

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE CHAPEL HILL TOWN COUNCIL
MONDAY, MAY 11, 2009, AT 7:00 P.M.**

Present were Mayor pro tem Jim Ward, Council Member Matt Czajkowski, Council Member Laurin Easthom, Council Member Ed Harrison, Council Member Mark Kleinschmidt, Council Member Jim Merritt, and Council Member Bill Strom.

Staff members present were Town Manager Roger Stancil, Deputy Town Manager Florentine Miller, Assistant Town Manager Bruce Heflin, Town Attorney Ralph Karpinos, Public Works Director Lance Norris, Mayoral Aide Carlo Robustelli, Engineering Services Manager Kumar Neppalli, Stormwater Engineer Sue Burke, Transit Director Steve Spade, Planning Director J.B. Culpepper, Adssistant Director Brian Litchfield, Sustainability Officer John Richardson, Long Range & Transportation Manager David Bonk, Senior Planner Kendal Brown, and Communications Manager/Acting Town Clerk Sandra J. Kline.

Mayor Foy absent excused. Sally Greene absent excused.

1. [Public Hearing: Land Use Management Ordinance Text Amendment - Adjustment to the Special Use Permit Threshold for Downtown Development in the Town Center Zoning Districts.](#)

Kendal Brown said this was a text amendment responding to a Planning Board petition to the Town Council in March. She said a Planning Board committee is studying the special threshold use; there were two scales for review, and while the committee continues its work, the board wished to bring forward its recommendation to exempt certain downtown redevelopment proposals. She said they believed such an exemption would align with the Council's stated goals. Ms. Brown said this exemption would be spelled out in one of the footnotes, and it would apply to the Town Center 1, 2, and 3 zoning districts. She said the draft does not include Town Center 3, but it will be corrected in the final copy.

George Cianciolo said the Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend the staff's recommendation that the Council adopt this text amendment to the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO). He said they agree with staff's conclusions that this text amendment would achieve the purposes of the comprehensive plan. He said they were very supportive, and hoped the Council would also be supportive before they adjourn for the summer.

Council Member Harrison questioned how soon can this come back.

Ms. Culpepper said they could bring this back at the June 8 meeting if that was acceptable.

Council Member Easthom said she would like to clarify that it does not involve additional stories; and wanted to know what significantly means.

Ms. Brown said they did discuss that, and said it would mean a second story would not bump out over the first floor if it was already a shear facade; and if floor area increased over 15 percent or 2500 square feet, it would automatically be referred to the Planning Board.

Council Member Easthom said she wondered if they were giving the go ahead to take a two-story establishment and not seeing anything that could rise to eight or nine stories. She said she thought the Council needs to see it, if it will rise to a certain point.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said it was difficult to talk about stories; he thought it would be helpful in the situation where a two-story building that had very high ceilings, and was suitable for renovation to three stories, without any appearance change on the outside. He said he imagined that was the purpose of this, given the application before the Planning Board that was the spark for this petition. He said if that was the limitation, he was very comfortable with it, and it seemed silly not to have this tool available.

Ms. Brown said it sounds like height is the issue.

Council Member Easthom said if they were working within the shell of an existing building, that's fine.

Ms. Brown said they can clarify that on building height.

Mayor pro tem Ward asked Mr. Cianciolo if the Planning Board brought up the same kinds of questions they had just raised.

Mr. Cianciolo said yes, they did; their understanding was that there would be no change in the facade, and no significant increase in height either. He said one thing there might be was that as buildings were upgraded with mechanical systems, they might want to increase the height by a couple of feet to hide any mechanicals on the roof. He said there would be no change in the footprint. He said in their discussions it was believed there weren't enough older buildings that might require this. Mr. Cianciolo said at this time they believed most of the need was in the downtown area.

Mayor pro tem Ward asked if that additional square footage might mean that there would be a different use, and that use might have some greater infrastructure demands, whether parking, or other types of demands. He asked if that was a realistic scenario.

Mr. Cianciolo said if there was a significant change in use, it would probably require a new SUP.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said if they had an office building the number of people that could work in that building might over-tax its infrastructure.

