

Dear neighbors:

I would like to thank you for the many supportive statements in this document. I must also acknowledge that there are number of unsupportive statements too. I would classify these in two categories, those statements of concern that are based in part on miscommunication of the particulars, and those based on a solid understanding of the proposal. There are a few instances where there are true disagreements, but the vast majority of the unfavorable statements below are due to miscommunications.

With a mind to correct this, I have emphasized a great number of things below. Sometimes written emphasis can be interpreted as indicating impatience, but I would ask that you accept these in the intent in which they are meant, a very direct effort to correct these misunderstandings, as clearly, and as often as necessary to correctly represent the parameters of the proposal.

Benefits of our rezoning proposal:

- *Improved traffic*
- *Improved Parking*
- *Improved school safety*
- *Decrease in crime*
- *Increase in property values*
- *Elimination of 16 absentee landlord rentals*
- *Decrease in allowable density 27 to 20 units*
- *Decrease in allowable height – currently 40'+, after <40, no more then 2 ½ stories on west end.*
- *Most SPR-30 protections carried forward and extended to the R-30 areas*
- *Many new protections implemented*
- *Code enforceable design standards*
- *REQUIRED public approval for the site plan*
- *Assertion of neighborhood control over ¾ of site otherwise outside SPR30 area.*

I respect that not everyone will like everything about our proposal, but I sincerely believe our project, if properly understood, is a great example of neighborhoods, city officials, and developers working together to create something that builds on the strengths of neighborhoods and in turn enhance those strengths. I hope that after considering all the possibilities for the site, you will vote in favor for it, knowing it is not perfect, but that it's the result of a series of mutual compromises leading to a mutually beneficial outcome.

My comments are below, in the same blue italics. Please feel free to call me at 271-1021 or email me at Richard-cityspace.nc.rr.com with any questions that remain unanswered.

Thanks you very much for all your input,

Richard

Jennifer-

Thanks for the information. Pretty interesting project. I too would hope the architectural style would be a bit different, however, am very pleased to see that they are incorporating more "green" elements. Would love to see more of this in the area!

Stephanie Brown

Stephanie, thanks for the positive comment. Fred, Jennifer and other design professionals in the neighborhood have helped us modify the architectural style to be more in keeping with the neighborhood. I hope you like the most current concept that showed the corner of Boylan and Hinsdale. We are going to try and extend that look down the block. Also, we entered a contingency in our rezoning request that will require us to go through the public approval process for site plan approval. At that time (3-6 months) we will be returning with detailed plans and elevations for the neighborhood and CAC to review.

Jennifer,

Just a note... the proposed project will have a significant negative impact on Partnership Elementary school (busing issues on Hinsdale and construction noise that I imagine would effect the school at all levels). Partnership, a Wake County public school, is located on Glenwood Avenue at the corner of Hinsdale (Paden, my oldest child is enrolled there). I let the school's co-principals know of the proposal, and as predicted, they had no previous knowledge about this project. I'm concerned that officials in city/county government seem to have significant difficulty communicating with key stakeholders!

Best regards,

Michelle (Terrell)

Michelle, I appreciate your concern and am open to any suggestions that may minimize potential negatives for the school. I would like to offer you the following potential positive effects the project may have

- We will be eliminating 3 back out driveways and alley on Hinsdale Street and directing all our resident's cars to either Peace or Boylan. This should make the street safer for pedestrians.***
- We will be more then doubling the off-street parking for the area, while increasing the density by on 2 residences. This should alleviate some of the parking issues along Hinsdale.***
- We support permit parking along Hinsdale and will assist the neighborhood in implementing such a plan if they desire it.***
- Our project will act as a significant noise buffer from the very busy Peace Street***
- We will be replacing 16 rental units along this block of Hinsdale with 16 owner occupied homes fronting Hinsdale. We are fortunate to have a great group of renters at the moment, but statistically the stability offered by owner occupancy reduces crime and this could be particularly important regarding the safety of the school children.***

- ***One of the problems with rental properties is the creation of no-mans-lands between units or in common areas. Also, the alley connecting to Peace Street is a large no-mans-land. These unclaimed spaces tend to attract crime as they offer many escape avenues and hiding spaces. Our design would give every resident along Hinsdale a private yard and will eliminate these no-man's-land areas. Studies have shown that giving individual residents a "claim" to outdoor spaces is an effective crime deterrent.***
- ***Eyes on the street, is another commonly understood crime deterrent concept relating to the built environment. The idea is that having homes with raised entrances and multiple windows and doors facing the street makes it difficult for would-be-criminals to get away with anything without being seen. Our design will have 16 homes facing and entering from Hinsdale, which creates the desired effect. This is contrast to other styles of buildings where there may be one common entrance, common yards, and lack of connection to the street. Our rezoning proposal prohibits the bad kind, and requires the good kind.***

Hi Jennifer,

I am generally in favor of this project but of course my main concern is the statement:

"Projects such as these will set a precedent for future infill projects in our neighborhood as well as in other Raleigh neighborhoods." I think wherever and whenever these rezoning petitions come in we (or City) have to take them one by one and not let the flood gate open. Our neighborhood (Glenwood - Brooklyn) is very attractive and in a very attractive location, but part of the attractiveness is the fact that this is still a residential, family oriented neighborhood dating back to the 1920s-1930s and not a hip-upbeat place for the young transitory people in their mid 40s (sorry for generalization). The fact is, that some new trends in urban architecture promote "mixed" development, and, some of these experiments work but some don't. The worst would be to let our neighborhood become a one big heaven for RE and developers making quick big bucks. Just a thought from my side.

