

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING  
OF THE CHAPEL HILL TOWN COUNCIL  
MONDAY, MAY 16, 2005, AT 7:00 P.M.**

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

Council members present were Sally Greene, Ed Harrison, Cam Hill, Mark Kleinschmidt, Bill Strom, and Edith Wiggins.

Council Members Dorothy Verkerk and Jim Ward were absent, excused.

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 Roger Waldon, Senior Development Coordinator J.B. Culpepper, Senior Planner Dana Stidham, Principal Gene Poveromo, and Deputy Town Clerk Sandy Cook.

**Item 4 – Public Hearing Concept Plan: Chapel Watch Village –  
Residential Development**

Mayor Foy noted that even though this was an initial Concept Plan hearing, it was necessary for all citizens who wished to speak to be signed up and sworn in by the Town Clerk. He asked if that was correct. Deputy Manager Florentine Miller replied that was correct, because there was an active Special Use Permit on Chapel Watch Village in existence.

Senior Planner Gene Poveromo noted this was a concept plan review for Chapel Watch Village, on a 35-acre tract south of Eubanks Road, west of the Northwood Subdivision, and north of the Larkspur Subdivision. He said the property was outside of Town limits but was in the Urban Service area. Mr. Poveromo displayed an area map, and noted that the proposal was for 120 multi-family dwelling units including 168,000 square feet of floor area, and 201 parking spaces including 90 garage parking spaces.

Mr. Poveromo said as noted, this project was unique in that the Council had already seen a concept plan for this project and an active Special Use Permit application was on file with the Town.

Mr. Poveromo provided a brief background of the project:

September 25, 2002      Community Design Commission (CDC) reviews the Chapel Watch Village Concept Plan proposal, with 354 multi-family dwelling units proposed with 603 parking spaces.

March 17, 2003      Town Council reviews the Chapel Watch Village Concept Plan proposal, with 306 multi-family dwelling units and 534 parking spaces proposed.

May 20, 2003                   Town receives an application for a Zoning Atlas Amendment to rezone the Chapel Watch Village site, with 282 units and 469 parking spaces proposed.

February 16, 2005            CDC reviews a revised Concept Plan for the Chapel Watch Village residential development. The proposal includes 120 multi-family dwelling units and 201 parking spaces, including 90 garage parking spaces.

Mr. Poveromo said that Attachment 5 in the Council materials contained CDC comments on the Concept Plan review. He said that Attachment 4 contained the minutes from the March 17, 2003 Concept Plan Review by the Council, and that distributed to the Council tonight were the minutes of the February 16, 2005 CDC review.

Mr. Poveromo displayed an area photo of the site, pointing out locations of various structures and roadways. He said during the CDC review with the neighbors of the project there was much discussion regarding connections between neighboring developments. Mr. Poveromo pointed out current and proposed connections to Larkspur. Mr. Poveromo said another stub out connection would be discussed which would make a connection to Weaver Dairy Road.

Mr. Poveromo said when the Larkspur development was presented to the Council, Northwood neighbors had expressed concern regarding connections. At that time, a connection to Larkspur was approved, with that connection reserved for emergency access only.

Phil Post, speaking as the developer, noted that Gary Buck, a local long-time developer, and Keith Britt, of Crosland, Inc., were part of the team that would develop this rental project. He said since so many changes had occurred with this project, the staff had correctly advised them to come back before the Council for another Concept Plan review. Mr. Post noted the project was now one third of the size of what had been originally proposed, noting that all of the intensities had been reduced. And, he said, because of that reduced size they believe that a rezoning was not necessary as the project could not meet the current zoning requirements.

Mr. Post said this was a proposal for rental townhouses, and they were proud of the architecture of the units, their size, and the quality of the development. He said the project was located across from a public park and ride lot, so there would be excellent transportation opportunities at the residents' front door. Mr. Post said this would be a quality development.