Mr. Cianciolo said they talked about that, but there wouldn't be that many buildings in downtown that would qualify for this.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said that's why he thought the limit to the Town Center 1, 2, and

3 was appropriate; he knows people complain about the lack of parking downtown, but they do have Town facilities to deal with that kind of activity. He said he thought it was a good idea to limit it to where their infrastructure was.

COUNCIL MEMBER BILL STROM MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER LAURIN EASTHOM, TO RECESS THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JUNE 8, 2009. THE MOTION WAS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0).

2. Public Hearings: Public Hearings on Carolina North Development Proposal.

Mr. Stancil said to give a little background, in February 2008, the Council authorized the Town staff to work with the University staff to develop options for Carolina North for the Council's consideration. He said as a result of that, the Council endorsed the idea of the creation of a new zone and a development agreement to guide the future development of Carolina North. He said it was now 14 months later, and tonight they open three public hearings regarding the Carolina North development proposal. Mr. Stancil said it had been a collaborative process, and over the last year they had had numerous sessions and meetings; all of this has resulted in exhaustive Town and University staff effort to compile the results of the meetings and to understand the results which now inform the products that the public hearing is on tonight.

Mr. Stancil said they propose that the evening's proceedings be broken into two main parts: the first public hearing they were asking the Council to consider creating a new zoning district; and next, combine public hearings to consider rezoning of the University's property and application of a development agreement (ZAA).

Mr. Stancil said for the first part of the evening, the hearing on the Land Use Management Ordinance Text Amendment (LUMOTA), they had asked David Owens, to describe generally the regulatory mechanisms that have been endorsed by the Council and the Trustees, and to provide specific information about the proposed new zoning district. He said the text amendment tonight proposes creation of a new University one zoning district. He said for the combined hearings of the rezoning application and the proposed development agreement, Mr. Owens will describe the rezoning and development agreement tool; he will be followed by Jack Evans who will present the University proposal. Mr. Stancil said Mr. Evans will be followed by Chris Conklin, who wrote and will describe the results of the Transportation Impact Analysis. He said following both parts of tonight, there will be an opportunity for public comment before they hear Council questions.

Mr. Owens said the amendment of section 3.5.5 of the LUMO text of the ordinance is largely procedural in nature. He said the new U-1 district creates the framework for large scale mixed-use development; expressly to allow educational research and medical uses, with integrated and supporting housing, retail, utility and other supporting uses for the primary use of academic research and medical uses. He said it is a unique district that was designed specifically for the Carolina North project. He said the applicant would be required to submit a long range concept

plan for the entire site, provide an ecological assessment, and provide the Council with a detailed plan, and a draft development agreement for a specific phase of development that would be approved within the district. Mr. Owens said the Council review and approval of both the decision to rezone into that district and a development agreement is a legislative choice of the Council. He said this choice is designed to allow full public discussion, interaction, and a collaborative approach to designing the development standards. He said extra steps have been added to the text amendment to assure that it is open, transparent, and fair to the public and applicant. He said the text amendment specifies the details of what has to be in a development agreement. Mr. Owens said that in sum is what is in the text change to the LUMO.

Mayor pro tem Ward asked for clarification of the site plan review by the staff for individual projects within the development agreement. He said he would like a description of the process and how does the public learn of this.

Mr. Owens said there were no public hearings on the individual site plans; the development agreement would lay out the site plan for the overall project. He said it would have all the building locations, the road, and utility locations in the development agreement itself.

Mayor pro tem Ward asked if there was a vehicle for the general public and the Council to maintain an awareness of what was going on.

Mr. Owens said there was nothing in the U-1 District that would require that other than the annual report to the Council.

Ms. Culpepper said for similarity, the OI-4 zoning district has provisions for a notification of neighbors by the University in the Perimeter Transition Areas.

Mayor pro tem Ward said the way most of us are envisioning the development of Carolina North, the perimeter is limited to frontage on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

Ms. Culpepper agreed.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said in the development agreement they were contemplating an annual reporting at a minimum of a 12-month period. He said he would imagine that would be a way the public and Council would be on notice.

Council Member Harrison asked Mr. Owens if there were any implications in how they handle the U-1 for the activities that were actually happening outside the 50-year area, such as the utilities corridors.

