Request:

16.94 acres from IND-1 to CX-3-CU

Submittal Date
8/12/2015
Case Information: Z-32-15 Oak Forest Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Oak Forest Drive, north side, at its intersection with Departure Drive Address: 6000 Oak Forest Drive PIN: 1726291738</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Rezone property from Industrial-1 (IND-1) to Commercial Mixed Use-3 stories-Conditional Use (CX-3-CU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Request</td>
<td>16.94 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Robert T. Hedrick 9409 S. Mere Court Raleigh, NC 27615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Michael Birch, Morningstar Law Group 630 Davis Drive, Suite 200 Morrisville, NC 27560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advisory Council (CAC)</td>
<td>North CAC – David Cox, Chair <a href="mailto:dcox1776@gmail.com">dcox1776@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Recommendation Deadline</td>
<td>December 21, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comprehensive Plan Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUTURE LAND USE URBAN FORM</th>
<th>Community Mixed Use Center: City Growth Corridor: Urban Thoroughfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENT Policies</td>
<td>Policy LU 1.2 – Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency Policy LU 1.3 – Conditional Use District Consistency Policy LU 2.6 – Zoning and Infrastructure Impacts Policy LU 3.2 – Location of Growth Policy LU 4.4 – Reducing VMT Through Mixed Use Policy LU 4.5 – Connectivity Policy LU 11.4 – Rezoning/Development of Industrial Areas Policy UD 1.10 – Frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCONSISTENT Policies</td>
<td>(None.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Proposed Conditions
1. Certain uses prohibited (adult establishment, passenger terminal-all types, detention center,
jail, prison.
2. To obtain building permits, differences in trip generation volumes shall not exceed certain limits. Other plan approvals subject to minimum standards for traffic studies.
3. Requires the recordation of a trip allocation covenant prior to subdivision or building permit issuance.
4. Specifies building types which will comply with the Parking Limited frontage standards if fronting on any new street constructed as part of the future development of the property.

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>7/29/15</td>
<td>9/2/15 (Y-6, N-1)</td>
<td>9/22/15; 10/13/15</td>
<td>10/20/15</td>
<td>11/3/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid Statutory Protest Petition

Attachments
1. Staff report

Planning Commission Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Approve with conditions. City Council may now schedule this proposal for Public Hearing, or refer it to committee for further study and discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Findings & Reasons | 1. The proposal is consistent with the Future Land Use Map, Urban Form Map, and pertinent policies of the Comprehensive Plan.  
| | 2. The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest. The proposal provides development opportunities for property within a City Growth Center and proximate to retail and commercial uses. In addition, future development of the site will increase the potential for improved street connectivity in the area.  
| | 3. The proposal is compatible with the surrounding area. There are a variety of existing uses in the area, and the proposal allows mixed-use development that would complement these existing uses. |
| Motion and Vote | Motion: Buxton  
Second: Fluhrer  
In Favor: Braun, Buxton, Fluhrer, Hicks, Schuster, Swink, Terando and Whitsett |

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.

10/13/15

Planning Director Date Planning Commission Chairperson Date

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

Overview

The site is located in northeast Raleigh at the intersection of Oak Forest Drive and Departure Drive. The Capital Boulevard corridor is just over a half mile to the east. Coming in at just under 17 acres, the site is vacant and completely wooded. Currently, the subject property's only street frontage (approximately 165 feet) is on Oak Forest Drive. There is approximately 50’ of dedicated right-of-way for an extension of Departure Drive adjacent to the property. Alignment of this future road with the current portion of Departure Drive to the south could result in reduced street frontage for the property upon development. The Raleigh Street Plan shows this new portion of Departure Drive running through the entirety of the site and eventually connecting with Barrow Drive to the north. Surrounding uses are primarily commercial and industrial in nature, ranging from office, retail, and indoor recreation to flex warehouse and light industrial. The Greenbrier townhouse development is less than a quarter mile to the northwest at the intersection of Old Wake Forest and Oak Forest. A single family residential development built in the late 1950s is located further to the east on the south side of Oak Forest. Triangle Town Center is located ½ mile to the east along Capital Boulevard.

