

**Project Overview** #1726764

**Project Title:** 2211 Rose Hill Rd., Fayetteville, NC  
**Application Type:** 5.1) Rezoning (Map Amendment)  
**Workflow:** Staff Review

**Jurisdiction:** City of Fayetteville  
**State:** NC  
**County:** Cumberland

**Project Location**

**Project Address or PIN:** 2211 ROSEHILL RD (0438470005000) **Zip Code:** 28305

Is it in Fayetteville? If you're not sure, click this link: [Cumberland County Tax Office GIS system](#)

**GIS Verified Data**

**Project Address:** 2211 ROSEHILL RD

**General Project Information**

Has the land been the subject of a map amendment application in the last five years?: No

**Previous Amendment Case #:** **Proposed Zoning District:** MR-5

**Acreage to be Rezoned:** 21.27 **Is this application related to an annexation?:** No

**Water Service:** Public **Sewer Service:** Public

**A) Please describe all existing uses of the land and existing structures on the site, if any:**

**Existing Use of Land**  
The subject property is presently vacant and undeveloped. It has no commercial, residential, agricultural, or industrial operations on-site and serves only as open land.

**Existing Structures**  
There are no permanent or temporary structures, foundations, utilities, or improvements on the parcel. The site is raw ground with natural vegetation only.

**B) Please describe the zoning district designation and existing uses of lands adjacent to and across the street from the subject site.:**

**Surrounding Zoning & Land-Use Context**

- Immediate adjacency (all sides): Parcels that physically abut the Rosehill Road tract are zoned SF-6 (Single-Family Residential), the same district that currently governs the subject property.
- Comparable MR-5 precedents within 500 ft:
  - Tiffany Court (350 ft west of the subject site) and
  - Topeka Street (475 ft southwest)
 are each zoned MR-5 (Mixed Residential-5) even though they, like the subject tract, are otherwise surrounded by SF-6 parcels. These two pockets provide recent, local examples of Council granting MR-5 where it advances housing needs and provides a mix of housing types.
- Frontage context: For most of the Rosehill Road frontage opposite the site, the land is a platted cemetery. Up-zoning the subject property to MR-5 will therefore have minimal impact on existing residential neighbors and no adverse effect on the cemetery.

**Conclusion**  
Because the subject tract mirrors the physical setting of Tiffany Court and Topeka Street, isolated MR-5 islands amid SF-6, the requested MR-5 designation is consistent with zoning patterns already deemed appropriate within this corridor. Given the lack of incompatibility or additional neighborhood burden but will simply extend an established zoning solution that promotes a greater mix of attainable housing types.

**Amendment Justification - Answer all questions on this and all pages in this section (upload additional sheets as needed).**

**A) State the extent to which the proposed amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan and all other applicable long-range planning documents.:**

The Rosehill Road tract already carries a *Medium-Density Residential (6-15 du/ac)* designation on Fayettevilles 2040 Comprehensive Plan Future Land-Use Map. Re-zoning from SF-6 to MR-5 is the most direct way to implement that map designation, because MR-5 is the Unified Development Ordinances intended zoning district for sites that are expected to deliver missing-middle housing - duplexes and quadplexes-at roughly 10-15 units per acre.

The Comprehensive Plans housing policy framework reinforces this match. Policy LU-7 calls on the City to expand the range of housing types and price points by promoting smaller lots, duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes in precisely those Medium-Density areas where utilities and transit already exist. By shifting to MR-5, the Rosehill site will provide those housing forms without surpassing the density ceiling the Plan envisions, thereby advancing the Citys goals for affordability and diversity of stock.

The Unified Development Ordinance adds a locational test: MR-5 parcels must front an arterial or collector roadway so that moderate densities are supported by appropriate infrastructure. Rosehill Road is mapped as a minor arterial, so the site satisfies that standard and can rely on existing water, sewer, and roadway capacity without requiring capital upgrades.

No adopted small-area or corridor plans assign a conflicting future use to this block of Rosehill Road. In fact, both the North Fayetteville Area guidance and countywide growth-management policies encourage moderate-density infill on under-utilized land where municipal services are already in place. Because the parcel is vacant, the rezoning will not displace residents or businesses, and the cemetery opposite the frontage will experience no operational impact.

Taken together, the requested amendment is entirely consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, meets every locational criterion in the UDO, and aligns with broader long-range goals to concentrate attainable housing where infrastructure can already support it.

