### Existing Zoning

**Property**: 0 Six Forks Rd

**Size**: 29.66 acres

**Existing Zoning**: R-1 w/SHOD-1 & FWPOD

**Requested Zoning**: R-10-CU w/SHOD-1 & FWPOD

Map by Raleigh Department of Planning and Development (mapsof): 10/8/2021
Rezoning Application and Checklist

Planning and Development Customer Service Center • One Exchange Plaza, Suite 400 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2500

Please complete all sections of the form and upload via the Permit and Development Portal (permitportal.raleighnc.gov). Please see page 11 for information about who may submit a rezoning application. A rezoning application will not be considered complete until all required submittal components listed on the Rezoning Checklist have been received and approved. For questions email rezoning@raleighnc.gov.

---

Rezoning Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rezoning Type</th>
<th>General use</th>
<th>Conditional use</th>
<th>Master plan</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text change to zoning conditions</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Rezoning case #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing zoning base district: R-1
Height: Frontage:
Overlay(s): SHOD-1 and FWPOD

Proposed zoning base district: R-10
Height: Frontage:
Overlay(s): SHOD-1 and FWPOD

Helpful Tip: View the Zoning Map to search for the address to be rezoned, then turn on the 'Zoning' and 'Overlay' layers.

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

---

General Information

Date: Date amended (1): Date amended (2):

Property address: 0 Six Forks Road
Property PIN: 1708 16 6669

Deed reference (book/page): Book 15075, Page 1062, Wake County Registry

Nearest intersection: Six Forks and 540 Property size (acres): 29.66± acres

For planned development applications only:

- Total units:
- Total square footage:
- Total parcels:
- Total buildings:

Property owner name and address: Mary Gut, Trustee of the Gut 2012 Irrevocable Trust

Property owner email: sguil@idealfastener.com

Property owner phone: 786.485.9500 ext.302

Applicant name and address: Beth Trahos, Nelson Mullins, 4140 Parklake Avenue, Suite 200, Raleigh, NC 27612

Applicant email: beth.trahos@nelsonmullins.com

Applicant phone: 919.329.3884

Applicant signature(s):

Additional email(s): Mary Gut, Trustee of the Gut 2012 Irrevocable Trust

---

RECEIVED
SEP 28 2021
BY: [Signature]
raleighnc.gov
Conditional Use District Zoning Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning case #:</th>
<th>Date submitted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing zoning: R-1</td>
<td>Proposed zoning: R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICE USE ONLY
Rezoning case #

Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

1. Only those Permitted, Limited or Special Uses allowed in the R-1 zoning district as well as Two-Unit Living and Multi-Unit Living uses, as shown in Section 6.1.4 Allowed Principal Use Table of the City of Raleigh Unified Development Ordinance shall be allowed on the subject property.

2. No more than 300 dwelling units shall be permitted on the subject property.

3. The property owner shall dedicate at least 10% of the total dwelling units as affordable for households earning 60% of the area median income or less for a period of not less than 15 years from the date of issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first unit on the subject property. An Affordable Housing Deed Restriction in a form approved by the City shall be filed and recorded in property’s chain of title by the property owner in Wake County Register of Deeds prior to the project receiving a certificate of occupancy. The rent and income limits for the Affordable Units will follow the affordable standards as determined annually by the City of Raleigh Housing & Neighborhoods Department. Affordable units offered within this condition shall be constructed concurrently with the project’s market rate units. The property owner shall certify to the City of Raleigh compliance with this zoning condition on an annual basis.

4. The property shall be subject to the use of Green Stormwater Infrastructure ("GSI") requirements set out in Section 9.5.2.C.3 of the UDO whatever the percentage of built area.

5. The post-development stormwater discharge peak flow rate shall not exceed pre-development peak flow rates for the 1, 2, 10, 25 and 50-year storms at the upstream headwall of any culvert under Interstate 540.

6. The provisions of Section 8.3.2 of the UDO, which is entitled "Blocks", shall be modified to 11,000 linear feet given the unique site constraints including the existence of I-540 and the city’s desire to limit impervious surface in this area.

7. Access to the subject property shall be from Six Forks Road and from a stub and an associated offer of cross access to the property to the west (1708 06 5666; Deed Book 17943, Page 1483), subject to the approval of the Raleigh Department of Transportation and the North Carolina Department of Transportation. These points of interconnection shall fulfill the cross-access requirements of Section 8.3.4.C of the UDO, and no additional access shall be required.

The property owner(s) hereby offers, consents to, and agrees to abide, if the rezoning request is approved, the conditions written above. All property owners must sign each condition page. This page may be photocopied if additional space is needed.

Property Owner(s) Signature: [Signature]

Printed Name: Mary Gut, Trustee of the Gut 2012 Irrevocable Trust

RECEIVED SEP 28 2021
BY: [Signature]
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CERTIFICATE OF TRUST

The undersigned Grantor hereby certifies the following:

1. This Certificate of Trust relates to the Gut 2012 Irrevocable Trust Agreement (the “Trust”) created by that certain trust agreement dated December 20, 2012 (the “Trust Agreement”) executed by Ralph Gut as Grantor and Mary Gut as Trustee.

2. The name of the original Grantor is Ralph Gut.

3. The original Trustee under the Trust is Mary Gut.

4. The name and address of the Trustee empowered to act under the Trust Agreement at the time of the execution of this Certificate of Trust is Mary Gut, c/o Ideal Fastener Corporation, 10800 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 400, Miami Florida, 33161.

5. This Trust is governed under the provisions of North Carolina law. This Trust further provides generally that the Trustee, without authorization by the court, may exercise all powers over the trust property appropriate to achieve the proper investment, management, administration, or distribution of the trust property. The Trustee is further authorized by the Trust Agreement to have and enjoy all of the powers set forth therein and under NCGS 32-27, specifically including the right to sell any property to which the Trustee may hold title on behalf of the Trust from time to time.

6. The undersigned hereby represent that the statements contained in this Certificate of Trust are true and correct, and that there are no other provisions in the Trust Agreement or amendments to it that limit the powers of the Trustee to sell, convey, pledge, mortgage, lease, manage, operate, control, transfer title, divide, convert, allot or sell trust property, including real and personal property.

7. This Trust has not been modified in any manner that would cause the representations in this Certificate of Trust to be incorrect. This Certificate of Trust is being signed by the currently acting Trustee of the Trust.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have duly executed this 17th day of September.

Mary Gut, Trustee

[Signature]

RECEIVED

SEP 28 2021

BY:
### Comprehensive Plan Analysis

The applicant is asked to analyze the impact of the rezoning request and its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is also asked to explain how the rezoning request is 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.