The Future Land Use Map has a variety of designations in this area. The subject property is designated for Community Mixed Use, as are properties to the east and west. Properties to the south are designated for both Business and Commercial Services and Office/Research and Development. To the northwest across Old Wake Forest Road, there is an area designated for High Density Residential development. The site and all surrounding properties are located within a City Growth Center on the Urban Form Map. In addition, Oak Forest Drive is designated as an Urban Thoroughfare. The site is also just outside of a ½ mile transit stop buffer. The Comprehensive Plan recommends an urban or hybrid frontage for properties with these designations in order to encourage walkability and create pedestrian-oriented streetscapes.

The site is currently zoned Industrial-1 (IND-1) as are all adjacent properties. Z-27-14 (UDO Remapping) proposes a designation of Industrial Mixed Use-3 stories-Parking Limited (IX-3-PL). IX and Commercial Mixed Use (CX) are the predominant proposed districts in the area.

The proposed zoning has four conditions: several uses are prohibited (adult establishment, passenger terminal, and detention center, jail, prison); trip generation volumes are limited; a trip allocation covenant (based on trip limits in the second condition) must be recorded prior to subdivision or issuance of building permits; and applies the Parking Limited frontage standards to certain building types if fronting on any new street constructed as part of future development.

Outstanding Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Suggested Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(None.)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>Industrial-1</td>
<td>Industrial-1</td>
<td>Industrial-1</td>
<td>Industrial-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Overlay</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
<td>Community Mixed Use</td>
<td>Community Mixed Use</td>
<td>Community Mixed Use</td>
<td>Community Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Land Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Commercial/industrial flex (home furnishings, martial arts, theatre conservancy, flooring company)</td>
<td>Bowling alley, flex warehouse, church, retail</td>
<td>Various commercial (video production company, art classes, service garage, office, retail), limited residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form (if applicable)</td>
<td>City Growth Center; Urban Thoroughfare</td>
<td>City Growth Center; Urban Thoroughfare</td>
<td>City Growth Center; Transit Emphasis Corridor; ½ Mile Transit Buffer</td>
<td>City Growth Center; Urban Thoroughfare; ½ Mile Transit Buffer</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>Not permitted</td>
<td>32 dwelling units/acre (543 total units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td></td>
<td>50'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side:</td>
<td></td>
<td>40' (aggregate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Intensity Permitted:</td>
<td>208,000 sf</td>
<td>280,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Intensity Permitted:</td>
<td>405,000 sf</td>
<td>502,000 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3 Estimated Development Intensities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>16.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning</strong></td>
<td>IND-1</td>
<td>CX-3-CU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Building SF (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>405,000 sf</td>
<td>678,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. # of Residential Units</strong></td>
<td>- 0 – Not permitted</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Office SF</strong></td>
<td>405,000 sf</td>
<td>678,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Retail SF</strong></td>
<td>208,000 sf</td>
<td>280,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Gross Industrial SF</strong></td>
<td>382,000 sf</td>
<td>Heavy Industrial not permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential F.A.R</strong></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The proposed rezoning is:

☑ Compatible with the property and surrounding area.

☐ Incompatible.

   Analysis of Incompatibility:

   n/a
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2. Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis

2.1 Comprehensive Plan

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

- Is the proposal consistent with the vision, themes, and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan?
- Is the use being considered specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map in the area where its location is proposed?
- If the use is not specifically designated on the Future Land Use Map in the area where its location is proposed, is it needed to service such a planned use, or could it be established without adversely altering the recommended land use and character of the area?
- Will community facilities and streets be available at City standards to serve the use proposed for the property?

