

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Affordable Housing

- Senior housing and parking requirements (too much required)
- Affordable Housing Task Force recommends incentives vs mandatory (incentives may include reduced fees, increased density)
- Disperse subsidized housing
- No affordable housing component in the 2000-acre Wakefield development
- Fast-tracking the process (group preliminary, construction drawings, final); currently a linear process (one person holds up the process); new issues arise on the 2nd or 3rd submittal
- Comp Plan faithfully incorporated AHTF recommendations
- Need a definition/clarification of “Affordable Housing”
- Increase facility fees/capacity fees and then reduce in exchange for AH component
- Eliminate 10-acre minimum for residential development in Thoroughfare District
- Expand opportunities for utility apartments/granny flats/garage apartments
- Building height measurement needs clarified
- Importance on Administrative Approval w/ no public hearing
- Supportive housing Residence Regulations appear to be working well

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Board of Adjustment, Historic Districts Commission, Appearance commission,

Board of Adjustment

- Side yard setbacks: Existing nonconformities that require a variance to legalize existing violation prior to proposed expansion which meets setback requirement. Legalize existing setback encroachments. Allow some discretion as to when a variance is needed (no more 1" variances). Would prefer method short of BOA review for minor variances (6" or less)
- More objectivity of SUP standards
- Front yard parking is an issue
- Clarify that process approvals can not come before both the BOA and the PC. Need more clarity on what the Board of Adjustment can hear and when in the process; avoid overlapping reviews

Appearance Commission

- Structured parking, efficient use of land. The code has created some building trends that are not necessarily satisfactory (i.e. structured parking)
- There is a disconnect between streetscape requirements and desired appearance with big box retailers and surface parking
-
- Parking on floors 2 through 8
- Competing objectives (tree-lined thoroughfares vs. visible retail)
- Public Open Space – No definition. Open space needs to be defined uniformly throughout the code. We need a master plan for open space that allows flexibility and has a pattern that enhances human development
- Ugly apartment attachments; tear downs
- Let's not prevent the very good just to avoid the very bad
- The appearance commission has no tools for evaluating the building envelope, but parking lots are made to engineered precision
- There are material quality issues (Morrisville does not allow EIFS)
- Do not discourage "good" design

Historic District Commission

- Historic viewscales
- Weave historic preservation into the code

- Include proactive courtesy reviews of projects in National Register districts
- There is a conflict between the housing code and the preservation demolition by neglect ordinance
- The Certificate of Appropriateness process does not have an economic hardship provision
- Consider a mid-step historic overlay district
- There are gaps between adjacent HODs
- If a neighborhood has enough character to be listed in the National Register, then perhaps there can be an automatic NCOD
- In the commercial area there is a potential conflict with the 10% height. The RHDC would like that to only apply to residential neighborhoods
- National register districts coming down the pike are mid-century and on larger lots. In neighborhoods with ranch houses it is very easy to add on anything – no matter how awful
- Teardowns are a problem because there is a mismatch between the housing of the 20s and 30s and the zoning code; people buy multiple lots, combine and re-build.
- Perhaps have a similar demo delay in NR districts
- Require a plan for construction prior to issuing demo permit
- Slave sites
- No new districts since 1984 (staff retrenchment)
- Upzonings in an HOD could result in tear-downs
- Ghost lot lines allowing inappropriately-sized lots via recombinations
- Contextual infill guidelines are needed – not just for height and pitch
- The current NCOD is insufficient because the neighborhood and pick and choose what characteristics to survey

