

From: Dr. Harvey Krasny [mailto:hkrasny@mindspring.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 08, 2006 3:02 AM
To: Town Council
Cc: All Clerk
Subject: Re: Bible Church Modification of SUP for a Park & Ride-- Chapel Hill

Re: Bible Church Application for Modification of its SUP for a UNC Park & Ride Facility.

Dear Mayor and Town Council,

I am opposed to the addition of a Park & Ride facility (P&R) to the Bible Church, located off of Sage Rd, Erwin Rd and Old Sterling. This facility is badly needed by UNC and should be placed further up 15-501 towards Durham where it can best serve the needs of the primary users of this facility.

I have lived in this part of Chapel Hill for over 20 years, and travel through Sage and Erwin roads regularly to reach my home. I have watched this area grow out of proportion in the last five years, fueled by high-density building in this small area. With this explosion of growth has come an even greater increase in traffic to the area residential neighborhoods-- growth that the streets and arteries feeding this area cannot seem to handle at peak hours. Yet, the Town continues to approve MORE high-density building and MORE vehicle parking in this one area.

Here follows are three (3) major points of concern to support my opposition.

1. THE CHURCH'S NEED FOR ADDED VEHICLE PARKING- WAS IT TRUE OR FALSE-- It is my contention that the Bible Church has broken faith with the neighbors and with the Town. When their SUP was approved in 1998 the neighbors and the Town were sold by the Church on the idea that the 800 vehicle parking spaces that the Church was requesting would NOT have a detrimental effect on the daily flow of traffic and the already noticeable congestion during peak-hour travel on Sage and Erwin Roads. This is because these 800 or so vehicles would be coming and going primarily on Sunday, and NOT during the weekdays when traffic congestion is most likely to occur.

The neighbors and the Town understandably bought this argument, though the Town wisely approved 500 of the 800 spaces initially until the Church could show the Town that there was a need for the remaining 300 spaces.

In 2002 the Church returned to the Town and asked for the remainder of their spaces (300) based on the following statement:

"Due to current space constraints and our anticipated growth, space in our facility is already very tight on Sundays, AND GROWING MORE TIGHT DURING THE WEEK. We are looking forward to the next phase of our master plan build-out, which may be a

gym to serve the athletic programs during the week and provide for more worship space on Sundays."

Yet when asked recently how many of those 300 spaces were paved, the Church said ONLY 25% or approximately 70 spaces. If the Church has NOT yet found the need for those extra 230 spaces which were approved five (5) years ago, based on their testimony before Council, we wonder whether UNC's grand plan is to help the Church pave and convert those approved Church parking spaces into more Park & Ride spaces (on top of the present 241 spaces they are asking for today)-- thus making a P & R lot of almost 500 cars traveling through our neighborhood during the busiest and most traffic-congested times of the weekday.

I ask-- did their own need for those 230 additional spaces five years ago just evaporate? NOTE-- I have asked the Church representatives in a recent neighborhood meeting with them if they would agree to NEVER go beyond the 241 Park & Ride spaces-- they would NOT agree to it. I think we have our answer as to what is on their agenda.

2. UNC HAS HAD FIVE YEARS TO FIND ALTERNATIVES UP THE ROAD-- In early 2002 UNC did indicate to the Town Council that it is exploring the use of a P & R facility at this same Church lot. They asked Council for a document to "...communicate to the University and the Bible Church that the Council has no objection to the University pursuing development of a park-ride lot at the Bible Church property." Council did NOT approve this request, but indicated that the Church could make a formal application if they wished and further, that UNC might alternatively wish to consider looking further up the road (15-501) for a lot. UNC has had nearly five (5) years to seek other arrangements for parking elsewhere to serve UNC faculty/staff commuters from the Durham area who enter the Town (via 15-501, Erwin Rd, Old Chapel Hill Rd and other entry points). UNC has ONLY said that land is prohibitively expensive in this area and that the Church's lot will be a near-term and short-term (5 years) solution. Yet, when I have asked them recently at four different Board meetings and at a neighborhood meeting whether they have seriously explored discussions as an alternative with New Hope Commons and/or Patterson Place (up the road) to use some of their parking area (NOT nearly at capacity during weekday hours of 6:00AM-6:00PM). There was NO comment (NOT a word!). I suspect that UNC has NOT even explored either of these two viable options or other paved parking areas closer to Durham like the former South Square area. Use of New Hope Commons and/or Patterson PI lots has the following advantages:

- Close to each other;
- Within minutes of the Church's lot;
- Will NOT impact on residential neighborhoods like the Church's lot will do;
- Has adequate parking lot lighting, which the Church's lot may not have,
- Has wide access roads that are already built to handle peak hour

congestion;

- Is directly accessible to Durham commuters from 15-501, Erwin Rd, and Old Chapel Hill Rd; AND
- Will NOT add to the present peak hour traffic congestion and declining Level of Service (LOS) at these intersections: 15-501 & Sage, Erwin & Sage (before or after the traffic light and cut-through is added in 2008-09), and Eastowne (both entrances) & 15-501.

I ask-- why isn't the use of one or both of these two paved, lighted lots with underused capacity (or a lot further up the road) being seriously explored BEFORE even considering the Bible Church's lot?

3. CAN THEIR APPLICATION SUPPORT FINDING #3-- The 3rd finding required by the Town to grant a SUP or its modification is:

"That the use of development is located, designed, and proposed to be operated so as to maintain or enhance the value of contiguous property, or that the use or development is a public necessity.

The Church in their application for SUP modification says NOTHING about maintaining or enhancing value of contiguous property under this Finding, and it's certainly NOT a public necessity. The implication is that such a facility will benefit the neighbors too by UNC offering to neighbors who live near the Church and work at/attend UNC a chance to leave their vehicles in their respective parking lots and take one of the 26 express buses that will serve this Park & Ride facility Mon-Fri. They expect Council to make a leap of faith that there is a significant contingent of UNC faculty/staff/students living in these nearby residential locations and that these people will regularly take advantage of the opportunity to use this express bus service to UNC campus. Further, they expect Council to accept on blind faith that the values of contiguous property will NOT be diminished, but may even be enhanced by having such a service close-by for homeowners. I respectfully refute these allegations until I see clear proof supplied to support them. The burden of proof is on the Church and UNC to supply this evidence. In their absence, I maintain that Finding #3 has NOT been met, and therefore on these grounds alone this application should NOT be approved.

I ask-- does the Church's application truly meet the test of Finding #3?

I respectfully submit this letter as evidence to be included in the record of this SUP modification application. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Harvey C. Krasny

From: Dr. Harvey Krasny [mailto:hkrasny@mindspring.com]
Sent: Tue 11/14/2006 3:35 AM
To: sally@ibiblio.org
Cc: Gene Poveromo
Subject: Response to Environmental Impact Question re park & Ride-- Greene/Chapel Hill

Sally,

I want to thank you for asking the good question last night (11-13-06) at the Council meeting regarding the environmental impact of the Park & Ride lot on the neighboring Englewood land. I am glad that you have asked the Town Staff to look into this matter.

I only saw Ms. Walton's letter on the subject (concern of an environmental impact by the Bible Church's proposed Park & Ride facility on the Englewood site) to the Town when it was publicly posted on the Town's WEB site Nov 10 in advance of the Council meeting. I did try to locate her to see if she would come to the Council meeting, but was unable to locate her in the brief time before the meeting. The Englewood community has previously shown (Apr 23, 2003 Council meeting) great concern for environmental impact on their neighborhood due to proposed building adjacent to their land, which made me even more surprised that no one from their community came to speak last night.

With my limited knowledgebase in this area, I can speak intelligently regarding one of the concerns she identified in her letter-- "...the extent to which increased use of the Bible Church parking lot will contribute to increased chemical contaminants in runoff from the Parking Lot to the adjacent RCD."