Thanks for keeping us in the loop,
Mietek.

Mietek, thanks for the comment.

- ***We completely agree with you and the other neighbors that this site is unique to the neighborhood and a rezoning here should NOT be used as a precedent. We have written a letter stating this to the COR Director of Planning, and COR Planning Commission Chairperson. The draft is attached to our previously attached proposal.***
- ***We believe the many high rise buildings crammed with miniature condos have saturated the "hip-upbeat..young transitory" market. Our plans for spacious 2000-3500sqft, community oriented homes with private gardens and no pool, should attract more established, family oriented home owners.***

Hi Jennifer-

Thank you for providing such detailed information and clear avenues for input regarding the pending Hinsdale Row project. With this short email, I'd like to provide my input to the Development Team.

On one hand, I view the project from an Outsider perspective in that my family and I have been

away from the neighborhood for the past 2 years while I've been on assignment here in Singapore. (As such, I am sensitive to the fact that my views lack a full appreciation from those who are most impacted by the project - as either residents within the rezoning area, or as neighbors directly across from the project). On the other hand, I very much see the project from an Insider perspective given I've been deeply involved with the neighborhood through the years, and look forward to resettling back in our home at 500 Devereux in 2009.

When I combine these two perspectives, however, I come to the following conclusion. During my return visits to the US and the neighborhood in 2006 and 2007, I had the distinct sense that Historic Glenwood Brooklyn is still a work in progress. Without question, the neighborhood has seen tremendous positive transformation in recent years. Yet, there is more to do for it to reach its fullest potential, and a catalyst-type project would help rekindle the momentum the neighborhood experienced starting in the late 90's.

I believe the Hinsdale Row project has the ability to be that catalyst. I have no doubt it will inject the neighborhood with renewed energy and vitality. The design and vision for the project is bold, yet consistent with the neighborhood dating back to the days of the trolley. Further, I am certain that the project supports a value that many in our neighborhood share to help contribute to the broader revitalization of downtown, Raleigh.

An opportunity like this doesn't come around often. I feel the neighborhood needs to partner with the developers and to seize the moment. It's time to write the next chapter in our neighborhood's history.

Thank you,

Chris

Chris Ernst, Ph.D.

Research Director, Global Leadership

Center for Creative Leadership-Asia

P: +65 6854 6000 | F: +65 6854 6030

www.ccl.org

[Think & Act Beyond Boundaries](#)

Chris, thanks so much for this comment. I hesitate to add to it, but will say that I agree that the project could act as catalyst because it will redevelop an area that is currently holding the rest of the neighborhood down. It would also eliminate any ideas of building a high rise on this site for the next hundred years. It is our hope that by working in concert with the neighborhood we can create a synergetic effect that allows the neighborhood to enhance our project, and allows our project to enhance the neighborhood.

Hi Phil,

I do not have the e-mail address of the person collecting comments for the Hinsdale project. Could you please forward to her? While there are many positive aspects about the planned development, I am deeply concerned about the potential height of the planned units. In their project description, the developers state that the maximum building height will be 40 feet. I would like to assume that this height would refer to the ridge line of the roof as measured from the mean street level in front of any given unit. However, the current information submitted by the developers is insufficient to let me know whether this is indeed the case. Therefore, I would like to request the following:

1. A site plan should be submitted as part of the PBOD rezoning request.

This plan needs to include elevations of the planned development such that the actual height of

each unit, as measured from street level to ridge line, is clear.

2. The maximum height of the development should be ramped down from east to west on Hinsdale Street such that the maximum building height for the unit planned at the Northwest corner (Hinsdale and Boylan) is 30 ft.

In the interest of transparency and sound planning, the developers should be more clear about their plans for this site by submitting a more detailed site plan!

Thank you,

Detlef

--

Detlef Knappe

Associate Professor

Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering North Carolina State University

Campus Box 7908 Raleigh, NC 27695-7908

Phone: 919-515-8791

Fax: 919-515-7908

E-mail: knappe@eos.ncsu.edu

Web page: <http://www4.ncsu.edu/~knappe>

Detlef, I appreciate your concerns and we have been working hard to address them.

In regards to the site plan, we have tried to address this in two ways. First, at the request of the neighborhood and in collaboration with them, we have created the extensive list of design codes previously submitted for your review and revised to incorporate the most recent neighborhood comments. Second, you may be aware that typically if you are building within the allowable parameters of a site, the site plan can be approved by COR staff. We have specifically excluded this possibility in our proposal and it will require us to go through a full public process for the site plan approval, just as we are now doing for the rezoning. This protects the neighborhood from us building something different than we are proposing.

In regards to the height, we have worked with architects in the neighborhood to diminish the effective heights and step down into the neighborhood as you have mentioned. I would point out that our proposal reduces the allowable heights on the entire site, while simultaneously reducing the allowable density on the site. This is difficult trick to pull off in the development world.

We have taken the following steps to reduce heights:

- ***We have eliminated the additional step back heights currently permissible on the entire site.***
- ***We have required that all the dwellings on the Western end of Hinsdale (the side closest to the neighborhood) are no more than 2 ½ stories. We have provided an easy to understand, illustrated definition of what this means to avoid confusion and effectively bind us to it.***
- ***We have taken further steps to reduce the height issues on the only the corner of Hinsdale and Boylan, which is the only section of our project that comes close to existing homes. These include:***
 - ***Stepping another 5 feet back from the neighborhood from our original proposal.***
 - ***Requiring a small, 1 story section on this façade to aid in the transition.***
 - ***Requiring additional articulation on this façade.***

- **Requiring ample fenestration on this façade**
- **Requiring a roof that slopes back on both sides of the corner (similar to the hip roof on Serena's).**

Also, please I have cut and pasted comments from my previous email to the neighborhood below specifically addressing height.

