

**University Village
Response To Comments
On University Village Concept Plan
From the Public Hearing of the
Chapel Hill Town Council meeting of 10/19/05**

East West Partners (EWP) issues the following response to key issues found within the summary minutes of the Town Council Hearing on October 19, 2005 concerning Item #5-University Village.

Comment:

"Council Member Strom asked Ms. Culpepper to identify on the map the area reserved by the Triangle Transit Authority for Phase II to pass through this area. Ms. Culpepper pointed that out on the map, noting that it would run along the south side of Prestwick Road. She noted that Prestwick Road itself had been generally identified as a potential corridor, stating that when the Prestwick Place development went through the SUP process, 20 to 30 feet beyond the right-of-way was reserved as potentially adding to that corridor.

Mayor Foy asked if that was 20 feet on the south side of the Prestwick Place property. Ms. Culpepper responded yes, as well as the north side of Prestwick Road. She stated that during the Prestwick Place SUP process, the Council had required that the additional reservation of land be added to the north side."

Response:

The location of the future TTA corridor, located on the southern portion of Prestwick Road, was kept under consideration as all on and off site improvements were designed during the University Village SUP application process. A sheltered transit stop is planned for the University Village community on the north side of Prestwick road, when/if the transit arrives.

Comment:

"Mr. Perry then exhibited a diagram of the total gross area of square footage and how it was distributed. He stated that they proposed the residential portion at 228,215 square feet including 30 percent for "for sale" affordable housing, the retail at 64,185 square feet, the office at 115,500 square feet, and the hotel at 70,000 square feet, for a total of 477,900 square feet. Mr. Perry stated that the parking required by ordinance for this site was a minimum of 976, noting that their proposal was for 922, 54 spaces below the required minimum with the understanding that the Council had expressed a desire to go below those minimum requirements in certain situations."

12-2

Response:

Total Gross Square Footage for SUP submittal

Residential = 238,904 gsf

Office = 120,214 gsf

Retail = 58,487 gsf

Hotel = 70,000 gsf

Total Parking

Required = 990

Proposed On-Site = 786

Prestwick Road (on-street parking) = 95

Comment:

"Mayor Foy said Prestwick Road was a public road and unpaved. Mr. Perry said their proposal was to pave Prestwick Road and provide parallel parking on the road as well as sidewalks on both sides. He said in the past nearby Glenwood School residents had requested that Prestwick Road not extend to Hamilton Road. Mr. Perry said they were prepared to close it at the edge of their property, or extend to on to Hamilton Road to provide inner-connectivity with Hamilton, depending upon the Council's wishes. He said they believed and good planning suggested that they should be inner-connected. Mr. Perry said this had in the past been a contentious issue, and they were willing to work with that. He said regardless it should be a pedestrian corridor to Hamilton Road and to the Glenwood School."

Response:

The SUP package shows a connection of Prestwick and Hamilton Road. A notification was sent to both the head of the PTA and the Principal at Glenwood School announcing a public information meeting for University Village on April 4th, 2006. Nobody representing Glenwood Elementary was present for the presentation.

Comment:

Mayor Foy asked if this proposed project connected to Hamilton Road. Mr. Perry responded that their property did not connect to Hamilton, noting that the Town's fire station was between their property and Hamilton Road. He said they did not have a curb cut from Hamilton Road that would allow access to the hotel. Mr. Perry said the hotel would be accessed through a right-in-right out entrance from NC 54, or from the median cut to the east. He said if they had a curb cut from Hamilton Road to the hotel, it would present stacking problems to the intersection since it was too close to it.

Response:

The plans are now showing a right-only exit connection onto Hamilton Road in addition to the right-in right out entrance from NC 54. EWP believes that a right-only exit connection may not present stacking problems at the intersection.

