarized in Table 3. The actual quantities are not as noteworthy as the percent change in network impacts.

Table 3: North Hills East Traffic Impacts for PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay (person-hours)</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>+ 21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (person-hours)</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>+ 18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Consumption (gal)</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>+ 10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocarbon Emissions (grams)</td>
<td>6,058</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>+ 5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Table 3 are based on a number of qualifying assumptions. The primary assumption is that the public street improvements “By Others” shown in Figures 5a and 5b have been constructed regardless of the outcome for rezoning case Z-28-16. The additional right turn lane at Six Forks Road and the I-440 westbound off-ramp along with the additional turn lanes at Hardimont/Saint Albans will be required as part of the North Hills East PD. These improvements will be constructed as tracts within the master plan are developed. An additional right turn lane at Wake Forest/Saint Albans has been proposed as part of the Hilton Hotel Subdivision plan (S-52-2016), currently under review by the City, but as of February 2017 this improvement is not formally required as a condition of approval. The proposed right turn lane at Six Forks/Lassiter Mill is not tied to a current development plan and there is no scheduled start date for construction. It is noted that the affected parcel is owned by the NHM00 Corporation with the registered agent listed as John M. Kane. These analyses assume that an additional northbound thru lane, recommended in the Six Forks Road Corridor Study, has not been constructed.

The expected impacts to individual intersections from case Z-28-16 are shown in Figures 4a through 4d. Note that an individual intersection will have many different levels of service. There is a vehicular level of service for each left turn and each thru movement, for each approach and for the entire intersection. There is also a separate level of service for pedestrians and pedalcyclists. Thus, it is important when discussing traffic impacts and levels of service to distinguish between the scale (movement, approach, overall intersection) and the mode (motor vehicles, pedestrians, pedalcyclists) and the time period (AM peak or PM peak). To avoid “information overload” I have used approach levels of service to summarize traffic impacts to Six Forks and Wake Forest Roads during the PM peak period. I will provide other traffic impact quantities upon request from the neighbors and other stakeholders.

Traffic signals along Six Forks Road and Wake Forest Road are timed to give priority to the northbound and southbound thru movements. Higher delays are accepted for the east-west minor movements in an effort to maximize traffic throughput. Even with the priority treatment for north-south thru movements, levels of service for Six Forks Road at the I-440 ramps will degrade from LOS-D to LOS-E upon approval of Z-28-16. Staff notes that for portions of the PM peak hour, Six Forks Road operates at LOS-F currently. Delays will increase as North Hills East is developed.
Other Transportation Plans

Independent of the North Hills East development, the City of Raleigh has planning efforts underway to better manage traffic along Six Forks Road and in the adjacent neighborhoods. The Six Forks Road Corridor Study is currently under review by the Raleigh City Council. It proposes a major redesign of Six Forks Road to accommodate multi-modal transportation needs. Among the recommendations are more bus stops, more frequent bus service, shuttle busses, people movers from North Hills to a future transit station, turn outs for bus shelters, transit hubs at North Hills Drive and Millbrook Road, enhanced bus stops, and specialized bus service for seniors.

Of the “Quick Fixes” developed for Six Forks Road, the item with the highest public support was to adjust countdown signal timing to make walking across Six Forks Road less daunting. This was followed closely by fixing broken or incomplete infrastructure and adding street landscaping, lighting, signage and new sidewalks. Providing an adequate and continuous bicycling and pedestrian system was also strongly recommended by the corridor study.

In addition, the City of Raleigh’s Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) was created to help control speeds and traffic volumes in residential areas and to promote safety for motorists and pedestrians. All City-maintained streets are available for use by the public; it is not possible to prohibit “cut-thru” trips but the NTMP can help reduce traffic volumes and speeds on neighborhood streets through a combination of policies, physical measures and outreach. Hardimon Road has been evaluated for Streetscape treatment and was ranked #2 of 86 potential projects. Scotland Street has been evaluated for Traffic Calming treatment and was ranked #4 of 73 potential projects. However, there is no timetable for construction of these projects. Other streets in the Midtown area, and their priority rankings, are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Abridged Priority List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardimon Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Scotland Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadkin Road - South</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Granville Drive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks Avenue - North</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Dartmouth Road - West</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramah Drive</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Yadkin Road - North</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadkin Road - Middle</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Bellevue Road</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail Hollow Drive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Camelot Drive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill Road - West</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Latimer Road</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramblewood Drive</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Drewry Lane</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Road</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>Manchester Drive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamlico Drive</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood Drive</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varnell Avenue</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Drive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampart Street</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transylvania Avenue</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

The Master Plan for North Hills East proposes the development and redevelopment of approximately 84.29 acres located at the northeastern quadrant of Six Forks Road and the I-440 Beltline. The City’s Future Land Use Map designates this area for regional mixed use. Accordingly, the area is targeted for high intensity urban development.

The Property is currently the site of a mixed use development under construction pursuant to an approved Rezoning (Z-16-06 and as amended by Z-22-09) and Master Plan (MP-6-05 and as amended by MP-4-08). The purpose of rezoning case Z-28-16 and Master Plan MP-6-05 is to add additional land to the project, as well as to refine and clarify certain aspects of Master Plan MP-4-08. The overall trip generation budget contained in MP-6-05 is being converted into maximum build-out scenarios reflected in the Z-28-16 traffic impact analysis.

The TIA reports that the North Hills East PD will have relatively minor impacts to bicycle, pedestrian, and bus levels of service along the study roadway segments. The development plan for North Hills East will provide improved pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity within the site as well as connectivity to existing streets. The TIA report did not recommend any new roadway infrastructure to improve pedestrian, bicycle or transit quality of service.

New trips generated by further development of North Hills East will disperse and travel to other activity centers or residential neighborhoods via the adjacent public streets. Traffic has a natural tendency to disperse. Even in conjunction with the City’s Neighborhood Traffic Management Program it is not possible to develop a project of this size and have zero impact to adjacent neighborhoods in the Midtown area. Staff notes that there will be additional questions from neighbors and other stakeholders on the traffic impacts from North Hills East. I will work with the traffic consultants and City staff to obtain answers in a timely manner. This concludes my preliminary review of traffic impacts for the North Hills East Planned Development.
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Figure 4c: North Hills East Level of Service Map C
Figure 4d: North Hills East Level of Service Map D
Figure 5a: North Hills East Recommended Improvements Map A