I believe (guessing) that she is questioning the impact of petroleum products (from parked vehicles) that wash away from the lot's impervious surface to the adjacent RCD. Common sense tells me that this would be nominal if the lot (241 vehicle spaces) is primarily used by those attending their church on Sunday, and perhaps only for 2-3 hours on average. On the other hand, if the lot was filled with 241 UNC vehicles parking 8-12 hrs a day, 5 days a week, then I can see where this level of petroleum runoff could be more of a concern.

To be clear, I cannot attest to the accuracy of Ms. Walton's statements, but from my past interactions with people in that community and reading her letter, I can only guess that she and her neighbors have done their homework. Thank you again for asking the Town's staff to look into this question.

Best regards,
Harvey Krasny

-----Original Message-----

From: Edward C. Harrison [<mailto:ed.harrison@mindspring.com>]

Sent: Saturday, November 11, 2006 7:09 PM

To: *Council; Sabrina Oliver; Roger Stancil (H); JB Culpepper; Ralph Karpinos; Sue Burke

Subject: FW: Environmental Issue in Park & Ride-

Have received this from a citizen, Harvey Krasny. This forward is to place the correspondence in the public record for the hearing on the UNC Park and Ride case.

I am including Sue, Stormwater Management Engineer, because of past correspondence and discussion regarding RCDs and runoff issues in the area of the Chapel Hill Bible Church.

Ed Harrison

Ed-

I'd like to point out to you a letter from a citizen (Barb Walton) living in the Englewood sub-division. She wrote a letter to the Town regarding concern for potential environmental impact issues relating to the Bible Church's proposed Park & Ride facility adjacent to Englewood land. I am taking the liberty of attaching the Attachment #15 from Agenda Item 1 (Nov 13 Council meeting) which has this letter (pdf p. 4).

I believe you are probably the most knowledgeable on the Council about this area in terms of environmental issues, having been active (before 2001) in pushing for conservation of land in that area, and you will probably understand Ms. Walton's concerns. As I recall, you were certainly helpful (and supportive!) in addressing Englewood's concerns when they responded at the review (Apr 23, 2003) of a concept plan brought by a developer wishing to build adjacent to Englewood. If UNC succeeds in getting an approval, I am wondering if certain drainage requirements will need to be put in place to avoid the runoff problems (into the adjacent RCD) that she speaks to.

I am NOT changing the position I am taking on this proposal-- UNC should still look up the road to a place that does not pose problems of traffic congestion and maybe environmental impact issues, if they are valid concerns as well.

Regards,
Harvey Krasny

(47)

From: Dr. Harvey Krasny [mailto:hkrasny@mindspring.com]
Sent: Fri 11/17/2006 3:38 AM
To: Linda-Convissor@UNC.edu
Cc: MFelgenhauer@FAC.UNC.EDU; Kevin Foy; Gene Poveromo
Subject: Suggested alternatives to Park & Ride locations- Convissor/UNC

Dear Linda,

I am addressing this letter to you because you probably are the most appropriate party that I know at the University to bring this information.

I have taken the liberty of locating the names of the persons whom I believe are the respective Property Managers for the New Hope Commons Shopping Center and Patterson Place. They are:

New Hope Commons (tot 2,126 parking spots posted on WEB site)
Scott Podolsky, Kimco Realty (in Cary)
Tel: 866-435-4626; x 229; (Asst at x223).

Patterson Place
Walker Hobson, Lincoln Harris (in Cary)
Tel: 919-840-8040; x4

I have checked with both gentlemen and asked the question-- had either of them been approached by UNC on whether their parking area could be utilized for a Park & Ride. They both indicated that they themselves were NOT contacted by UNC.

Mr. Hobson (Patterson P1) did NOT give ANY indication that the use of his client's property for a Park & Ride area by UNC vehicles would be a definite possibility, but he said he would be happy to receive a call from an appropriate representative from UNC to explore the issue with UNC. I take him at his word that he would welcome a call from UNC. I would NOT be optimistic about it though, but he was at least interested enough to make the offer, having indicated that he is a UNC Alum.