The proposal can be considered consistent with the vision, themes, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the Future Land Use and Urban Form designations for the property. While the proposal does not include an urban or hybrid frontage designation, it offers zoning conditions which are equivalent to the Parking Limited frontage. Existing community facilities and streets appear sufficient to accommodate the redevelopment possible under the proposed rezoning.

2.2 Future Land Use

Future Land Use designation:

The rezoning request is:

☑ Consistent with the Future Land Use Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:

n/a

2.3 Urban Form

Urban Form designation:

☐ Not applicable (no Urban Form designation)

The rezoning request is:

☑ Consistent with the Urban Form Map.

☐ Inconsistent

Analysis of Inconsistency:

n/a
2.4 Policy Guidance

The rezoning request is inconsistent with the following policies:

(None noted.)

2.5 Area Plan Policy Guidance

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

3. Public Benefit and Reasonableness Analysis

3.1 Public Benefits of the Proposed Rezoning

- Increased opportunity for development of a site within a designated City Growth Center that is also close to existing and planned transportation and transit facilities.
- Permits mixed-use development in proximity to other commercial and residential uses.
- Increased potential for improved street connectivity.

3.2 Detriments of the Proposed Rezoning

- None anticipated.

4. Impact Analysis

4.1 Transportation

The site is bounded by Oak Forest Drive on the south and commercial properties on the east, west and north. Oak Forest Drive is classified as Avenue 2-Lane, Undivided in the City’s Street Plan Map. There are no CIP projects planned for Oak Forest Drive. The Raleigh Street Plan Map shows Departure Drive extending northward from Oak Forest Drive, through the subject parcel, and connecting with Barrow Drive at an unspecified future date.

This site lies just outside a 1/2 mile buffer for future fixed-guideway transit. Site access shall be in accordance with the Raleigh Street Design Manual section 6. The block perimeter bounded by the rights-of-way for Oak Forest Drive, Old Wake Forest Road and Capital Boulevard is ~10,000 feet. In accordance with UDO section 8.3.2, the maximum block perimeter for CX-3 zoning is 3,000 feet.


4.2 Transit

Transit is currently not available on Oak Forest Drive and neither the Raleigh Short Range Transit Plan nor the Wake County 2040 Transit Study anticipate future routes on it. However, GoRaleigh Route 25L Triangle Town Center Connector operates in a one way loop northbound on Old Wake Forest Road and there is a stop on Old Wake Forest/Oak Forest approximately 500’ from this parcel. In addition, GoRaleigh Route 1 Capital operates in both
directions on Capital Blvd and there are outbound and inbound stops on Capital/Oak Forest approximately 0.5 miles from the site.

**Impact Identified:** None.

### 4.3 Hydrology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floodplain</th>
<th>No FEMA Floodplain present, but alluvial soil type Me is on this property.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Basin</td>
<td>Marsh and Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Subject to stormwater regulations under Article 9 of UDO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Identified:** Subject to stormwater regulations under Article 9 of UDO.

### 4.4 Public Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Demand (current)</th>
<th>Maximum Demand (proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>211,750 gpd</td>
<td>339,375 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>211,750 gpd</td>
<td>339,375 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Identified:** The proposed rezoning would add approximately 129,625 gpd to the wastewater collection and water distribution systems of the City. There are existing sanitary sewer and water mains adjacent to the properties.

The developer may be required to submit a downstream sanitary sewer capacity study and those required improvements identified by the study must be permitted and constructed in conjunction with and prior to the proposed development being constructed.

Verification of available capacity for water fire flow is required as part of the building permit process. Any water system improvements required to meet fire flow requirements will also be required.

### 4.5 Parks and Recreation

Site does not have any impacts to proposed or existing greenway trail, connector or corridor. Closest trail access is Simms Branch Trail, 4.2 miles. Recreational services are provided by Millbrook Exchange, 1.3 miles.

