

**Neighborhood Interface Subcommittee Analysis of UNC's December 2003 Carolina North Plan
December 10, 2003**

Attending: Al Burk, Joe Capowski, Linda Convissor, Pat Evans, and Blair Pollock

The following comments are referenced to the full committee's principles and indicate the consensus of the subcommittee as to whether the plan presented by UNC was consistent with each principle.

General Principle 1:

Yes for the most part, however, the subcommittee is concerned that the large number of parking places will compromise the sustainability principles, the report provides no details on large impact utilities, and should place earlier emphasis on developing housing. Specifically, the subcommittee recommends that UNC's plan should retain the town's HW committee's 25% housing goal recognizing that this may require tradeoffs with housing density, open space, and the number of onsite employees.

General Principles 2 –3:

No inconsistencies noted.

Neighborhood Interface Principle 1:

No, the University and Chapel Hill/Carborro City Schools should work together to identify and reserve appropriate school site(s). UNC should help fund construction of schools in proportion to Carolina North's impact on student populations.

Goal 1B-

No, only allows 1.5 spaces per residence, should allow 2.25.

Goal 1D-

Subcommittee questions whether enough space is provided for basic civic needs such as police and fire. In particular a recycling site should be included.

Neighborhood Interface Principle 2:

Yes for the most part however, details not yet available to fully evaluate. The proximity of Carolina North to North Haven is a strong concern. Existing town LUMO standard on neighborhood buffering should be applied as a minimum.

Goal 2A-

Strategy 2A.a-

Some of us are concerned about the adverse neighborhood impact of a large amount of automotive traffic on weaver Dairy Rd extension. While the subcommittee acknowledges the need for multiple northern access points to Carolina North we recognize the potential conflict between developing neighborhoods and automobile traffic. A supplemental route may be to use the railroad corridor and a park and ride at Eubanks road.

Strategy 2A.b-

The proximity of Carolina North to North Haven is a strong concern.

Strategy 2A.f-

The subcommittee notes an E/W connection is only available in later phases. Suggest an early greenway be created as a non-motorized E/W connection from Airport Rd to the Chapel Hill High school area schools.

Strategy 2A.h-

Not addressed at all in the presentation (needs to be addressed).

Goal 2B-

Strategy 2B.a-d-

Satisfactorily addressed.

Strategy 2B.e-

Not addressed at all in the presentation (needs to be addressed to ascertain neighborhood impacts).

Strategy 2B.f-

Satisfactorily addressed.

Additional Comments:

- 1) Taller buildings up to 5 stories are acceptable/desirable in the interior of the development tapering down towards adjoining neighborhoods.
- 2) The amount of parking shown on the current plan is excessive and would be damaging to the nearby neighborhoods and should be reduced to promote transit.
- 3) Active public recreational sites should be specified and identified.
- 4) We collectively recommend that UNC make the building approval process for CN more public so that citizens whose lives will be impacted by these buildings may provide input to their size, location, and environmental impacts.

QUESTIONS REGARDING UNC'S DEVELOPMENT IN CHAPEL HILL HWCC Fiscal Equity Subcommittee.

The University has failed to address the fiscal impact of their proposed development and we don't feel that plans should move forward until it does.

Further

We appreciate the Council accepting our strategies, but would like to hear Council discussion or public mention of them and have all the fiscal equity strategies included in any development proposal that comes forward.

We offer these additional questions, as well.

*How much Chapel Hill taxpayer dollars has been spent (including hours of staff time, numerous consultants, etc) over the past ten years on repeated planning efforts for Horace Williams without even a single prospective tenant for the site? To whom is the university accountable for these costs?

*Is there need for a public/private development in Chapel Hill?

*What assessment has been made of Centennial Campus at NC State, both in terms of the actual need for such a corporate/university campus, as well as an assessment of its effectiveness, cost to Raleigh/Wake County taxpayers and impact on local resources?

*UNC has just embarked on a massive expansion plan for the main campus called the Master Plan. Questions that need to be answered related to this development expansion before embarking on a plan for Carolina North:

--What impacts will the main campus Master Plan as well as Horace Williams have on Chapel Hill taxpayers?

--What impacts will the main campus Master Plan and the Horace Williams plan have on both the natural resources and the built environment of Chapel Hill?

*Given the Triangle's air pollution problems, is it responsible of the university to add well over 40,000 vehicle trips daily to our roads? Should not a forward-thinking, leading university adopt a standard of zero net increase in emissions for a project of this size if built?

*If UNC-CH can justify Horace Williams in other than very general terms like "a living and learning campus," what mechanism could be established to determine if the natural and built environment can sustain such a development, plus the main campus Master Plan development in Chapel Hill?

*What are the infrastructure and utility costs directly associated with Carolina North?
How will the town and the public utilities be reimbursed for these costs?

*Given the specific problems of affordable housing, environmental pollution, traffic and sprawl that confront our town, in what way does Carolina North's development plan address these issues?

*Because the basic economic model of Chapel Hill's tax base is askew because of UNC, won't the creation of Carolina North exacerbate this problem?

TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

HORACE WILLIAMS CITIZENS COMMITTEE TRANSPORTATION & LAND USE SUB-COMMITTEE

Report on the meeting held at the Orange County Health and Human Services Building, Room C, from noon to 1:20PM on 11 December 2003

Attendees:

Joyce Brown, Del Snow, James Corley, Bill Strom, Buck Branson

The purpose of this meeting was to compile comments of the committee members on their impressions of the plan for CAROLINA NORTH that had been presented by UNC at a series of public meetings held during the first ten days of December 2003.

At its meeting scheduled for 18 December 2003, it's hoped that the full HWCC will choose to elicit further comment and discussion on many of these topics with the members of the TLU Sub-Committee.

Attendees' comments:

Joyce: 1] "UNC has given no idea of the type of tenants who will be there, nor of their transportation needs, and therefore the Town should not enter into discussions with UNC at this time. The Town Council cannot do its job." 2] "We need more specificity with regard to uses." 3] "There should be no Homestead Road connection."

Del: 1] "Roads should not be part of the transportation improvements infrastructure to be built at the onset. Emphasis should be put on transit." 2] "There should not be an interior road connection to Homestead Road because of the Weaver Dairy Rd problem and the environmentally sensitive areas that would be harmed by a road leading from Homestead Rd to the area of dense development." 3] "Reiterate our request for permanent open space."

James: 1] "This plan is an automobile oriented design as evidenced by the number of parking spaces and their placement. This should be designed as a 'park once' environment." 2] I'm concerned that UNC hasn't made adequate provision for financing the infrastructure as well as the potential costs to the citizens over the years."

Bill: "This plan is a 'non-responsive bid.'"

Buck: 1] "The planned proximity of improvements to the North Haven community is contrary to our recommendations regarding the protection of existing neighborhoods. There is abundant acreage to allow for much wider buffering between the developed areas of Carolina North and existing neighborhoods." 2] "I'm concerned about the proposed phasing of the additions to transportation "infrastructure" (including road improvements, both on site and off site). Much of it is planned to severely lag what will be a constantly growing need for more capacity."