1. We believe reducing the height would have unintended consequences resulting in a much less attractive building. Our intention is to try and have these dwellings read as separate houses as much as possible. I think most people will agree that this is being accomplished in the concept sketch, and it is in part due to the vertical proportions of the individual units. *If you take a story off this format, and then spread it across the entire ½ block, it will tend to read like a long ranch house. Much more attention will be brought to the horizontal lines of the building, which will make it appear more like group housing than individual units.* The appealing proportions of the individual concept sketch depend on the 2 1/2 story format we have proposed.
2. *By your measurements, our building would only be 6' taller than the Serena's adjacent building. This is ½ the 12' building to building height differentiation allowed under the SPR-30. Although we recognize the SPR30 building to building height limitations wouldn't apply in this way, we do think it shows a degree of difference that is appropriate.*
3. The 2 ½ story style of construction is consistent both with the style of the neighborhood and the height limitations set by SPR30.
4. The homes will face the side of a school and a parking lot. Having no residences across the street or immediately adjacent to the project greatly diminishes the impact of any difference in height.
5. *Our neighborhood friendly, lower density proposal depends on at least the 2 ½ stories we have suggested.* Our proposal to build a product that does NOT maximize density by cramming in as many units as is physically possible, is dependent on building larger units, which requires the 2 ½ story concept we have proposed. If we loose this story we will have to go back to the drawing board. All the limitations and concessions we have made as part of this proposal are dependant on the equation of trading high density condos (as are being built everywhere else) for larger, more expensive, townhouse style units.

Hi Jennifer,

Thanks for organizing the meeting. I appreciate it. Regarding my thoughts about the project, I think all what we heard from Richard and his partner is all good. However, the danger is that what they say versus what they'll actually do... might be different. Too many times we hear all these promises only to get the approval or support and once this is in, the rest is just about the "buck" and how to make the most money and cut corners. I hope this is not the case here but... it sometimes sounds too good if we hear.. "this will really improve the neighborhood...", whereas we all know (we are all adults living in the reality we live in) that this is all about money for Richard and his partner. And there is nothing wrong about it as long as we do not get "run over" by the train of quick profit.

Thanks,

Mietek.

(COLE STREET)

Mietek, I respect your "trust but verify" philosophy. I think we have successfully addressed this by taking the following actions.

1. ***Full, early, and open disclosure of our plans and the relevant issues driving the design.***

- 2. The comprehensive architectural design standards we have drafted in conjunction with the neighborhood.**
- 3. Our binding commitment to go through the public site plan approval process with our final design. (see above)**

I agree that this is a for-profit venture, but respectfully disagree that it is all about money for Jon & I. I view this as a vocation, and I take great pride in what we are doing. You may recall that the house across the street from you was cut into four apartments and called "little Amsterdam" by the neighbors because "you could get anything legal or illegal there day or night". Jon & I purchased that house and converted it back into a single family home, while preserving its historic charm. Just as in this project, we bet that that by investing a great deal of money and producing a very high quality product, we would be able to make a profit while creating something that we could be proud of.

The house sold, and I had the pleasure of meeting your new neighbor for the first time at the neighborhood meeting last week. She told me how much she loved the house and this filled me with the pride of knowing that every corner I didn't cut in that 18 month long renovation has paid off. I think there can be no doubt that our efforts did improve the neighborhood, reducing crime, increasing value, preserving character, and providing you with a lot nicer neighbor.

It is that same spirit that we are approaching this project, with the firm belief that all these benefits can be incorporated into an economically viable development.

Greetings Jennifer and Fred,

First and foremost thank you for lending your professional expertise and donating your time to the greater good of the neighborhood.

Based on the short time frame and need to move quickly in the next 10 days.

1. We second the suggestion during the meeting to have a neighborhood meeting to briefly explain/discuss any issues and have a vote. This will hopefully determine if we will lay our bodies

in front of the bulldozers or welcome the developers with open arms. ***Nicely put: for the record, we don't anticipate either of these extremes, but hope that with honest dialog such as this we can come to a serious of compromises that will create a desirable project that the neighborhood can support.***

2. The present rezoning/ Street scape process in our opinion provides a golden opportunity to take a closer look at the present traffic/parking situation and discuss and implement the need for; - Speed bumps/ one way traffic, permit parking and enforcement. ***We would love to support the neighborhood in this in anyway we can. We are going to provide the GBNA a letter stating that we believe the GBNA have say on these issues.***

3. We further strongly second the opinion that this will be a unique rezoning situation, and not be a trend for future high density mixed retail/residential projects on the Peace street borderline of our neighborhood. ***We agree, see above for steps we have taken to try and strengthen this position.***

4. If we can be of any assistance in the coming days, please let us know

Regards

Frake and Valerie Hunsel

709 Gaston Street

I have read the blog and have concerns about the project. The density impact on traffic and the height of the buildings are a concern. Please keep me informed. Thanks Nikki Riddle

Thanks again for this wonderful information I do not know if I am in sync with the neighborhood or not but I think it is a beautiful piece of architecture. It is tasteful, graceful, and fits the property perfectly. I just hope it is an economic success and becomes a reality because it should be a benchmark as how to make Raleigh beautiful. So far as the roofline goes. my suggestion is to leave it to the capable architects to design instead of people, like myself, who do not know what they are talking about (When the plans are taken out of the professional hands you get something that looks like it was designed by a committee or worse yet by a lawyerexample a camel ugly and disagreeable.. As the Japanese artist say, "the beauty of nature is in the variety of it's imperfection."