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Business Groups

- Downtown Raleigh Alliance (DRA) – Signage for multi-tenants, process and regulations, DRA's Retail Analysis (send to consultants), DRA's Business Improvement District Map (send to consultants)
- Additional reviews/delays add costs to the project
- TIAs and Tree Conservation add cost
- The need to hire lawyers to negotiate process adds cost
- Unpredictability (process) adds cost
- Research Triangle Park (RTP) will continue to be main economic engine for employment & traffic generating; although Downtown Raleigh & other corridors need to compete w/ RTP for jobs
- Mixed-Use (required) is not appropriate throughout the entirety of the City
- Raleigh is “raise-a-family” friendly and people move here to enjoy a suburban lifestyle
- Things are the way they are for a reason – if we don't provide the housing / shopping desired by suburbia, a surrounding jurisdiction will
- Current code has served the City well, albeit cumbersome
- The thinking to raise impact fees to induce incentives (impact fee credit) for new urbanism development is flawed
- No flexibility within Sign Ordinance for Shopping Centers
- Current PDD is cost intensive with potential for denial (detailed drawings required during the rezoning process)
- “Tax everything or subsidize” – got to be tempered – can't codify all

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Developers, Builders. **Realtors**

- Incentive basis (expedited review, fee reductions)
- Best practices in Downtown Development (more restrictive than 10 years ago; parking, open space, tree conservation)
- Process not very transparent
- Parking issues (too much required)
- Sign Ordinance (more flexibility) – Projecting signs in Downtown
- Tree conservation (alternate methods of compliance)
- Lack of Mixed-Use districts options
- Major shift of development model
- Education process from the neighborhoods to alleviate fears of change
- Tree Conservation Ordinance – requires trees to be saved along thoroughfares instead of in the rear adjacent to residential (buffer)
- Site Plan approval process needs revamped.

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Development Services Advisory Council (DSAC)

- Accountability of staff (getting a question answered in a timely fashion)
- Code interpretations in a timely fashion. A prescriptive, black-and-white code could allow for simple staff reviews to happen more frequently than the code now allows for. However, if the developer wants flexibility in the application of the regulations, then it may cost more, take longer, and require a public review.
- Predictability of the process (time). Flexibility and predictability are sometimes at conflict.
- Administrative discretion is a double-edged sword. How far could/should it go? It might result in staff corruption.
- The code cannot anticipate everything so professional judgment should play a role.
- Urban design is more subjective than perhaps an engineering concern because it isn't easily quantifiable.
- The code must encourage sustainability and might include performance standards.

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Environmental

- Allow community gardens within residential districts, promote urban agriculture
- Too auto-oriented (not bikable/walkable)
- Too much stormwater run-off
- Landscaping should enhance urban wildlife
- Only allow development where the infrastructure is located
- Connect Development Nodes with better transit
- Revise parking standards – too much required parking
- Reduce impervious surfaces
- Need to include incentives for incentives to do environmentally–friendly development
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Low impact developments
- Habitat conservation
- Invasive species control
- Visit Wetlands Education Center
- Greenways need protection from erosion
- No parking on grass
- Forestry management is needed
- Promote urban conservation
- Promote use of BMPs fro everyone – not just developers
- Encourage working with the Soil and Water Conservation Service
- Environmental education
- Floodplain preservation
- Incentives for LEED
- Encourage “what we do want”
- Make the intent clear

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Information Technology, Public Affairs

- No attendees

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Land Use Attorneys

- Site Plan Standards #2 – “consistent with the Comprehensive Plan”. No site plan can be approved unless it is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, if there is a conflict, the more stringent shall apply is an issue. As stated CP overrides regulatory provisions.
- Districts do not match up with CP goals/policies. Questioned whether code will trump CP (consultant responded yes)
- Mixed-use Projects (vertical) have been process cumbersome. The mixed-use concept is hindered by parking requirements, and only one use on a property
- Neighborhoods will continue to be threatened by M-U mid-rises. (What kind of community tolerance will there be for developers being allowed to have some by-right development?) “People are afraid of change”. Resistance from neighborhoods – concerns about parking on streets; more traffic in neighborhood
- Use of Conditional Use District zoning assumes that code is not strong enough
- Citizens reluctance to higher density. We need zoning districts that allow for the densities recommended by the 2030 Plan
- Can not implement CP recommendation unless more administratively-approved projects (too political otherwise)
- Tall buildings and setbacks are an issue, will buildings closer to the street be acceptable to Raleigh citizens
- More appropriate transitions need to be made between development, the location of services, building design (height, bulk), lighting, parking, etc. need to be addressed, not just landscaping
- Framing of the conversation for what is allowable/ appropriate development
- Get rid of the public process for non-residential development within 400 feet of residential
- Increased political process came about because of cumulative type zoning districts; rather than downzoning - adopted CP policies that did not allow something
- Consultant questioned whether allowing by-right uses after a more detailed planning study was done for a specific area (example – TODs) and a tool kit was built that included form based standards for area and then translated into code would be an acceptable process. There was not a lot of feedback on this – concept seemed to need more explanation, detail, examples.

