

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE CHAPEL HILL TOWN COUNCIL
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2006 AT 7:00 P.M.**

Mayor Kevin Foy called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Council members present were Laurin Easthom, Sally Greene, Ed Harrison, Cam Hill, Mark Kleinschmidt, Bill Strom, Bill Thorpe, and Jim Ward.

Staff members present were Deputy Town Manager Florentine Miller, Assistant Town Manager Bruce Heflin, Town Attorney Ralph Karpinos, Town Information Officer Catherine Lazorko, Planning Director J. B. Culpepper, Development Planning Coordinator Gene Poveromo, and Acting Town Clerk Sandy Cook.

Item 2 – Concept Plan: UNC Development Plan Modification #3

Development Planning Coordinator Gene Poveromo noted that this modification included 810,000 square feet of new floor area; demolition and replacement of Davie Hall; expansion to Boshamer and Kenan Stadiums; relocation and improvement to the Ground Facilities; replacement of Skipper Bowles Drive tennis court with parking deck/tennis court; relocation of parking spaces from the Bell Tower Deck to the Craig Parking Deck; and construction of a reclaimed water storage facility.

Mr. Poveromo stated they recommended that the Council review this Concept Plan, receive comments from the Community Design Commission and citizens, and adopt a resolution transmitting comments to the applicant.

Anna Wu, speaking for the University and the UNC Health Care System, presented an overview of the Concept Plan. She noted that the recent updates to the Campus Master Plan were guiding the modifications to the Development Plan. Ms. Wu said that some of the projects were new proposals, and others were revisions to previously approved projects.

Ms. Wu displayed a site development map that showed the location of the 29 site development permits that had been issued to date. She then displayed a map that indicated the 14 projects proposed under this modification. Ms. Wu stated that overall the projects included academic, research and office buildings, infrastructure, athletic facilities and pedestrian improvements. She said the three parking deck proposals relocate previously approved spaces and stayed within the cap of approved spaces.

Ms. Wu stated that the 14 projects represented an increase of approximately 1,000,000 square feet. She said none of the projects meet the requirements for expedited review, and two had been identified as perimeter transition area projects. Ms. Wu then provided a brief overview of each of the 14 projects:

A-22 Replacement of Davie Hall

The replacement of Davie Hall is planned to be a 25,000 square-foot footprint with three floors for a total of 75,000 square feet. This building will restore the streetscape and pedestrian connection along Cameron Avenue to the Arboretum by setting the building away from the street. It will also provide updated classroom, research and office space for the Department of Psychology.

0-5 Addition to Alumni Center

This project is a small addition to the existing Alumni Center to provide more office and meeting space. The addition would be approximately 12,000 square feet.

ATH-1 Boshamer Stadium Improvements (PTA)

Planned improvements include: additional seating, concessions and toilets, a new batting tunnel, field and landscape improvements, lighting improvements, circulation changes and a field maintenance building. Pedestrian and streetscape improvements on Ridge Road between Boshamer and Henry Stadiums are also included in this project.

ATH-2 Kenan Stadium Improvements

Planned improvements include additional box seats on the south side of the stadium and new seating areas on the east side. Additional toilets, concessions, a structured concourse and a pedestrian connection to Rams Head Plaza are also included. New seats would total 8,804 and new building area would total 125,000 square feet.

P-12 Tennis Deck Site

This deck would be on the site of the tennis courts on Bowles Drive. The deck would provide parking on two levels with new tennis courts on the top of the deck. These new tennis courts will be accessible from the new open space created by the new Ram Village residence halls. This deck will accommodate the remaining 230 unassigned permit parking spaces.

A-20 School of Information and Library Sciences

The School of Information and Library Sciences (SILS) will be housed in approximately 125,000 square feet on the south side of Blythe Drive. This facility will provide a consolidated location for the SILS program near complementary users on campus and will address the current deficit of classroom, library, and office space for the school.

1-7 Reclaimed Water Tank

This tank is a joint project with OWASA to provide a reclaimed water system on campus, just south of the Manning Steam Plant. A water storage facility is a necessary component of this overall project.

1-6 Grounds Facility (PTA)

This project will provide administrative office and storage space for the Grounds Department. The Grounds Department is currently located in temporary facilities slightly north of the proposed site. The total square footage for these buildings and structures is

approximately 48,000 square feet. The proposed site is south and west of Mason Farm Road and is on the site currently occupied by Odum Village buildings #700 - #711.

R-5 UNC Imaging Center

The Imaging Center will allow the Medical School to centralize all the MRI and other imaging processes in a single location; they are currently scattered throughout campus. This building will connect to the Lineberger building on its south side and be approximately 330,000 square feet.

0-4 Medical Office Building

This new office building on North Medical Drive will provide space for a portion of the Medical School faculty and staff who currently occupy Medical School wings B, C, D, E and F. This will allow future redevelopment of this area for hospital expansion projects. It will also help meet the demand for Medical School faculty offices that already exists on campus. The building is currently planned to be 180,000 square feet.

P-11 Craige Parking Deck Expansion

This expansion would add three new levels to the existing Craige deck. Approximately 990 parking spaces that were previously approved for the Bell Tower site (890) and unassigned spaces from other parking projects (100) would move to the Craige deck.