**B) Are there changed conditions that require an amendment? :**

**Changed conditions warranting the map amendment**

Several conditions have emerged since the parcel was last zoned that now make an MR-5 designation more appropriate than the legacy SF-6:

**1. Acute housing-inventory shortfall.**

A 2024 countywide housing study found Cumberland County is already short of both rental and for-sale units and will add another 1,800 households in the 2023-2028 window. The analysis singles out a lack of missing-middle

**2. Fort Bragg-related demand shift.**

Ongoing barracks renovations and troop relocations at Fort Bragg are pushing hundreds of soldiers and their families into the off-post market, intensifying demand for attainable units within a 10-mile commuting ring that incl

**3. Corridor infrastructure upgrades now underway.**

In spring 2025 the City launched storm-drain and pedestrian improvements on Rosehill Road, replacing undersized cross-pipes and upgrading sidewalks. These capital works increase the corridors capacity to absorb mode

**4. Policy evolution toward medium-density infill.**

The 2040 Comprehensive Plan, adopted after the current SF-6 zoning was applied, calls for Medium-Density Residential (615 du/ac) on this block. Re-zoning to MR-5 is the specific mechanism the Unified Development Ord

**5. Nearby precedents for MR-5 islands.**

Since the last zoning action, the City has approved two isolated MR-5 pockets; Tiffany Court and Topeka Street; within the same SF-6 fabric and within 500 feet of the subject site. Extending the same treatment to Rosehill F

Taken together-documented housing pressure, fresh infrastructure capacity, an updated land-use vision, and recent MR-5 approvals in the immediate vicinity; these changed conditions create a compelling rationale for amending t

C) State the extent to which the proposed amendment addresses a demonstrated community need.:

**How the amendment meets a demonstrated community need**

Cumberland County is experiencing an acute housing shortage; vacancy has hovered below 1 percent and both renters and buyers face rising prices. A March 2025 housing-market update noted that only **0.7 percent of homes v sale, well under the 23 percent considered healthy**, and nearly half of renters now spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing. The City's own 2024-2028 Action Plan likewise calls the lack of moderately-priced uni countys most pressing issues.

At the same time, renovations and temporary closures of barracks at Fort Liberty are forcing hundreds of soldiers and their families to seek off-post housing through at least 2026, intensifying demand within a short commuting rac Road. Local real-estate professionals have identified **duplexes and quadplexes; exactly the missing-middle types permitted in MR-5**; as the product type in shortest supply.

Re-zoning this vacant parcel from SF-6 (single-family, ~6 du/ac) to MR-5 (mixed residential, up to 15 du/ac) will:

- Deliver roughly **160 attainable units** on existing water-sewer lines, adding supply without sprawl or new infrastructure costs.
- Provide housing options that are naturally more affordable than large-lot detached homes, directly addressing the cost-burden highlighted by City and county studies.
- Ease pressure on neighboring single-family neighborhoods by absorbing some of the Fort Liberty spill-over demand in a location fronting an arterial road and buffered on the opposite side by a cemetery, thus minimizing con

In short, the amendment is responsive to clearly documented, near-term housing needs and offers a practical, policy-supported way to supply the missing-middle units the Fayetteville market currently lacks.

D) State the extent to which the proposed amendment is compatible with existing and proposed uses surrounding the subject land, and why it is the appropriate zoning district for the land.:

**Compatibility and Appropriateness of MR-5 for the Rosehill Road Tract**

The requested MR-5 district harmonizes with its surroundings while supplying a housing type now missing along Rosehill Road:

- **Scale and form match the neighborhood fabric.**  
MR-5 permits duplexes and quadplexes limited to 35 ft in height and subject to the same side- and rear-yard setbacks that govern the abutting SF-6 parcels. From the street they read as large single-family homes rather tha
- **Natural buffering across Rosehill Road.**  
The site fronts a cemetery for most of its road frontage. That low-intensity institutional use has no residential privacy concerns, meaning the added density will neither block views nor introduce incompatible activity opposite
- **Precedent pockets of MR-5 within 500 ft.**  
Tiffany Court and Topeka Street (each surrounded by SF-6 lots) were recently zoned MR-5 without adverse neighborhood effects. Granting the same classification here applies the City's zoning logic consistently along the c
- **Infrastructure already sized for moderate density.**  
Rosehill Road is a mapped minor arterial with existing sidewalks, transit access, and water-sewer mains sized to accommodate up to 15 dwelling units per acre (UDO locational criterion for MR-5). No off-site upgrades are
- **Smooth land-use transition.**  
MR-5 sits between low-density detached housing (SF-6) and larger multi-family districts (MF-15, MF-24). Rezoning the vacant tract to MR-5 provides a logical missing-middle step that eases the shift from one-unit lots to hig
- **Vacant land minimizes impacts.**  
Because the parcel is undeveloped, no residents or buildings will be displaced. Construction can incorporate perimeter landscaping and architectural controls to maintain neighborhood aesthetics, ensuring compatibility in b

Given these factors, MR-5 is the **appropriate zoning district** for the Rosehill Road property: it meets the Unified Development Ordinances siting rules, complements adjoining SF-6 lots in scale and character, extends an establis frontage and existing utilities to deliver needed missing-middle housing without new infrastructure or adverse effects on adjacent land uses.

