

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE CHAPEL HILL TOWN COUNCIL
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2007, AT 7:00 P.M.**

(WITH DEVELOPER'S COMMENTS TO QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS)

Present were Mayor Kevin Foy, Mayor pro tem Bill Strom, Council Member Laurin Easthom, Council Member Sally Greene, Council Member Ed Harrison, Council Member Mark Kleinschmidt, Council Member Bill Thorpe, and Council Member Jim Ward.

Staff members present were Town Manager Roger Stancil, Deputy Town Manager Florentine Miller, Assistant Town Manager Bruce Heflin, Town Attorney Ralph Karpinos, Town Information Officer Catherine Lazorko, Planning Director JB Culpepper, Development Coordinator Gene Poveromo, and Acting Town Clerk Sandra Kline.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

	Rebecca Board, Downing Creek Community Association
1	expressed support for the project because its positive features outweigh traffic concerns. She said her neighborhood was legally part of Durham but wanted to strengthen its connection to Chapel Hill. This development would link them to NC 54 up to Barbee Chapel Road
2	praised the development that had taken place throughout that area. Ms. Board described the site as "ugly" as it is, and said that the bicycle and walking paths would enhance and improve the neighborhood.
3	said recent improvements on NC 54 had made a difference regarding traffic, and the neighborhood was feeling encouraged that the road could be improved.
	<i>Developer's Comment: We agree. The TIA prepared for the Town and submitted with this application supports this assessment.</i>
4	said that Capital Associates had been interested in solving traffic problems and was willing to phase the project
	David Hill, Community Association in Meadowmont and the Village of Meadowmont.
5	expressed strong support for Woodmont
6	praised the plan for its connectivity and for how the concept was to support Meadowmont rather than compete with it.
	<i>Developer's Comment: We agree. We have met with Mr. Hill and other representatives of the Meadowmont owners and merchants associations on a number of occasions in order to understand their needs and to work with them to meet the mixed use objectives of this area.</i>
7	Meadowmont would like to reciprocate with some of their recreational activities, events, and so forth
	<i>Developer's Comment: We will certainly welcome the opportunity and will encourage our tenants and residents to participate in Meadowmont events.</i>
	Henry Lister, a resident of Sherwood Forest
8	praised Henry Bowles for his sincerity and integrity

9	<p>said his neighborhood supports the proposal because Capital Associates had promised Deep, wooded setbacks and had a track record of quality construction and maintenance of their properties.</p>
	<p><i>Developer's Comment: We agree. There are, in addition, a number of advantages to the Woodmont development proposal for the area residential neighborhoods including Sherwood Forest. These are detailed in this application and include removing deteriorating warehouses; providing a large greenscaped/waterscaped area along the NC 54 frontage; improving access to Hwy 54 and to the Town's bicycle/pedestrian path along NC 54; increasing demand for the nearby residential properties; and access to new recreational opportunities and transportation opportunities associated with the Woodmont property.</i></p>
10	<p>expressed personal opposition to Woodmont because of its scale and limited uses, because it would not enhance the health, safety or property values of any adjacent neighborhood, and because of traffic problems.</p>
	<p><i>Developer's Comment: While we certainly understand and respect Mr. Lister's concerns, we would offer the the following brief points: Regarding scale, the project is located on over 33 acres and development density is concentrated at the center of the property, well removed from the neighboring properties and the east entryway of NC 54.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding uses, there is an abundance of the other major possible uses for this property (retail, restaurant, and residential) in the immediate area of Woodmont. We strongly believe that predominately office use here makes the most sense for all parties involved.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding enhancing the health, safety, and property values of adjacent neighborhoods, Woodmont will provide for all heath and safety requirements involving water, sewer, stormwater management, erosion control, internal roadway systems, external roadway improvements, noise and light controls, as well as those benefits noted in Item 9 above.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding traffic, the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the Town and accompanying this application indicates that Woodmont will not have a significant impact on the studied intersections. Woodmont will in addition bring resources and the ability to work with the Town, (including public transit), with DOT, and with the nearby residents including those of Sherwood Forest to enhance the traffic picture in this area.</i></p> <p><i>Each of these issues is addressed in more detail in other sections of this application.</i></p>
11	<p>said his neighbors were accepting Woodmont because the next proposal might be worse.</p>
	<p><i>Developer's Comment: While this statement may have validity, it is only one part of the reason that Woodmont has received the active support of a number of the residential neighbors, as noted in the responses above.</i></p>

	COUNCIL COMMENTS
	Council Member Kleinschmidt
1	<p>thanked the applicant for being responsive to prior comments and to the concerns that he expressed last year.</p>
2	<p>praised the phasing plan, and said he was looking forward to hearing the energy efficiency proposal</p>
	<p><i>Developer's Comment: Re Phasing: The plan for Woodmont has been proposed in such a manner to allow the Town to make a more informed decision on each proposed phase of Woodmont, at the time that phase is proposed via the Town's</i></p>