**Impact Identified:** None.

### 4.6 Urban Forestry

Subject to UDO Article 9.1 - Tree Conservation.

**Impact Identified:** None.

### 4.7 Designated Historic Resources

There are no known historic resources within 1,000 feet.

**Impact Identified:** None.
4.8 Community Development
This site is not located within a redevelopment plan area.

Impact Identified: None.

4.9 Impacts Summary
- Sewer and fire flow matters may need to be addressed upon development.

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

5. Conclusions
The proposal would allow increased opportunity for residential and mixed use development that is compatible with surrounding uses and consistent with the Future Land Use Map, the Urban Form Map, and the Comprehensive Plan. The proposal offers conditions which apply the built form standards of the Parking Limited frontage.
### Rezoning Application

#### Rezoning Request

- **Conditional Use**
- **Existing Zoning Classification:** Industrial-1
- **Proposed Zoning Classification Base District:** CX
- **Height:** -3
- **Frontage:** None

If the property has been previously rezoned, provide the rezoning case number.

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

---

#### GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address: 6000 Oak Forest Drive</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property PIN: 1726-29-1738</td>
<td><strong>August 12, 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Intersection: Oak Forest Drive and Departure Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner/Address: Robert T. Hedrick 9409 S. Mere Court Raleigh, NC 27615</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone:</strong> 919-850-0800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner/Address: Michael Birch, Morningstar Law Group 630 Davis Drive, Suite 200 Morrisville, NC 27560</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone:</strong> 919.590.0388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong> <a href="mailto:mbirch@morningstarlawgroup.com">mbirch@morningstarlawgroup.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner/Agent Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert T. Hedrick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property size (in acres): 16.94 ac**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Case Number: Z-32-15</th>
<th><strong>OFFICE USE ONLY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Submitted: October 13, 2015</td>
<td><strong>Transaction Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning: Industrial-1</td>
<td>Proposed Zoning: CX-3-CU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NARRATIVE OF ZONING CONDITIONS OFFERED

1. The following principal uses as listed in the Allowed Principal Use Table (UDO section 6.1.4.) are prohibited: (i) adult establishment, (ii) passenger terminal – all types, and (iii) detention center, jail, prison.

2. For the purpose of obtaining building permits, the proposed zoning shall not produce a difference in trip generation volumes compared to the existing zoning more than the limits set forth in the Raleigh Street Design Manual, being 12,040 total daily, 685 total AM peak, and 745 total PM Peak hour trips. Other plan approvals shall still be subject to the minimum standards for traffic studies set forth in the Raleigh Street Design Manual.

3. Prior to recordation of a subdivision plat or the issuance of a building permit, whichever shall first occur, the owner of the property shall cause to be recorded in the Wake County Registry a restrictive covenant that allocates among the lots of record comprising the property the trips permitted by Condition 2 of this rezoning ordinance. Such restrictive covenant shall be approved by the City Attorney or his designee prior to recordation of the restrictive covenant. Such restrictive covenant shall provide that it may be amended or terminated only with the prior written consent of the City Attorney or his designee.

4. The following building types, if fronting on any new street constructed as part of the future development of the property, shall comply with the Parking Limited frontage standards set forth in UDO section 3.4.5 and any allowable administrative alternates: apartment, general building, mixed use building, and civic building.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner/Agent Signature</th>
<th>Print Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Robert T. Hedrick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT OF CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide brief statements regarding whether the rezoning request is consistent with the future land use designation, the urban form map and any applicable policies contained within the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The property is designated Community Mixed Use on the Future Land Use Map. This category encourages commercial and residential uses, with low- and mid-rise buildings. CX is the primary corresponding zoning district for property designated Community Mixed Use. Therefore, the rezoning request for CX is consistent with the Future Land Use Map designation.

2. The Community Mixed Use description notes that height is generally in the three- to five-story height range. The rezoning request for three stories is consistent with this guidance.

