**AGENDA**

- Welcome
- Approval of Minutes
- Announcements
- City of Raleigh Staff Reports
  - Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Report
  - Raleigh Police Department Report: Officer Upchurch
  - Housing and Neighborhoods Dept. – Code Enforcement Report: Blade Perdue
- Latta House Park Master Plan presentation
- ADU overlay district discussion with Travis Crane and Mark Holland - City of Raleigh
- Courtesy presentation on rezoning case Z-31-18: one lot at 910 Marilyn (Glenwood CAC) that abuts 910 Ridge Rd.
- Final presentation and vote on the change of bylaws (revised)
- Logo contest for Facebook and new signs
Hillsborough Wade CAC meeting
September 25, 2108
Minutes taken by Candace Haigler. An informational addendum prepared by Bob Geary and Candace Haigler
Meeting called to order by Chair Donna Bailey
The Minutes of the last meeting were unanimously approved after a motion to approve and a second.

Announcements
The merger of our two CACs has been approved by the City Council.
Voter registration forms are available in the back of the room.
Flyers were passed out by a Wake-up Wake County representative about candidate forums (in association with the League of Women Voters) and about a housing survey.
City Councilors Russ Stephenson, Kaye Crowder, and a representative for Steff Mendel were in attendance.

City Staff Reports
Police, Officer Upchurch: For our entire area, a total of 795 calls were reported last month. This is a relatively low number for an area of our size. There were domestic incidents; suspicious people; parking violations; driving while intoxicated; hit and run; false alarms; vehicle break-ins; and two residential break-ins.
Do not put your valuable jewelry in a jewelry box—creatively hide it in your home.
Interestingly, there were no calls about parties.
There were numerous 911 hang up calls—if you misdial 911, always answer the call back; otherwise emergency responders will be sent.
CAC members reported seeing people rummaging in cars. Always lock your cars and don’t leave anything of value (keys, guns, electronics) visible inside.

Parks, Dan Bacon: Flyers about upcoming events are available; Basketball registration is coming up, and ages 5-8 children and adult games are hosted at Jaycee Park. Programs and registration:
https://www.raleighnc.gov/parks/content/PRecRecreation/Articles/ProgramsClassesAndEvents.html

Code Enforcement, Blade Purdue, came to answer questions from prior meetings.
A permit should exist for dumpsters and pods in the street. This requires a payment of a $35-$50 fee per day, depending on where you live. The number to get a permit is 919-796-6309, and the number to complain about such items in the street is 919-796-6315. A dump trailer attached to a vehicle does not require a permit, because the assumption is that it will move soon.
Front yard parking: must be on a solid surface (gravel to asphalt) with stricter regulations in the NC State area. Call zoning about locations of concern.
Storm debris: The City is working with homeowners to try to get problem locations cleared after the recent storm. Fees are waived until the first of October for self-delivery to the New Hope Road yard debris delivery site.

Presentations
Update on Dix Park planning, Will Hooker
The current Master Plan draft has been generated with the participation of working groups, a presentation to all the CACs, and other input elements. Another opportunity for input is October 4, 6-8 pm, Raleigh Union Station. All are invited.
Major areas currently planned in the park include:
Creek: The existing waterway (Rocky Branch) will be graded differently on each side to generate sound buffering. A land bridge will tie into Pullen Park. There will be a small boat pond and lawn areas by the creek. An entrance to the park will cross the creek.
Meadow: The existing open field will be stretched longer to reach the land bridge, but its overall width will be decreased.

Grove: This major tree area will be retained, along with the sledding hill. A small amphitheater, seating about 300-400 people, will be included. A council ring, for small group meetings, will be included, and perhaps more of these will be added.

Downtown Gateway: This area is still in flux because it will require some city commitment to build it out ideally. A children's playground will be close to the entrance. Perhaps a more 'significant' feature should be added here.

A 5-7K amphitheater seating 5-7,000 people will eventually replace Red Hat. Some existing buildings will be repurposed. Several small courtyards will be retained. The McBride building will have a garden on top.

A grand entry architectural feature is proposed, and other ways to highlight the significance of the park are still being discussed.

There will be level walkway about one mile long that surrounds many of the main features in the park. It is proposed to be wide enough in places to handle vehicles in special events.

An elevated trestle will allow overviews of the park.

Optimizing park access via (currently) narrow Lake Wheeler Road is still being discussed. Many parking lots are being included, but there will likely have to be other 'people shuttling' strategies for major events.

Some other out/ward connectors to the park are being explored with other landowners.

Open play fields are being scattered throughout.

First presentation on the proposed rebuilding of Bellwood Condominiums

- Michael McGuire, representing the developer (Worthing Companies, out of Atlanta) and a representative of Parker Poe in Raleigh spoke, and several others involved with the project were in attendance. Meetings with neighbors (residents and businesses) have already been conducted and feedback is being incorporated. They anticipate at least eight more months of planning, so this is an introductory meeting to the larger group.