- Expanding housing choices is a vision theme in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan indicates that "Raleigh will have expanded supply of affordable and workforce housing options that provide housing opportunities for all segments of our population in all areas of the city." The proposed rezoning is consistent with the overarching theme of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the subject property is located in an Affordable Housing Opportunity Area as shown on Map H-2.
- The Future Land Use Map designates the subject property as Rural Residential. This designation is appropriate where "...intensification to more urban uses is not expected due to watershed constraints..." and recommends an overall density of one unit per acre. The subject property is unique in that it is located in an already existing urban area – it is located south of Interstate 540, Magellan Charter School, a Duke Energy facility and the A. E. Finley YMCA, which is also zoned R-10 Conditional Use.
- The Falls Lake Small Area Plan discourages new non-residential uses. The proposed rezoning encourages residential uses in compliance with the Falls Lake Small Area Plan by allowing for a broader variety of residential uses on the subject property.

### Public Benefits

Provide brief statements explaining how the rezoning request is reasonable and in the public interest.

- The proposed residential use would not alter the character of this area, which is already home to a mix of institutional, office, retail, and residential uses of varying intensities.
- The proposed rezoning is in the public interest because it provides for more and varied housing stock, including a commitment to affordable housing, in an area where such housing is scarce.
- Although current street sections are primarily auto-oriented, streets are planned to include bicycle and pedestrian elements to facilitate access to nearby amenities. The subject property is located in close proximity to shopping at Harvest Plaza Shopping Center and Six Forks Station Shopping Center, schools (Magellan Charter School and Baileywick Elementary School), churches, Baileywick Road Park, and the A. E. Finley YMCA among other amenities, and public transit at the Six Fork Station Shopping Center on the south side of Strickland Road and Six Forks, via Go Raleigh.
- The subject property will fulfill all requirements of the Falls Watershed Protection Overlay District (which mandates 40% open space, limits impervious area and includes stringent stormwater requirements) with the additional commitment to utilize green infrastructure practices whatever the percentage of built-upon area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rezoning Application Addendum #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Historic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The applicant is asked to analyze the impact of the rezoning request on historic resources. For the purposes of this section, a historic resource is defined as any site, structure, sign, or other feature of the property to be rezoned that is listed in the National Register of Historic Places or designated by the City of Raleigh as a landmark or contributing to a Historic Overlay District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Historic Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List in the space below all historic resources located on the property to be rezoned. For each resource, indicate how the proposed zoning would impact the resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no historic resources on the subject property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide brief statements describing actions that will be taken to mitigate all negative impacts listed above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Urban Design Guidelines**

The applicant must respond to the Urban Design Guidelines contained in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan if:

a) The property to be rezoned is within a "City Growth Center" or "Mixed-Use Center", OR;

b) The property to be rezoned is located along a "Main Street" or "Transit Emphasis Corridor" as shown on the Urban Form Map in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban form designation:</th>
<th>Click <a href="#">here</a> to view the Urban Form Map.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>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. <strong>Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7 | Buildings should be located close to the pedestrian-oriented street (within 25 feet of the curb), with off-street parking behind and/or beside the buildings. When a development plan is located along a high-volume corridor without on-street parking, one bay of parking separating the building frontage along the corridor is a preferred option.  
Response: |
|---|---|
| 8 | If the site is located at a street intersection, the main building or main part of the building should be placed at the corner. Parking, loading or service should not be located at an intersection.  
Response: |
| 9 | To ensure that urban open space is well-used, it is essential to locate and design it carefully. The space should be located where it is visible and easily accessible from public areas (building entrances, sidewalks). Take views and sun exposure into account as well.  
Response: |
| 10 | New urban spaces should contain direct access from the adjacent streets. They should be open along the adjacent sidewalks and allow for multiple points of entry. They should also be visually permeable from the sidewalk, allowing passersby to see directly into the space.  
Response: |
| 11 | The perimeter of urban open spaces should consist of active uses that provide pedestrian traffic for the space including retail, cafés, and restaurants and higher-density residential.  
Response: |
| 12 | A properly defined urban open space is visually enclosed by the fronting of buildings to create an outdoor "room" that is comfortable to users.  
Response: |
| 13 | New public spaces should provide seating opportunities.  
Response: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>Parking lots should not dominate the frontage of pedestrian-oriented streets, interrupt pedestrian routes, or negatively impact surrounding developments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Parking lots should be located behind or in the interior of a block whenever possible. Parking lots should not occupy more than 1/3 of the frontage of the adjacent building or not more than 64 feet, whichever is less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>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 cane make a significant improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Convenient, comfortable pedestrian access between the transit stop and the building entrance should be planned as part of the overall pedestrian network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21 | Sidewalks should be 5-8 feet wide in residential areas and located on both sides of the street. Sidewalks in commercial areas and Pedestrian Business Overlays should be a minimum of 14-18 feet wide to accommodate sidewalk uses such as vendors, merchandising and outdoor seating.  
Response: |
| 22 | Streets should be designed with street trees planted in a manner appropriate to their function. Commercial streets should have trees which complement the face of the buildings and which shade the sidewalk. Residential streets should provide for an appropriate canopy, which shadows both the street and sidewalk, and serves as a visual buffer between the street and the home. The typical width of the street landscape strip is 6-8 feet. This width ensures healthy street trees, precludes tree roots from breaking the sidewalk, and provides adequate pedestrian buffering. Street trees should be at least 6 1/4" caliper and should be consistent with the City's landscaping, lighting and street sight distance requirements.  
Response: |
| 23 | Buildings should define the streets spatially. Proper spatial definition should be achieved with buildings or other architectural elements (including certain tree plantings) that make up the street edges aligned in a disciplined manner with an appropriate ratio of height to width.  
Response: |
| 24 | The primary entrance should be both architecturally and functionally on the front facade of any building facing the primary public street. Such entrances shall be designed to convey their prominence on the fronting facade.  
Response: |
| 25 | The ground level of the building should offer pedestrian interest along sidewalks. This includes windows entrances, and architectural details. Signage, awnings, and ornamentation are encouraged.  
Response: |
| 26 | The sidewalks should be the principal place of pedestrian movement and casual social interaction. Designs and uses should be complementary to that function.  
Response: |
## Rezoning Checklist (Submittal Requirements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Requirements – General Use or Conditional Use Rezoning</th>
<th>To be completed by Applicant</th>
<th>To be completed by staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have referenced this Rezoning Checklist and by using this as a guide, it will ensure that I receive a complete and thorough first review by the City of Raleigh</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pre-application conference.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Neighborhood meeting notice and report</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rezoning application review fee (see Fee Guide for rates).</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Completed application submitted through Permit and Development Portal</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Completed Comprehensive Plan consistency analysis</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Completed response to the urban design guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Two sets of stamped envelopes addressed to all property owners of area to be rezoned and properties with 500 feet of area to be rezoned.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Trip generation study</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Traffic impact analysis</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For properties requesting a Conditional Use District:**

