

**ADDITIONAL TOPICS:**

**Utility Duct:**

I asked Ron where they proposed to locate the utility duct.

He said that they are planning to run the utility duct **alongside** the north side Mason Farm Road sidewalk, instead of **under** the sidewalk.

I said that I was surprised that they had the room to do that. The existing north side easement extends approximately ten feet in from the road in front of my house. It takes 9.5' for an 18" curb-and-gutter plus 3' of grass plus 5' of sidewalk. I asked if the 4' utility ditch would go under the 3' of grass and if so, how? He said that they would have to talk to the Town about that.

I asked him to point out on the map where the utility duct would go in front of my house.

He pointed not to the sidewalk area but to an area well into my front yard and said that it would go in that easement there.

I told him that there is no easement through my front yard and that I have met with UNC representatives and have told them I do not want to sell an easement for the utility duct. I said that it was my understanding that the Egans said the same thing about their property.

Ron said "Then we'll have to put it somewhere else."

**Sidewalk:**

Ron told me that they would not need the five extra feet of land previously discussed by a UNC representative for the sidewalk in front of my house, but that they might need up to three feet for parts of the Egan's frontage (apparently in the area of their western driveway entrance).

I said that it was my understanding that the Egans and I had already said no to selling extra footage for the sidewalk.

I asked about the **timing** of sidewalk construction.

Ron said that they would do the part from the bypass to the Baity Hill entrance first and he didn't know about the rest.

Ron asked if we could we get together or talk some time next week. I said yes, but then I will be leaving on Tuesday for three+ weeks (1-25 July). Ron said that I should not be surprised if while I'm gone he submits the plan he showed me (60 foot buffer restored + trash stuff gone = both good, but bad driveway location remaining. "All-or-none" apparently mislaid.) thus putting myself "at the mercy of the Manager's whims". I said

that I did not think of the Manager as whimsical and that I trusted the Town.

We all shook hands, and they left.

---

**Additional Commentary:**

I went into this current process expecting that Building H21 would be built next to me as part of the current approved development plan and as specified therein. The more that I see of the difficulty that the contractor is having squeezing this structure into UNC's currently available land, while trying to honor the Town's development guidelines, the more I question the timing of building this unit now.

When I asked Ron at last Wednesday's hearing "Is this really the building you want to be building?" he answered "No, we would rather be building a much larger structure that would extend over your lot."

I said, "Wouldn't it make more sense and be more economical to go ahead and build the eight buildings around the Baity Hill loop and up the eastern end of Mason Farm Road first? Learn from that, and you would then be that much closer to being able to finish out the remaining Mason Farm Road buildings when you own more of the property. Then you could build the larger units that you say you actually prefer. Why rush to shoehorn a 24 unit structure into an inconvenient space? Much of the effort and expense of this phase of the western Mason Farm project is a direct consequence of planning to build H21 as a single isolated structure".

Ron said that UNC needs all the units that it can get, now.

I pointed out that those eight buildings around Baity Hill and on east Mason Farm Road will provide 373 units, a respectable increase up from the 306 units in the development plan.

[Semi-irrelevant note on building size: the development plan's 12 buildings averaged 25 units each; the new modification's eastern 8 buildings average 46 units each + the 24 units in H21]

**Conclusion:**

I was pleased and relieved by the removal of the east end trash collection area and by the restoration of the 60 foot vegetative buffer. I still feel that the vehicular access for the building should be at the west end, as a logical extension of Purefoy Road.

I would expect the buffer to be completed all the way to the back of the lot in the site development plan unless UNC does indeed have a recorded easement over my land there.

I would expect the fence to show up in the site development plan.

I assume the Town knows what the setback guidelines are.

5-62

I appreciate Ron Strom and Marty Linn's willingness to discuss this with me.

---

The Town staff, planners, Mayor and Council have been very helpful in keeping the Chapel Hill citizens and interested others informed during this process. I, for one, appreciate it. I look forward to continued thoughtful cooperation. Thank you.

Diana Steele

**Cal Horton**

---

**From:** Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Monday, June 30, 2003 7:59 AM  
**To:** Gregg Jarvies  
**Subject:** FW: Important LLEBG Deadline Date Change, from the Bureau of Justice Assistance

\*\*\*\*\*

W. Calvin Horton, Town Manager  
306 North Columbia Street  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27516  
919-968-2744 Bell South  
919-682-8636 Verizon  
919-969-2063 FAX  
919-967-2626 Home  
<mailto:calhorton@townofchapelhill.org>

Note: Mail sent to or received from the Town Manager is subject to publication under the provisions of the North Carolina open records law.

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

**From:** Giovacchini, Mary Jo [mailto:MGiovacchini@aspensys.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 27, 2003 5:34 PM  
**To:** 'LLEBG\_CEOS@ncjrs.org'; 'LLEBG\_CONTACTS@ncjrs.org'  
**Subject:** Important LLEBG Deadline Date Change, from the Bureau of Justice Assistance

Important LLEBG Deadline Date Change, from the Bureau of Justice Assistance

As you know, we are nearing the LLEBG application period formerly scheduled to open August 11th and to end September 8th. Unfortunately, we now have an immediate need to change these dates. We now anticipate opening the application system on August 4th and closing it on August 28th.