P-4 Bell Tower Parking Deck

In order to preserve an appropriate scale of development in the Bell Tower area, the design has been refined. A key decision that keeps a balance of building and open space in this area is to reduce the size of the approved 1600 space parking deck by 890 spaces for a new total of 710 spaces in Bell Tower. These spaces will shift to the expanded Craige Deck and a connector road that had been planned from the deck to Manning Drive will be eliminated.

A-21 Bell Tower Academic Building & R-1, 2, 3

This update to the Bell Tower development shows the latest configuration of research buildings 1, 2, and 3, a smaller parking deck (P-4) and a new academic building (A-21) to screen the parking deck from the green space. The design also includes a pedestrian bridge across South Road. A-21, the only new footprint in this area, will house research and office support services in approximately 80,000 square feet.

A-14 Dental Science Building

Approximately 175,000 square feet of additional space is planned for this building; the existing Dental Office Building and Dental Research Building will be demolished. An 84,990 square foot building was approved at this location in the Development Plan. The larger facility currently planned will allow the School of Dentistry to increase its enrollment by 50% to meet the health care needs of North Carolina. This facility will provide the research, academic and clinical science capacity to educate more dental students.

Ms. Wu said in addition to the notification to the Town and to over 1,000 residents of tonight's meeting, the University had presented these plans at a community meeting on March 21 and to the Laurel Hill Garden Club on April 11. She said they plan to submit a full application later this spring and return to the Council in the fall for further discussion. Ms. Wu stated that in March the University had offered to provide the Council with a tour of the development plan projects that had reached completion, and tonight again extended that invitation.

Joe Capowski stated that he was a resident of Coolidge Street, which was adjacent to the southwest corner of the campus. He quoted several statements made several years ago by UNC officials and others regarding the health affairs area and its effect on the surrounding area, as well as other statements that had been made regarding the lack of "human space" in this area.

Mr. Capowski said after a decade this area was worse than ever, and continued to deteriorate in the areas of noise, traffic, congestion, unsightliness, difficulty for people to walk around, and outdoor human spaces. So far, he said, planning had not worked.

Mr. Capowski said he was afraid that what was presented was not planning; rather it was utilitarian placement of large buildings with little regard for their cumulative impact. He said it was a shift of more high-intensity campus functions towards the southeastern and southern areas of the campus.

Mr. Capowski quoted the third principle identified by the Horace Williams Citizens Committee regarding the Carolina North property: "We may reach a point where the cumulative impacts of growth are such that no amount of mitigation would be possible and still retain the charm of the Town and the quality of life that both the citizens and the State expect." Mr. Capowski noted that although that principle was written with regard to Carolina North, it applied today to the Health Affairs area of the campus.

Mr. Capowski said they were still waiting for NCDOT to improve South Columbia Street, and asked that this development plan modification be conditioned on the South Columbia Street improvements being finished before any of these new buildings could be staffed and used.

Kimberly Brewer, a resident of Purefoy Road, speaking as a member of the neighborhood adjacent to the south campus, a professional planner, and a member of the UNC Advisory Committee that helped to develop the Master Plan. She stated that over the past five years the south campus had become a major construction zone. Ms. Brewer noted that 13 of the 14 proposed modifications were located on the south campus. She stated that although the total number of parking spaces had not increased above the cap, many had been relocated to the south campus.

Ms. Brewer said traffic was an issue before the construction boom, and, as predicted, it had worsened during the boom. She said that this modification would further worsen the traffic impacts. Ms. Brewer requested that the Council approve only the proposed

modifications that were contained in the original Master Plan adopted by the Council, and only contingent upon the improvements to South Columbia Street and the addition of traffic calming improvements in adjacent neighborhoods.

Ms. Brewer also asked that the Council not approve the additional square footage that was beyond what was approved in the original Master Plan, unless and until the University could show that the traffic impacts could be fully mitigated. She said they could very well reach a point where the south campus could not absorb the development, and this modification may put them at that point. Ms. Brewer asked that the Council carefully consider that so that point was not reached.

Ms. Brewer agreed with Mr. Capowski's comments regarding the aesthetics of the south campus, saying it had become a "hodpodge of concrete." She added that the Development Plan did not appear to offer an orderly phased mechanism to implement the Master Plan, but merely a way for the University to inform the Town and neighbors of its latest development plans and projects. Ms. Brewer said each time the University proposed modifications the surrounding neighborhoods were impacted. She said they needed more continuity and more certainty in the planning process.

Mayor Foy said the Master Plan was not adopted by the Council but had been adopted by the University, adding it had a goal of making south campus more human-centered. Mayor Foy said they don't see that happening, and asked for a response. Ms. Wu said that the last five years had seen intense construction, and she knew that it was hard to see where the end goal was. She said when you had as many disturbed sites as they did, you had to look past the exposed dirt to imagine what it would look like beyond that.

Ms. Wu said beginning in the fall significant changes would be noticeable, particularly in the area of the Bowles parking lot where Ram Village was under construction. She said when the construction was completed and the open spaces restored you would see a huge change in that area. Ms. Wu said ITS/Manning was expected to be completed at the end of 2006, at which time the streetscape would be extended on Manning Drive that currently ran in front of the new residents halls further west on Manning.