Mr. Post said in the two years that this proposal had been modified to its current state, the Larkspur neighborhood had been created. One of the things that had happened, he said, was when it was presented to the CDC two ago there was the realization that Larkspur was now its own neighborhood with its own sense of what should happen here, particularly how the roads might be connected. Mr. Post said he wanted to direct his comments to those issues the Council may hear about tonight so they might understand the developer's position.

Mr. Post said one of those issues would most likely be the connection from the Larkspur development, which he indicated on a map. He said it had always been assumed that there

would be a public road connection to Eubanks Road. Mr. Post said he was bringing forward options tonight for consideration in case that connection was not built.

Mr. Post displayed a site plan which depicted routes of travel as proposed, noting two entrances off of Eubanks Road with a circular pattern through the development with the public road connector. However, he said, there were other choices for different connectivity. Mr. Post said an alternative would be to utilize the two entrances off of Eubanks, and instead of adding the public street connection there might be an emergency vehicle connection and bicycle and pedestrian connection, so there would be a high level of connectivity without the possibility of cut-through traffic.

Mr. Post said they believed that Chapel Watch would be fully served and meet all of the Town's standards for emergency access with those two complete entrances as well as an internal loop system to provide good access. In other words, he said, they did not believe that the public access road was a necessity.

Mr. Post said there was another option. If it was decided that two points of access were not sufficient, he said, it would be easy to make a third point of access onto Eubanks Road, with some type of emergency access connection from Larkspur. Mr. Post said that Chapel Watch could be fully served regardless of what action might be taken regarding a public street access. He said they did want some guidance from the Council on this issue so they could plan accordingly.

Mr. Post said the next issue had to do with the fact that there would be about 150 feet from the property line to the nearest unit, and the neighbors had asked about the screening of the potential units. He displayed photos taken from the rear of the Larkspur development, noting the soil banks and trees as well as a utility easement. Mr. Post said all of those things help to buffer the views from Larkspur to Chapel Watch, adding the good news was that it was a south facing tree line so it got good sunlight and was fairly dense. He said there was a great deal of natural vegetation that would provide even more of a sense of buffer, and they intended to be careful about retaining that vegetation. Mr. Post noted that the land also sloped into Chapel Watch, and they planned to cut the units into the slopes, allowing the ground to provide even more or a buffer.

Mr. Post said he wanted to assure the Council and the neighbors that they intended to do a good job on buffering, that they had alternatives for connections that they had asked for guidance about, and were hopeful that they would receive favorable comments that would allow them to move forward with the project.

Mayor Foy said these units were proposed for rental, and asked what the plan was for affordable housing. Mr. Post said they had held several meetings with Mr. Dowling. He said he did not want his comments to be misconstrued, but it was his information that the need for housing on the rental side was completely different from the ownership side. Mr. Post said that as you get closer to our employment centers there was a better stock of affordable rental housing already, and he believed the administration of affordable rental units had its own complexities. So far, he

said, the discussion with Mr. Dowling was how this project could make a contribution and fulfill the affordable housing component to provide a stock of rental units.

Mr. Post said at this point, they believed it would be possible to proceed with the project and make a payment-in-lieu of affordable housing. He said that Mr. Dowling had described the direct need for subsidy money, with which he could do more creative things. Mr. Post said this project might provide a good synergy here, that it would provide a pocket of subsidy money that could in turn be leveraged into ownership opportunities for people served by the Land Trust. He said he had hoped that the Council or staff would work with them to provide more detail about an affordable component for this project.

Mayor Foy said the Council could request more information from the Town Attorney regarding what could be done with a SUP application pending, but certainly the staff could work with them on that. He asked what had caused them to reduce this proposed development from 354 units to the current 120 units. Mr. Post said the joint rezoning seemed to be a daunting task, which would have to be agreed to through an Orange County process as well as a Town process. He said that seemed complicating, and because of the amount of money already invested in this project they wanted to have a completion time in sight. Mr. Post said it was determined that if the size was scaled down and the quality of the units increased, and it stayed within the existing zoning, then many of the complicating factors would no longer exist. He said from reactions from the CDC and neighbors, that had proven to be true.

