Rezoning Case: 23CZ13 Seymour Mixed Use PUD

Planning Board Meeting Date: January 8, 2024



Report Requirements:

Per NCGS §160D-604(b), all proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance or zoning map shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review and comment. If no written report is received from the Planning Board within 30 days of referral of the amendment to the Planning Board, the Town Council may act on the amendment without the Planning Board report. The Town Council is not bound by the recommendations, if any, of the Planning Board.

Per NCGS §160D-604(d), the Planning Board shall advise and comment on whether the proposed action is consistent with all applicable officially adopted plans, and provide a written recommendation to the Town Council that addresses plan consistency and other matters as deemed appropriate by the Planning Board, but a comment by the Planning Board that a proposed amendment is inconsistent with the officially adopted plans shall not preclude consideration or approval of the proposed amendment by the Town Council.

***************************************	DJECT DESCRIPTION: eage: (s):	±81.9 acres 0741142574, 0741152543, 07	741155913
Cur	rent Zoning:	Residential Agricultural (RA) a	and High Density Single-Family Residential (HDSF)
Pro	posed Zoning:	Planned Unit Development-Co	onditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)
Cur	rent 2045 Land Use Map:		m/High Density Residential; Medium/High Density Residential, High Density Residential, Office Employment
	ezoned as proposed, the 2	045 Land Use Map Designatio	on will change to: Medium Density Residential; Medium/ ity Residential; Office Employment, Commercial Services
The I			onsistent with the following officially adopted plans, n. Reason:
Per s			atically if rezoning is approved.
√	Apex Transportation Plan ✓ Consistent	n Inconsistent	Reason:
7	Parks, Recreation, Open ✓ Consistent	Space, and Greenways Plan Inconsistent	Reason:

Rezoning Case: 23CZ13 Seymour Mixed Use PUD

Planning Board Meeting Date: January 8, 2024



Legislative Considerations:

The applicant shall propose site-specific standards and conditions that take into account the following considerations, which are considerations that are relevant to the legislative determination of whether or not the proposed conditional zoning district rezoning request is in the public interest. These considerations do not exclude the legislative consideration of any other factor that is relevant to the public interest.

1.	Consistency with 2045 Land Use Plan. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's appropriateness for its proposed location and consistency with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the 2045 Land Use Plan. Consistent Inconsistent Reason:
Per	state law, the Land Use Map will be updated automatically if rezoning is approved.
	·
2.	Compatibility. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's appropriateness for its proposed location and compatibility with the character of surrounding land uses. ✓ Consistent
3.	Zoning district supplemental standards. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's compliance with Sec. 4.4 Supplemental Standards, if applicable. ✓ Consistent ☐ Inconsistent Reason:
4.	Design minimizes adverse impact. The design of the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's minimization of adverse effects, including visual impact of the proposed use on adjacent lands; and avoidance of significant adverse impacts on surrounding lands regarding trash, traffic, service delivery, parking and loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration and not create a nuisance. Consistent Reason:
5.	Design minimizes environmental impact. The proposed Conditional Zoning District use's minimization of environmental impacts and protection from significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources. ✓ Consistent ☐ Inconsistent Reason:

Rezoning Case: 23CZ13 Seymour Mixed Use PUD

Planning Board Meeting Date: January 8, 2024



Ο.		nd services, including road	Is, potable water and wastewater facilities, parks, Reason:
7.	Health, safety, and welfare, safety, or welfare of the resi Consistent		al Zoning (CZ) District use's effect on the health, J. Reason:
8.	Detrimental to adjacent pr substantially detrimental to ✓ Consistent	•	proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use is
9.		traffic impact or noise, or b	sed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use constitutes ecause of the number of persons who will be using Reason:
10.	-	imposed on it by all other	the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use or applicable provisions of this Ordinance for use,