Ms. Wu said it was incremental, and all of the planned connections were not yet in place. She said she believed the transformation would start picking up the pace in the next two to three years as they moved out of this intense construction phase.

Ms. Wu said this was one of the reason the University had encouraged tours for the Council. She said when you see the Rams Head Plaza and the Science Complex and some of the other new spaces you could see how the campus would improve. Ms. Wu agreed that right now it was difficult because of the construction and detours for pedestrians and vehicles. She said they did their best to provide information to the public, but they did see completion of these projects coming.

Ms. Wu said the construction may seem chaotic, but it was a planned process and it took time. She said they understood people's frustration about the construction and disturbances.

Mayor Foy asked about the parking spaces being relocated to south campus. Ms. Wu explained that the original plan contained a proposal for a deck at the end of Manning Drive, which was approved for 1,500 parking spaces. She said that deck had been deleted and had asked that some of those spaces be diverted to the Jackson parking deck and some to the Cobb parking deck, but that did not total all of the 1,500 spaces that had been approved. Ms. Wu said when she referred to the "unassigned" parking spaces proposed to be relocated in the tennis court parking lots, she was referring to 230 of those spaces not previously diverted from the 1,500 approved. She added the remaining 100 would go into the expansion of the Craige deck.

Mayor Foy asked, regarding the deleted deck that Ms. Wu had referred to, if she was saying it was deleted from the Master Plan or the Development Plan. Ms. Wu responded it had been deleted from the Development Plan, adding they had proposed to build that deck in the first plan, but under Modification #1 had removed it. She said it remained in the Master Plan, but they did not see it being built in the foreseeable future.

Mayor Foy said in order to be clear, Ms. Wu was saying that some of the 1,500 parking spaces approved for the Manning deck, now deleted from the Development Plan, were being shifted to the Craig deck. He asked if that expansion to the Craig deck was included in their Master Plan. Ms. Wu said the expansion of the Craige deck with the three additional levels had been considered when additional design work was being completed. She said in the second modification they had asked and the Council had approved that the 1,000 spaces from Venable be combined with the 600 spaces in the Bell Tower. Ms. Wu said once they had looked at the design for that area which included a new chiller plant, parking deck and research buildings, they realized it was far too much development for that area. She reiterated that all of the shifts of parking spaces necessitated by changes in the Development Plan remained within the 1,500 cap approved for additional spaces.

Ms. Wu stated that the Dental Sciences building would include a bridge across the intersection of South Columbia and Manning to the plaza at Thurston Bowles. She reminded the Council that a student had been killed at that location, and that the intersection had a tremendous amount of pedestrian traffic. Ms. Wu said they had always anticipated with the development of that corner the ability to construct a pedestrian network that would link the medical research campus all the way to the genetic medicine building.

Council Member Easthom asked if this plan reflected the changes recently announced at East Carolina University (ECU) regarding the dental program. Ms. Wu said it did, adding that even though a new dental school was proposed at ECU there would continue to be some enrollment growth here.

Mayor Foy said there were two speakers who requested that the South Columbia Street improvements be linked to the Development Plan Modification approval, and they had received communications from other citizens regarding that. He said the Council had a strong preference for those improvements to be made, noting there was a precedent on the Council, using as an example the construction of the superstreet, that roadway improvements be linked with new construction on the theory that the roadway system needed to be settled in order for them to understand how it would work. Mayor Foy said that was something that the Council would consider.

Council Member Kleinschmidt asked which two areas were identified as perimeter areas. Ms. Wu replied the improvements and additions around Boshamer Stadium and the ground facility at Hibbard Drive. Council Member Kleinschmidt said those two areas were not referenced by the neighbors who spoke, and asked what if any discussion had taken place about them. Ms. Wu said when they met with the Laurel Hill Garden Club they had explained the Boshamer project including the new facilities to be added in order to begin a discussion.

Council Member Kleinschmidt asked about the grounds facility. Ms. Wu responded that project was a relocation of existing facilities to a new permanent site, noting it had occupied the site now under construction for genetic medicine. She said because it was proposed to be relocated on the edge of the campus, they had felt it appropriate to propose it as a transition area project.

Council Member Kleinschmidt asked about the impact of the ECU dental school on UNC, which had proposed a new 175,000 square foot building. Ms. Wu said the actual student numbers were still being considered, but they did expect some increase in enrollment and that would necessitate the addition of faculty. She said what they were doing was replacing outdated office and research space, and providing new and expanded facilities.

Council Member Kleinschmidt asked if she saw that as a perimeter project. Ms. Wu said not in the sense that there were other University buildings between that site and the property line. Council Member Kleinschmidt said with the way the road network operated in that area the impact on the Westside neighborhood might be worth exploring more closely.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said when the Manning deck was deleted from the Development Plan and the spaces were transferred, he was disappointed because he had never liked the idea. Now, he said, he was disappointed that those spaces were being shifted into the interior of the campus. Council Member Kleinschmidt said he continued to believe it was not proper to move those spaces. He said the 1,500 space cap had been approved with the original development proposal was reached in part with the understanding that many of those spaces would be located on the periphery of the campus next to a major interchange at Manning and 15-501. Council Member Kleinschmidt said that had made it more tolerable for citizens to accept, but as we move them more interior to the campus it becomes more problematic and he did not like that approach.