Mayor Foy said there were several citizens who wished to speak on this issue, and reminded people that the Council would not make a decision tonight. He asked that speakers limit their remarks to three minutes as was the normal process. Mayor Foy stated that they needed to give constructive comments to the applicant and to the Council, and they did not need redundant comments. He asked that speakers not repeat already stated comments just to make a point. Mayor Foy said he made that statement on the assumption there would be a lot of comments regarding the road connection, but asked speakers to keep in mind that others may have already stated what they wanted to say. He reminded speakers that they must be signed up and sworn in by the Town Clerk.

Amy Chute, of 206 Old Larkspur Way, said that she and a number of her neighbors that were concerned about the proposal had formed a committee called Larkspur Safety First. She said they had put together a presentation, where five of them would make a couple of points each. Ms. Chute said that all of the neighbors she had been in contact with agreed with their position, and had not heard even one dissenting opinion.

Ms. Chute said a summary of Larkspur's position was:

1. Add a buffer zone. We are in disagreement with the developer about the planned lack of a wooded buffer zone between Chapel Watch and Larkspur. They are requesting 50 feet of buffer.
2. No Maywood/Eubanks Connector. They were not opposed to being connected to Chapel Watch Village, but were opposed to being connected to Eubanks Road. She said that was

due to the proposed Town Operations Center which would be only a mile away, and the cut-through traffic that might produce. We are in agreement with the developer to prohibit a vehicular connector between Chapel Watch and Larkspur, and to create a pedestrian and bicycle access between Chapel Watch and Larkspur.

Ms. Chute said they had done extensive research on Chapel Hill Design Guidelines, and wanted to make sure they were followed. She pointed out that these same two requests were made when the Larkspur development was approved and they were granted, and they were asking for the same thing tonight.

Ms. Chute displayed a photo of the power easement that separated Mr. Buck's property from the Larkspur development, noting the dense woods. She said the Design Guidelines stated that when portions of woods must be developed, wooded perimeters or the most desirable natural site features should be protected. She said that part of that power easement that backed up to Larkspur had no natural vegetation, and Mr. Post had commented there would be some but the plan showed that there was none.

Ms. Chute said they agreed with LUMO criteria, noting Section 5.6.1 which dealt with the purpose of buffers, Section 5.6.5 which noted the responsibility of buffers, and Section 5.6.9 which talked about existing vegetation. She said the buffer was to provide a separation of space and to provide privacy, that the responsibility for the buffer falls to the responsibility of the developer and not to Larkspur, and that existing vegetation was their choice for a buffer rather than a wall or something of that nature.

Dr. Ronald Herring, a resident of 304 Larkspur Way and a member of Larkspur Safety First, said it had been proposed that Maywood be extended through Chapel Watch Village and connected to Eubanks Road. He stated their connector concerns:

- The proposed Maywood/Eubanks connector will cause unintended multiple problems for both developments, notably a substantial increase in vehicular traffic and cut-through traffic, and child safety concerns.
- There were several high volume commercial sites along Eubanks Road, such as the landfill, the UPS center, the industrial park, the park and ride lot, and the "ominous" Town Operations Center. That connector would create cut-through shortcuts to I-40.

Dr. Herring said the cut-through was likely, because the Maywood connector would bypass four to five traffic lights. But, he said, the Traffic Impact Analysis did not address this issue. He said that the Design Guidelines stated exactly how developments and roads would be put together, that it said that dual access should be provided for new projects, and could be achieved by future development in nearby land if road stub is provided, but it should not be designed so that it does not encourage through traffic. Dr. Herring said, in effect, the Guidelines say that when cut-through traffic would occur, then don't do it.

Dr. Herring said they were in favor of connectivity, but believed that connectivity should be a link between adjacent and contiguous neighborhoods for pedestrians and bicycles only. He said the solution that occurred between Larkspur and Northwood was the ideal solution, which was a

paved, wide pedestrian pathway that could be used in emergency situations. Dr. Herring said that the collector road was not needed. He noted that there would likely be another access in the future because there was another stub out on Butterfield Court and was a cut out on Weaver Dairy Road, and when the intervening land was developed that second access would occur.