Mr. Owens said it was addressed in the development agreement. He said one of the questions was should the Town rezone only the portion of this tract that was subject to building development, or the entirety of the University property. He said one of the potential advantages to the Council looking at the entirety of the area was the development agreement would then apply to that area, and included some limitations of what the University could do, that would not otherwise be subject to Town zoning or land use regulations.

Council Member Strom said he knew the Council had not settled that issue, but he believed applying it to the entire area would make sense because with this change in zoning for the entire tract, his understanding was that no buildings which were not represented in the development plan could emerge anywhere on the tract, and with the existing zoning they could come in for a SUP. He asked if it was a significant locking in of the development plan by zoning the entire parcel.

Mr. Owens said yes, that locking in really comes with the development agreement itself.

Council Member Easthom said she wanted to follow up on keeping the citizens informed; after the development agreement, when the building is occurring, is there any other way than the annual report to use their on-line Internet resources to let people know what was happening at six months. She said the citizens were going to want to know what was happening.

Mr. Owens said yes, certainly it was going to be possible to write something that required more frequent reporting; it could even be incorporated into the ordinance or development agreement, or just direction to the Town staff.

Mayor pro tem Ward said maybe when the Town Manager receives something to review, it gets put up on the web as an action that has been initiated.

Council Member Strom said they could have their staff update it daily; he thought it was more of an administrative detail they could handle after as they proceed.

Mr. Owens said the University had submitted a petition to rezone the entirety of the Horace Williams tract to the U-1 zoning district; approximately 643 acres. He said that is one part of the hearing, whether to rezone all or some portion of the property into the new zoning district.

Mr. Owens said the second part of this is the proposed development agreement; the U-1 development standard requires that the applicant submit a proposed development agreement. He said this agreement is a fairly complicated and detailed legal document, but it lays out the policies and conditions and the mitigation measures by which the University could proceed to develop this property. He said it incorporates the site plan for the portion of Carolina North that is subject to the development agreement. Mr. Owens said one of the principals the Council asked them to look at a way to be adaptive and take advantage of new learning, new experiences as the project unfolded.

Mr. Owens said the next steps after this evening's hearing are the staff will review the public comments, those from the advisory boards, the web, and the staff analysis, and they will incorporate all the updates and comments. He said next week they will send the Council an updated version so they will have that available for their next discussion with the Trustees on May 21.

Mr. Stancil said the meeting on May 21 is at 7 p.m. at Extraordinary Ventures.

Mr. Evans said the third part of this agenda is a draft development agreement with a duration of 20 years for the development of up to 3 million square feet on 133 acres within the proposed U-1 Zone. He said this is all a continuation of a process initiated on October 31, 2008 by the University to the Council regarding the Carolina North property; with a revision being submitted in April 2009. He said this consisted of a long range plan for Carolina North of approximately 250 acres of development for the next 50 years.

Mr. Evans said a draft development agreement has been created through April 28, 2009, and he wanted to comment on how this work satisfied the requirements of the development agreement. He said one of those was plan consistency, another transportation, and the following topics were each addressed in the agreement: physical impact, housing, noise and lighting, various environmental topics and public utilities. Mr. Evans said this development agreement seems to be an effective vehicle for UNC and the Town to realize desirable mutual benefits; an agreement of multi-years in duration, as well as interdependent commitments that are of interest to both the Town and UNC.

Mr. Evans said benefits to the Town include that it is an implementation vehicle for an effective overall plan; it provides protection outside the development area, protection against undue adverse fiscal impact, it provides for certainty, timeliness and predictability in the planning, and allows for the establishment of integrated plans. He said it also includes provisions that address transportation, including transit, pedestrian, greenways and bike access; and it creates an assurance that the University provides certain improvements, facilities, and services. Mr. Evans said that the benefits to UNC are that it provides certainty, timeliness, and predictability in the Town's review process, provides an opportunity to proceed with mixed-use academic development, secures development rights for up to 3 million square feet of development in accordance with the approved plan. He said it also allows for integration of site plans, design elements, land uses, site engineering, and mitigation. Mr. Evans said, in conclusion, the plan addresses the University's needs in support of its mission of education, research, public service, and contribution to economic development. He stated that the development agreement that is being drafted is emerging through a collaborative process and will next be considered at their meeting with University representatives on May 21.