Ms. Wu stated they would consider Council Member Kleinschmidt's comment about the Dental building being considered as a perimeter transition area project. Council Member Kleinschmidt said he understood why it had not been included before.

Council Member Ward said when this came back to the Council, he wanted to understand what kinds of things were built into the project budgets to make sure that the University was keeping up with the infrastructure needs of the transit system, whether it be bus shelters or other bike and pedestrian amenities. He said in many cases where the volume was heavy, the facilities were inadequate.

Council Member Ward said in the process of construction of many of the projects, it would require the demolition of many buildings. He said he wanted to know what was being done to keep that demolition material out of the landfill, and how it was being recycled for reuse. Council Member Ward said a lot of the construction was on the southern part of the campus, which was the watershed. He said if it was just during construction with all the raw soil exposed or the more permanent creation of impervious surfaces, he wanted to understand what was being done regarding stormwater issues and the watershed.

Council Member Ward asked the staff to report on how the Town was following the stormwater requirements associated with OI-4 relative to the water quality and volume.

Council Member Ward said that one of the improvements noted for Boshamer Stadium was a goal to improve the pedestrian flow along Ridge Road, and asked that the University consider including in that survey of connectivity the bike and pedestrian connectivity with the Coker Pinetum which shared a boundary with the neighborhood, the stadium and Ridge Road.

Council Member Ward said regarding the traffic impacts with changing the location of the parking spaces, he would like to understand what the shifts of those parking spaces do to the performance of the Manning/Fordham intersection and the South Columbia/Manning intersection, which were the closest to those parking shifts and concentrations.

Council Member Ward asked what the implications were in regards to the partial tunnel collapse on Pittsboro Road. He asked about the impact on surrounding buildings and the integrity of that tunnel. Ms. Wu said they were coming to the Historic District Commission in May to ask for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish Nash Hall, which sat on top of that utility tunnel. She said they had worked with the Department of Cultural Resources as part of that discussion.

Ms. Wu said the building had been vacated and occupants relocated to other facilities. She said they had plans underway to construct a new tunnel and that work would begin once the Manning steam tunnel was on line. Ms. Wu said work was progressing well on the correction at Pittsboro Street, noting they had received NCDOT approval.

Council Member Harrison asked how functional the Craige deck would be while construction was taking place, noting adding three levels was drastic. Ms. Wu said their initial feasibility study showed they could maintain about three-quarters of the deck in operation while under construction. She said they did not now have the project scheduled, and the funding needed to be finalized. Ms. Wu said they had completed engineering studies to determine how to add those three levels to the deck.

Council Member Harrison asked what would happen to the one-fourth of the current users of the deck that would not longer be able to park there during construction. Ms. Wu replied that parking would be redistributed to other locations. Council Member Harrison asked if that deck was used primarily by staff. Ms. Wu responded yes.

Council Member Harrison said that mobility issues on the south campus had been mentioned. He said he believed it was going to be difficult for people to get from transit stops to where they needed to go. Council Member Harrison said he believed the University would have to rethink those transit routes and stops because new streets would be created giving people new places to go. Ms. Wu said it was true they had not anticipated the difficulties caused by the closing of Pittsboro Street. Council Member Harrison said that should be good training for what this would be like. He said it looked as if this would be a difficult part of the campus to get around in, and difficult for people to move from one side of campus to the other with this much going on.

Council Member Harrison said he agreed with the comments made regarding the improvements to South Columbia Street, noting the Council would do whatever it took it get it built. He said it should not be something that had to be continually brought up, because it should have already been done.

Council Member Greene said regarding the scale of south campus and Manning Drive in particularly, the development was enormous. She asked what were the ultimate plans for Manning Drive, asking if they planned to shrink it in size. Ms. Wu said there were no plans to reduce the width. She said that as buildings moved closer to the road, it served to calm the traffic, but that was accompanied by including the appropriate streetscape in the project. Ms. Wu said when you approach the top of the hill and see the new residence halls, that did signal to drivers that they needed to slow down in that zone.

Ms. Wu said when all of the projects in that area were completed, from the new residence halls to East Drive, they would have shifted the sidewalks inbound and added planting strips with bollards and street trees, channeling pedestrians to appropriate intersections. She said that would take place in stages, but when completed would make a significant improvement to safe pedestrian access.

Council Member Greene asked if they had thought about a median strip down Manning Drive. Ms. Wu said they had considered that, but with the turning lanes and existing curb-to-curb dimensions they could not add medians. She said their traffic team had spent a lot of time discussing the feasibility of that with NCDOT, but in the end they had

opted not to widen it but to narrow the lanes and add planting strips and bollards and chains as an approach to traffic calming.

Council Member Greene said the future road planned parallel to the south, which she understood was not part of this plan and was indefinite, was nonetheless of great concern to the neighbors, and they were anxious to understand more about it and to participate in that process.

Mayor Foy asked if the other new road, referred to as Blythe Drive, was connected to this Development Plan. Ms. Wu said that would connect Skipper Bowles to Hibbard Drive. She said it would be completed in the next year or so, noting the utility tunnel was located there and the road would be placed on top of that walkable tunnel. Mayor Foy said the School of Information and Library Science would be located on that road. Ms. Wu said that was correct.