Jon Dehart of 102 Larkspur Lane and a member of Larkspur Safety First, introduced his young daughter, who asked for no speeding. Mr. Dehart said that right now, Larkspur was a medium-sized quite community of single family homes, with 41 currently occupied and a total of 86 planned. He said there were many children in the neighborhood playing and riding bikes. Mr. Dehart said they had a busy community clubhouse, with a playground and pool.

Mr. Dehart said the local streets were designed for residential access, and not as collector roads. He said the speed limits were 25 mph and the residents observe it, which made it a safe place. Mr. Dehart said that the houses had short setbacks from the streets, so there was not a lot of room for driver error. He noted that Maywood had a sidewalk on only one side of the street.

Mr. Dehart noted there were 63 children in the 41 occupied units, and the two homes in the Land Trust that would soon be occupied which would add an additional three children to that number. He said as the neighborhood grows, the percentage of children would continue to grow. Mr. Dehart displayed photos of children playing in the neighborhood, on the sidewalks and on the streets. He said on Maywood Drive, if two cars were parked on either side of the street, which was allowed, and if two cars attempted to pass it would be an unsafe position.

Mr. Dehart said they would like to petition the Town Council to consider the Larkspur second ingress/egress issue separately at a future business meeting, for the Larkspur residents to have input, noting that emergency vehicle access already existed via the Northwood I-IV neighborhood.

Mr. Dehart said their request was for no vehicular access between Chapel Watch and Larkspur, noting the safety of their children was at stake, and that a significant natural forest buffer of 50 feet be required. He said the desired result was that the character of their neighborhood as a quiet, safe environment where neighbors congregate and children play outside be preserved. Mr. Dehart thanked Mr. Buck for considering other options to his plan. He said Mr. Buck was an example of a good corporate citizen who had tried to work with the neighborhood.

Maria Piskoor, speaking for Larkspur Safety First, stated that the Town Operations Center would increase the demand for access, and was in fact the largest capital project in the Town's history. She provided a brief outline of what the Town Operations Center would house and what the overall site plan included. Ms. Piskoor stated that included adding a traffic light at Millhouse Road and Eubanks Road, and widening Eubanks Road from Millhouse Road to Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to provide two 12-foot travel lanes, bike paths, and a right turn lane. She said despite extensive plans to handle the traffic load, the Chapel Watch Village Traffic Impact Analysis did not take any of that traffic into account.

Regarding Eubanks Road, Ms. Piskoor said that traffic on that road was forecast to increase significantly over the next 25 years to the point where it would outgrow its capacity. She said

that the 2030 Transportation plan identified this area as one of the "hot spots" of congestion. Ms. Piskoor said Millhouse Road was scheduled to extend south of Eubanks to the Horace Williams property to partially accommodate increased demand, noting that Millhouse connected to Eubanks just west of Chapel Watch Village which meant that all the traffic would be going right by Chapel Hill Village. Ms. Piskoor said that Millhouse Road Extension was the proper place for this traffic, not Larkspur.

Jungsang Kim, a resident of 300 Old Larkspur Way and representing Larkspur Safety First, said as they had shown if those two roads are connecting, the temptation to cut through Larkspur would be great. He said that traffic calming devices such as speed humps were not an ideal solution, since the effectiveness of traffic calming devices was controversial. Mr. Kim said it was desirable to use good designs to prevent cut-through traffic in the first place.

Mr. Kim said regarding the Larkspur second access proposal, the preferred egress would be via Butterfield Drive to avoid cut through possibilities, noting the stub out already exists and would provide a more efficient service vehicle route.

Demetra Vlachos, a resident of Old Larkspur Way, said if residents of Larkspur and Chapel Watch could have been present when the connector road was proposed, it would have been rapidly defeated. She said the decision was made several years ago and was well-intentioned, but now it was obvious that it would not be in the best interest of present or future residents of that area.