Rezoning Case: 23CZ13 Seymour Mixed Use PUD

Planning Board Meeting Date: January 8, 2024



		17 CAR
Plan	ning Board Recommendation:	To recommend approval with conditions as presented with an
	Motion:	additional condition to address Apex Peakway issue
I	ntroduced by Planning Board member:	Ryan Akers
	Seconded by Planning Board member:	Keith Braswell
	Approval: the project is consistent wit considerations listed above.	th all applicable officially adopted plans and the applicable legislative
✓		is not consistent with all applicable officially adopted plans and/or the as noted above, so the following conditions are recommended to be see it fully consistent:
Additi	onal condition: Applicant to work with s	staff to resolve Apex Peakway fee-in-lieu vs. full construction issue.
	Denial: the project is not consistent legislative considerations as noted about	with all applicable officially adopted plans and/or the applicable ove.
		With5_ Planning Board Member(s) voting "aye"
		With 4 Planning Board Member(s) voting "no"
		<u></u>
	Reasons for dissenting votes:	
	Dissenting votes Tina Sherman, Daniel R	Khodaparast, Tim Royal, and Sarah Soh. See attached.
,		
	report reflects the recommendation of t	the Planning Board, this the <u>8th</u> day of <u>January</u> 2024.
Attes	st: [*]	
	Ma To	Digitally signed by Dianne F. Dianne F. Khin Khin Date: 2024.01.08 20:49:04 -05'00'
Regi	nald Skinner, Planning Board Chair	Dianne Khin, Planning Director
	, "	

Dissenting Member Comments



Planning Board Member Name: Daniel Khodaparast	
Meeting Date: 01/08/2024	
Rezoning # 23CZ14	
☐ Long Range Plan amendment(s)	
☐ Other	

Reason(s) for dissenting vote:

I do not feel that there has been adequate follow up to ensure that the necessary concerns of staff for the Peakway ultimate option and the neighborhood have been met. The proposed zoning adjacent to the western parcel does not complement the existing neighborhood aesthetic. The increase in density and uncertainty around sewer capacity are also concerning, given that the property has not been developed for quite some time. In addition I would have liked to have seen more clarification on addressing green space for residents.

Dissenting Member Comments



Planning Board Member Name: Sarah Soh	
Meeting Date: 1/8/2024	
□ Rezoning # 23CZ13 Seymour Mixed-Use PUD	
☐ Long Range Plan amendment(s)	
□ Other	
Peacen(s) for discenting vote:	

Reason(s) for dissenting vote:

Reasons being Staff does not recommend, and traffic study does not include Grace Christian School expansion/ extension. Although the school is in conversation with the developer, that information is not public yet. The infrastructure is priority and with the vast growth around the Apex Peakway and Salem St, we need to be more cognizant of what is needed Day 1. Rezoning conversations needs polishing with neighboring residents that shared their concerns with storm drainage, density of units. 800 units is significant in this area esp. with insufficient school space in all levels. I believe this is a good beginning but just needs tightening up and come to agreement between Planning Staff, residents and developer.

Dissenting Member Comments



Planning Board Member Name: Tim Royal	
Meeting Date: 1/8/2024	
■ Rezoning # 23CZ13 Seymour PUD	
☐ Long Range Plan amendment(s)	
□ Other	

Reason(s) for dissenting vote:

- 1. Tingen road downgrade from a future 4 lane to 3 lane causes serious concern given the proposed Grace Christian School TIA was not included and they currently have approximately 1,200 students enrolled. Buses will not be an option so parent and student must drive themselves.
- 2. Apex Peakway no commitment from the developer to add language per staff requests.
- 3. Stub streets from Salem Village need to continue the same lot size and remain detached single family residential with .25 acre lots further into the proposed Seymour PUD.

Dissenting Member Comments



Planning Board Member Name: Tina Sherman
Meeting Date: 1/8/2024
\square Rezoning # $2 \& 3$
☐ Long Range Plan amendment(s)
□ Other
Reason(s) for dissenting vote: not aligned with the land use map & issues with staff alignment