Thank you for keeping us so well informed and your unceasing efforts
Jerre Parker

Jerre, thanks for you articulate words of support. Regarding density & traffic, I would refer you to the discussions in the presentation which is on the neighborhood website. I will note here that we believe the project will improve the traffic situation in the neighborhood and that the density is increasing only slightly. Also, we recently received a professional traffic study that indicates the impact will be negligible and counteracted by the removal of the high traffic inspection station business. I will attach it to the email I am sending out.

Hi Jennifer,

Thanks for keeping us so informed about this project. I could not make the meeting last week but- based on everything you have sent, it seems like this would be a wonderful addition to the neighborhood. Do you have any specific concerns that I may be missing?

All the best,
Jill Mertens

Thanks for the support

Hi Jennifer,

First of all thank you for your time and commitment to the neighborhood.

We attended 3 of the meetings regarding the Hinsdale project rezoning request.

My comments are:

1. The parking issue will impact the neighborhood negatively. I am for the idea of having on-street parking along Hinsdale in front of the proposed project. Still this alone will not resolve the problem. ***Our proposal will improve parking within the neighborhood. This is simply a fact. The current parking ratio less the 1:1 (that is, there is less then 1 parking space per dwelling unit on the rezoning property) Our project will have more then a 2:1 ratio, this alone is more than a 100% improvement to the present parking situation. In addition to this, the elimination of 4 cub cuts on Hinsdale will expand the current street parking. So we will be cutting the demand for on street parking in half, while increasing its capacity.***
2. The height of the proposed townhouses on Hinsdale will overwhelmed the scale of the neighborhood. During the last meeting, the developer proposed to lower the height along the western half of Hinsdale to two and half stories. I saw it as a positive step until I realized that the front yard of the units was 2ft above the sidewalk and the first floor level was elevated an other 2- ***Please see my comments above regarding heights. I believe stone retaining walls are commonplace in Raleigh Historic districts. 2' is far less then existing raised yards on the site.***

2.5ft on top of that. I am not sure why the first floor level couldn't be lower (maybe because of

excavation costs), but I would like to see this elevation lowered more. ***We are lowering the first floors as much as possible on the Western end of Hinsdale. We are limited by the grading of the rear alley and how it intersects the garages as it slopes down the hill.***

3. The sloped roof of 12 / 12 is a much better proposal than the previous Mansard roof. I think we should be careful about the treatment of the roof dormers and gables. See corner elevation of Boylan and Hinsdale. (The big gable next to the dormers will give the feeling of an extra floor i.e higher building). ***At the request of the neighborhood we have excluded the possibility of mansard roofs on the Western end, and we have been pleasantly surprised with the appeal of the resulting design.***

4. This is a question more than a comment. What would be the impact if there were only two entrances to the proposed project, one from Peace and one from Hinsdale? This MIGHT relieve future traffic on Boylan. ***Although there was some debate at the meeting, I believe there has been a consensus among your neighbors that we should keep traffic off Hinsdale and away from the school if possible. In response to a request in the official GBNA response we have included language in our proposal that would forbid any entrances on Hinsdale unless we are required to by city officials.***

Thank you,
Roy Saba & Patsy Poole
700 Devereux St.

Hi Jennifer,

Below is a comment you may add to the others about the Hinsdale rezoning from Special R-30 to R-30 CUD. The Peace Streetscape Plan allows a maximum height of 30 feet on the north side of Peace Street to establish a transition to the Brooklyn neighborhood. The proposed zoning should complement this requirement and continue the transition in designing the west building. A maximum of 28 feet in height is appropriate for the west building with a maximum of 26 feet at the corner of Hinsdale and Boylan Avenue.

Building heights must be measured to the midpoint of the roof as standard practice for the City of Raleigh. Mansard roofs are not appropriate since not used on any other residential buildings in the neighborhood.

Thanks, Martin

Jennifer,

Below is a brief list on my top concerns.

Parking – The zoning conditions should reflect that 2 spaces must be provided for each residential unit ***This has been done, see the new plan.***

and 5 spaces must be provided for each 1,000sf of retail space. ***We will be providing 5 commercial spaces, the retail portion of the site will be around 1000-1300 sqft, some of the Peace street units may have home offices.***

The portion of Hinsdale Street west of Boylan should be made a permit parking area to protect the neighborhood residents' ability to park on Hinsdale. ***We are in support of this.***

Height – There should be an appropriate height transition along Hinsdale street. I believe this could be achieved by a 200 foot transition from the corner of Hinsdale and Boylan heading west. The height would transition from the existing building height on the southwest corner of Hinsdale and Boylan to the maximum building

height allowed in the rezoning. The zoning conditions should clearly outline how the height transition will be handled (i.e. 20' max height for first 50 feet of the transition area, 25' max height for next 50 feet, 30' max height for next 50 feet, 35' max height for last 50 feet). ***See above for height discussions.***

Building Massing and Architecture – Ensure that the proposed building are in keeping with the Gleenwood-Brooklyn Neighborhood architecture. The final building elevations that are agreed upon for the rezoning hearing should be incorporated as part of the rezoning conditions. ***The final building elevations will be required for the public hearing process which is required by the rezoning conditions.***

I recommend that the zoning conditions be modified to specifically address any agreements between the developer and the neighborhood (i.e. height, architecture, parking, etc.). I believe this is the only way to ensure that the developer is legally bound to adhere to agreements that are reached with the neighborhood. Please let me know if you would like me to elaborate on the above or provide any additional information.