Council Member Hill said looking at the aerial views of the campus, it appeared that the overall theme of the Development Plan was that concrete and masonry were good and trees were bad. He said he looked at some of the photographs and could not determine what area he was looking at, even though he was very familiar with the campus. Council Member Hill said the campus was becoming unrecognizable.

Council Member Hill said the University should be proud of its ability to raise funds and put up buildings, but he believed that planning was completely absent. He said he believed their strategy was to overbuild this area to the point that it would not work any longer, and that any objections the Council might have to Mason Farm and expansion of those streets would be hard for them to render. He said adding 600 parking spaces to the Craige deck would impact Country Club Road and South Road to such a degree as to be unworkable.

Council Member Hill said the differences between the Manning deck, the Cobb deck and the Craige deck were huge as far as adding traffic to the interior of the campus. He believed that at a minimum the idea of tying the improvements to South Columbia Street to this plan made sense, he said.

Council Member Hill asked how old Davie Hall was. Ms. Wu said it was built in the 1960s. Council Member Hill said it had always been considered unattractive, and now it was scheduled for demolition. He asked how that fit in with the University's concept of sustainability when they planned to tear down a 40-year-old building, noting that the same applied to the demolition of Odum Village. Ms. Wu responded that the decision to replace Davie Hall rather than renovate it came from an analysis that indicated that addressing the deferred maintenance items was coming very close to the replacement value of that building. She said that facility was out of date with a lot of accessibility issues and code issues, and they saw the opportunity to improve that site.

Council Member Hill asked if the new building would be larger. Ms. Wu said it would be close to the same size, noting Davie Hall was 72,000 square feet and the new building was planned for 75,000 square feet.

Council Member Hill asked how the additions to Kenan Stadium were funded. Ms. Wu said they were funded through athletics, with no State appropriations. Council Member Hill said he understood that some of those additions would include box seats, meaning that someone would pay extra for those seats. Ms. Wu said she was not familiar with the pricing plan for those box seats.

Council Member Thorpe said he was curious as to how the University felt about the concept plan process. He said the process allowed the Council to ask any question they wanted to because there was no project in front of them. Council Member Thorpe asked about the placement of the water tower. Ms. Wu said the proposal was to site it just south of the Manning steam plant and just north of Blythe Drive, which would begin to aggregate some of their infrastructure sites together. She said the water tower had height requirements related to the pressure needed, and one of the reasons they proposed to site it there was that it was next to the walkable tunnel and Mason Farm followed that alignment. Ms. Wu said that site was also central to the location of the chiller plants, and because of the height they needed to be conscious of the flight paths for the health care system. She said that area already contained tall structures related to the steam structure so it was the most appropriate site.

Council Member Thorpe stated that with the new seats added to Kenan Stadium, that the University communicate to the NCDOT that the University would not receive approval until the improvements were made to South Columbia Street. He said those new seats would add to the traffic woes.

Council Member Thorpe commented that the University supported national championship teams, mentioning the men and women's basketball programs and the fact that the women's coach, Sylvia Hatchell, had won National Coach of the Year honors. He said with all the success achieved by the University, when the Council invited a University team or group to appear before it to receive the Town's congratulations he believed they should have the courtesy to accept.

Council Member Thorpe also commented on the cost of attending a football or basketball game, noting it was out of reach for many of the Town's citizens. He suggested that the University consider a reduced rate for Town residents, and possibly reserving some seats for Town residents since many times games were sold out.

Council Member Easthom echoed the sentiment regarding the shift of the parking spaces to the south, as well as the timing of the South Columbia Street improvements. She said at minimum a traffic impact analysis or some sort of study of the implications of moving the spaces should be conducted. Ms. Wu said that analysis would be included in the traffic analysis when they submit the application.

Mayor Foy said one of the things that was of concern to the Council that the University should consider was that the Master Plan did include attempts to make the south campus more like north campus, and he would want to show the work being done in that regard now or begin doing some of it with this development plan. He said that would help not make it look as if all the "good stuff" was being deferred and all the big buildings were being built now.

COUNCIL MEMBER KLEINSCHMIDT MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER WARD, ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION R-1. THE MOTION WAS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY (9-0).

Transportation Impact Analysis

for

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Development Plan Modification No. 3

Prepared for

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Prepared by

**MARTIN
ALEXIOU
BRYSON**

Revised October 2006

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a part of the modification to the Development Plan, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is required to submit an updated Transportation Impact Analysis. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is requesting modifications to the Development Plan that was approved by the Town of Chapel Hill in 2001 and modified in March 2003 and March 2004. As part of the approval process for the original Development Plan, a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) was submitted to the Town of Chapel Hill in July 2001 in accordance with the requirements of the Town's Office/Institutional-4 OI-4 Zoning District regulations. An update to the TIA, titled *Transportation Impact Analysis and Transportation Management Plan*, was subsequently submitted in January 2002. In March 2003, a modification to the Development Plan was submitted (Modification No. 1) and approved followed by an update to the TIA in January 2004. In March 2004 another modification to the Development Plan (Modification No. 2) was submitted and approved. In February 2006 an updated TIA was submitted. Modification No. 3 of the University Development Plan was submitted in June 2006. As part of an agreement with that submittal, new traffic data was collected at certain locations during the Fall of 2006. This report documents revisions to the traffic analysis of Modification No. 3.