3. The property is located in a City Growth Center with limited frontage along an Urban Thoroughfare (Oak Forest Drive), as shown on the Urban Form Map. The rezoning request is consistent with the Urban Form Map guidance even though a frontage is not being applied. The City Growth Center and Urban Thoroughfare guidance recommends an urban or hybrid approach, but the descriptions of both urban form elements acknowledge that site constraints may require an alternate approach. In this case, the property has very limited frontage on Oak Forest Drive, which will be reduced even more as a result of aligning right-of-way with Departure Drive on the south side of Oak Forest Drive. This limited frontage and the constraints of even a hybrid frontage make compliance with a frontage impractical. Therefore, even without application of a frontage, the rezoning request is consistent with the Urban Form Map.

4. The rezoning request is consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan policies: LU 1.2 "Future Land Use Map and Zoning Consistency", LU 3.2 "Location of Growth", LU 4.5 "Connectivity", and LU 8.10 "Infill Development".

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

1. The rezoning request benefits the public by rezoning property in accordance with the Future Land Use Map and the Comprehensive Plan.

2. The rezoning request benefits the public by permitting a mix of uses in close proximity to major transportation infrastructure (I-540 and Capital Boulevard), major retail centers (Triangle Town Center and Plantation Point), and employment areas, thereby providing for the opportunity of reduced vehicle miles traveled, enhanced street and sidewalk connectivity, and increased pedestrian activity.
### URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

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

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

**Response:** The rezoning request permits a mix of uses, consistent with this guideline.

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

**Response:** The rezoning request limits height consistent with surrounding built environment and proposed zoning.

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

**Response:** It is anticipated that future development will extend a road through the site as shown on the thoroughfare plan, consistent with this guideline.

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

**Response:** It is anticipated that future development will extend a road through the site as shown on the thoroughfare plan, consistent with this guideline.

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

**Response:** The property has limited frontage along Oak Forest Drive, but will contribute to reducing block length along Oak Forest Drive by constructing the road as shown on the thoroughfare plan.

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

**Response:** Building and parking lot location will be governed by the UDO.

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

**Response:** Building location will be governed by the UDO.

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

**Response:** Building location will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

**Response:** Open space will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

**Response:** New urban spaces will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

**Response:** Open space will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

#### 12. A well-defined urban open space is visually enclosed by the fronting of buildings to create an outdoor "room" that is comfortable to users.

**Response:** Open space will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

**Response:** New public spaces will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

**Response:** Parking lot location will be governed by the UDO.

#### 15. Parking lots should be located behind or in the interior of a block whenever possible. Parking lots should not occupy more than 1/3 of the frontage of the adjacent building or not more than 84 feet, whichever is less.

**Response:** Parking lot location will be governed by the UDO.
16. Parking structures are clearly an important and necessary element of the overall urban infrastructure but, given their utilitarian elements, can give serious negative visual effects. New structures should merit the same level of materials and finishes as that a principal building would, care in the use of basic design elements can make a significant improvement.

Response: No parking structures are anticipated as part of this development.

17. Higher building densities and more intensive land uses should be within walking distance of transit stops, permitting public transit to become a viable alternative to the automobile.

Response: The property is located in close proximity to major transportation corridors and a bus stop on Old Wake Forest Road.

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

Response: Pedestrian access will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

19. All development should respect natural resources as an essential component of the human environment. The most sensitive landscape areas, both environmentally and visually, are steep slopes greater than 15 percent, watercourses, and floodplains. Any development in these areas should minimize intervention and maintain the natural condition except under extreme circumstances. Where practical, these features should be conserved as open space amenities and incorporated in the overall site design.

Response: Natural features will be preserved in accordance with the UDO.

20. It is the intent of these guidelines to build streets that are integral components of community design. Public and private streets, as well as commercial driveways that serve as primary pedestrian pathways to building entrances, should be designed as the main public spaces of the City and should be scaled for pedestrians.