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Land Planners, Architects, Engineers, Surveyors

- Current criteria for Admin Approval vs. PC/CC is good (the public hearing threshold)
- Cross-referencing is good
- Alternative means of compliance (landscape ordinance) and staff's understanding of intent is working well
- Group Housing Regs. need overhauling – Too suburban
- Parking Regs. need new look – more flexibility
- Parking in Downtown should be viewed differently – more flexibility
- Tree Conservation Areas (per Ordinance) need to be reconsidered, especially in urban areas
- Urban Design Guidelines conflict with Transitional Protective Yards/TCA
- Landscape Ordinance is too suburban oriented
- Trees within NCDOT-controlled roads
- Fire Department's dictate for wider private streets internal to development
- Requirement for all buildings to be addressed, which requires parking lots to be classified as private streets, which unnecessarily results in greater standards
- Height, setbacks, FAR need to be more flexible for urban development (too suburban)
- Need for consistent interpretations throughout Code. Code has a lot of gray area.
- Different personnel review preliminary plans and final plans, resulting in different interpretations
- Change-of-use can unnecessarily require formal site plan review
- Smaller-lot subdivision regulations
- NC State regulations conflict with good urban development
- Need for "bundling" of construction drawing/final site plan reviews
- Conflicts between "site distance" and "landscape ordinance"
- Tree Conservation / Landscape Ordinance within urban areas results in high cost with little benefit
- City-wide Rezoning (City-initiated) to be consistent with CP's Future Land Use Map
- City needs to clearly define areas that need to be urbanized (welcome redevelopment) and define those areas that the City does not want to change
- Need to recognize that National Register Historic Districts are important assets to be protected
- Retail "Alternate Method of Compliance" for landscape regulations
- Current maximum height allowances can not support urban setting

- Minimum 30-foot setback requirement in order to allow a ground sign conflicts with a desire to move buildings closer to the street
- Unity of Development Regulations have not resulted in good design
- Need for “Granny-flats” and Garage Apartments”
- Need more small parks
- Property owners prefer flexible zoning districts
- The PDD allows for retention of future value of land
- There don’t seem to be too many public hearings and only about 25% are contentious
- Problems between thoroughfares and trees
- Perhaps the city could incentivize use of “green” elements
- Conflict between sight distance and tree ordinance
- The stormwater requirement when going from a surface lot to a building makes no sense
- The city should rezone – not individual property owners
- The requirement of open space on tall buildings is odd
- Perhaps there could be a fund to pay into for open space
- There are 25 national register historic districts but only 5 are protected
- How will the new ordinance treat NR districts> lone size does not fit all
- The ordinance currently does not recognize national register properties
- Some people in NR districts are ready for local ordinances
- Conflict between parking required for restaurants v. drive-throughs
- Definitions could be better

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Planning, Inspections, Community Development