Thanks for your help. ***Agreed, this is what we have done with the Hinsdale Street plan***
Asa Harris

I was unable to attend the meeting last week – but from what I have seen/heard of the project, renderings etc. I am all for it. I think that they are very attractive (certainly an improvement over what is there now), and will only increase our property values. I also think that this sort of thing is part of urban infill/progress and am happy with the direction we are headed – it reminds me of the brownstones you see in cities like DC (Georgetown). Sorry if that isn't the reaction that you were hoping for.

Brooks Turner
501 Devereux St.

Thanks for the words of support. Our original inspiration came from some of the examples you have sited. But, we have worked with the neighborhood to alter the design so it syncs better with the area.

Jen,

Hi! I wanted to provide my personal comments regarding the Hinsdale development.

While the project has several aspects that I find appealing, I am against the proposed height of the units on the western end of the proposed development (corner of Hinsdale & Boylan).

In my opinion, the 40' height aspect does not provide a reasonable transition from the modest homes lining Hinsdale Street (the block from Gaston to Boylan). Additionally, I understand the height of the units closest to the Hinsdale & Boylan intersection could be as high as that of Jenkins Memorial Church. The physical and historical presence of Jenkins Memorial Church in the neighborhood should not be overshadowed by a multi-story residential unit. If the height of the units near the Hinsdale & Boylan intersection were decreased, then the scale of the buildings would be visually appropriate for our neighborhood.

Currently, I am opposed to the building heights as shown in the renderings provided for neighborhood review.

Christine Belledin
711 Gaston
Hi Jennifer,

Jen,

See above for notes about the height in general. I think the statements regarding the church are misleading. The homes we intend to build on the corner will have eves just 4

feet taller than Serena's below – this is written into the code. According to Fred's measurements they would be just 6' taller overall than Serena's.

The Romanesque church is far taller, far more massive & monolithic, it is designed to impress with huge windows, doors, and a spire. Our proposal will be residential in scale and would not begin to compete with the church. I think it is clear from our concept sketch (which has been included as representative in our conditions) that our townhomes will look very similar to the many other 2 ½ story houses in the neighborhood.



Thanks again for pulling this all together! I've attached my feedback [see below] – please let me know if you have any questions. I'd rather you didn't try to consolidate everyone's comments at this point, but rather let everyone speak in their own words. Some know a lot more about this than others and I'm afraid if it's condensed down to only common points, that will dramatically reduce the impact.

Thanks!!

Lisa Hughet

Hinsdale Row Project
Concerns – Lisa Hughet, 712 Hinsdale St.

Lisa:

I would like to say that I really enjoyed meeting you at the Planning Commission meeting last month. I found you very friendly and upbeat.

I was disappointed to find so many inaccuracies and misunderstandings in your essay below. I apologize for not communicating clearly enough to you.

My hope is that you will review my notes below, see how almost all of your concerns have already been addressed in productive ways, and turn in to my greatest supporter in the neighborhood.

Barring that, I still appreciate how congenial you have been in your disagreement.

.

POSTION:

I am a resident of the historic neighborhood of Glenwood-Brooklyn. I have seen the draft for the proposed rezoning of Special R-30 to R-30 and PBOD (Z-12-08 / SSP-1-08), dated January 17 & 21, 2008, and other packets of information about the project proposed for the block bounded by Hinsdale and Peace, and Boylan and Glenwood. I also understand the special conditions that our current SPR-30 zoning provides to help maintain the historic character of our neighborhood. Until the PBOD includes a set of conditions providing an equivalent level of protection for the historical registration and thus, character of our neighborhood, I DO NOT support the requested re-zoning. Further, I agree this matter should be brought back in front of the 5 Points CAC since their approval was conditional and based on conceptual documents only. ***Just a note, the CAC's approval was based on 5 months of meetings, emails, and detailed discussions over design issues with a group of neighborhood design professionals. It was also, the second of two such CAC meetings at which I discussed the project.***

CONCERNS:

5pts CAC approved this. While I realize that this is the process the City put in place to get citizen input, this is a major development proposal and should have garnered much more effort on the members of that committee to seek neighborhood involvement. Information may have gone out to the CAC mailing lists but that does not include everyone in the neighborhood. I receive periodic notices about meetings and never recall seeing one for discussion on this topic.

From my understanding, what the CAC approved at their meeting last year was based on conceptual information and was not considered in any way to be approval of the proposed rezoning. ***The CAC vote was specifically to support our request for a rezoning.***

City of Raleigh's Staff Report states 5 times that the proposed rezoning is "inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan".

- o "Outstanding issues: This request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

- o "This request is inconsistent with the adjacent Peace Streetscape Plan." page 8

- o "This request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The subject property is located within the Glenwood Brooklyn Small Area Plan which designates this area as appropriate for medium density residential, or 7 to 14 dwelling units per acre." page 5 ***The current zoning is more inconsistent with the current comprehensive plan. Our proposal reduces the allowable density and brings it more in line with the current comprehensive plan.***

- o The proposed zoning is for "27 dwelling units (Pedestrian Business Overlay District introduces opportunity for higher density above the underlying district)"

- o page 3 ***As noted above the current zoning allows for 27 dwelling units, the new zoning will allow for only 20 dwelling units. Again, our project reduces the allowable density by 7 units or a 25% reduction.***

- o "Detriments of the proposed rezoning" "Without proper revisions to the proposed streetscape plan, the proposal could be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood." page 6 ***These revisions have been made in conjunction with the city.***

- o "Staff disagrees with the applicants' assessment of this location being within the city center." page 7

The Brooklyn/Glenwood Small Area Plan, 11-5.1 of the Raleigh Comprehensive Plan supports the concerns I have listed in more detail below. I've included the information from this plan at the end of this document. This plan expressly states that the character of the neighborhood should be retained.