Mayor Foy arrived at 7:40 pm.

Kumar Neppalli said they were there tonight to present the Traffic Impact Analysis; Chris Conklin would be presenting most of the report. He said the main report was posted on the Town website last week; and their purpose tonight was to provide the Council with the findings and preliminary recommendations; and get their input as they wanted to finalize the report in the next few weeks.

Chris Conklin, consultant to the Town, said the TIA covers a broad range of topics related to transportation. He said it provides an evaluation of the existing and future conditions of the various transportation networks that serve the project; it looks at the proposed development plan

and provides an estimate of how many trips will be made on a daily basis, in the peak hours of travel to and from the site; and how those people choose to travel. He added then the directional distribution, what areas those trips come and go to, are they within the two communities of Chapel Hill and Carrboro, or are they trips to the broader region. He said there was also an assessment in the TIA of the impact of various levels of parking supply on travel behavior to the site. Mr. Conklin said they looked at the traffic impact of the site on segments of roadway within the Town, on intersections within the Town, and then potential impacts of project generated traffic on some residential neighborhoods. He then described in more detail the report with a slide presentation.

Mr. Neppalli gave his comments and said they will be including some specific recommendations for sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle lanes. He said the main entrance at Piney Mountain Road will be failing in the near future with the build-out, so they will be recommending access on Estes Drive.

Council Member Harrison asked Mr. Neppalli if either the TIA draft or his preliminary recommendations add any length of travel lanes. He said only turn lanes were talked about.

Mr. Neppalli said for the 800,000 square feet, that was correct. He said he thought Mr. Conklin made some recommendations for the 2025, three million square feet, that they reconstruct that roadway to add some travel lanes on both sides; and also recommended some travel lanes on Estes Drive. Mr. Neppalli said they were still looking at the recommendations, and in the next two weeks plan to discuss this with the NC DOT.

Council Member Harrison asked Mr. Conklin what a Continental Crosswalk was.

Mr. Conklin said it had a ladder pattern instead of the two parallel bars, and has better visibility for drivers.

Council Member Strom ask Mr. Neppalli what was the guiding principal from the Town staff's point of view in working on this TIA; did they have a number in mind of intensity of use; a number of parking paces. He asked had there been opportunity to say what if they push the transit scenario further, and it was too much for them to bear; let's try to reduce trips more. He asked had there been that back and forth in communications; if not, he thought there needed to be. Council Member Strom said it felt like they were taking this report and going right to the DOT with it. He said he was concerned that they needed to look at some additional scenarios, and asked Mr. Neppalli if that had occurred; and how did he see that occurring.

Mr. Neppalli said they were not going to the DOT with this report yet. He said they had given the Council the number of vehicular and transit trips, and also for bikes and pedestrians. He said should the Council provide some guidance to them in the next week or so; if they decide to change some of those things, it is a very easy task to go back and plug in those numbers in the analysis, and see what is actually happening to the findings again; and see what needs to be happening. Mr. Neppalli said that is what they were there for today and expect them to provide that guidance. He said they have looked at some alternate scenarios before which they used the base and then reduced the parking spaces.

Council Member Strom said he would like to hear from the citizens, and then he would like to talk to Mr. Neppalli about some different scenarios that wouldn't result in so many parking spaces.

Mayor Foy asked how did they account for the fact that there was no regional rail system, but there might be at some point like even 2025.

Mr. Neppalli said for the analysis purposes they had decided not to include regional rail until 2025, because they did not have any reason to plan, and they cannot assume that there will be a regional rail. He said should the Council instruct them to do so, they will go back and reanalyze using some trips by regional rail; they would be happy to do that.

Madeline Jefferson passed out a copy of the report Transportation Planning in Carolina North - Recommendations of Citizens in Northern Chapel Hill and Carrboro prepared for Neighbors for Responsible Growth. She said NRG was addressing just traffic and transportation. She said the TIA gives them an idea of the very serious traffic that they can expect. She stated that making sure that public participation was ensured within the development agreement is a key conclusion of their report. Ms. Jefferson said in the report they encourage the public to engage in comprehensive transportation planning by, where appropriate, incorporate as many of the recommendations as possible into the development agreement, and the Town and University should provide feedback on all recommendations. Ms. Jefferson said representatives from four neighborhoods that will be directly affected by Carolina North would speak on four different segments of the report: monitoring and mitigating impacts on neighborhoods, accommodating safe, sustainable mobility, promoting active, public participation, and ensuring adequate safeguards and accountability.