12-3

Comment:

"Mr. Perry then presented a summary of the project, noting the following:

- They were committed to providing 30% of affordable housing, which was double that required.
- All of the buildings would be built to LEED silver standards at a minimum.
- They proposed to preserve the area where the significant stand of trees was located.
- The proposal was for mixed used, to include residential, retail, office, hotel, and structured parking.
- This was an infill/redevelopment site, which would encompass a majority of the entire block.
- The structured parking would be a combination of underground parking and a 4-story parking deck.
- The site would have multimodal transportation in addition to regular vehicular traffic.
- The site was zoned for 235,570 square feet of retail space, noting that their proposal would generate 28 percent fewer trips per day than what was allowed by zoning.
- The proposed impervious surface area was approximately 20 percent below the allowed area, noting that increased density was offset by a large green space, underground parking, and the parking deck. The stormwater retention and detention structures would be "best practices" and would be underground collection and retention storage facilities.
- The architectural design incorporated classical design principles of proportion, order, symmetry, and composition to provide a functional and aesthetically pleasing environment, adding the total design would create a harmonious and pleasing architectural solution that was an asset to the Town.
- They were requesting that the allowable floor area ratio be increased from 43 percent to 98 percent.
- They were requesting that the allowable building height be increased from 34 feet to 75 feet."

Response:

University Village is applying for acceptance into the LEED-ND pilot program which focuses on Neighborhood Development. If accepted, University Village will pursue its LEED silver standard for a project as a whole as opposed to registering individual buildings.

The proposed impervious is still below the allowable, but not likely to be by 20%

Building height requests to 76 feet

12-4

Comment:

" John Anderson, a resident of Rogerson Drive, commented his street was right across from the entrance noted on the original plan. He said there were many good things about this proposed development, but he was concerned about the two compromises Mr. Perry was proposing regarding the increase in allowable floor area and building height,

Mr. Anderson said the entrance to the current hotel was directly across from Rogerson Drive, and if you made a left turn onto NC 54 going towards campus there was no cut-through provided by the State. He said it was difficult to see traffic coming from Hamilton Road, and when traffic volume was high or moving fast it was difficult to get across at that location. Mr. Anderson said with increased traffic it would become worse.

.....Council Member Hill said Mr. Perry had anticipated what the Council would want and had included it in his proposal. But, he said, he did not want any more new stoplights in Town if at all possible. Council Member Hill said the idea of a right-Wright-out cut by the hotel onto NC 54 was not as problematic, but he believed the entrance into University Village at Rogerson Drive would become a major intersection. He said that could all be eliminated if the two accesses onto NC 54 were cut out and all of the property was accessed from Prestwick Road. Council Member Hill noted that might be too much for Prestwick to handle, but it would make the effects of this development all borne by the development itself. He said he did not know if that was doable, but was an idea he wanted to explore."

Response:

AN traffic and road improvement possibilities are currently under consideration. The lane improvement and curb cut plans as shown have not changed since the October 19th hearing. The final TLA report should become available soon at which time further recommendations will become available.

Comment:

"Council Member Ward asked about continuing the ten-foot-wide bike lane that was in place to the east of this site. He asked if Mr. Perry envisioned pulling that across the frontage of this development. Mr. Perry said they had not as yet focused on this issue, but he thought it was a great idea to do that. He said one of the significant problems with Meadowmont was that the linkages to campus were not complete, and it would be a shame for that to happen to this existing bike lane. Mr. Perry said he believed Council Member Ward's suggestion was a good one and they would work to incorporate it into their plans. Council Member Ward suggested articulating that to UNC Hospitals so they would be aware of those plans. Mr. Perry stated it would affect the setbacks somewhat."

Response:

As shown, the bike path connection will continue along the frontage of University Village.

(12.5)

Comment:

"Council Member Ward encouraged Mr. Perry to maintain the connection with Prestwick and Hamilton. He said on the site map, both Buildings 1 and 2 come very close to two trees, and encouraged Mr. Perry to modify his plans somewhat to pull the buildings away from the trees to provide them a good chance to survive. Mr. Perry said moving buildings was problematic, and they had assumed that those two trees would not be saved. He said they were willing to take another look at that. Council Member Ward said he believed using the alternate configuration for Building 1 would save one of the trees. Mr. Perry replied that was correct, noting it was easier to save that one than it was the other one."

Response:

An attempt to locate the buildings so that the two trees located on the main portion of the site could remain proved unsuccessful. As shown, the proposed design of the development will not allow for this. This is due to the density of the development and the limited space.

Comment:

"Council Member Kleinschmidt said regarding how this development interfaced with the one next to it, did the site plan show that the top left corner of the site was all surface parking. He said that appeared to be unattractive to him and it did not seem to follow the same principles that apply to the rest of the development and its relationship to the other two developments. Mr. Perry said that was a challenge, but noted that the parking was "double loaded" on each side with a large green space towards the inside. He said they would revisit that issue. Council Member Kleinschmidt referred to it as "a horrible space." Mr. Perry agreed that it may be if it remained as it was, reiterating that they would focus some attention to that."