- Transitional Protective Yard (Buffer Yard) requirements within Downtown/ Urban setting are problematic
- Townhouse Parking not required to be shared, resulting in deficiencies at peak times
- Duplex dwellings only require 1 parking space/unit
- Code does not address good urban form (setbacks, landscaping) and pedestrian connectivity
- Current Zoning Map does not match good urban design within 2030 CP designated growth centers. Should pursue city-initiated rezonings to implement Comp Plan
- Site plan Standard #2 creates conflicts between Code & CP (gives legal status to CP w/ over 700 policies)
- Is the 1500 foot public street connectivity standard adequate? Should investigate the Virginia model – non-connected subdivision do not get benefit of city maintenance
- Connectivity in legacy shopping centers could be challenging
- Open Space vs Density conflicts (How to achieve both?)
- Better pedestrian/bicycle connectivity within residential neighborhoods
- Lack of flexibility of Landscape Ord./Tree Conservation Ord.
- Enabling legislation for tree conservation is flawed
- Lack of flexibility in tree ordinance is problematic – tree save areas are always in the front, regardless of condition
- Site-by-site drainage mitigation in downtown may be cost-prohibitive
- New code should allow public alleys
- Conditional use zoning (conditions should be limited to zoning/subdivision subject matters). Conditional use zoning is difficult to enforce and interpret
- Process should be divorced from the Code. Too much process information is contained in the current code
- Code lacks design flexibility to achieve a better result. There is a lack of design standards in the current code – especially related to design materials. The current code is too objective – need more flexibility to be creative
- Infill subdivisions problematic. Infill subdivisions should be revised
- Plot plans / Site plans are out of balance in regard to rational nexus for required public improvements. More thought should be given to administrative/public hearing review threshold. Need to better define what is a site plan vs. what is a plot plan.
- Need to establish parking maximums. Can the location or parking and maximum percent of impervious surface be explored?

- Bad use of retaining walls, unnecessary cut & fill. The cut/fill allowance seems excessive – there is no thought given to topography preservation. Buildings can serve as a retaining wall
- Create incentives for good design in order for administrative approval purposes (meeting only minimum standards should then require PC/CC approval). There should be incentives for different review processes (administrative vs. public hearing)
- The only “one projecting sign per premise” needs to be amended
- Need for adequate facilities ordinance
- The Thoroughfare zoning district is too ‘open’
- Consolidate uses within Table of Permitted Uses. It would be nice to have allowed uses grouped in the new code, as opposed to a long list
- Minimum size area / # of lots necessary to submit a rezoning case
- Currently, no open space required for a standard subdivision. Explore the possibility of open space dedication or fee-in-lieu for residential subdivisions
- Measurement of “building height” confusing. Building height limitations should be explored – how height is measured, average grade should be examined
- The current code contains obstacles to good development (open space, tree conservation and parking)
- Would like the new code to explore inclusionary zoning
- Can floor area ratios be more predictable and part of the new code?
- The subdivision regulations should have design standards – clear directives, not policies

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Public Utilities, Public Works, Solid Waste

- Code cross-references are too numerous
- Competing interests in the Code (tree conservations vs urban-scale development)
- Curb & Gutter vs Ribbon pavement, Stabilized shoulder and ditch section
- R-O-W dedications vs dedications
- Utilities vs. Tree Conservation Areas
- Need ability to cluster cottage homes
- Solid Waste Regulations should be put in the Code
- Over time, Homeowner Associations can not afford maintenance of private streets

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Raleigh Citizen Advisory Council

- Transitions between uses (architecture)
- Guidelines for open space, urban design
- How uses and density interface
- Walkability
- Existing affordable housing needs to stay affordable
- Blindly looking at one project at a time; need to review the collective impact of numerous projects
- Traffic generation
- Existing zoning is inconsistent (more intense) than built environment
- Existing site plan process is a struggle
- The timing of neighborhood input occurs too late in the process
- Public Notification (area should be increased)
- Valid Statutory Protest Petition (area needs to be increased)
- The length of the review process (public hearing, numerous committee meetings, commission meetings) is hardship on neighbors; advantage to the professionals in charge of getting the plan/rezoning approved
- Enforcement of zoning conditions – compliance with zoning/site plan conditions missed during the construction process
- Land Banking of zoning – if rezoned and not developed within a designated time period should revert back to previous zoning
- Loss of open space

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Raleigh Transit Authority, Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission

- Current Code makes vertical Mixed-Use a challenge. We need to take a stronger look at how to make it happen.
- We need to connect areas better. Some components don't lead anywhere—sidewalks that dead end, lack of in-street bike lanes; our transit system is hub and spoke, but those aren't the routes many people need.
- Safe bicycle connectivity. Roads with high-speed traffic and narrow lanes are not suitable for bike travel.
- Cyclists need more than travel lanes—they also have to have a place to park.
- We need to look at transit stops, and make sure there is adequate pedestrian infrastructure associated with them; developers should be required to provide bike/ pedestrian/ transit connections.
- NCDOT appears to be pushing the Complete Streets approach, and bike lanes are an important component of that. We need to include bike lanes in upcoming rounds of resurfacing.
- Wide streets can narrow at intersections, creating safety issues.
- Transit “hub & spoke” formula does not work. The greenways help me bike to work—taking a bus would take me 1 ½ hours due to connect the hub and spoke route system.
- Bicycle “side path” not the answer
- Need for bicycle storage facilities (short term / long term). Bike facilities should be designed for security...more than a tree, but less than a garage.
- Include bike parking at all transit hubs.
- Transit stops and pedestrian infrastructure needs to support each other
- Bicycle/pedestrian connectors (if not auto) between cul-de-sacs
- Bus lanes / crosswalks / bicycle parking
- All-weather bicycle parking
- Special consideration should be given to bike wayfinding signage, especially where greenways intersect with streets
- Safe bicycle signage. On greenways, we need to consider bike/ pedestrian interaction—develop etiquette signage for safety...plus provide wider greenway paths.
- Sidewalk connectivity
- Sidewalks on both sides of commercial streets and thoroughfares
- Level of service improvements required for bus stops
- Sidewalks: we need to do a better job of creating a welcoming pedestrian environment. Too often they are being installed right next to high-traffic roads, and away from buildings

- There are a lot of bus stops where there is no sidewalk; riders might have wait in standing water or a ditch.
- We need bus shelters at stops.
- The City would like to see multiple hub-type connections, especially at major intersections. Cross-town connections are challenging.
- Transit planning is currently based on a 5-year horizon; we want to go to 15-year; that'd include possible rail connections.
- We should also consider the environmental impacts of the impervious surfaces created by new bikeways and sidewalks.
- Codify the interconnectivity of natural areas.
- Four-foot wide sidewalks are too narrow; the minimum should be five feet.
- Include Park and Rides in transit planning, utilizing existing parking areas.
- Specifically plan bike lanes to be suitable for young bicyclists.

STAKEHOLDER NOTES: Schools, Hospitals, Government

- Campuses – most issues because single parcel vs. parcel out the buildings
- Impact on fragile neighborhoods
- To build 2 new buildings at Meredith required entire campus Site Plan. Site plan- single huge parcel- have to show ALL details of whole site, even for small project. A lot of unknowns in site plan process
- Campuses signage have to use business model
- Campuses should have an overlay district or new zoning district
- Parking at campuses should have lower requirements – most don't have cars
- Stadium issues need to be addressed
- No. Ral. Christian Academy expansion issues with existing stadium, had to get special use permit after the fact
- Want equity of private vs. public schools
- Transition yards unrealistic – made to preserve dying trees w/retaining wall
- Required parking for stadiums too high – most walk from campus buildings
- Campuses – bad densities, bad behaviors effect neighborhoods
- Student housing – what is it – how to manage it
- Institutions in residential districts get re-thought
- Development process needs to go more smoothly
- Building heights; Campus density; Lighting; Stormwater; Safety and security; Transition yards
- Shaw- public access issue
- Peace College signage outside and inside campus
- Dormitory Parking- treated like a standalone apartment building, but campus has lower demand
- How to work with campus master plans- don't always share them with city
- Neighbor issues- edges
- Building Green is harder than regular
- Stadium needs \$25k stadium permit, but wasn't told in site plan review
- Public schools don't have to get the permit- unfair
- Trees- need flexibility when neighbors don't want the buffer. Regulations need common sense - They don't save the best trees
- Parking for stadium- didn't feel like they needed it- students already on campus. Need way to prove reduced demand and get an exception
- Neighbors should consider a residential parking permit system