Chintana Melton, a resident of Larkspur, urged the Council not to open the connector road to Eubanks Road. She displayed a map which showed the number of children who lived on each lot, noting that most of them lived on Maywood and Old Larkspur Way. Ms. Melton said Larkspur was only about half finished, and already there were 63 children in the neighborhood. She said if traffic was increased in the area, she was concerned for the safety of the children

Ms. Melton asked if the Council decided to move ahead with the connector, could they promise her and all the other mothers in that area that their children would remain safe.

Frank Corr, of 210 Northwood Drive just off of Eubanks, said he was President of the Northwood Homeowners Association, and was pleased with the Concept Plan. He said the Northwood Board had met with members of the community and reviewed the Plan, finding few issues pertinent to Northwood residents.

Mr. Corr said that light pollution had been identified as an issue and brought it before the CDC, and Mr. Buck had offered to install a newer type of light that would cause less pollution. Another concern was the location of the dumpsters, and Mr. Post had informed them that there were no dumpsters, but rather a trash compaction system in the middle of the subdivision. Mr. Corr said Mr. Buck had expressed a desire to work with the neighbors, and they had no other issues at this time.

Carol Ann Zinn, the developer of Larkspur, said she supported the position of the Larkspur homeowners. She said regarding the buffer, Mr. Post had supplied them with pictures showing

the trees and vegetation with full leaves. Ms. Zinn remarked that when you are talking about buildings that were two or three stories, those units would tower over the trees. She said she supported the desire to provide a larger buffer.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said the Larkspur development was one of the first he had worked on as a new member of the Council. He said he remembered the conversation concerning the connectivity into Northwood, and the connector was resolved to be a pedestrian and bicycle and emergency access only. Council Member Kleinschmidt said at the same time they had talked about the inevitability of a connection going up and into Eubanks. He said he recalled a strong indication that was going to be what would happen, so strong that it was his understanding that future property owners in Larkspur were going to be told about that. Council Member Kleinschmidt asked if that was the case. Ms. Zinn replied she was not a realtor dealing with people buying homes, so she could not respond to that. She said Larkspur was required to have two stub outs, one at Butterfield Court and one leading to the Buck property. Ms. Zinn said at the time that Larkspur gained its approval, Mr. Buck did not have an application before the Council, so his timing or concept was unknown to her.

Council Member Kleinschmidt asked how the road was built. Ms. Zinn said it had been built to the property line, which was the requirement for a stub out. Council Member Kleinschmidt said it was also his memory that there was a stipulation in Larkspur's Special Use Permit that the stub out would have a sign placed at its end that stated it was a connector. Ms. Zinn said she did not believe that was correct, but it could be checked. She said there was no sign there. Council Member Kleinschmidt asked the staff to check that and report back to the Council.

Mr. Poveromo said he had the same question, so had checked the resolution granting the Special Use Permit for Larkspur. He said that normally a stipulation was included stating that where there was a stub out there needed to be a sign indicating that the road would be stubbed out in the future. Mr. Poveromo said he was not able to find that stipulation in the resolution.

Heather Schwartz, of 111 Butterfield Court, wanted to remind the Council of a prior commitment to neighbors, specifically the recent approvals to the Wilson Assemblage for bollards for emergency access. She said that was exactly what they wanted for their neighborhoods. Ms. Schwartz said that because of the location of some power lines, they have a "natural disconnect" with the Buck property, so that connecting them was not natural.

Ms. Schwartz said she and her husband were one of the first families in Larkspur, and they had no idea of what had been planned regarding future stub outs or roads.

Atul Mahableshwarkar said he would soon be moving into a home being built at 401 Old Larkspur Way. He said then there would be 65 children in Larkspur. Mr. Mahableshwarkar said they had seen the stub out but no sign was present, and when they asked about it they were told it may happen and it may not happen. He said they were told that there were other alternatives that may keep it from happening, and encouraged the Council to consider those alternatives.

Rafael Rodriguez thanked Council Member Kleinschmidt for bringing forth the issue of the lack of signage at the stub out. He said that he had sat with a realtor and had walked the



neighborhood three times before buying his property, and never once was he told that there was a possibility that 300 units may be built nearby. Mr. Rodriguez asked who was accountable for exposing what amounted to a pre-existing condition. He said when you enter into a contract such things should be disclosed.