11. Completed zoning conditions, signed by property owner(s). | ✔ |  | Yes | No |  |

**If applicable, see page 11:**

12. Proof of Power of Attorney or Owner Affidavit. |  | ✔ | Yes | No |  |

**For properties requesting a Planned Development or Campus District:**

13. Master plan (see Master Plan submittal requirements). |  | ✔ | Yes | No |  |

**For properties requesting a text change to zoning conditions:**

14. Redline copy of zoning conditions with proposed changes. |  | ✔ | Yes | No |  |
15. Proposed conditions signed by property owner(s). |  | ✔ | Yes | No |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Requirements – Master Plan</th>
<th>To be completed by Applicant</th>
<th>To be completed by staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have referenced this <strong>Master Plan Checklist</strong> and by using this as a guide, it will ensure that I receive a complete and thorough first review by the City of Raleigh.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total number of units and square feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 12 sets of plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Completed application; submitted through Permit &amp; Development Portal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vicinity Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Existing Conditions Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Street and Block Layout Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General Layout Map/Height and Frontage Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Description of Modification to Standards, 12 sets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Development Plan (location of building types)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pedestrian Circulation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Parking Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Open Space Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tree Conservation Plan (if site is 2 acres or more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Major Utilities Plan/Utilities Service Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Generalized Stormwater Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Phasing Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Three-Dimensional Model/renderings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Common Signage Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Can Initiate a Zoning Request?

If requesting to down-zone property, the rezoning application must be signed by all the property owners whose property is subject to the downzoning. Downzoning is defined as a zoning ordinance that affects an area of land in one of the following ways:

1. By decreasing the development density of the land to be less dense than was allowed under its previous usage.
2. By reducing the permitted uses of the land that are specified in a zoning ordinance or land development regulation to fewer uses than were allowed under its previous usage.

If requesting to rezone property to a conditional district, the rezoning application must be signed by all owners of the property to be included in the district. For purposes of the application only (not the zoning conditions), the City will accept signatures on behalf of the property owner from the following:

1. the property owner;
2. an attorney acting on behalf of the property owner with an executed power of attorney; or
3. a person authorized to act on behalf of the property owner with an executed owner’s affidavit.

An owner’s affidavit must be made under oath, properly notarized and, at a minimum, include the following information:

- The property owner’s name and, if applicable, the property owner’s title and organization name.
- The address, PIN and Deed Book/Page Number of the property.
- A statement that the person listed as the property owner is the legal owner of the property described.
- The name of the person authorized to act on behalf of the property owner as the applicant. If applicable, the authorized person’s title and organization name.
- A statement that the property owner, as legal owner of the described property, hereby gives authorization and permission to the authorized person, to submit to the City of Raleigh an application to rezone the described property.
- A statement that the property owner understands and acknowledges that zoning conditions must be signed, approved and consented to by the property owner.
- The property owner’s signature and the date the property owner signed the affidavit.

If requesting to rezone property to a general use district that is not a down-zoning, the rezoning application may be signed, for the purpose of initiating the request, by property owners or third-party applicants.
Temporary Option for Virtual Neighborhood Meetings

During times when in-person gatherings are restricted, this document consists of guidance and templates for conducting a virtual meeting that may satisfy the pre-submittal neighborhood meeting prerequisite for filing a rezoning request and, when required, the second neighborhood meeting prerequisite for Planning Commission review. All requirements related to notice and neighborhood meetings found in the UDO are still applicable and should be reviewed when preparing for a neighborhood meeting.

Raleigh Planning & Development staff are available to advise you in the preparation for virtual neighborhood meetings. For more information, contact JP Mansolf (919) 996-2180 or jp.mansolf@raleighnc.gov.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF A NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING?
A neighborhood meeting is a required form of community outreach to receive community feedback regarding a rezoning prior to submittal to Raleigh Planning & Development or prior to Planning Commission review, per the standards found in UDO Ch. 10. The intention of the meeting is to facilitate neighbor communication; identify issues of concern early on; and provide the applicant an opportunity to address neighbors' concerns about the potential impacts of the rezoning request at key steps in the rezoning process.

GUIDANCE FOR VIRTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS
The virtual neighborhood meeting option is available to applicants on a temporary basis during times when in-person gatherings are restricted. Above and beyond the requirements for neighborhood meetings found in the UDO, the following practices are strongly encouraged for virtual neighborhood meetings:

Verification of mailed notice for virtual neighborhood meetings can be completed by USPS or Raleigh Planning & Development staff.
Neighborhood meeting notification letters can be verified in one of two ways for virtual neighborhood meetings:

- By using USPS in compliance with UDO Sec. 10.2.1.C.1.b.
- By coordinating with Raleigh Planning & Development staff.
  - When City of Raleigh facilities are open to the public, applicants may present stuffed, stamped, addressed, and unsealed neighborhood meeting notifications to Raleigh Planning & Development staff prior to the 10-day period for confirmation that the complete list of property owners is being noticed and that the notices contain adequate information to satisfy the requirements of the UDO and are in keeping with this guidance document.
  - When City of Raleigh facilities are closed to the public, applicants may present electronic documentation to city staff prior to the 10-day period for verification. Documentation should include: an electronic copy of the notification letter and any enclosures, the mailing list, photographs of the mailing that demonstrates the number of envelopes prepared for mailing, an attestation from the applicant that the mailing satisfies all UDO requirements and that acknowledges that false statements negate validity of the mailing.
The meeting should be held within specific timeframes and meet certain requirements. The UDO requires that "the applicant shall provide an opportunity to meet with property owners of the development site and property owners within the mailing radius described in UDO Sec. 10.2.1.C.1. In order to provide meaningful opportunity, a virtual neighborhood meeting should follow these guidelines:

- Electronically via an interactive online video conferencing software such as Microsoft Teams, Zoom, WebEx, or any similar platform of the applicant's choice.
- The software must support a two-way conversation that allows for residents to ask questions and provide thoughts, as well as hear the applicant's presentation.
- The software should provide an option for an individual to participate exclusively by telephone.
- The meeting should be conducted for a minimum of two (2) hours, Monday through Thursday, during the 5:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. time period.
- The meeting should not be held on City of Raleigh or State of North Carolina recognized holidays.
- Just as with an in-person meeting, an attendance sheet must be completed to log known attendees of the virtual meeting. Note if no one attended.

Additional informational material should be provided by post to all invitees. To help facilitate discussion during the meeting for all participants, especially those that may participate exclusively by telephone, informational material should be provided by post. A copy of all mailed materials should be included as part of the Neighborhood Meeting report required for the rezoning application. In addition to details required by UDO Sec. 10.2.1.C.1, the following information should be mailed with the meeting notice:

- The date, time, and detailed instructions for how to participate in the virtual meeting either online or by telephone.
- A current aerial photograph of the area.
- A current zoning map of the area.
- A draft of the rezoning petition to be submitted.
- For a rezoning request to a district that requires a master plan (UDO Art. 4.6 and 4.7) preliminary or schematic plans of the proposed master plan should be provided to help facilitate discussion.