	<p><i>Special Use Permitting process. Re energy efficiency: We intend to pursue efficiencies of 20% above current ASHRAE standards for the larger (>40,000sf) office buildings in Woodmont, and to pursue LEED and Triangle J Council of Government guidelines to the extent commercially practical in the design and construction of these buildings.</i></p>
3	<p>expressed skepticism regarding the workability of a shuttle.</p> <p><i>Developer's Comment: We intend to initiate the continuous loop shuttle between Woodmont and Meadowmont Village when site population will support reasonable use of this service. We will also encourage the neighboring residential population to make use of this shuttle in order to minimize lunchtime traffic to and from Meadowmont.</i></p>
	<p>Council Member Harrison</p>
4	<p>referred to CDC comments from October regarding the applicant's (alleged) assertion that studies were being done on NC 54. His contact at NC DOT had confirmed that there was no such study happening, he said.</p> <p><i>Developer's Comment: We did not intend to state or imply during CDC discussions that there was a comprehensive DOT study of the NC 54 corridor in process. We apologize for any confusion in this regard. The Southwest Durham/Southeast Chapel Hill Collector Street study with ties to NC 54 was ongoing at this time. Also at this time, DOT (Jim Dunlop, Congestion Management Section) was evaluating significant NC 54 lane layout changes at the NC 54 and I-40 intersection area. These lane layout changes have since been implemented and have improved the ramping of traffic from eastbound NC 54 onto I-40 East and improved the passage of through traffic at this intersection. Finally, we were preparing to initiate at this time, via the Town's process, the Traffic Impact Analysis for Woodmont, which has since been performed, and does evaluate a large section of NC 54 from US 15/501 to I-40.)</i></p>
5	<p>expressed concern about how the second and third phases would proceed, considering that a study had not been started and given the kinds of delays that Chapel Hill and Durham experience in getting projects done.</p> <p><i>Developer's Comment: Tying subsequent phases of Woodmont development to the Town's SUP process places the burden of proof upon the developer that there will be adequate transportation infrastructure for each phase. The Traffic Impact Analysis developed for the Town and filed with this application indicates that, although future traffic along NC 54 will require some infrastructure upgrades, Woodmont's development is not expected to significantly impact that traffic picture. Woodmont's presence will, on the other hand, provide a significant resource to help the Town address NC 54 transportation efficiency, including help with funding public transit route expansion and related public transit initiatives.</i></p>
6	<p>predicted decades before there would be meaningful improvements on NC 54. Council Member Harrison said that this information makes the applicants ideas regarding shuttle and Chapel Hill Transit speculative.</p> <p><i>Developer's Comment: See comments on Item 5 above. We look forward to working with the Town and Chapel Hill Transit to implement a payment-in-lieu structure that will further the Town's goals regarding public transportation, and will at the same time enhance the quality of life of Woodmont tenants and residents and of nearby residential neighbors as well.</i></p>

Council Member Ward	
7	said this project had made a "startling metamorphosis"
8	appreciated the effort that had brought them all to this point.
9	praised the building reuse idea and the applicant's commitment to the shuttle service.
10	requested 50 percent energy efficiency in the buildings, and noted that the traffic impact analysis would be critical.
	<i>Developer's Comment: As noted in comment to Councilman Kleinschmidt's item #2 above, we are proposing to comply with the Town's recently adopted guidelines for energy efficiency enhancement. Re the Traffic Impact Analysis, as noted above we believe it provides a solid base of support for allowing Woodmont to become a partner with the Town, DOT, and neighbors in helping manage the traffic picture in this area.</i>
11	recommended that the applicant take comments about light and noise pollution seriously
	<i>Developer's Comment: We intend to do so, and to work with Town staff, and with residential neighbors on an individual basis as necessary, to address these issues. We are very confident that, given the very deep buffers being provided, we will be able to totally alleviate any concerns in these areas.</i>
12	wanted to understand how pedestrians and bicyclists would cross NC 54.
	<i>Developer's Comment: The proposed median cut and signalized intersection on NC 54 at Woodmont will provide the best location in this area for surface crossing since it is the narrowest section of NC 54. We intend to press for support of pedestrian/bicycle-friendly signalization of this intersection. In addition, by funding the extension of the bicycle/pedestrian path eastward from Barbee Chapel Road, we will provide direct access to the existing tunnel beneath NC 54 at Meadowmont.</i>
13	asked what the views looking west from the Little John location would be like.
	<i>Developer's Comment: We will be including cross sectional views in the presentations to CDC, Planning Board, and Council associated with this submittal.</i>
14	told staff that he wanted to know, at some point, whether the Council would approve all three phases or one phase at a time. <i>(Mr. Poveromo replied that one possibility would be three separate SUPs, as was done with Meadowmont.)</i>
	<i>Developer's Comment: It is our intent to submit for SUPs one phase at a time.</i>
15	asked about the request for rezoning in regard to that. <i>(Mr. Poveromo replied that the staff anticipated a conditional rezoning, which would remain in place as long as the Council reviewed and approved the SUP within a certain time period. If not, then the rezoning would revert back, he said.)</i>
16	requested that the staff bring back more information on that.
Mayor Foy	
17	this project seemed like a good test case for the "transit impact contribution," suggested that the applicant push Town staff to help them work on that analysis.
	<i>Developer's Comment: We fully support the transit impact contribution payment in lieu concept, and have begun discussions with Town staff to provide a framework for this during Woodmont's phased development.</i>
	Council Member Thorpe

18	liked the concept of mixed use. asked the applicant to build residential along with office units.
	<i>Developer's Comment: We are proposing three residential buildings as part of the Woodmont mix. These will provide 60 ownership condominium units, 15% of which will be workforce-affordable units.</i>
	Mayor Pro Tem Strom
19	asked Mr. Gurlitz if they were considering hiring a public artist for the project, or were they planning to provide space or make a contribution toward public art. <i>(Mr. Gurlitz replied that it would be premature to focus on one or the other. Mr. Gurlitz explained that they had spoken to the Public Art Commission's director and that they probably would develop something very specific.)</i>
	Mayor Foy
20	expressed appreciation to the applicant for taking the Council's prior comments seriously.
21	said that their response had benefited all and that this was a much better project