Mr. Rodriguez said the community had come together over the last two months to discuss the ramifications of this development, and he would encourage the Council not to approve the connection. He said he would like the community to remain the way he believed it would when he purchased his home. Mr. Rodriguez said it was disturbing to him that some would try to say that this was a new issue, when it had in fact been present for years but was not disclosed.

Council Member Harrison commented to the audience on the Council's process. He said that the Concept Plan process was something that worked very well. Council Member Harrison said if you were in Raleigh, Durham or Cary, you would not get this kind of review, rather the application would just turn up for consideration. But here, he said, you have Gary Buck who had been building in Chapel Hill for years and had a good feel for the Town, and a Council who actually asked for this extra step in the process so that they could have a free conversation about what a development consisted of. Council Member Harrison said it also meant that the developer would get the message, which certainly happened tonight, that the application needed to be changed to consider the other options.

Council Member Harrison said the set of loops, the one that involved the pedestrian connection and the internal looping, was something that would work well in terms of moving transit in and out of Chapel Watch. He said he was happy that we had this Concept Plan process in the approval process.

Council Member Harrison congratulated the neighborhood on a well-researched presentation that showed a lot of thinking and pre-planning.

Council Member Kleinschmidt thanked the neighbors as well, stating he was as shocked as they were although for different reasons that they did not know what was happening. He said the project came before the Council as an initial concept almost immediately after the approval of Larkspur. Council Member Kleinschmidt said he was disappointed that they had no chance to understand or prepare before they bought their property. But, he said, it was not over yet.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said he was not completely convinced that the connection to Eubanks was something that necessarily had to be eliminated. But, he said, he did believe that the direct route out of Larkspur up to Eubanks may be problematic, even with a traffic circle. Council Member Kleinschmidt said it had been suggested that a third connection could come out on the east side, and suggested that one could come out on the east side but the central one was eliminated, while retaining the traffic circle. He said that might make it less attractive to cut through traffic but still retain the kind of connectivity they wanted to see.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said he believed the best option was still the connector that goes over to Northwood because of the number of turns required, noting it was the kind of connection they wanted to replicate. He said the way it stands now it was one turn then straight up, which

he believed was problematic. Council Member Kleinschmidt asked the developer to try to develop the road infrastructure in this development that would replicate the multiple turns that would have occurred had it gone through Northwood, which he believed it should have.

Mayor pro tem Wiggins, speaking to the Town Attorney, said there was nothing in the ordinances or regulations that called for disclosure of a stub out. Mr. Karpinos said that was correct. Mayor pro tem Wiggins asked if that was something that could be done through enactment of an ordinance or adoption of a resolution. She said that normally would be included as a stipulation in SUP's, but it was overlooked this time. Mr. Karpinos said he would look at that issue and talk to the Planning Department about this.

Mayor Foy asked if a traffic impact analysis been prepared. Mr. Poveromo said a traffic impact analysis was done for the SUP that was submitted. He said the applicant was working with the Traffic Engineer to revise that analysis and update it for this new proposal. Mayor Foy the SUP was from two years ago when 280 units were proposed. Mr. Poveromo said that was correct, and that required a traffic impact analysis.

Mayor Foy asked the applicant if they had to prepare a new traffic impact analysis. Mr. Post replied that the Town does that, not the applicant. He said that new analysis was just received yesterday, and he had not had an opportunity to see it. Mayor Foy asked had this proposal been before the Transportation Board. Mr. Post said it had not.

Mayor Foy asked Mr. Poveromo when this project would go to the Transportation Board for comment. Mr. Poveromo replied the next step in the process would be for the applicant to submit plans to the staff for department review, and after that they would provide the applicant with comments, they would revise their plans then the staff would set up the schedule for hearings before advisory boards. Mr. Poveromo said no meetings would be scheduled with advisory boards until the applicant responds to the staff comments and resubmits plans.