The meeting agenda should describe the action to be requested and the nature of the questions involved. This information should be addressed during the meeting:

- Explanation of the rezoning process.
- Explanation of future meetings (additional neighborhood meetings, if any; Planning Commission review; City Council public hearing).
- Explanation of the development proposal, including proposed uses and zoning conditions; explanation of any proposed master plan; and any public information available about the property owner or buyer, developer or builder, and/or likely tenant.
- Questions or concerns by virtual attendees and responses by the applicant.
- Report of any questions and concerns received by the applicant in correspondence or phone call in advance of the meeting, along with any applicant-provided responses.
The applicant shall be responsible for notifying any neighbors who request to be kept up-to-date of any additional neighborhood meetings and the actual submittal date to the City of Raleigh Development Portal.
NOTIFICATION LETTER TEMPLATE

Date:

Re: (SITE LOCATION)

Neighboring Property Owners:

You are invited to attend a neighborhood meeting on (MEETING DATE and TIME). The meeting will be held virtually. You can participate online or by telephone. To participate, visit:

(MEETING WEB ADDRESS)

Or call:

(MEETING PHONE NUMBER)

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss a potential rezoning of the property located at (SITE ADDRESS AND NEARBY LANDMARKS). This site is currently zoned (CURRENT ZONING DISTRICT) and is proposed to be rezoned to (PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICT). (ANY OTHER RELEVANT DETAILS OF THE REQUEST.)

Prior to the submittal of any rezoning application, the City of Raleigh requires that a neighborhood meeting be held for all property owners within 500 feet of the area requested for rezoning.

Information about the rezoning process is available online; visit www.raleighnc.gov and search for “Rezoning Process.” If you have further questions about the rezoning process, please contact:

JP Mansolf
Raleigh Planning & Development
(919)996-2180
JP.Mansolf@raleighnc.gov

If you have any concerns or questions about this potential rezoning I (we) can be reached at:

(NAME)
(CONTACT INFO)

Sincerely,
ATTESTATION TEMPLATE

Attestation Statement

I, the undersigned, do hereby attest that the electronic verification document submitted herewith accurately reflects notification letters, enclosures, envelopes and mailing list for mailing the neighborhood meeting notification letters as required by Chapter 10 of the City of Raleigh UDO, and I do hereby further attest that that I did in fact deposit all of the required neighborhood meeting notification letters with the US. Postal Service on the ______, day of ________, 2020. I do hereby attest that this information is true, accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and I understand that any falsification, omission, or concealment of material fact may be a violation of the UDO subjecting me to administrative, civil, and/or, criminal liability, including, but not limited to, invalidation of the application to which such required neighborhood meeting relates.

________________________________________  _____________________________
Signature of Applicant/Applicant Representative  Date
SUMMARY OF ISSUES

A neighborhood meeting was held on __________________________(date) to discuss a potential rezoning located at __________________________(property address). The neighborhood meeting was held at __________________________(location).

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

Summary of Issues:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</table>
Neighborhood Meeting Minutes
June 9, 2021 from 6 to 8 p.m.

A virtual neighborhood meeting was held on Wednesday, June 9, 2021 from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. to discuss the rezoning of three properties as a part of two zoning cases: (a) 9304 and 9316 Baileywick Road, totaling approximately 11.65± acres (the “Gut Property”), and (b) property located at the intersection of I-540 and Six Forks Road, totaling approximately 29.66± acres, (the “Magellan Property.”) Owners of property within 1000 feet of the subject properties were invited to attend the meeting. Attached as Exhibit A is a copy of the neighborhood meeting notice, including the attached aerial map, zoning map and Future Land Use Map. A copy of the mailing list of meeting notices is attached as Exhibit B, and an attestation of mailing is attached as Exhibit C.

Members of the Project team included: Beth Trahos, Nelson Mullins; Michael Vanpran, McAdams; and Josh Reinko, Ramey Kemp. Sara Ellis attended from the City of Raleigh.

As the meeting was virtual, attendees had the option of identifying themselves in some way or remaining anonymous. A complete list of attendees as they identified themselves in the virtual meeting is attached.

Beth provided a brief introduction of the two zoning cases. She explained that the Magellan Property is being proposed to be brought into the City of Raleigh and zoned R-1 CU with the SHOD-1 and FWPOD, the same zoning district as the existing Magellan Charter School, to allow for future school uses. The Gut Property is being proposed to be zoned R-10 CU with the SHOD-1 and FWPOD district. No more than 300 dwellings, likely apartments, are proposed on the 29.66± acre Gut Property with provision that at least 10% of the of the dwelling units to be utilized as affordable units as detailed in the conditions.

The following topics were discussed:

- Traffic;
- Access onto Six Forks Road;
- Whether a traffic impact analysis was prepared;
- The desirability of affordable housing in the area;
- Stacking of traffic for school;
- Pedestrian access and interconnection to the area;
- Availability of public utilities;
- Stormwater, water quality, and drainage;
- Permitted uses under current and proposed zoning;
- Building height and location;
- Number and location of access points;
- Plan for area road widening and infrastructure;
- Area land use patterns;
- Future Land Use Map and current zoning;
- Other zoning cases in the area; and
- Rezoning process and likely timeline.

A complete list of questions asked during the meeting follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MV</th>
<th>Michael Vampren (Me)</th>
<th>EV</th>
<th>Eric's iPhone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Beth Trhos (Host)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FMoore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Alex Schroder</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Frank Thoburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>Allen Whitaker</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Galaxy S8+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Andre Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gisele Manole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Astor and Ned</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>H.C. Woody Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Barbara Efird</td>
<td>HF</td>
<td>Hunter Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>bconl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie Lunder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Bev Brown</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>Jeff S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Bill Provett</td>
<td></td>
<td>johh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Brian Carroll</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>John Reeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Charles Lanier</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>Josh Snotherly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>chrisbraga</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>Joshua Reinke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Cindy Forrester</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>Kathy and Gary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Colon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Klisures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Crystal Johnson</td>
<td>LW</td>
<td>Lana wray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dav1226@bellsouth.net">dav1226@bellsouth.net</a></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>David Freeman</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Loraine Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Elisabeth Schroder</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Marvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Eric's iPhone</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Matthew Crumlich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Crumlich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Johnson</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randal Rempfer</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger May</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Ottavio</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosanne</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planni...)</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>ZF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Conley</td>
<td>19193972495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shawnhumble</td>
<td>19194146809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steeplechase</td>
<td>19196012816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Schanz</td>
<td>19196129543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>19196161959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonebridge HOA</td>
<td>19198188967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy Allaire</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Stephens</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Derricksons</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

Hi, Sara Ellis from the City of Raleigh's Planning and Development Department here as a staff resource. Happy to help answer questions.

From Chrisbraga to Everyone:

Any plans/requirements for road widening or sidewalks along Baileywick, with these plans?

From Zach Feldman to Everyone:

Can you go through what the zoning designations mean?

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

How are you handling sewer?

From H.C. Woody Woodward to Everyone:

Good evening folks this is Woody Woodward with the Stonebridge HOA

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

How many apartments are you actually planning to build and would you agree to limit it to less than 300 units?

