

From: JB Culpepper
 Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2007 2:31 PM
 To: Dana Stidham
 Cc: Gene Poveromo
 Subject: FW: University Village Project

For the file and attachment to the Post PH memo for the SUP. Thank you, JB

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

From: Bill Strom [mailto:billstrom@nc.rr.com]
 Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2007 10:38 AM
 To: JB Culpepper
 Subject: Fw: University Village Project

JB,

for the hearing record

Please see that these comments are part of the public hearing record, and that

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

From: "Segev Phillips" <Segev.Phillips@law.duke.edu>
 To: <fourseasons709@aol.com>; <laurineasthom@gmail.com>; <markkleinschmidt@gmail.com>;
 <sally@ibiblio.org>; <ed.harrison@mindspring.com>; <billstrom@nc.rr.com>;
 <hillcc@nc.rr.com>; <jimward@nc.rr.com>; <aschaefer@townofchapelhill.org>;
 <kevinfoyt@townofchapelhill.org>
 Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2007 10:31 AM
 Subject: University Village Project

- > Dear Mayor and Council Members,
- > I appreciate your calling for public comments on the proposed
- > University Village project. My wife and I own and live in a townhome
- > in the Oaks community. From our back door we can see and hear the
- > traffic on 54, and the proposed project would be directly behind us.
- > As such, I have a sincere interest in the proposed project.
- > I speak for myself as well as many of my close neighbors with the
- > following comments: 1) That we are in favor of the project generally
- > - it will likely increase our property value and provide us with
- > greater pedestrian access to goods and services; 2) However, we are
- > concerned about the light and noise possibly generated from the
- > complex (both operational and during construction), as well as the
- > increased foot traffic directly behind our units.
- > Therefore, we suggest that such development be conditioned on the
- > developer also building a wall from Burning Tree to Rogerson, with
- > gates at the current pathways, on the north side of the north
- > sidewalk, and that such wall be constructed so that 1) it is not an
- > eye-sore (perhaps brick or stone), and 2) it is of a sufficient height
- > to limit the noise and light that would otherwise affect our lives.
- > Many thanks,
- > Segev Phillips

Dana Stidham

46

From: gkneeb@aol.com
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2007 5:24 PM
To: Dana Stidham
Cc: Bill Webster; shell@nc.rr.com
Subject: Re: request for information regarding University Village development proposal - TIME SENSITIVE

Dana,

Thank you for your reply. I am fairly new to Chapel Hill and may need some guidance as to how to voice my concerns and who I should voice them to.

My concerns about this development (and other proposed new development) has to do with the current over-crowding of the schools. At present the schools that would serve this area are (University Village) at or above capacity. As you may know, construction of the 10th elementary school has been delayed which means that no relief is in sight for the elementary schools. As a parent, I am opposed to further over-crowding in the schools as the town approves more and more new housing.

I have voiced my concerns to Steve Scroggs at the School District office but want to voice tme to the appropriate Town Council members, committees etc... Who should I be contacting and which meetings should I be attending?

Thank you for your help.

Jeanne Brown
338-2560

1/23/2007

47

January 30, 2007

Dear Sir/Madam;

East West Partners has proposed a large, mixed use project on NC 54 and Hamilton Road dubbed University Village. *The Chapel Hill News* reported (1/21/07) that few people have shown up for meetings about the project. Roger Perry, the developer, can't understand the silence. He seems to think he's done his best to inform the public.

Gary Kaye of Chapel Hill opines in the 1/24/07 *News* that he's not confused. Speaking for the silent majority, he wants it all....more Southpoint, more Patterson Place, more Meadowmont, more shopping!

I live very near the proposed project on Oakwood Drive and I think both these fellows need correction.

First of all, I have never been directly notified of meetings or hearings on the project. I did respond to a local bulletin board posting and attended one meeting last summer. I noted my address on a register then and assumed I would receive notices about future meetings, but I didn't. Even *The Chapel Hill News* waited until the day of the Mr. Perry's appearance before town council to announce it.

Had I attended that council meeting, I would have made one point, the same point I made to Mr. Perry at the previous meeting. This project is too BIG!!! The scale of the buildings is disproportionately large. Existing structures on site and in the neighborhood are two story, modest buildings. The seven proposed structures are two and three times that height with large footprints! This density of development is out of character with the neighborhood and hardly fits the concept of a "village". Other issues raised at the summer meeting included traffic and safety concerns, aesthetics, and an already limited demand for retail space at Meadowmont and Glen Lennox. Interested parties have hardly been silent and I wonder what East West has done to address these concerns..

I hope that the town council makes a visit to the property and really tries to imagine its future. I hope they don't see another Southpoint or Patterson Place but a properly scaled development with local shops and affordable residences that fits in with the character of the neighborhood.

Tom Carson
44 Oakwood Drive
Chapel Hill

Sent to Chapel Hill News, Opinion page.
Please enter into the record for the
University Village project.