E) State the extent to which the proposed amendment results in a logical and orderly development pattern.:

Re-zoning the vacant Rosehill Road parcel to MR-5 advances a **logical, orderly pattern of growth** for four reasons:

**1. It fills a planned missing-middle pocket rather than leap-frogging outward.**

The City's 2040 map already earmarks this block for Medium-Density Residential. Converting an empty interior parcel that fronts an arterial road implements that policy exactly where the plan intended, instead of pushing new units deeper into rural edges or established SF-6 streets.

**2. It steps density up gradually along the corridor.**

Rosehill Road now exhibits three tiers of intensity: very-low (cemetery), low (SF-6 homes), and two isolated MR-5 nodes at Tiffany Court and Topeka Street. Rezoning the subject tract extends that middle tier in a continuous line, creating a clear progression \_\_cemetery\_\_ MR-5 duplexes/quadplexes\_\_ SF-6 lots behind; rather than a patchwork of abrupt jumps.

**3. It leverages built infrastructure, avoiding piecemeal upgrades.**

The site already fronts a minor arterial with sidewalks, transit, and water-sewer mains sized for up to 15 du/ac. Adding units here uses that latent capacity and keeps development compact, which is the textbook definition of orderly growth under the UDO and Comprehensive Plan.

**4. It preserves the existing street grid and block structure.**

MR-5 housing can share a single Rosehill curb cut and internal drive while respecting side and rear-yard setbacks equivalent to SF-6. That means no new public streets or odd lot splits; just one cohesive block that aligns with the rectangle of surrounding parcels.

Because it carries out the future-land-use map, extends an established MR-5 line, builds where services already exist, and fits the surrounding plat pattern, the amendment produces a development layout that is both predictable and neatly integrated into Fayetteville's broader growth framework.

F) State the extent to which the proposed amendment might encourage premature development.:

The requested shift from SF-6 to MR-5 **will not encourage premature development** for three key reasons:

**1. Planned density, not acceleration.**

The City's 2040 Future Land-Use Map already designates the site for Medium-Density Residential, so rezoning simply applies the zoning district envisioned for the parcel; it does not leapfrog past the Comprehensive Plan or

**2. Infrastructure is in place today.**

Rosehill Road is an existing minor arterial with adequate capacity, continuous sidewalks, and stubbed water-sewer mains sized for up to 15 dwelling units per acre. No extensions of utilities, roads, or public services are req

**3. Vacant infill, not edge growth.**

The parcel lies within the City limits and is surrounded by developed property on all sides (including a cemetery across the road) so the rezoning activates a gap in the current urban fabric instead of pushing growth to outlyir

Because the amendment merely implements the adopted land-use plan on a fully serviced, in-town site, it does **not** create pressure for premature or uncoordinated development elsewhere.

G) State the extent to which the proposed amendment results in strip-style commercial development.:

The requested change from SF-6 to **MR-5** permits only residential uses (duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, town-home clusters, and limited civic facilities). It **does not introduce or expand any retail zoning** along Rosehill Road,

- **Use limitations.** MR-5 expressly excludes general retail, drive-through, automotive, or big-box uses that typify strip corridors; its non-residential allowances are limited to small civic or community facilities (e.g., day-care, ne
- **Frontage character.** Buildings in MR-5 must front the street with residential faades, maintain 20-ft front setbacks, and observe the same height envelope as adjacent SF-6 homes, so the visual environment remains residen
- **No incremental retail pressure.** Because the parcel is bordered by a cemetery on the opposite frontage and SF-6 lots on its flanks, the rezoning does not create a logical follow-on retail corner or pad site; any future comm

For these reasons the amendment **does not (and cannot) result in strip-style commercial development** along Rosehill Road.

H) State the extent to which the proposed amendment results in the creation of an isolated zoning district unrelated to adjacent and surrounding zoning districts.:

The MR-5 zoning requested for the Rosehill Road parcel would **not create an isolated, out-of-place district**. Two MR-5 pockets already exist within 500?feet (on Tiffany Court and Topeka Street) each surrounded by SF-6 lots much like the subject site. Rezoning this tract simply stitches a third MR-5 area into that same corridor pattern, reinforcing a modest string of missing-middle housing zones rather than standing alone. Because the new district will sit on an arterial frontage and share identical height, setback, and residential character controls with its SF-6 neighbors, it remains contextually tied to the surrounding fabric rather than forming a disconnected outlier.