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

Hey Zach, I'd be happy to help answer that question. R-1 stands for Residential-1 and is a zoning district that only allows single family residential. Here is a link to a page in the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) that shows what types of buildings can be constructed in which zoning district.

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

Baileywick is a Sensitive Area Road.

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

Apologies, I didn't include the link: https://user-2081353526.cld.bz/UnifiedDevelopmentOrdinance/14/?zoom=2

From Wanda Bridgers to Everyone:

How does this effect the property across the street
From Wanda Bridgers to Everyone:

How does this effect the property across the street

From H.C. Woody Woodward to Everyone:

Let's make sure that no more Stormwater is sent under I-540 and Emerywood Drive which now floods.

From Gisele Manole to Everyone:

What are the plans for a traffic study for the Gut property?

From Tom W to Everyone:

Tom Welch The two schools are already at capacity. Would the developer spend the $$ to increase th school's capacity?

From Rosanne to Everyone:

When you say widen Baileywick WHAT exactly does that mean? Is it the entire length of Baileywick to Creedmoor???

From Andre Mann to Everyone:

There is a rezoning request for 225 apartments to be built at Six Forks and Strickland. Will this, along with your rezoning proposal trigger a traffic study given so many apartments being added to Six Forks within a few blocks?

From Bill Provett to Everyone:

The school causes a traffic problem now. What is the prognosis for the traffic with added entrances?

From Kathy and Gary to Everyone:

how is permitting to be accomplished, all city of Raleigh or state, county and city involved with permitting? especially with this in watershed - we've seen development in adjacent area increasing runoff

From Ron Ottavio to Everyone:

Where will the shared access road be onto Baileywick? Would you show us on the map.
From Ron Ottavio to Everyone:

Where will the shared access road be onto Baileywick? Would you show us on the map.

From Galaxy Note9 to Everyone:

Is a pedestrian pathway to YMCA in the plan?

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

You would require a pump station however.

From Tom W to Everyone:

Tom W. Sonebridge soccer field is already experiencing serious erosion from the creek flowing under the freeway, which was not an issue 40 years ago, before the development of the six forks/strictland corner. Can you divert the storm water into the city stormwater system?

From Wickus Martin to Everyone:

Is it possibly to find out the specific school use in mind for the Magellan area? If for instance the intent is to use it as a parking lot for school buses, that would significantly increase morning traffic and of course tarmac would reduce the impervious area.

From Kathy and Gary to Everyone:

all sewer and water connections are city of Raleigh and no tap in to line from pleasant union down six forks

From Ron Ottavio to Everyone:

Has a traffic study been conducted when school is in session?

From Kathy and Gary to Everyone:

that's a question

From Bev Brown to Everyone:

Hi Beth, are you at liberty to reveal yet who the developer is and when the rezoning applications will be filed?
Hi Beth, are you at liberty to reveal yet who the developer is and when the rezoning applications will be filed?

From Kathy and Gary to Everyone:

when would building on

Gut Property start

From Jamie Lunder to Everyone:

Will the city address the water infrastructure issue that is already present in this area? Watter pressure is already a known problem by the city of Raleigh in our neighborhood.

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

Will the comprehensive plan need to be amended as part of the process or does that need to happen first?

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

If this request is deemed inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), and the request is approved it automatically triggers an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

From Charles Lanier to Everyone:

Have any other R40 rezoning requests been approved in the watershed? If so, where?

From Wanda Bridgers to Everyone:

How will this effect property taxes

From Galaxy Note9 to Everyone:

Josh, glad to provide stats for Finley YMCA peak traffic activities.

From Kathy and Gary to Everyone:

is any of this 300 unit building part of American Rescue Plan for Community Development ($800 million with $575 million to lower income housing) that pays developers and gives large tax incentives
From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

Stoney Manor already experiences high speed cut through traffic. This would make that much worse. Would you agree to traffic calming as ap\\n
From Zach Feldman to Everyone:

Would the improvements to Baileywick Road be only in front of the new property or would it continue further down?

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

part of your plans?

From Jeff S to Everyone:

What about the impact of traffic on Baileywick Road? Baileywick already carries a significant amount of traffic, particularly during rush hours. Also, how about speed limits on Baileywick? Those of us that front Baileywick already face issues trying to access Baileywick.

From Owner to Everyone:

from John Bosch, Steeplechase: What are the provisions/plans for on-site recreation facilities (e.g. basketball courts)? Also, the lines of parent cars waiting to pick-up their children from school: how are these planned to be avoided in the site designs?

From H.C. Woody Woodward to Everyone:

Beth the Flooding occurs at the Emerywood Play Area not Emerywood Drive.

From Jeff S to Everyone:

300 units would add a significant amount of traffic - will a stop light be needed? If so, another light will be a definite problem.

From Carrie to Everyone:

That traffic light for wyndham is a danger waiting to happen. We would need a designated turn left light coming out of the subdivision. This also impacts Reedham Oaks because we will be forced to go to that light.
From Carrie to Everyone:

That traffic light for Wyndham is a danger waiting to happen. We would need a designated turn left light coming out of the subdivision. This also impacts Reedham Oaks because we will be forced to go to that light.

From Brian Carroll to Everyone:

Can you describe specifically where the new shared driveway would hook in to Baileywick?

From Curle to Everyone:

Where will the entrance be into the apartment units?

From Rosanne to Everyone:

So pretty much you're proposing adding 300-600 cars in our neighborhood that go through TWO school zones.

From Stonebridge HOA to Everyone:

can you please provide a copy of the presentation to all who request?

From Curle to Everyone:

What typically happens to housing values when an affordable housing apartment complex moves into an area?

From Alex Schroder to Everyone:

when will traffic study be completed?

From dav1226@bellsouth.net to Everyone:

Will the driveway alleviate school traffic from Hunter Road being used for a turnaround?

From Michael Stewart to Everyone:

Has the City ever rezoned Falls Lake watershed area from R-1 to R-10? Will this open the door to others?
From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

How are you planning to cross the existing buffered stream that cuts the Gut site in half?

From Shawnhumble to Everyone:

What if we as residents of the area just don't want 300 new apartments here? We generally like the wide open areas of North Raleigh and don't want to increase the density of the area. How can we stop the rezoning from happening?

From Rosanne to Everyone:

excelling question Shawn!

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

Houses along Baileywick Road have the right to know if their front yards are being taken away. You can't just say "some of it will have to be widen". We need specifics. Do you not know or just don't want to share? This is just too vague.

From Rosanne to Everyone:

agreed! DID NOT feel Beth answered my question

From Stonebridge HOA to Everyone:

Apologies if my terminology is off, but can you also please provide a copy of the environmental report/Phase 1 report?

From Tom W to Everyone:

Baileywick School is already at capacity. Has the School been consulted?

From Rosanne to Everyone:

I LIVE on Baileywick! I concur!

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

Beth needs to be more specific and less vague!!
From Heritage Point to Everyone:

Beth needs to be more specific and less vague!!