PARKING & TRAFFIC:

Commercial Parking – lack thereof, encroaching on residential areas. Example – Mellow Mushroom on any day of the week takes spaces from adjacent businesses, and closed businesses on weekends. Where would this parking come from in the future? I realize the City has extremely minimal requirements for commercial parking but the reality is people will drive here and will need a place to park. I think it's irresponsible on the City's part to only require a paltry 6 spots for the commercial development of this project. ***Lisa, I agree with you that the parking for business not associated with our project is a municipal issue. We want to work with the neighborhood to promote a parking garage in this area. I believe that your community leaders have had a great deal of input in the creation of the Peace Street Streetscape plan. That plan requires that ANY development on the corner of Peace and Glenwood incorporate retail and specifies the number of parking spaces. Also, it should be noted that our request is for a rezoning of the adjacent tract, does not include this property, and that anything built on that property will be built to the existing codes.***

Current traffic is already problematic, particularly 7:30am and 3pm when two local schools start and let out. We already have oversized school buses using N. Boylan, Hinsdale and Gaston St. The parade of SUV's dropping off their children at Partnership Elementary has already been switched around several times due to traffic complaints from the City and the neighborhood. There is no more room for allowance here. ***Our proposal will improve this situation. Please see comments above regarding decreased traffic and increased safety by the school.***

The proposed development would have traffic entering and exiting on N. Boylan between Peace St and Hinsdale. The length of this block would only allow for ~2cars exiting the development and going to the Peace St light. Additionally, the width of N. Boylan on this block does not allow for this density of traffic. More options need to be explored for either handling this traffic with additional cutouts or reducing the amount of cars (e.g. units) to begin with. ***There are currently two driveways on the section you sight here. Our proposal will improve this situation by eliminating them and the awkward spacing between them, replacing them with a single drive a the center of the block.***

The proposed streetscape plan does not take into account the amount of traffic that will be pushed onto crowded neighborhood roads and pedestrian safety. ***Our proposal will improve this situation*** No traffic will be pushed into the neighborhood, we are eliminating the alley that currently pushes traffic from Peace by the school and rerouting the residential traffic away from the neighborhood.

More easement needs to be required between the street and the sidewalk than the 1ft currently proposed (stated as "typical city standard"). ***Our proposal will improve this situation*** ***The one foot you are referring to is at the interior side of the side walk. The streetscape plan will double the current 2' spacing between the sidewalk and the curb to 4'.***

I can not stress enough the concerns of having upwards of 48 additional cars moving through the tight roads in this neighborhood. ***48 additional cars? There are presently 16 residential units on the site with 15 parking spaces. Our proposal would include 20 residential units (two of which are mostly on the adjacent site) with 51 parking spaces.***

Assuming you were using a 2 car per dwelling figure, we will have 8 additional cars with 36 additional parking spaces, none of which exit into the neighborhood.

The intersections coming out of this neighborhood also do not allow for this sort of traffic. Vehicle and pedestrian safety are at definitely at risk. Any one who does not understand this needs to spend several days in the neighborhood during the day to see the size of vehicle (like delivery trucks to Peace St. market, and school buses), speed, and congestion (Brooklyn, Gaston, Devereux, Wills Forest, Hinsdale, N. Boylan). This is the "Historic Glenwood-Brooklyn Neighborhood". The neighborhood pursued Historic recognition in addition to the Special R-30 zoning to preserve the integrity of the first planned neighborhood in Raleigh. This can not be taken lightly. **Our proposal will improve this situation again, our proposal eliminates egress from Peace into the neighborhood, eliminates residential traffic from the site to Hinsdale, and directs all traffic directly to peace or a drive exiting Boylan at the furthest boundary of the neighborhood.**

DENSITY & CHARACTER:

There are currently (7) residential buildings **This is an improper comparison. If you want to use buildings as a comparison, we will be moving from 7 residential buildings to only 2. But we would not use such a description as we have been very careful to be accurate and truthful in all our communications. We will continue to use the accurate description of going from 16 dwelling units, to 20 dwelling units, a 25% increase in existing use, and going from an allowable 27 units, to an allowable 20 units a 25% decrease in allowable density. I would bet that we are the first developer to ever ask for a DECREASE in allowable density in the whole history of the GBNA.** , in the proposed development area for a total of 14,000 ft². A minimum of (18) units are being planned to replace those for a total of 50,000 ft². This is over 3.5 times the current density. Essentially this will become one McMansion, 4-story lot. This is unacceptable to the preservation of our historic recognition. An additional 6-11 units complete the entire project, some of which are not under the re-zoning proposal.

I am particularly concerned about lack of any affordable housing. This development will be priced at \$300/ft² or between \$750,000 - \$1,000,000 per unit. I suspect that only 5% of current residents would even be able to afford that. The great thing about this neighborhood is the character that comes from diversity in living situations and economy! **You are correct, none of the homes in the entire neighborhood will ever again be considered affordable housing. But of course, any homeowner can offer his or her home at an affordable sale price if they desire to. For the record, our pricing is anticipated to start at around 600k. This is not to say that it is anything like affordable housing. The size and pricing of these homes is in direct response to our desire to build a few very nice homes, instead of maxing out the density with a bunch of, still expensive, small condos.**

I would be interested in working more with the developers if part of their project included aspects of affordable housing like has been done in other downtown neighborhoods (Mordeci for example).