The proposed modifications include building expansions, the construction of new buildings, and relocation of previously approved parking facilities. The modifications focusing on parking facilities will affect traffic patterns on roadways on and around the University campus. These modifications are listed below:

Parking Facility Changes

- Bell Tower Deck Reduction – The number of parking spaces in the Bell Tower parking deck is reduced from the approved 1,600 to a new total of 710 spaces. The remaining 890 spaces are shifted to the Craige Parking Deck.
- Craige Parking Deck Expansion – The existing parking deck will be expanded to accommodate 990 additional parking spaces. In addition to the 890 spaces shifted from the Bell Tower parking deck, 100 previously unassigned spaces will be shifted to the expanded deck.
- Tennis Deck Site – A new deck will be constructed on the existing tennis courts site on Bowles Drive to accommodate approximately 231 remaining spaces that were previously unassigned.

This report provides an analysis of traffic impacts resulting from the proposed parking changes. University and Town of Chapel Hill staff agreed to the scope of the analysis to address these impacts. Since the amount of parking proposed to be added on Main Campus has not changed, the trip reduction strategies proposed to address the shortfalls (e.g., park-and-ride and transit improvements) are unchanged and therefore not described in this report but can be found in the February 2006 TIA Update.

49

The traffic analysis was undertaken by applying the same techniques, model, and assumptions used in the February 2006 TIA Update. In agreement with the Town of Chapel Hill, the University collected new traffic counts at certain intersections to update the traffic analysis in the February 2006 TIA Update and the original report for Modification No. 3. The new counts were completed in Fall 2006.

In addition to the intersections that were analyzed as part of the February 2006 TIA Update, intersections on the NC 54 corridor, the Martin Luther King, Jr corridor, and the US 15-501 corridor were assessed for inclusion in the analyses. The following intersections are included in the revised analyses for Modification No. 3:

- Raleigh Road (NC 54) at East Barbee Chapel Hill Road
- Raleigh Road (NC 54) at West Barbee Chapel Hill Road
- Raleigh Road (NC 54) at Burning Tree Lane
- Raleigh Road (NC 54) at Meadowmont Lane
- Raleigh Road (NC 54) at Hamilton Street
- US 15-501 at Culbreth Road
- US 15-501 at Bennet Road
- US 15-501 at Main Street (Southern Village)

The analyses performed for the February 2006 TIA Update resulted in only minor changes in the 2004 update projections for intersection levels of service. In some cases, the level of service slightly improved as a result of a decline in existing intersection traffic volumes compared to the previous counts (undertaken in 2003). The February 2006 analyses also indicated that conditions at several intersections that were already suffering poor levels of service would deteriorate further in 2010 as a result of growth in background traffic unrelated to the Development Plan. Those same findings can be reported from the analyses included in this Modification.

Although the shift in parking alters traffic patterns in some key intersections, the peak hour level of service at the affected intersections is not significantly impacted. The shift in parking spaces is primarily focused on south campus, altering traffic patterns on Manning Drive and the other south campus roadways.

3.5.2 Office/Institutional – 4 District (01-4)

(a) Purpose and Intent

The purpose and intent of the Office/Institutional-4 District OI-4 is to establish procedural and substantive standards for the Town Council's review and approval of development on large tracts of land where the predominant use is to be college, university, hospital, clinics, public cultural facilities, and related functions.

The objective of this Section and the OI-4 district is to allow for growth and development while protecting the larger community, nearby neighborhoods, and the environment from impacts accompanying major new development. A key feature of this district is the preparation of a Development Plan that would allow the property owner, immediate neighbors, and the larger community to understand specifically what levels of development are being proposed, and what impacts would likely accompany the development, so that mitigation measures can be designed and implemented.

(b) Overview of Development Review Procedures

Procedures in this zoning district are designed to facilitate:

- ⌚ Articulation of development plans that involve multiple buildings in multiple locations over an extended time period on a given tract of land, as defined in a Development Plan;
- ⌚ Identification of total infrastructure needs for such proposed development as specified in a Development Plan and cumulative impacts resulting from full development as specified in a Development Plan; and
- ⌚ Provision of measures to mitigate the negative impacts, including off-site construction of parking decks as described in subsection (d)(2), phased in a manner appropriate with the pace of construction.

To this end, owners of property zoned OI-4 are encouraged to prepare detailed Development Plans, as described below, for review and approval by the Town Council. For buildings that are included in an approved Development Plan, Site Development Permits for individual buildings are to be issued by the Town Manager, following a determination by the Town Manager that such individual building plans are generally consistent with the Town Council-approved Development Plan.

For development proposed within an OI-4 zoning district that is not included in a Town Council-approved Development Plan, but is a minor change according to the provisions of subsection (i) of this Section, the Town Manager may approve a change to the Development Plan and issue a Site Development Permit. For development proposed within an OI-4 zoning district that is not included in a Town Council-approved Development Plan and that cannot be considered a minor change to the Plan according to subsection (i) of this Section, such development shall be considered to be a Special Use, and subject to the Special Use Permit procedural requirements of Section 45 of this Chapter. In the alternative, the applicant may apply to the Town Council for an amendment to the Development Plan.