From David Freeman to Everyone:

I have been a Magellan parent for years, Steve Schanz is right on with his comments concerning traffic on Baileywick.

From Stonebridge HOA to Everyone:

Well said Professor Schanz

From Bill Provett to Everyone:

Steve,

From Stonebridge HOA to Everyone:

 Former student

From Bill Provett to Everyone:

I agree with you on all your points

From Rosanne to Everyone:

I do too!

From Ron Ottavio to Everyone:

Is the YMCA on this call? What are your interests given the proximity to the proposed apartments?

From Zach Feldman to Everyone:

Are you able to show on the drawings where the potential drive would be along Magellan property?

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

Cross access this traffic onto Baileywick Road is inappropriate as it will increase traffic congestion and safety issues for children. There are two school zones right there.
From Heritage Point to Everyone:

Cross access this traffic onto Baileywick Road is inappropriate as it will increase traffic congestion and safety issues for children. There are two school zones right there.

From Steve Schanz to Everyone:

When school is in session it is difficult to get out of our subdivision due to Magellan traffic using the Baileywick Park as a turnaround. Oftentimes we have to wait over 5 minutes to access Baileywick. Adding another egress to Baileywick Rd will only add to the congestion!

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

Sounds like a nightmare.

From Loraine Cooke to Everyone:

What is the timeframe for this development and who is the developer?

From Kathy and Gary to Everyone:

reason asking about sewer connections is because pleasant union to Raleigh sewer connection paid for by residents via assessment after hurricane Fran is not to be used by city/added to without additional assessment to developer

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

Do our comments and questions get shared with staff and City Council?

From Kathy and Gary to Everyone:

1.4 inches is way too low to design for

From David Freeman to Everyone:

Maybe Michael can answer why it already smells like a cesspool when you drive down Strickland Rd. in front of Harvest Plaza. History has proven that the local government, whether city or county, has gotten it very wrong when it comes to sewage control around here.

From Kathy and Gary to Everyone:

we've been having rainstorms that cause way more runoff than that
From Stonebridge HOA to Everyone:

who can we directly contact with the city/county about erosion control?

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

You can keep track of zoning cases that have been officially filed here:

Dale Hyatt, PE
Stormwater Administrator - Infrastructure Projects
919-996-4071, dale.hyatt@raleighnc.gov

He is the best contact from the City for erosion control.

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

She's right

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

More information on the City's drainage programs here:
https://raleighnc.gov/projects/content/PWksStormwater/Articles/DrainageAssistanceProg.html

From David Freeman to Everyone:

I doubt many have an issue with the property adjacent to Magellan. I believe MANY have a major issue with rezoning the piece you would like to put 300 apartments on. Why are these two parcels being presented together in one package?

From shawnhumble to Everyone:

Agree. The property adjacent to Magellan doesn't seem like an issue. It's the development of all these apartment units that is the problem.

From Jayne and George Rusincevitch to Everyone:

If Magellan School has no specific plan for the new property, what are the chances of that property being paved over and becoming a parking lot for buses and other vehicles? That would be very concerning.
From Steve Schanz to Everyone:

The Magellan property is an issue because of the traffic added to Baileywick, especially if you live off of Baileywick.

From Steve Serf to Everyone:

See above
2. No benefits for current residents.

From David Freeman to Everyone:

I have heard that Magellan was planning a baseball field. Maybe someone from the Board of Directors is on this call?

From Carrie to Everyone:

How do we find out what roads are owned by NCDOT or Raleigh.

From H.C. Woody Woodward to Everyone:

What about anything concerning Fire and EMS.

From Stonebridge HOA to Everyone:

agree with Woody. Fire/EMS considerations?

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

You can view which roads are maintained by the City of Raleigh and which roads are maintained by NCDOT here: https://ral.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=7f522ff4b033436b8b3fc2c7ef1f3f81

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

at least 10%

From Rosanne to Everyone:

To alleviate 300-600 cars on Baileywick, sounds like Baileywick will have to be widened! To what? two lanes each way? Nice added value to my property said no one ever...
From Steve Schanz to Everyone:

Ditto to what Rosanne said!

From Zach Feldman to Everyone:

What is the discount for affordable housing rent?

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

concur with Rosanne

From Rosanne to Everyone:

There's a different level of transiency for apartment living. Six months to 2 years. Different for homeowners that have been living in their homes for decades

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

When is this being submitted and when does it go to Planning Board and City Council?

From Steve Schanz to Everyone:

I ride my bike down Baileywick and pray while doing so. The added traffic will certainly affect the ability to safely ride down this street in the future.

From Rosanne to Everyone:

It's dangerous NOW!

So I agree

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

After the application is submitted, here is a flow chart that shows the process: https://cityofraleigh0drupal.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/drupal-prod/COR22/RezoningProcessFlowchart.pdf

From Wanda Bridgers to Everyone:

How will this effect the value of my property
From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

After the application is submitted, here is a flow chart that shows the process:
https://cityofraleigh0drupal.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/drupal-prod/COR22/RezoningProcessFlowchart.pdf

From Wanda Bridgers to Everyone:

How will this effect the value of my property

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

You didn’t answer Mr Lanier’s question. He didn’t ask what is R40W. He asked “Have any other R40 rezoning requests been approved in the watershed?”

I appreciate Michael Vampran’s willingness to do his homework before the next meeting.
From Michael Stewart to Everyone:

Has the City rezoned any other tracts from R-1 to R-10 in the watershed?

From Steve Schanz to Everyone:

Seems like this project is quite disruptive to and negatively affects our watershed, traffic, sewer, etc.

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

Here is a map to the City's rezoning case viewer: https://raleighnc.gov/SupportPages/zoning-cases. This goes back to 2019.

From Loraine Cooke to Everyone:

Why are these requests combined?

From Peter to Everyone:

How many people live at the "Y"?

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

In R40W you can build a single family house, a church or a school. No need to rezone for schools....

From Sara Ellis (City of Raleigh Planning) to Everyone:

Here is a link to the page showing all rezoning cases dating back to 2000, and the approval or denial status: https://raleighnc.gov/business/content/PlanDev/Articles/Zoning/FinalizedRezoningCases.html
From Heritage Point to Everyone:

Use them as zoned.

From SAS to Everyone:

Your proposal referring to the Baileywick access as being "secondary" and Six Forks access being "primary" is vague. What will make one primary and the other secondary. It seems to me that the users will determine primary vs secondary. Will there be controls in place to limit traffic use of secondary access.

From Steeplechase to Everyone:

I personally have had eminent domain used to take our property...in Raleigh...on sandy forks. I was also taxed on that so your comment is not exactly on point with that Micheal

From Carrie to Everyone:

No it should be Strickland

From Heritage Point HOA to Everyone:

No one is in favor of dumping 100's of car/trips per day on Baileywick Road. 300 apartments means lots of those residents are going to use the 'back way' to cut thru down to Creedmoor at the difficult intersection by 540. A horrible idea to create that back entrance to the apartment complex.