Shelly Defosset said she was very concerned about the impact of the development, and the ensuing transportation that comes with the development on the quality of life in Chapel Hill. She said different neighborhoods were going to feel the impact of Carolina North in different ways. She read recommendations from the report.

Penny Rich said most of the people in her neighborhood, Ironwoods, were very positive about Carolina North, but very concerned about the kids getting to school, and their safety. She said the Council emphasized sustainable public transit, and her neighborhood hoped they will continue with this concept, because they would like to see less parking spots and more people taking buses, riding bikes, and walking just like their kids do now. They would like to see the citizens posted when these roads were going to change like a year in advance of it.

Mickey Sorrell said she lives in the North Forest Hills Community on Piney Mountain Road, and she wanted to thank the Town and the University for their efforts to solicit public input throughout this Carolina North process, and particularly on the transportation planning. She said it was going to be ongoing and to be really effective they were going to have to approach it incrementally. She said the citizens in Chapel Hill wanted to be at the table throughout all the major transportation planning discussion of Carolina North. She said although they have had a

lot of public events sponsored by the Town and University, they have not provided for a lot of interaction and discussion, and they would like to have more of that. She said they believe that will educate citizens and provide them with a richer citizen feedback. She said they would like the Mayor to appoint a citizen liaison to coordinate communications between local neighborhoods, the Town, and UNC on issues pertaining to Carolina North, and for the transportation planning to be more transparent.

Alan Snavely said he lives in the Pinebrook neighborhood, and access to their neighborhood will be directly impacted by Carolina North traffic. He said he would like to briefly draw their attention to the fifth item of the NRG report entitled Ensuring Adequate Safeguards and Accountability. He said they believed that effective transportation planning depends largely on the accuracy of the assumptions, the models and the data used by the planners; however, given the complexity of the Carolina North development, and the far-reaching impacts on the communities of Chapel Hill and Carrboro, it is unrealistic to think that those assumptions will always be correct. Mr. Snavely said what they have heard from citizens in northern Chapel Hill and Carrboro is that Carolina North may be a 50-year project, but they need to focus on the needs of their families, the safety of their children going to school today. Mr. Snavely said this means citizens want safeguards in place that will protect them when planning decisions don't work out the way they thought they would. He said they strongly believe that a clearly articulated set of expectations and standards will benefit all stakeholders throughout the development process. He said the last section of their report focuses on a set of recommendations they would like to see integrated into the development agreement. He said they would like to work with staff to draft amendments for the Council's consideration.

Douglas MacLean said he lives in the Morgan Creek area, works at UNC, and is a member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Board; but tonight is speaking for himself. He said the TIA paints a bleak picture of what life in the Town will look like. He said a problem was estimating the traffic flow; the report left out any account of traffic generated by people trying to get to and from the main campus and Carolina North. Mr. MacLean said how are they going to keep the campus as one unit was not addressed in the study, and he believed it should be. He said the main reason he wanted to speak tonight had to do with the utter lack of imagination that went into thinking about pedestrian and bicycle use; and ways of negotiating between the two campuses. He said rather than seeing this whole thing as a huge problem, it could be seen as an opportunity to finally make Chapel Hill a bicycle and pedestrian friendly community; and in order to do this they had to think big at the beginning, not by putting a bike lane on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., but how they can build off-road bike and pedestrian paths. Mr. MacLean said there were routes that could be done through Carrboro. He said Carolina North could become a hub of bike and pedestrian paths that could really make the Town a bicycle-friendly place. He said he would like to encourage everyone to think more imaginatively about how to solve these problems; and how to integrate and encourage bicycle and pedestrian traffic as we go forth with this planning.