Response: Public streets constructed as part of this development will comply with the UDO.

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

Response: Sidewalks will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

Response: Streets and streetscapes will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

Response: Building location will be governed by the UDO.

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

Response: Building location, orientation and design will be governed by the UDO.

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

Response: Architectural features and other building articulation will be provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

Response: Sidewalks will be provided in accordance with the UDO.
REPORT OF MEETING WITH ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS
ON JULY 29, 2015

Pursuant to applicable provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance, a meeting was held with respect to a potential rezoning with adjacent property owners on Wednesday, July 29, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. The property considered for rezoning totals approximately 17.0 acres, with the address of 6000 Oak Forest Drive, and having Wake County Parcel Identification Number 1726-29-1738. This meeting was held in Room #2 at the Millbrook Exchange Community Center, located at 1905 Spring Forest Road, Raleigh, NC 27615. All owners of property within 100 feet of the subject property were invited to attend the meeting. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a copy of the neighborhood meeting notice. A copy of the required mailing list for the meeting invitations is attached hereto as Exhibit B. A summary of the items discussed at the meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit C. Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a list of individuals who attended the meeting.
Dear Neighbor:

You are cordially invited to attend an Informational meeting at 7:00 in the evening on Wednesday, July 29, 2015. The meeting will be held in Room #2 at the Millbrook Exchange Community Center which is located at 1905 Spring Forest Road, Raleigh, NC 27615.

The purpose of this meeting is to share with you preliminary plans for a proposed Residential Community located on approximately seventeen (17 AC) acres of land northeast of the intersection of Oak Forest and Departure Drives. Stewart will be submitting a Zoning Map Change Application for this proposed community to the City of Raleigh by mid-August. Your Input at this meeting is Important to us and would be beneficial as we further develop our plans.

We are looking forward to meeting with you. If you are not able to attend this meeting and have any questions concerning the development of the project, please feel free to contact me by phone at 919.866.4789 or by e-mail at mtarrant@stewartinc.com.

Sincerely,

Michael P. Tarrant, PLA, ASLA
Land Planning & Design Project Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JFW ASSOCIATES LLC</td>
<td>5915 OAK FOREST DR, STE 101</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27616-1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTECH PROPERTIES</td>
<td>PO BOX 1249</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27605-2491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOAF, EARL F SHOAF, PHYLLIS D</td>
<td>5117 WYNNEFORD WA</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27614-9813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORTHS PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>5915 OAK FOREST DR</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27616-1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N &amp; B CO LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 87128</td>
<td>Fayetteville, NC 28304-7128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PABOYS LLC</td>
<td>4725 LAKE WHEELER RD</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27603-3913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHMALZ PROPERTY USA LLC</td>
<td>5200 ATLANTIC AVE</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27616-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC AUTOMOTIVE LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 40110</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27629-0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLC AUTOMOTIVE LLC</td>
<td>PO BOX 40110</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27629-0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPB PROPERTIES LLC</td>
<td>6100 MADDRY OAKS CT</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27616-3156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDSTEIN BROTHERS REALTY LLC</td>
<td>6104 MADDRY OAKS CT</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27616-3156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNEDY, KENNETH D JR</td>
<td>PO BOX 6427</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27628-6427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT T. HEDRICK</td>
<td>9409 S MERE CT</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC 27615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT C

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ITEMS

On Wednesday, July 29, 2015 at 7:00 p.m., the applicant held a neighborhood meeting for the property owners adjacent to the parcels subject to the proposed rezoning. The following items were discussed:

1. Existing zoning
2. Proposed rezoning district
3. Purpose for rezoning
4. Connectivity
5. Building height and location
6. Buffer locations
7. Stormwater facility locations
8. Anticipated development scenario
9. Anticipated price range
1. Mike Blawas
   6100 Maddry Oaks Court
   Raleigh, NC 27616