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

I concur with Heritage Point HOA

From Steve Schanz to Everyone:

Amen!
From Irritated that someone is trying to deval... to Everyone: 07:32 PM

Good! TELL THE STAFF WE'RE NOT INTERESTED IN wrecking havoc in our own neighborhood!

From Heritage Point to Everyone: 07:32 PM

David is correct

From Carrie to Everyone: 07:34 PM

Wouldn't money be better spent on Mass transportation to land that is further out and cost of living would be less and more land and preserving the watershed

From Steve Senf to Everyone: 07:35 PM

We do nit need this. Traffic and noise on 540 is terrible.

From Rick to Everyone: 07:36 PM

Very concerned about Stoney Manor residents trying to turn left out of the neighborhood onto Baileywick Rd. after pouring 300 apartment residents onto Baileywick Road. 300 apartments could have multiple people driving cars.

From Irritated that someone is trying to deval... to Everyone: 07:38 PM

I concur Rick, so estimate is between 300-600 cars piling onto Baileywick

From H.C. Woody Woodward to Everyone: 07:38 PM

Gary I am in touch Beth>
From Heritage Point to Everyone:

Will an increase in sediment and hydrocarbon pollutants from the impervious surfaces affect the quality of Falls Lake drinking water?

From Wanda Bridgers to Everyone:

no residents live at this Y is correct

From Galaxy Note9 to Everyone:

correct the Y has no residential units at then Finley Y (or any Triangle Y)

From dav1226@bellsouth.net to Everyone:

How do we oppose this rezoning?

From SAS to Everyone:

Is it possible to have access from Gut land through Duke property onto Lead Mine? This would replace the Baileywick access.

From Irritated that someone is trying to deval... to Everyone:

Attend every meeting? Perhaps involve all the residents?

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

best efforts...another vague answer

From Curle to Everyone:

Definitely don't want a 300 apartment unit!
From Steeplechase to Everyone:

Please increase the notification letters in terms of distance. I am in steeplechase and those in my own neighborhood were not notified, and this would affect them no less than me

From Christine Havericak to Everyone:

@dav1226 I have the same question
From irritated that someone is trying to devalue my home to Everyone:

ME TOO!

Oh brother!

From Wickus Martin to Everyone:

Does the traffic impact analysis only include the expected residential traffic or also delivery traffic. Lots of Amazon, FedEx, UPS, etc trucks running around.

From Heritage Point to Everyone:

build as zoned

From Steeplechase to Everyone:

Please remind us what current zoning on the Gut property would allow in terms of housing? Thanks

From Wickus Martin to Everyone:

I'm surprised that there isn't a restriction on the rate at which density is allowed to increase in an established area such as ours.

so that the impact can be truly felt/understood after each increment of density

From Terry Stephens to Everyone:

r-1 means 30 units max

From Steeplechase to Everyone:

Thanks Terry
May 27, 2021

Dear Sir or Madam:

You are invited to attend a virtual neighborhood meeting on Wednesday, June 9, 2021 from 6 pm to 8 pm. This meeting will be held virtually with access online or by telephone. Depending upon attendance, the programmed portion of the meeting is likely to end between 6:30 and 7:00. The additional time is intended to accommodate technical issues. We would appreciate your patience if technical issues do occur. Once the programmed portion of the meeting has been completed, the line may be silent but the virtual meeting will remain open until 8 p.m. We are happy to answer any questions or provide a summary of the presentation during that time, as needed.

You can access the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone as follows:

Visit:  
https://zoom.us/join  
Enter the following meeting ID: 669 880 4418  
Enter the following password: 738062

Alternatively, you can participate by telephone:

Dial:  
1 301 715 8592  
Enter the following meeting ID: 669 880 4418#  
Enter the Participant ID: #  
Enter the following password: 738062#

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the zoning of three properties located in close proximity to one another, and to solicit your comments and feedback. The zoning cases will likely be filed as two separate zoning petitions with the properties divided as set out below.

1. 9304 and 9316 Baileywick Road. This property totals 11.65± acres and is currently zoned Wake County R-40W. It is proposed to be annexed into the City of Raleigh and zoned R-1 Conditional Use District with Special Highway Overlay District-1 ("SHOD-1") and the Falls Watershed Protection Overlay District ("FWPOD"). These properties are identified by the number "1" on the enclosures described below.
2. **I-540/Six Forks Road Property.** This property is 29.66± acres and is currently zoned R-1 with SHOD-1 and FWPOD. This property is located within Raleigh's corporate limits. It is proposed to be zoned R-10 Conditional Use District with SHOD-1 and FWPOD. This property is identified by the number "2" on the enclosures described below.

For your reference, please find attached zoning and aerial maps of the properties plus relevant portions of the draft zoning applications.

The City of Raleigh requires that prior to the submittal of any rezoning application an invitation to a neighborhood meeting be sent to all property owners and tenants within 500 feet of the area requested for rezoning. This notice has been mailed to property owners and tenants within 1,000 feet of the three properties requested for zoning and any landowner or tenant who is interested in the learning about the proposals is invited to attend.

For more information about rezoning, you may visit [www.raleighnc.gov](http://www.raleighnc.gov) and search for "Rezoning Process." If you have further questions about the rezoning process, please contact Carmen Kuan in the Raleigh Planning and Development at: 919.996.2235 or by email at: Carmen.Kuan@raleighnc.gov

Please join us to discuss the proposal in more detail on Wednesday, June 9, 2021 from 6-8 p.m. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me with questions at 919.329.3884 or at beth.rahos@nelsonmullins.com Thank you in advance for your time.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Elizabeth C. Trahos
# Rezoning Application and Checklist

Planning and Development Customer Service Center • One Exchange Plaza, Suite 400 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2500

Please complete all sections of the form and upload via the Permit and Development Portal (permitportal.raleighnc.gov). Please see page 11 for information about who may submit a rezoning application. A rezoning application will not be considered complete until all required submittal components listed on the Rezoning Checklist have been received and approved. For questions email rezoning@raleighnc.gov.

## Rezoning Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rezoning Type</th>
<th>General use</th>
<th>Conditional use</th>
<th>Master plan</th>
<th>Text change to zoning conditions</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY Rezoning case #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing zoning base district: R-40W</td>
<td>Height:</td>
<td>Frontage:</td>
<td>Overlay(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed zoning base district: R-1</td>
<td>Height:</td>
<td>Frontage:</td>
<td>Overlay(s): SHOD-I and FWPOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Helpful Tip:** View the Zoning Map to search for the address to be rezoned, then turn on the 'Zoning' and 'Overlay' layers.