George Cianciolo, representing both the Planning Board and the Community Design Commission said building the Transit Transfer Station on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. should be a priority and in phase one of Carolina North. He said the second recommendation would be parking that would be required for Carolina North at outlying lots, should be built as structured parking on existing lots rather than generating additional impervious surfaces on valuable and

dwindling land. He said in expanding the Eubanks Road Park and Ride lot, they believe the University and Town should consider asking the NC DOT to allow a direct access to only this lot from I-40 to alleviate the negative impact on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. from Weaver Dairy North to I-40. He said, third, in the TIA, table 10, the total number of parking spaces should be based on constrained, minus 10 percent ratio or less; therefore, it should be 1373 or less. Mr. Cianciolo said in table 11 of the TIA, the total number of parking spaces constrained minus 20 percent or less, and that should be 4,668 spaces or less. He said UNC is encouraged to achieve these numbers or fewer, by creative use of shared parking on the site between activities with different peak-time requirements. He said, fourth, Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. should be made more pedestrian-friendly by creating more pedestrian islands, signalized crosswalks, and ideally, a pedestrian bridge at its most heavily trafficked location. He said, fifth, construction traffic should be minimized by requiring as much activity as possible occur on site during the build-out phases. He said, and lastly they believe any school built on the Carolina North site should be built in a way to discourage parents from driving their children to school.

Mr. Cianciolo said he had some preliminary recommendations from the Community Design Commission (CDC); the first was that a final plan review of building elevations and lighting plans for buildings adjacent to existing, public areas or roads require a CDC review. He said the CDC suggest that the concept plan review program be utilized with both CDC and Council review. He said, second, transitional height: the CDC believes buildings constructed along existing public streets should be no more than four stories at the street level. He said, third, street setbacks along public streets should be 100 feet; and also the CDC believed the development review should be reviewed more often than every 20 years; they believed every eight years. Mr. Cianciolo said the CDC believed the current University design standards, while good, were not as specific as they would like, and would like to see them tightened up before the final development agreement was accepted. He said the CDC believed the Carolina North development should have no negative impact on non-Carolina North property water rates. He said any increase in costs associated with rates, or capital expenditures associated with the the increased water usage, as a result of Carolina North be borne by the University.

Council Member Czajkowski asked Mr. Conklin questions about the traffic growth from his report.

Mr. Conklin said that the results of their analysis showed that the Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd./I-40 and the 15/501 and I-40 intersections do get significantly worse over that time horizon of morning and evening. Mr. Conklin said the growth and traffic volumes that were included in their report were very high; it was 2 1/4 percent for the first eight years, and then 1 1/4 percent for the remainder of the study. He commented that that was a lot of growth.

Council Member Czajkowski asked if he was correct in saying that the most significant cause of the congestion that Mr. Conklin was showing them was in the no-build scenario from their projected organic growth. Mr. Conklin agreed.

Council Member Kleinschmidt stated Mr. Conklin had said that the 60 percent regional impact was coming from outside the community and 40 percent inside the community. He said in terms

of growth outside the community, over which they had no land use authority; and they were creating an employment generator in center of their Town; the 60 percent was going to remain. He asked if that was that accurate.

Mr. Conklin said of the traffic going to the site, 60 percent was projected to be from outside the borders, but he said that was not going to be a static percentage.

Council Member Czajkowski asked if the 60 percent to which Mr. Conklin referred was for Carolina North alone.

Mr. Conklin said it was actually the projected distribution of housing and employment in the region for 2025, but applying it only to Carolina North.

Council Member Harrison asked if the 60 percent outside jurisdictions was straight to the campus, not adding in the Park and Ride.

Mr. Conklin said no, 40 percent of the origins to employment locations in Chapel Hill were from within Chapel Hill or Carrboro.

Mayor Foy said Mr. Conklin had suggested roundabouts at specific intersections, but not at others; what was his thinking on that.

Mr. Conklin said the only places they had suggested those were on existing, unsignalized intersections that look like they were going to need some other type of traffic control in the future.

Mayor Foy said their projections were that by putting in modified roundabouts on 15/501 they got greater capacity on the road for a significant period of time. He said if that did work, it was anticipated, they may put roundabouts in other locations, to continue to maximize the capacity without widening the road.

Mr. Conklin said the ones they had proposed here were quite different from that.