There exists a beautiful historic, and maintained brick apartment building on Glenwo0d that would be torn down if this project goes ahead as is. It would be a shame to tear this structure down and replace it with a new brick "north Raleigh" type

residence. **Nothing about this project will be “North Raleigh” we have sought out and hired one the best (and most expensive) historic infill architects on the east coast. Our land planner is a long time resident of Oakwood and has the deepest local professional knowledge of anyone in this area. We have gone to great lengths to make this appropriate to the neighborhood. The current zoning for the tract you refer to allows for a plethora of development opportunities including 60’ tall apartment buildings, old folks homes, frat houses, and cell phone towers. There are currently no codes to prevent the construction of any style of architecture. An ultra utilitarian, 60 foot tall cement building with a 60’ tall spire on top could be built without siteplan approval. AFTER our request, all the codes specified in the streetscape plan will apply and you will definitely not get a “north Raleigh’ building.**

We have Keeping it as apartments will be able to retain part of the existing diversity. ***I would again assert that any owner in the neighborhood can rent their place out if they feel strongly enough about this to take personal action.***

The neighborhood supports what’s happening on Glenwood South. Many people wouldn’t live near here if there wasn’t such a vibrant development happening. But the Glenwood South project Peace St. Plan were specifically put in place to preserve and protect the Glenwood-Brooklyn neighborhood from that sort of residential and commercial density. It was created to act as a buffer between the two. By approving this development, the City is essentially lopping off one entire block of this historic neighborhood. ***Please seem my comment on reduction in allowable density above***

The 40’ height is of extreme concern. The church on Devereux and N. Boylan and the brick apt building on Glenwood might be that tall – but nothing else comes close. A block of 4story structures would overpower anything else. ***There will be no 4 story units. We are obligating ourselves to a 3 ½ stories near Glenwood and 2 ½ stories on the Western Side. We are reducing the allowable heights. Please see my other comments above.*** Even the businesses on

Peace St. This is no way to transition from Glenwood South to a “residential” neighborhood. ***We are transitioning from the 10 story Paramount building to 2 1/2 story units.*** There may be argument for such a height on Glenwood as the grading makes that possible. But going west on Hinsdale towards N. Boylan, the grade is such that a 4-story unit is very impractical.

There has been a lot of discussion about another aspect of this project that you won’t see in any development plans or zoning codes and that has to do with another reason this neighborhood is presently protected from such mass density development and that is neighborhood involvement. This is a difficult aspect to measure and put in any code requirements but is a large part of the decision people choose to live here. Getting to know your neighbors is one thing our neighborhood can proudly say they do. We live in detached homes that are close together and park in driveways or on the street. As a result we are outside and easily run into each other. A development that has their parking in the back, along an alley, with no yards ***each of our the sixteen units on Hinsdale will have a private front yard, private entrance, and porch precisely to create the neighborhood feeling you are espousing. This will be a great improvement over the 16 units presently on the site, less then half of which have either porches or front entries.*** to maintain is essentially an anonymous community. The current proposal allows for porches on the front but the residents are going to be coming and going from their parking in the back.

The proposed style of architecture (Queen Anne) and building materials (masonry) do not fit with the rest of the neighborhood and would definitely stand out and apart. Enhancements/additions by current residents have honored historical registrar requirements, existing architecture. This proposal is a big departure from that in looks and spirit. **As you know, we have altered our concept plan and embedded it into the streetscape plan. Please see the rendering we provided at the meeting and in the plan. For the record, the historic register lists a number of Queen Anne style homes within 100 yards of the site.**

CODE INTERPRETATIONS:

It is very unclear how this lot or group of lots is to be treated. For example, under Special R-30:

o Buildings and structures, unless otherwise regulated by this Code, may be constructed to a height of twelve (12) feet higher than any other residential building or structure which is both located within thirty (30) feet of said lot and located within the Special Residential-30 District. Buildings and structures greater than forty (40) feet high, however, shall add one (1) foot additional width to each required district yard setback for each foot of height greater than forty (40) feet high. **See above – our proposal eliminates this option**

In addition, SPR-30 only allows for buildings on 50% of the lot.

Different members of the City (Planning Commission, people in the planning office, City Council, etc.) all are offering different “opinions”. Only recently was the city lawyer responsible for SPR-30 brought into the discussions. How can it be that if you just find someone in these offices to agree with you, you can rezone anything without those affected or responsible ever knowing about it?

Special R-30 zoning is in place to help guide new development to fit within the existing context of the neighborhood. Why would we want to replace that? ***In order to make it possible to encourage the construction of a well-thought-out, well designed, less than maximum density, attractive project that will enhance the neighborhood, increase the number of long term home owners, eliminate 16 absentee landlord units, decrease crime, increase property values, and do so in cooperation with the neighborhood, so that most of the previously existing protections are included and a great number of previously nonexistent protections are put in place.***

CONCLUSION:

I like the fact that the developers are seeking input from the neighborhood and appear to be willing to change and negotiate to our concerns. This is key for all parties and can be an enjoyable, albeit, sometimes frustrating, journey. I sincerely hope we can come to agreements on reasonable growth, density, traffic, height and architectural character. I support urban growth but at the same time support urban character that comes from unique characters of downtown neighborhoods like Glenwood-Brooklyn. We’d live in North Raleigh if we all wanted to live apart from our neighbors in McMansions. But we don’t, we live here. And at this time, I do not support rezoning of Special R-30 along Hinsdale St.

As stated in the Raleigh Comprehensive Plan, 5/98

Part 5 Glenwood/Brooklyn Small Area Plan, 11-5.1

These neighborhoods should continue to develop at medium densities. The existing character of the neighborhoods should be retained by encouraging compatible building scale, mass and architectural style. The zoning of the area as Special Residential-30

provides development standards which will help to address some of the negative impacts which may occur with redevelopment.