Response:

Changes were made in the plans to address the surface parking on the Southeast portion of the site. EWP was in agreement on this, and the surface parking was broken up and designed in a manner that would increase the flow with the rest of the site. A car wash and refuse area are also now contained in this region.

Comment:

"Mayor pro tem Wiggins asked if there were plans to "touch base" with any of the people or groups that may have been "contentious" at the prior discussion regarding this development, to discuss any concerns they may have if Prestwick was connected to Hamilton Road, including any school officials. She said that would allow Mr. Perry to include mitigating aspects to his proposal that would ease those expressed concerns. Mayor pro tem Wiggins said for example, a right turn lane would accommodate school buses turning in and out of the school lot, as well as parents dropping off and picking up their children. She said any kind of consideration he could take into account as he planned that connection would be helpful. Mr. Perry said that the CDC had commented that at the point they reviewed the Concept Plan, it had not been addressed by the neighbors. He said they were at the concept stage of their plans and were only getting

12-6

comments from the Town at this point. Mr. Perry said they had a long history of working with neighborhoods and would continue to do so, although they might not always agree. He said they would approach the different constituents in the area, including the Rogerson and Oaks neighborhoods as well as the school."

Response:

Two separate informational meetings were held on the evening of April 4th, 2006. Notice was sent weeks in advance to all residents of Rogerson Dr. and Oakwood Dr., as well as to the Principal and PTA President at Glenwood School. As previously mentioned, nobody representing Glenwood School was present for the first session. Approximately 8-10 neighbors from Rogerson and Oakwood were present for the second meeting. All but one member of this group seemed to be in support of the plans for University Village. One neighbor voiced concern over the height of the buildings, but did not seem to object with the overall concept of the development.

Comment:

"Council Member Harrison quoted Mr. Broadwell as follows: "You attempt to improve transitional scale between the proposed development and nearby neighborhoods." Council Member Harrison said where that comment struck him was that it appeared that the highest buildings were towards the inhabited neighborhoods and not towards the transit corridor. He wondered if it would be better to have height reduced right on NC 54 and the higher buildings stepped back. Council Member Harrison said no one lived on Prestwick Road, so there would be no complaints."

Response:

The tallest buildings in the University Village proposals are in fact located on the transit corridor portion of the site. These buildings are 6 stories tall while the buildings along Hwy 54 are 4 stories tall. This was the case on October 19th, but was not properly noted at this time by EWP.

Comment:

"Mayor Foy suggested that instead of pulling the buildings up, perhaps we could consider pushing the sidewalk back away from NC 54. He said he liked what Mr. Perry had done at Meadowmont. Mayor Foy said by pushing the sidewalk back, pedestrians would have direct access to the storefronts without having to leave the sidewalk and travel to each individual store. Mr. Perry said that was a good idea, noting there was a bus stop at one location and moving the sidewalk would make that area more pedestrian friendly. He said then a vegetative buffer could be included between the curb and the sidewalk. Mayor Foy agreed, noting that would give pedestrians a feeling of protection from NC 54. Mr. Perry added that would allow them to include the bike lane that Council Member Ward had suggested."

Response:

This comment was well received and has been incorporated into the plans. Sidewalk access is now available for both sides of the storefront and away from NC 54.

12-7

Comment:

"Mayor Foy supported Council Member Ward's statements regarding the fire station, and thinking about how that property might be integrated into the area so that it was not "just a corner." He said the developments planned for that area were quite large, and potentially the fire station could become a part of that in some way."

Response:

EWP is open to this possibility.

Comment:

"Council Member Ward said his last comment was not directed at just this project. He said the Council had talked about strategies to more comprehensively identify places where we could direct additional density in our community, and it looked like this was one project where a significant increase in density was appropriate for the site. Council Member Ward said he wanted the Council to use this project and their conversations regarding a focused Comprehensive Plan revision to help them identify other places where high density could be encouraged. He said that would include conversations with OWASA, since he did not believe OWASA's projections have anticipated the added density and related water use. Council Member Ward said he did not want such situations to be a surprise to OWASA, in that we were cognizant of what their plans were in regard to their ability to provide water to this community, and what would put their projections at risk in terms of their service to the community."

Response:

Opening dialogue has occurred between EWP and OWASA. OWASA has reviewed the plans and both parties are optimistic that the appropriate infrastructure upgrades can be arranged