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

## General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date amended (1):</th>
<th>Date amended (2):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property address: 9316 and 9304 Baileywick Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property PIN: 1708 06 5666 and 1708 06 5017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed reference (book/page): 17943, 1483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest intersection: Baileywick and Hunter Roads</td>
<td>Property size (acres): 11.65± acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For planned development applications only: Total units:</td>
<td>Total square footage:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parcels:</td>
<td>Total buildings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner name and address: Magellan Education Foundation, Inc. c/o Mallory Underwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner email: <a href="mailto:mallory@metroproductions.com">mallory@metroproductions.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner phone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant name and address: Beth Trahos, Nelson Mullins, 4140 Parklake Avenue, Suite 200, Raleigh, NC 27612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant email: <a href="mailto:beth.trahos@nelsonmullins.com">beth.trahos@nelsonmullins.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant phone: 919-329-3884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant signature(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional email(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Conditional Use District Zoning Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning case #:</th>
<th>Date submitted:</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing zoning: R-40 W</td>
<td>Proposed zoning: R-1 with SHOD-1 and FWPOD</td>
<td>Rezoning case #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

1. Uses shall be limited to School, public or private (K-12), together with accessory and ancillary uses in support of a school such as recreational fields, playgrounds, amenities, and other uses typically associated with schools.

2. A minimum fifteen foot (15') wide landscape buffer shall be provided on the subject property along the common boundaries with property known by Wake County PIN 1708 06 8022 and further described in Wake County Estate File 14-E-3934.

3. The property shall be subject to the use of Green Stormwater Infrastructure ("GSI") requirements set out in Section 9.5.2.C.3 of the UDO whatever the percentage of built area.

4. The post-development stormwater discharge peak flow rate shall not exceed pre-development peak flow rates for the 1, 2,10, 25 and 50-year storms at the upstream headwall of any culvert under 540.

5. Access to the subject property shall be provided via an offer of cross-access with the existing Magellan School site (Wake County PIN 1708 06 5666; Deed Book 17943, Page 1483, Wake County Registry) and one (1) additional driveway access onto Baileywick Road (the "New Driveway"), subject to the approval of the Raleigh Department of Transportation and the North Carolina Department of Transportation. The New Driveway shall be designed to provide cross-access to the adjacent property to the east known by Wake County PIN 1708 16 6669 further described in Book 15075, Page 1062. These points of interconnection shall fulfill the cross-access requirements of Section 8.3.4.C of the UDO, and no additional street stubs shall be required.

6. The provisions of Section 8.3.2 of the UDO, which is entitled "Blocks", shall be modified to ___ linear feet given the unique site constraints including the existence of I-540 and the city's desire to limit impervious surface in this area.

The property owner(s) hereby offers, consents to, and agrees to abide, if the rezoning request is approved, the conditions written above. All property owners must sign each condition page. This page may be photocopied if additional space is needed.

Property Owner(s) Signature: ____________________________

Printed Name: ____________________________
Rezoning Application and Checklist
Planning and Development Customer Service Center • One Exchange Plaza, Suite 400 | Raleigh, NC 27601 | 919-996-2600

Please complete all sections of the form and upload via the Permit and Development Portal (permitportal.raleighnc.gov). Please see page 11 for information about who may submit a rezoning application. A rezoning application will not be considered complete until all required submittal components listed on the Rezoning Checklist have been received and approved. For questions email rezoning@raleighnc.gov.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rezoning Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing zoning base district: R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed zoning base district: R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELPFUL TIP: View the Zoning Map to search for the address to be rezoned, then turn on the 'Zoning' and 'Overlay' layers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the property has been previously rezoned, provide the rezoning case number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning case #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay(s): SHOD-1 and FWPOD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property address: 0 Six Forks Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property PIN: 1708 16 6669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed reference (book/page): Book 15075, Page 1062, Wake County Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest intersection: Six Forks and 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For planned development applications only:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parcels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner name and address: Gut 2012 Irrevocable Trust c/o Steven Gut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner email: <a href="mailto:scut@idealfastener.com">scut@idealfastener.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owner phone: 1.786.485.9500 ext.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant name and address: Beth Trahos, Nelson Mullins, 4140 Parklake Avenue, Suite 200, Raleigh, NC 27612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant email: <a href="mailto:beth.trahos@nelsonmullins.com">beth.trahos@nelsonmullins.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant phone: 919.329.3884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant signature(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional email(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Conditional Use District Zoning Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning case #:</th>
<th>Date submitted:</th>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing zoning: R-40W</td>
<td>Proposed zoning: R-10</td>
<td>Rezoning case #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Narrative of Zoning Conditions Offered

1. No more than 300 dwelling units shall be permitted on the subject property.

2. The property owner shall dedicate at least 10% of the total dwelling units as affordable for households earning 80% of the area median income or less for a period of not less than 15 years from the date of issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the first unit on the subject property. An Affordable Housing Deed Restriction in a form approved by the City shall be filed and recorded in property’s chain of title by the property owner in Wake County Register of Deeds prior to the project receiving a certificate of occupancy. The rent and income limits for the Affordable Units will follow the affordable standards as determined annually by the City of Raleigh Housing & Neighborhoods Department. Affordable units offered within this condition shall be constructed concurrently with the project's market rate units. The property owner shall certify to the City of Raleigh compliance with this zoning condition on an annual basis.

3. The property shall be subject to the use of Green Stormwater Infrastructure ("GSI") requirements set out in Section 9.5.2.C.3 of the UDO whatever the percentage of built area.

4. The post-development stormwater discharge peak flow rate shall not exceed pre-development peak flow rates for the 1, 2, 10, 25 and 50-year storms at the upstream headwall of any culvert under 540.

6. The provisions of Section 8.3.2 of the UDO, which is entitled "Blocks", shall be modified to ___ linear feet given the unique site constraints including the existence of I-540 and the city's desire to limit impervious surface in this area.

7. Access to the subject property shall be from the existing driveway onto Six Forks Road and from a stub and an offer of cross access to the property to the west (1708 06 5666; Deed Book 17943, Page 1483), subject to the approval of the Raleigh Department of Transportation and the North Carolina Department of Transportation. This point of interconnection shall fulfill the cross-access requirements of Section 8.3.4.C of the UDO, and no additional street stubs shall be required.

The property owner(s) hereby offers, consents to, and agrees to abide, if the rezoning request is approved, the conditions written above. All property owners must sign each condition page. This page may be photocopied if additional space is needed.

Property Owner(s) Signature: ____________________________

Printed Name: ____________________________
Attestation Statement

I, the undersigned, do hereby attest that the electronic verification document submitted herewith accurately reflects notification letters, enclosures, envelopes and mailing list for mailing the neighborhood meeting notification letters as required by Chapter 10 of the City of Raleigh UDO, and I do hereby further attest that that I did in fact deposit all of the required neighborhood meeting notification letters with the US. Postal Service on the ___27th___, day of ___May___, 2021. I do hereby attest that this information is true, accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and I understand that any falsification, omission, or concealment of material fact may be a violation of the UDO subjecting me to administrative, civil, and/or, criminal liability, including, but not limited to, invalidation of the application to which such required neighborhood meeting relates.

____________________________  5/27/2021
Signature of Applicant/Applicant Representative  Date