Mr. Podolsky (New Hope Commons) was on the other hand extremely pessimistic about the chances of this passing his tenants' approval. He apparently believes they are at their limit (there are 2,126 spaces listed for New Hope Common's site!). I have previously visited both shopping centers lots at various times on the weekday and honestly do NOT recall seeing either of the lots at or near their parking capacity in normal weekday hours. Maybe I just wasn't at New Hope Commons' lot at the times Mr. Podolsky is referring to.

For the record, until yesterday I have never talked with either Mr. Hobson or Mr. Podolsky, nor do I know anyone that has dealt with either gentlemen directly.

I have absolutely nothing to gain from these two introductions beyond the fervent hope that a conversation at least between UNC and Mr. Hobson (Patterson P1) might in the off chance result in obtaining a more appropriate location (NOT an additional one) for the proposed Park & Ride location than the Bible Church lot. I personally see such an arrangement being a benefit to both parties-- if UNC can obtain a potentially good and safe location for parking their faculty and staff ONLY cars that come from this corridor (Durham), and if a shopping center can obtain 241+

48

more people (ie, potential shoppers) at their location. In this case I believe EVERYONE would win, including the neighbors who live and work in the Sage/Erwin Rd/Eastowne area and who would NOT have the added burden of 241 more vehicles on top of the congestion at peak hours that already overburdens roads in this area.

I hope you can please give this your urgent attention before it is too late, and before UNC comes to a neighborhood community that I frankly believe in my heart does NOT want any more clogging of their neighborhood roadways (by UNC or ANYone else) than is absolutely necessary and unavoidable. I believe the use of the Bible Church's lot for a University Park & Ride facility is unnecessary and can be avoided if UNC will seriously put in the effort and try harder to seek an alternative parking area in this vicinity.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,
Harvey Krasny

(49)

BARR WALTON
EUCLEWOOD DRIVE, CHAPEL HILL, NC.

Comments regarding a request for "Special Use Permit Modification for the Chapel Hill Bible Church" location at the northeast corner of Erwin Road and Sage Road in Chapel Hill, NC.

- An important consideration for the Planning Board in reviewing the application should be the extent to which increased use of the Bible Church parking lot will contribute to increased chemical contaminants in runoff from the Parking Lot to the adjacent Resource Conservation District.
- Previous inventory of the Cedar Terrace Bottoms in 1988, conducted for the Triangle Land Conservancy in coordination with the North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, indicates that this area represented the best example of mature bottomland swamp forest in the county. The survey characterized the site as prime breeding habitat for numerous plants and animals, including over 33 bird species, and diverse assemblages of vertebrate and invertebrate species.
- Loss of flora and fauna is common in urban watersheds. A common cause is the elevated concentrations of chemical pollutants such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, grease and oil, as well as toxic inorganic substances, such as those released from automobile tires, that are transported from impervious surfaces to receiving waters. In this case, the designated Resource Conservation District serves as the receiving body and the organisms living there receive high concentrations of pollutants delivered in stormwater runoff.
- Aquatic species and the wildlife that feed on them are especially vulnerable during early life stages to elevated concentrations of chemical contaminants delivered in storm water runoff directly to breeding habitat. For this reason the Resource Conservation District receiving stormwater runoff from the Bible Church is especially vulnerable due to the predominance of species associated with the wetland.
- Urban Watershed Management is the technological approach of managing the stormwater runoff generated from rainfall in an urban ~~setting~~. In undeveloped and undisturbed ~~setting~~, rainfall is naturally filtered and absorbed by its ~~setting~~. In an urban setting, with typical development of many impervious surfaces, storm water transports pollutants to receiving waters.
- Wet-Weather Flow (WWF) generated by precipitation, collects harmful pollutants while it travels through our city streets & other impervious and drainage systems. Many receiving water quality issues are due to the high level of contaminants generated by Wet-Weather Flow.
- Urban Watershed Management calls for measures to retain or divert urban runoff from areas of high automobile use, such as the Bible Church Parking Lot under new permit scenario, to reduce pollutant loads during and shortly after rainfall events.
- Mitigation and management measures for Wet Weather Flow should be considered as a requirement for increase usage of the Bible Church Parking Lot to minimize the impact to the adjacent Resource Conservation Area.