I) State the extent to which the proposed amendment results in significant adverse impacts on the property values of surrounding lands.:

The rezoning to MR-5 is **not expected to cause any significant adverse impact on the value of nearby properties** for several reasons:

**Comparable local precedent shows stable values.**

Homes abutting the MR-5 pockets on Tiffany Court and Topeka Street continue to list and sell at prices in line with, or slightly above, the broader SF-6 market. Those rezonings did not trigger discounted sales or assessment challenges, indicating that duplex-and-quadplex development of this scale is already accepted by the market.

**Neighborhood character remains residential and low-rise.**

MR-5 buildings are limited to 35 feet in height and must meet the same front, side, and rear setbacks as SF-6 structures. From the street they read as large homes, not apartment blocks, so potential buyers in the SF-6 streets behind the site still enjoy the same visual character and privacy expectations.

**Additional eyes on the street can increase desirability.**

Moderate infill adds residents who support better maintenance of public infrastructure, increases passive surveillance, and can raise perceptions of neighborhood vitality; factors that research shows either stabilize or improve adjacent single-family values rather than erode them.

**Cemetery frontage buffers the most immediate interface.**

Because a cemetery occupies most of the opposite frontage, no single-family homes sit directly across from the new units. This arrangement further reduces any perceived competition or conflict that might otherwise weigh on front-door curb appeal.

**Sewer, water, and roadway capacity already exist.**

No off-site assessments or special districts are required to serve the project, so surrounding owners will not face infrastructure cost-sharing that could negatively affect their equity.

Taken together (documented local sales experience, strict residential form controls, inherent buffering, and no new financial burden on neighbors) the proposed amendment offers additional housing choice without any credible mechanism for depressing surrounding property values.

J) State the extent to which the proposed amendment results in significantly adverse impacts on the natural environment.:

**Extent to which the amendment affects the natural environment (wetlands included)**

A mapped wetland complex skirts the southwest corner of the Rosehill Road parcel, so environmental safeguards are an important part of any future development. Even with that resource present, the proposed change from SF-6

1. **Rezoning alone does not disturb soil or water.**  
A map amendment is a policy decision only; ground-disturbing activity cannot proceed until a site-specific plan has been reviewed for compliance with City storm-water rules and state/federal wetland regulations.
2. **Wetland impacts are tightly regulated at two levels.**  
**Federal/State permits.** Any fill within jurisdictional wetlands will require a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit and a companion NC DEQ 401 Water-Quality Certification or Isolated-Wetland authorization. The **City UDO standards.** Fayettevilles ordinance echoes those requirements, expressly stating that all state and federal wetland approvals must be in hand before a grading permit is issued.
3. **MR-5 can preserve more wetland area than SF-6.**  
Because MR-5 allows 3- to 4-unit buildings on a single foundation, the same 160 units can fit on a smaller development footprint than 160 detached houses on 6,000 ft2 lots. The higher-yield building arrangement lets the sit
4. **Post-construction storm-water controls remain identical.**  
Whether the land stays SF-6 or becomes MR-5, any development must meet the Citys post-construction storm-water standards (peak-rate detention, water-quality treatment, and erosion-control measures) ensuring runoff

**Conclusion**

With federal, state, and City safeguards in place (and the design flexibility MR-5 provides to cluster buildings away from sensitive areas) the rezoning itself does **not** pose a significant adverse impact on the wetlands or the broad

**Primary Contact Information**

**Contractor's NC ID#:**

**Project Contact - Agent/Representative**

Benjamin Strout  
Strout Architecture  
438 Carr Ave  
Homewood , AL 35209  
P:2055698774  
[ben@anotherstory.com](mailto:ben@anotherstory.com)

**Project Owner**

Benjamin Strout  
Strout Architecture  
438 Carr Ave  
Homewood , AL 35209  
P:2055698774  
[ben@anotherstory.com](mailto:ben@anotherstory.com)

**Property Owner Email:** [claudio@valoriscapitalpartners.com](mailto:claudio@valoriscapitalpartners.com)

As an unlicensed contractor, I am aware that I cannot enter into a contract that the total amount of the project exceeds \$40,000. :

**NC State General Contractor's License Number:**

**NC State Electrical Contractor #1 License Number:**

**NC State Electrical Contractor #2 License Number:**

**NC State Electrical Contractor #3 License Number:**

NC State Mechanical Contractor's #1 License Number:  
NC State Mechanical Contractor's #2 License Number:  
NC State Mechanical Contractor #3 License Number:  
NC State Plumbing Contractor #1 License Number:  
NC State Plumbing Contractor #2 License Number:

Indicate which of the following project contacts should be included on this project: Architect