Once a property is zoned Office/Institutional-4, all regulations, standards, and procedures prescribed for the previously-applicable zoning district shall apply until (1) a Development Plan is approved; or (2) six months have elapsed, whichever comes first.

(c) Concept Plan Review

Prior to submittal of a Development Plan or Modification of Development Plan, a Concept Plan Review shall be conducted by the Town Council. It is the intent of the Conceptual Development Plan process to provide an opportunity for the Town Council, Town Manager and citizens to review and evaluate the impact of the proposed development on the character of the area in which it is proposed to be located.

- (1) Submittal Requirements. Applications for Conceptual Development Plan review shall be filed with the Town Manager. The Town Manager shall prescribe the form(s) on which information shall be submitted. Application submittal requirements shall include the following:
 - A. Descriptions of proposed development with building locations, building sizes, parking arrangements, and description of building heights with consideration of impact on adjacent areas.

(d) Development Plan

A Development Plan shall address issues such as general location and size of new facilities, parking, utilities, stormwater management, impervious surface, and access/circulation. A Development Plan shall identify the general location, size, and proposed uses of buildings. A Development Plan shall project anticipated impacts on streets, water and sewer facilities, stormwater runoff, air quality, noise, and lighting.

- (1) Submittal Requirements. Application submittal requirements shall include the following:
 - A. Specific descriptions of proposed development with building locations, building sizes, parking arrangements, and description of building heights with consideration of impact on adjacent areas.
 - B. Analysis of impacts resulting from proposed development, along with options to mitigate impacts relating to:
 - Transportation Management (traffic, transit, parking, bikes, pedestrians, air quality);
 - Stormwater Management Analysis (quantity and quality);
 - and
 - Noise and Lighting Analysis.

Individual effects must be evaluated in the context of the whole Development Plan and not in isolation. Impacts shall be evaluated in accordance with guidelines endorsed for use by the Town Council.

- C. Preliminary timetable and sequencing schedule for building construction and for related mitigation measures.

- (2) Off-site Components. Mitigation measures involving construction of parking decks may need to be developed outside the boundaries of the Development Plan. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Land Use Management Ordinance, a parking deck proposed to mitigate impacts of a Development Plan, and approved by the Town Council as part of a Development Plan, may be located on a site not within the boundaries of an OI-4 zoning district. Any such facility shall be reviewed as a Site Development Permit according to the provisions of subsection (i) (2) of this Section.

(e) Permitted Uses and Development Intensities

Permitted uses shall be identical with uses listed in the Use Matrix (Section 7.3 as being permitted in OI-3, except that Place of Assembly shall be considered to be a permitted use and not a special use. The maximum floor area allowed shall be as provided in a Development Plan that is approved by the Town Council. Special restrictions apply in Perimeter Transition Areas (see subsection (g)).

For purposes of calculating compliance with a specified maximum floor area, the following land uses shall not be counted as floor area: new residential development (including Dwellings and Residence Halls), and new Public Cultural Facilities.

(f) Standards

Development in the OI-4 zoning district shall be designed in a manner that provides a mix of uses which are integrated, interrelated and linked by pedestrian ways, bikeways, and other transportation systems. Development Plans shall, as practical and consistent with applicable laws and regulations, include measures to encourage reduction of automobile use and promote alternative modes of transportation; to mitigate adverse environmental impacts; to promote conservation of non-renewable energy resources; and to achieve visual continuity in the siting and scale of buildings. Specifically, a Development Plan shall address the following:

- (1) Noise: Noise levels from development proposed in the Development Plan shall not exceed those allowed by the Town of Chapel Hill Noise Ordinance.
- (2) Environment: Development proposed in the Development Plan shall minimize impacts on natural site features, and be accompanied by measures to mitigate those impacts.
- (3) Transportation: Development proposed in the Development Plan shall be accompanied by measures to mitigate transportation impacts that are caused by the development.
- (4) Stormwater Management: Development proposed in the Development Plan shall be accompanied by measures to mitigate stormwater impacts (quantity and quality) that are caused by the development.
- (5) Public Utilities: There shall be a general demonstration that water, sewer, and other needed utilities can be made available to accommodate development proposed in the Development Plan.

- (6) Historic Districts: The provisions of Section 3.6.2 of this Chapter shall apply to any development proposed within one of Chapel Hill's Historic Districts.

(g) Perimeter Transition Areas

A Development Plan shall designate a Perimeter Transition Area establishing appropriate standards at borders of the Development Plan, necessary to minimize impacts of development proposed in the Development Plan on adjacent property, to be approved by the Town Council as part of the Development Plan. Standards shall address:

- (1) Screening mechanical equipment
- (2) Exterior lighting
- (3) Height limits
- (4) Landscaping

(h) Procedures for Approval of Development Plans

Applications for a Development Plan, Special Use Permit, or Site Development Permit shall be filed with the Town Manager.

- (1) Application Submittal Requirements. The Town Manager shall prescribe the form(s) of applications as well as any other material he/she may reasonably require to determine compliance with this Section. Applications shall include information described in subsection (d) (1).

- (2) Process for Review.