- The Worthing Company works exclusively in multi-family/high-end residential apartments. They are a vertical company who will build and manage the project. The already have 35-50,000 units in the southeast, built with traditional architecture and quality materials. Their tenants have an average age of 39 and high incomes.

- Bellwood now includes 55 condominiums built in the 1940s. Due to increasing infrastructure problems, the owners sold the property to Worthing Companies.

- The existing zoning of the property is RX-3. The Hillsborough Street Cameron Village Small Area Plan shows that RX-5 may be acceptable, if a rezoning request is granted. Worthing Companies is proposing RX-7 with conditional use and an actual height near 5 stories. There is a 35 foot drop on the site, and things are in flux in the City about how steep hills will be interpreted. They intend to build to 5 stories on all sides, so the actual request for rezoning may eventually drop to RX-5. The grade dictates that some regions of the large complex will be built at 4 stories.

Plans at this stage include:

325-349 apartment units with 1000 to 1200 square feet each

Buildings will come close to the sidewalk/street (urban frontage).

The facade visible from the street will be 5 stories or less.

Public and visible open space has been incorporated in two locations, including saving one of the major existing trees.

There is a pathway across the project from Clarke to Cameron, which will also reduce the biggest building to the 'block' limit of unified structures.

Streetscape and connectors will take into account walkability and have plantings.

There will be an internal swimming pool for residents, not visible from the street.

There will be structured parking, wrapped with the building, so it will not have a visible impact. Some design features of the parking are still in flux, but they anticipate 460-480 spaces, 1.6 per unit, plus 30-40 guest spaces.

The will improve the appearance of an unsightly wall near the loading dock.

There will be no retail, due to adjacency with Cameron Village. Only 4000 square feet was recommended in the Small Area Plan, but there is no need or local preference for this.

There may be co-working space for the residents, and they are thinking about whether or not to open this to the public.

Existing utilities, some of which are unmarked, are being accommodated.
They are discussing adjacent intersections and the possibility that Bellwood will become one-way in the future. A traffic study is forthcoming. Water drainage has to be retained on the site and released at a rate less than today, and in a clean condition. There will be two underground tanks to hold water that will be slowly released. This must occur even though much of the water from Cameron Village drains into this site.

Questions from meeting attendees along with responses of the presenters:

Question: What about the impact on the infrastructure of the area?
Answer: A separate study of sewer capacity is ongoing, and the developer will have to make needed repairs. The City will reimburse the cost at some point in the future.

Question: What about affordable housing—are you including any?
Answer: We are thinking about it.

Question: What about replacement of condominiums owned by people with deep roots in the community with rental apartments, especially given several other large luxury apartment buildings adjacent to Cameron Village?
Answer: Worthington Companies is an apartment developer, and we bought this site.

Panel Discussion on Accessory Dwelling Units
Panelists: Bob Geary (City of Raleigh Planning Commission member; Ted Shear (NC State Associate Professor of Forestry and Environmental Resources; Tom Barrie (NC State Professor of Architecture)

Points of Information:
An addendum to these minutes includes additional facts to clarify some points mentioned quickly in the meeting.

Geary introductory comments:
The Raleigh Planning Commission has considered accessory structures, like garages, in a lot-size-dependent way. It is anticipated that once those regulations are adopted for size and set-back considerations, a later-adopted ADU ordinance will use the same framework, but have the 'overlay district' added onto it to allow the necessary utilities and resident occupancy of backyard structures.

Two adults can live in an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), plus any number of their children.

Shear introductory comments:
People may be receptive to ADUs, but they also have concerns even though some were built in the past and still exist. They may be beautiful, or unsightly in a way that detracts from neighborhood character (pictures were distributed to illustrate this). Fears are not unfounded due to what you can easily see as having already occurred. Neighborhood overlays for various reasons may be a tool to address this. Many newer neighborhoods have inherent deed restrictions prohibiting such dwellings, leaving 20-30% of the city to carry the weight of ADUs.

Barrie introductory comments:
Dynamic growing cities with entrepreneurial people often allow ADUs. For example, Austin, Chapel Hill, Charlotte Mecklenburg, Durham, Wilmington, Winston Salem, and Asheville allow them, with various types of restrictions. Set-backs and height are usually restricted, and often character is restricted to match the existing home. Petitioning to build ADUs may become burdensome.

General comments and questions by meeting attendees and answers of the panelists:
Many states allow ADUs only for owner-occupied houses, but NC law does not allow such a restriction. Many neighborhoods in Raleigh do not benefit from rentals in their neighborhoods now. The overlay district is designed to allow neighborhoods that want them a way forward.