Mayor Foy said it would be useful to the applicant if during this Concept Plan stage they received some comment from the Transportation Board. He said he assumed if that were the case, was there any impediment to that. Mr. Karpinos responded that the Council could refer it to the Transportation Board. Mayor Foy said the Council could refer it to the Transportation Board and ask them to pre-empt something and look at it quickly. Mr. Poveromo said Mr. Post had stated he was okay with that, and he was sure the Transportation Board would be glad to do a courtesy review of the project.

Mayor Foy asked the Council if they believed that would be helpful. Council Member Strom commented he believed it would be very helpful. Mayor Foy said he believed they should do that.

Amy Chute said her understanding of the new traffic study was that the Town Operations Center was not included in the analysis. Mayor Foy said no one had looked at it yet. Ms. Chute asked that it be reviewed carefully because the 500 parking spaces there had not been taken into account, nor the bus, truck and employee traffic. She said that the Town Operations Center was

located in the northern most quadrant of Town, and their neighborhood would be attractive for people coming from the southern part of Town to get to work.

Ms. Chute said she was also told that any traffic study would not look at a small connector road like the connector into Maywood. She said she was told those studies only looked at major arteries and major collector routes only, so it would give a forecast on Eubanks, but not what would come through Larkspur.

Mayor Foy said that did not sound correct, noting why would they even bother with a study. Mr. Poveromo said before a traffic impact analysis was done, the applicant met with the Town Traffic Engineer and outlined the parameters of the analysis. He said the Traffic Engineer would indicate certain intersections to be studied, but he did not know what parameters were specified for this development or how much of the Larkspur and Town Operations Center developments were to be looked at.

Mayor Foy asked if the newly received traffic impact analysis could be sent to the Transportation Board for review as well. Mr. Poveromo replied yes, it could. Mayor Foy said to please do that.

Council Member Harrison said a lot of the goal for a traffic impact analysis was for the Town to have a basis to require improvements on the road, and the focus for Chapel Watch would be on Eubanks. He said the only reason a connector road plays into it was if it affected the number of trips on the main road. Council Member Harrison said that was why it may not rise to the level of being included in the traffic impact analysis, although it was obviously important. He said it was not included in Larkspur because it did not exist as yet, so it was a road that sort of fell through the cracks in the analysis process.

Mayor Foy said maybe not, since they didn't know what the parameters were for the analysis.

Council Member Strom said clearly if this connector was not included in the analysis, then it would not be particularly useful. He asked Mr. Poveromo if he would be the staff person responsible for getting this information to the Transportation Board, and would there be a draft of the minutes from tonight given to the Board. Mr. Poveromo said he was not sure what the Clerk's schedule was for preparing the minutes from tonight's meeting.

Deputy Town Manager Miller responded that the minutes would be made available as quickly as possible. Council Member Strom said that copies of all the materials including maps and slides would be helpful to the Board as well. He said he would like the Board to receive everything that the Council had received.

Mayor Foy said that they would ask the Transportation Board to review this Concept Plan and provide the Council with comments, we would see what the traffic impact analysis showed, and the process would proceed from there. He reiterated that no decision would be made tonight.

COUNCIL MEMBER HILL MOVED ADOPTION OF R-1, AMENDED TO INCLUDE REFERRAL OF ALL COMMENTS AND MATERIALS TO THE TRANSPORTATION

BOARD, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER STROM. THE MOTION WAS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY (9-0).

**A RESOLUTION TRANSMITTING COUNCIL COMMENTS ON A CONCEPT PLAN FOR THE CHAPEL WATCH VILLAGE – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (2005-05-16/R-1)**

WHEREAS, a Concept Plan has been submitted for review by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill, for the Chapel Watch Village – Residential Development; and

WHEREAS, the Council has heard presentations for the applicant, and citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Council has discussed the proposal, with Council members offering reactions and suggestions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council transmits comments to the Transportation Board and the applicant regarding this proposal, as expressed by Council members during discussions on May 16, 2005, and reflected in minutes of that meeting.

This the 16<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.