Mayor Foy said he understood that, but wondered why they were not thinking about them along Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

Mr. Conklin said these were not the type they had done with the traffic signal control and unique intersection design; but it didn't mean that they couldn't develop a scenario like that on some of these other improvements.

Council Member Strom said the trip generation table on page 4.2 of the summary, talked about 23,261 vehicle trips at build-out. He asked what assumption was associated with that number as far as parking spaces.

That was the base line, Mr. Conklin said.

Council Member Strom said he would give these requests to Mr. Neppalli. He said he would like to see the modes split changed to bike and pedestrian, and add transit, and see Carolina North presented the opportunity to be a game-changer for multi-model transit in the community. He said he would also like to see a different mode split that was doable and the constraint would be funding. Council Member Strom said he would like to see what the Town would look like in 2025 with an additional 24,000 trips and 5,000 parking spaces at Carolina North. He said he would like for Mr. Neppalli to push it a little bit and at least generate some conversations.

Mr. Neppalli said they have a follow-up meeting in the morning; he will take the comments and work with the University to come up with a game plan to address these comments. He said he did want to remind the Council that they had to pay for any additional analysis.

Mayor pro tem Ward said it would be very helpful to him and the average citizen to translate some of the results here, and put him in his car and tell him how long it would take him from A to B; pick some of the routes, and how long it is going to take today, and in the future.

Mr. Conklin said it is about a five to seven minute trip now on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., from the I-40 Eubanks area down to the Carolina North project site. He said the change going northbound in the evening is four minutes, so from five to seven to nine to 11 minutes. He said it was a significant change.

Mayor pro tem Ward said percentage wise that was a bunch; he did not think people were going to want to work at, build at, drive past Carolina North if that kind of decrease in level of service was found in this area. He said he thought they needed to follow the line of thinking that Council Member Strom brought up by changing the mode split to free capacity. He said his experience was that traffic circles keeps traffic moving; he said it was great for traffic, but really lousy for pedestrians. He said when they talk about that type of infrastructure, let's talk about all modes of traffic using that crossing.

Mayor pro tem Ward said he had a question for Mr. Neppalli, in terms of mitigation measures within the TIA, how do they mirror or conflict with the kinds of mitigation measures we have been envisioning based on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. corridor study.

Mr. Neppalli said the Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. study was mainly concentrated on improvements for safety and circulation for pedestrians and bicycles; the recommendations from the consultant were consistent with the recommendations from the study. He said where they may not be consistent was the study that the Town did was for the entire corridor, the consultant's recommendations were focused between Homestead and Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.

Council Member Easthom asked Mr. Neppalli about the impact on the adjacent neighborhoods and traffic calming; and the mitigation measures that have specific roads that require his suggestions for traffic calming measures, mainly Town roads. She said her question was how do they factor that into the fiscal equity of the impact of Carolina North; and the Town having Town roads with speed tables; how do they indicate that to the University, that yes, these cars are actually coming as a result of Carolina North. She asked how do they quantify that in terms

working with UNC on cost sharing. Council Member Easthom said in the development agreement it refers to a cost sharing agreement under transportation, transit, parking, streets, and sidewalks. She said also if they are not Town roads, how do they work with the NC DOT as they have been difficult to work with getting traffic calming done.

Mr. Neppalli said the draft that David Owens provided them today does not include some of these things. He said they were planning to work with him to get the costs; or the University itself may provide some of these things. He said traffic calming was one of the areas they have not discussed in detail with the University, and what the recommendations will be. He said it was very difficult to come up with a plan before you approve this development agreement on June 28. He said they intend to recommend a stipulation to the development plan that the University design, install, and pay for the traffic calming devices as approved by the Town Manager and the neighborhood. He said the DOT roads are a concern to him also; they are thinking about it because the NC DOT does not allow any physical traffic calming devices, so they have to come up with a plan to bring back to the Council to see which is the best for their community.

Council Member Easthom said she was very concerned about Estes Drive as a whole; it is narrow, and the school is directly on it. She said she couldn't imagine the traffic in that east/west corridor connecting two major roadways. She said there was going to be a significant traffic impact right in the yard of a school.