What about retention of permeable land? There will be regulations about how much of the backyard of a main house can be occupied.

Parking requirements will be regulated to the extent possible (if curb cuts are allowed). Some neighborhoods do not allow additional curb cuts, and in this case the additional cars will be on the street.

Very few cities have considered the overlay route, but many of them have the ability to restrict ADUs to owner-occupied properties. We do not have the ability to add the owner-occupancy restriction to the potential buildings of ADUs in Raleigh.
The biggest issue is that lack of ability to link owner occupancy to permitting of ADUs. We need to work to get this changed with the legislature. The AARP has documents that say that ADUs without associated owner occupancy on the lot deteriorates property values, and the speaker, a CAC member who is a relator and broker, agreed. He stated that according to his observations most landlords are not responsible. We felt that Raleigh does not need the pressure of ADUs without owner occupancy to send older neighborhoods backwards, especially because many of them are re-establishing their vigor in recent years.

ADUs without an owner occupancy requirement are not good for neighborhoods adjacent to universities. This would tilt the balance back toward absentee landlord student rentals, and there are cases where this has occurred with great detriment to universities and their host cities.

Portable dwellings such as campers and mobile homes would fall outside code in other ways if someone tried to place one in most neighborhoods where ADUs might be built.

Load on infrastructure, especially in older neighborhoods, will be a problem.

Austin restricts them by zoning areas. They allow them near the university, because they are needed there.

It was stated that some people who argue publicly for the value of ADUs have contracts in their neighborhoods that prohibit such dwellings.

Two CACs members spoke up for their preference to be able to do anything they wished with their property, as long as it met relevant city regulations, without having to seek the consent of their neighbors.

The counter-argument was made that the proposal is just another kind of overlay district, of which the city has many. The ADU overlay district would be established by similar processes.

Chair Bailey stated that we would follow up this meeting with discussing further what obtaining an overlay district to allow building of ADUs would require.

Meeting Adjourned.

See the next page for an Addendum to the Minutes, which contains further facts about what is currently being considered in Raleigh regarding the building of ADUs.
Addendum to the Minutes:

To provide some additional information about how Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) will likely be regulated, the following preliminary information was adapted from follow-up comments of Bob Geary as an addendum to the minutes of the September 2018 Hillsborough-Wade CAC meeting.

The Planning Commission is currently working on a DRAFT of allowed dimensions for Accessory Structures (ASs) on residential lots, as shown below. It is anticipated (but not yet enacted) that these dimensions, as finally POTENTIALLY MODIFIED and adopted by City Council, will be applied eventually to ADUs when new ones may become part of city policy after the necessary city processes are completed. Existing ASs and ADUs are grandfathered in as permissible.

Definitions:
Accessory Structure (AS): may have two (but not three) of the following, electricity, plumbing, and kitchen, implying that no one can live there. Examples are garages and sheds.
Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU): will have electricity, plumbing, and a kitchen to allow people to live there. The tenants may or may not pay rent.
Floor area: This is inclusive of all stories of one or more structures; it is NOT only the footprint on the ground if there is more than one story in one or more buildings.

General Regulations on set-backs and heights:
The AS(s) cannot be closer to the primary street or a side street than the principle structure (the main house) on the lot.
1-story AS(s), the minimum side and rear setbacks are 10 feet.
1-story has a maximum of a 12-foot wall plane and 16-foot total height.
1.5-story AS(s), the minimum side and rear setbacks are 15 feet.
1.5-story has a maximum of a 12-foot wall plane and 20.5-foot total height.
2-story AS(s), the minimum side and read setbacks are 20 feet.
2-story has a max of 25-foot total height, with no wall plane criterion.

AS Size Limits vs Lot Size and Filling:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot size</th>
<th>Maximum total floor area</th>
<th>% Backyard Occupied by AS(s)</th>
<th>% Full Lot Occupied by All Structures**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 10,000 ft² (0.23 acres)</td>
<td>600 ft²</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 ft² up to 40,000 ft² (0.23 to 0.92 acres)*</td>
<td>900 ft²</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,0001 ft² and above (above 0.92 acres)</td>
<td>1200 ft²</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Growth and Natural Resources Committee of the City Council originally recommended that lots up to 20,000 ft² would be limited to a maximum of 600 ft² in AS(s). The Planning Commission is suggesting that this change to 900 ft², if the 'general regulations' are met.
**All structures refers to the principle house plus AS(s).

Example:
On a lot up to 10,000 ft² (0.23 acres), the 600 ft² for AS(s) could be within a 1-story 20 x 30 ft building (e.g. a garage), a 2-story 10 x 30 ft building, or a 1 story 20 x 20 ft building and a 1 story 10 x 20 ft shed. Any of these single structures or the combination could be built as long as no more than 50% of the backyard and 75% of the total lot was occupied by structures and the 'general regulations' were met.