A. Applications for Development Plan approval shall be reviewed by the Planning Board and forwarded to the Town Council for consideration at a public hearing. The Planning Board shall review the application and the Town Manager's report and shall submit to the Town Council a written recommendation based on the findings required in subsection (h)(3). The Planning Board shall prepare its recommendation within thirty-five (35) days of the meeting at which the Town Manager's report is submitted to it or within such further time consented to in writing by the applicant or by Town Council resolution. If the Planning Board fails to prepare its recommendation to the Town Council within this time limit, or extensions thereof, the Planning Board shall be deemed to recommend approval of the application without conditions.

B. Notice of the date, time, and place of the public hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the planning jurisdiction once a week for two (2) successive weeks, with the first notice to be published not less than ten (10) nor more than twenty-five (25) days prior to the date of the hearing.

C. The Public Hearing shall be open to the public and all interested persons shall be given the opportunity to present evidence and arguments and to ask questions of persons who testify. The Town Council may place reasonable and equitable limitations on the presentation of evidence and arguments and the cross-examination

of witnesses to avoid undue delay. All persons who intend to present evidence at the public hearing shall be sworn.

- D. The applicant shall bear the burden of presenting evidence sufficient to establish persuasively that the proposed development will comply with the determinations required in subsection (h)(3).
- E. A record of the proceedings of the hearing shall be made and shall include all documentary evidence presented at the hearing. Town Council action on an application for Development Plan approval shall occur within 120 days of the date of submittal of a complete application.

(3) Town Council Action.

A. The Town Council shall approve a Development Plan unless it finds that the proposed development would not:

- Maintain the public health, safety, and general welfare; or
- Maintain the value of adjacent property; or
- Comply with all required regulations and standards of this Chapter, including all applicable provisions of Article 2 and with all other applicable regulations; or
- Conform with the general plans for the physical development of the Town as embodied in this Chapter and in the Comprehensive Plan.

B. Town Council action shall be to:

- Approve;
- Approve with conditions; or
- Deny.

(i) Actions After Decision on Development Plan

(1) Recording Approval. If the application for approval of a Development Plan is approved or approved with conditions, the Town Manager shall issue the approval in accord with the action of the Town Council. The applicant shall record such approval in the office of the County Register of Deeds. The Development Plan, including all conditions attached thereto, shall run with the land and shall be binding on the original applicant as well as all successors, assigns, and heirs.

(2) Individual Site Development Permits. If the Development Plan is approved, or approved with conditions, the Town Manager may then accept applications for individual Site Development Permits for specific buildings that are described in the Development Plan. No work on a building identified on the Development Plan may begin until a Site Development Permit has been issued. The Town Manager shall prescribe the form(s) of applications as well as any other material he/she may reasonably require to determine compliance with the Development Plan. Any application for a Site Development Permit in a Perimeter Transition Area shall include provisions for mailed notification to property owners

within 1,000 feet of the proposed development. If the Town Manager finds that the application is consistent with the Development Plan, he/she shall approve the application and issue the Site Development Permit within 15 working days of the submittal of a complete application. If the Town Manager finds that the application is not consistent with the Development Plan he/she shall deny the application within 15 working days of the acceptance of the application and refer the applicant to the Special Use Permit process described in Section 4.5 of this Chapter. Alternatively, the applicant may apply for an amendment to the Development Plan.

- (3) Expiration, Abandonment, Revocation of Development Plan. If an application for a Site Development Permit pursuant to an approved Development Plan has not been submitted to the Town Manager within two (2) years of the date of approval of the Development Plan, the approval shall automatically expire. On request by the holder of an approved Development Plan, the Town Council shall approve the abandonment of the Plan if it determines that no subsequent development approvals have been granted and no construction activity has taken place pursuant to the Development Plan. If material conditions of a Development Plan are violated, and remain in violation after giving the property owner a reasonable amount of time to correct such violation, the Town Council may revoke the Plan after notification to the property owner and opportunity for property owner response at a public meeting of the Town Council.

(j) Process for Amending Development Plan

The Town Manager is authorized to approve minor changes and changes in the ordering of phases in an approved Development Plan, as long as such changes continue to be in compliance with the approving action of the Town Council and all other applicable requirements, and result in a configuration of buildings that is generally consistent with the approved Development Plan. The Town Manager shall not have the authority to approve changes that constitute a modification of the Development Plan.

Before making a determination as to whether a proposed action is a minor change or a modification, the Town Manager shall review the record of the proceedings on the original application for the Development Plan and any subsequent applications for modifications of the Development Plan, and shall use the following criteria in making a determination:

- (1) A change in the boundaries of the Development Plan approved by the Town Council shall constitute a modification;
- (2) A substantial change in the floor area or number of parking spaces approved by the Town Council shall constitute a modification. (General rule: more than a 5% increase in overall net new floor area or parking in a Development Plan approved by the Town Council would be considered substantial.);
- (3) Substantial changes in pedestrian or vehicular access or circulation approved by the Town Council shall constitute a modification. (General rule:

52

changes that would affect access or circulation beyond the boundaries of a Development Plan would be considered substantial.); and

- (4) Substantial change in the amount or location of open areas approved by the Town Council shall constitute a modification.

If the proposed action is determined to be a modification, the Town Manager shall require the filing of an application for approval of the modification, following procedures outlined in this Section for initial approval of a Development Plan.