Bordering the Brooklyn and Glenwood neighborhoods are nonresidential uses which should be retained, but not allowed to further encroach into the existing residential areas. Low intensity office uses and commercial uses exist. In order to fulfill the comprehensive Plan's goal of reducing traffic congestion and visual clutter within these areas as they redevelop, the zoning, subdivision and site plan review process should encourage comprehensive assembly of small lots, reduction of access points, shared parking, and aesthetically pleasing developments.

Lisa-

Ok after skimming through the details and reading your draft. I think I agree with what you have said in your draft letter. I will be glad to attach my name to it if I can. I don't like the 40' height nor the brick for sure, since no where is brick really used in the hood. **As lisa mentions, there is a substantial brick building on the site, across the street, and within 100'. But we have also revised our proposal to include clapboard siding on the side of the project that faces a clapboard house.**

Somewhere you mention we love downtown and our neighborhoods active participation in things downtown. I would bring up the fact that we are the only neighborhood that has been raising money for the past 4 years now with events to get people to promote businesses etc and to help disadvantaged youth etc. Basically to show that we are doing our part to be an active part of the city and its development of people but that this development is like a slap in the face in some respects if the city lets it go through. if the plan doesnt fit into the long range small area plan and peace streetscape then it SHOULD NOT even be considered. **The current 20 year old comprehensive plan is in the process of being revised, it will encourage precisely this kind of development** I mean end of story- those plans were developed comprehensibly with the neighborhood, etc to shape the future and protect. So basically the city staff has said (5 times or more) that it doesnt comply. ***We have met with many city officials regarding this project. They all agree that this is exactly the kind of thing they are looking for. Please feel free to investigate this on your own. Also, please see my comments regarding minor technicalities in comprehensive plan section of Lisa notes above...so that should be end of discussion in my opinion. The city made changed to peace st flow of traffic to improve the situation(i dont think it did) but anyway this additional burden on boylan,hinsdale and peace will create a huge safety concern!!***

mention the children at the school and the amount of "traffic conflict points" that will be created by these additional units. ***Our proposal will greatly increase the safety of the school children, please see above.***

overall im with you on this one. let me know if you want me to sign something

Rhett Fussell

(HINSDALE STREET)

The proposed Hinsdale project will negatively impact its immediate next door neighbor, Partnership Elementary (a Wake County Public School which serves over 350 kids in K-5). In talking with school leaders, I have found they have significant concerns which need to be heard and addressed. **See above for note on the many ways this proposal will improve the school situation**

I share these as a Glenwood-Brooklyn property owner and parent of children at the school. Specifically:

- The impact of construction and the noise which will disrupt the learning process for an extended period of time.
- Parking during construction with multiple construction vehicles jockeying for limited existing

parking.

- Interference and safety concerns with the loading and unloading of busses on Hinsdale.
- Safety concerns with our students being on the playground and the very close proximity to the on going construction. ***Of course, ANY construction might be disruptive. We will work with neighborhood to minimize this. I believe we will be able to fence off the whole Hinsdale streetscape and keep construction traffic off Hinsdale.***
- Even though the existing plan cites two car garages for parking for the 90 owners,

90 Owners??? The rezoning will increase the dwelling units from 16 to 20, with a total for the whole project of 28 residential units. it does not

accommodate for any parking for visitors, service vehicles etc., compounding an existing lack of parking in the area for parents coming to the school and existing homeowners. ***Please see above for notes about how this proposal would more than double the number of parking spaces per dwelling, and how each unit will have two private spaces plus overflow spaces, and how street parking will be improved.***

Jennifer, please share these specific concerns with the Planning Commission!

Many thanks.

Michelle Terrell

791.1881

Hi Jennifer -

I just wanted to take a moment to give you some feedback on the proposed Hinsdale Row Development. We live at the corner of Hinsdale and Glenwood, and obviously, our biggest concern is that our block will be torn down and we will have to move out and relocate. It is a shame that if the proposal goes through, the affordable rental housing that

is located on the property today will be torn down. ***There are other developer creating affordable rental units nearby. I would suggest you look into the Tucker Street Apartments about a block away. They might be ready before we start construction. We are pledging not to build apartments on this site.***

We truly value the fact that we are able to live so close to downtown and pay an affordable rent. With this development, those options will be gone.

I fear for the traffic that the new development will cause as well.

There is already so much traffic on Hinsdale due to the school, **Please see the comments above regarding the many ways this proposal will improve traffic, parking, and school safety.** and 20+ additional units **There will only be 20-16=4 additional residences in the rezoning area, and 28-16=12 additional residences on the entire site.**

will increase traffic flow as well as increase the

number of people parking on the street further into the neighborhood. I

understand there will be parking underneath the units, however whenever

friends drop by and whenever people want to go to the Mellow Mushroom,

they will be parking along Hinsdale and the side streets, which will ***The parking situation will be more than twice as good as it is now. Please see above for details.***

cause further congestion in the area. In addition, the Glenwood/Peace

intersection ***This intersection's safety will be drastically***

improved. There are currently 2 curb cuts on Glenwood right next

to the corner, and two curb cuts on Peace right next to the corner, as well as the alley near the corner. The corner cuts serve a very high traffic business and make for a very dangerous corner. All these access points will be eliminated by our plan and only one entrance in the very middle of the block will connect with Peace. is already very

dangerous and I'm afraid this development will add to the traffic flow and cause more congestion on Peace as well.

Thank you for taking time to listen to our thoughts.

Best, Caroline Hope and Chad Griffith

601-3 Hinsdale St