Dana Stidham

(48)

From: Mangiamangia@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2007 11:05 PM
To: Kevin Foy; billstrom@nc.rr.com; laurineasthom@gmail.com; sally@ibiblio.org; ed.harrison@mindspring.com; hillcc@nc.rr.com; markkleinschmidt@gmail.com; FourSeasons709@aol.com; jimward@nc.rr.com
Subject: Comments regarding University Village missed inclusion.

I emailed the following comments to the Clerk shortly before 3:30 PM on Wednesday, after meeting with Planning staff earlier in the day. I was surprised to hear that no comments in opposition to the project were presented. I have additional concerns, including parking and traffic, which I hope to address at future hearings. Thank you for your attention.

Forwarded Message:

Subj:	Letter for Town Council
Date:	1/17/2007 3:29:26 P.M. Eastern Standard Time
From:	<u>Mangiamangia</u>
To:	<u>townclerk@townofchapelhill.org</u>

Regarding January 17, 2007 Public Hearing on University Village

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend tonight's meeting. Please distribute and read into the public record.

Dear Mayor Foy and Town Council:

I have great concern over the amount and intensity of development proposed for University Village. Its approval requires creating an entirely new zoning district, whose guidelines are reminiscent of an all-you-can-eat buffet, a veritable smorgasbord of developer delicacies.

The Mixed Use-Village zone amendments deviate so substantially from the original, that its resemblance is in name only.

NOTE As reported, floor area ratio is to double, from .6 to 1.2, even though it appears on Dimensional Matrix 3.8-1 that maximum FAR in the MU-V zone as .5. Even an FAR of 1.0 would result in a high intensity project before aggregating the residential component.

NOTE Residential densities are proposed to increase from 15 units per acre to 20. The present standard of 15 has produced the mix of residential uses that are visible today at Southern Village and Meadowmont, where single family homes coexist with apartment type, multiunit structures and townhomes. Those densities do not include the double dipping of commercial floor area, which allows the developer to realize the maximum commercial use in addition to the maximum residential use. The proposed 20 units per acre results in a development proposal which is exclusively comprised of multiunit buildings. That would seem inconsistent with a "village" concept, which presumably was the original intent of the designation.

NOTE Increasing the maximum height from 60 to 85 feet would, once again, seem to reduce the village or human scale of the development. Furthermore, coupling taller buildings with reduced setbacks, creates canyons which evoke urban city centers, rather than outlying neighborhoods, where lower intensities distinguish and help to establish a sense of place, differentiated and respectful of maintaining a "downtown."

While the project addresses affordable housing in a proactive manner, that in and of itself, should not preclude you from considering its shortcomings or from further analysis of its perceived benefits. For example, the significant increase in commercial and office square footage, plus the 140 room hotel, should be analyzed for its impacts on employment and wage generation. Will more jobs of low and moderate income levels be created

1/22/2007

49

than could be accommodated by the 30% affordable housing units that will be constructed? If so, then the project will actually export an affordable housing deficit for the city to absorb elsewhere, rather than assist in alleviating the present shortage.

Is there a demonstrated demand for the additional commercial retail square footage and does the Chapel Hill real estate market have the elasticity to absorb such an increase, or will it likely result in additional vacancies at existing locations? While it not the responsibility of city government to protect existing businesses from competition, neither is it advisable to double the allowable intensity of new development with full knowledge of the negative impact that it will likely visit on its existing tax base.

Density, by itself, is not a "green" concept. Only when coupled with reduction elsewhere does it achieve that level. Preserving an environmental easement on a portion of a parcel, while permitting higher intensity development on the balance is a good example. This proposal seems to lack the trade-off that would be perceived as a public benefit in exchange for granting the developer increased rights to sell more units. The increased affordable housing units do not offset the increased development right. Five additional units per acre translate to a potential increase of 56 units. Instead of the thirty units of affordable housing that would be required with this proposal, the developer is offering sixty. In other words, if there is a linkage between the increased density and the affordable housing, the town should push for all of the units above the present density. If you can't build affordable when the land is effectively free, when will you be able to build it?

The proposal to increase residential density to 20 units per acre, if approved, still leaves over twenty units "on the table" which the developer could potentially ask for later as a right of use.

Another issue which cuts against application of the "green" label to this project is the 64% impervious surface ratio. An interpretation of North Carolina law apparently permits this level of overdevelopment, which is immediately apparent at first look at the site plan. It would clearly be worthwhile for the town to take a hard look at this extremely lenient situation. I apologize for having neither the time nor legal expertise to further research the possibility to challenge this, but its benefit would be obvious.

Finally, the cumulative effect of this property combined with the massive amount of other construction that is in the pipeline, should give the Council great pause before increasing allowable levels of development within a zoning district. It hardly seems like developers need to be given additional incentives in order to break ground in Chapel Hill.

Sincerely,

Elliot Baron
215 Westside Drive,
Chapel Hill