Council Member Easthom said she wanted to endorse the NRG suggestions A through K, and have the staff address those, because one of the things she had been thinking about was how could they incorporate in the development agreement something that says if the level of service on some of these roads has just too much traffic, and it becomes overwhelming, at what point can they say they are going to hold up a site development plan for a particular building. She said they had instituted those safeguards in the development agreement now as far as with housing. She said another question she had was about the presentation by the University of various maps and attachments dated in April. Council Member Easthom said also in the Carolina North Design Guidelines there were some maps with specific streets that were inconsistent with the TIA; how do they work through those, and what maps specifically were going to be included in the back of the development agreement that will be the rule to follow.

Mayor Foy said he wanted to comment on something that the Planning Board recommended which was the idea of a dedicated on/off ramp to the Eubanks Road Park and Ride lot. He said he would be interested in knowing what the process would be for evaluating the possibility of doing that, and then how they would go about it, if it was determined that it was a good idea. Mayor Foy said he wanted to follow up on the traffic, and he didn't think they knew exactly what the connection was between traffic and parking, but there was one. He said one concern was even in the most constrained scenario that was 4,700 parking spaces in the first three million square feet. He said he knew they can't do a straight line projection for the full eight million square feet, but if they did, that would be about 12,000 parking spaces and the traffic that goes with it. He said he thought that was what was really alarming, and it speaks to

what Mr. MacLean was saying about the necessity of designing this in a way that takes the pressure off the car culture. He said they do need advice about how to balance these things out.

Council Member Harrison said he wanted to follow up on the Eubanks Park and Ride ramp. He said it was worth exploring, and he would like to see the analysis. He said Doug MacLean brought up the all-important principal, which all of them need to be working with, which is how to keep the campus as one unit. He said it was important to the Town, and he was sure it was important to the University. He said one thing he was wondering about was there was a range of recommendations on bike and pedestrian facilities from different advisory boards; one of them addressed having paved greenways on either side of the road, so they would be combined bike and pedestrian facility, because, he said, it looks like it is going to take a long time to get funding for the bike facility on that road. He said he would like to get a staff analysis of how reasonable that was.

Mayor pro tem Ward said he had a set of questions for Mr. Evans. He said he wanted to make sure where the Chapel Hill Town limits were relative to the railroad tracks, to Seawell School Road and the property line of Carolina North on that western boundary.

Mr. Evans asked if he was questioning where the inter-jurisdictional boundary was.

Mayor pro tem Ward said yes, and he was assuming Carolina North's boundary would mirror whatever that boundary was.

Mr. Evans said he thought the intent of this discussion was for the boundary in the development agreement to be defined by the boundary between the two jurisdictions, wherever that was.

Mayor pro tem Ward said to the Town staff that he would like to have confirmed where that boundary is. He asked Mr. Evans what happens to the existing Park and Ride lot that is on Carolina North now; where is that in the next 20 years.

Mr. Evans asked Anna Wu if she would like to say anything. Ms. Wu said the storage lot that is off Estes Drive is called remote student parking.

Mayor pro tem asked what happens to that.

Council Member Kleinschmidt said it did not look like it was built on during the first three million square feet.

Ms. Wu said that was correct. She said if she remembered correctly there was a connection between the development plan for the main campus and that lot.

Mayor pro tem Ward asked what was the waste landfill cleanup status; will that be articulated more fully in the development agreement.

Mr. Evans asked if he was referring to landfill remediation, not the waste site remediation. He said the waste site remediation has been completed; the landfill remediation will be incorporated

in the plan as needed.

Mayor pro tem Ward asked if the waste site remediation was within that boundary.

Mr. Evans said he did not know the answer to that right now, but they could determine that.

Mayor pro tem Ward said there was an interest in having a bike access to Carolina North, if you were coming from north Greensboro, Carrboro that you could get into Carolina North at the earliest possible point.

Mr. Evans said he thinks that is a suggestion that makes a lot of sense. He said they did not have a specific plan for that now, but it should be something that ought to be straight forward to incorporate into the plan.

MAYOR PRO TEM JIM WARD MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER BILL STROM, TO RECESS THE PUBLIC HEARING TO JUNE 15, 2009. THE MOTION WAS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0).

The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.