We apologize for the shorter turnaround time for applications, but it is important that we are able to get you

5-63

**Joyce Smith**

---

**From:** Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2003 4:19 PM  
**To:** Joyce Smith; Roger Waldon  
**Subject:** FW: University Master Plan Revisions

\*\*\*\*\*

W. Calvin Horton, Town Manager  
306 North Columbia Street  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27516  
919-968-2744 Bell South  
919-682-8636 Verizon  
919-969-2063 FAX  
919-967-2626 Home  
<<mailto:calhorton@townofchapelhill.org>>

**Note:** Mail sent to or received from the Town Manager is subject to publication under the provisions of the North Carolina open records law.

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

**From:** Carol Abernethy **On Behalf Of** Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 3:58 PM  
**To:** 'Bev Kawalec'  
**Cc:** Pat Evans; Bill Strom; Dorothy Verkerk; Ed Harrison; Edith Wiggins (sandewiggs@yahoo.com); Flicka Bateman ; Jim Ward (W) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; 'Jim Ward'; 'Edith Wiggins (rr)'; Toni Pendergraph; Cal Horton; Flo Miller; Joyce Smith; Ralph Karpinos; Sonna Loewenthal; Kirsten Olson; Bill Stockard; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** RE: [REDACTED] Revisions

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member.

Carol Abernethy  
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office  
Town of Chapel Hill

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

**From:** [REDACTED] [mailto:[bevkawalec@attglobal.net](mailto:bevkawalec@attglobal.net)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 2:49 PM  
**To:** Town Council  
**Subject:** University Master Plan Revisions

I am writing to once again request that you not permit the University to direct all the foot traffic from the proposed Cobb parking deck through Town property, the Old Chapel Hill Cemetery which is recognized as a National Historic treasure. As proposed all of the pedestrian traffic to Fetzer Gym, Wollen Gym, Carmichael Auditorium, Hooker Field and Fetzer Field will go through the Old Chapel Hill Cemetery. Such a plan does not show proper respect and appreciation for our nationally significant cemetery and the history it represents. Many people,

(5-64)

including me, would prefer not to have the parking deck built there at all. If it is built there, then at least don't allow this misuse of the Cemetery in the process.

I understand that University officials have visited the cemetery and did not see the destruction of the grave markers that I spoke of earlier. The newly damaged markers are those along the walkway being proposed as the main cut-through. They include:

- grave stone of a Norwood – 1841
- grave stone of a 16 year old child
- grave stone of Sally Norwood – 1868
- grave stone of L.J. Weaver – 1876
- gravestone of Sarah Burkhead – 1856
- gravestone next to Sarah Burkhead – totally demolished
- gravestone of Ann Areanet – 1812 – pushed over.

In addition, parts of a decorative iron fence are missing.

The oldest portion of the cemetery, and the portion which has had the most vandalism, is the area around the path that goes by the gazebo. In this, the oldest area of the cemetery, the graves are so old that there is no one around anymore to advocate for their safekeeping. This path, by the gazebo, is the one that is least suited for a cut-through path because this area is most in need of protection. When vandalism has occurred, it has been the Town, not the University, that has paid for the restoration.

Pedestrian traffic should be directed around, not through the cemetery. The alleyway which runs between the cemetery and Connor and Winston dorms should be devoted to pedestrians and upgraded to be a safe and inviting walkway. If it is not possible to construct a parking deck without using this lane for cars, then the deck should be built elsewhere.

If you do permit the University to build the proposed parking deck, you do not need to permit them to use Town property as the major path to and from the sports facilities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Beverly Kawalec

5-65

**Joyce Smith**

**From:** Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2003 4:20 PM  
**To:** Joyce Smith; Roger Waldon  
**Subject:** FW: Old Cemetery Protection

\*\*\*\*\*

W. Calvin Horton, Town Manager  
 306 North Columbia Street  
 Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27516  
 919-968-2744 Bell South  
 919-682-8636 Verizon  
 919-969-2063 FAX  
 919-967-2626 Home  
<mailto:calhorton@townofchapelhill.org>

**Note: Mail sent to or received from the Town Manager is subject to publication under the provisions of the North Carolina open records law.**

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

**From:** Carol Abernethy **On Behalf Of** Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2003 11:29 AM  
**To:** 'Steven Moore'  
**Cc:** Pat Evans; Bill Strom; Dorothy Verkerk; Ed Harrison; Edith Wiggins (sandewiggs@yahoo.com); Flicka Bateman ; Jim Ward (W) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; 'Jim Ward'; 'Edith Wiggins (rr)'; Toni Pendergraph; Cal Horton; Flo Miller; Joyce Smith; Ralph Karpinos; Sonna Loewenthal; Kirsten Olson; Bill Stockard; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** RE: Old Cemetery Protection

UNC Development

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member.

*Carol Abernethy*  
 Exec. Asst., Manager's Office  
 Town of Chapel Hill

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

**From:** [REDACTED] [mailto:ncsu.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2003 10:43 AM  
**To:** Town Council  
**Subject:** Old Cemetery Protection

I watched the debates this week on cable TV and remain concerned over the future of the status of the Old Chapel Hill Cemetery. Although you may not remember, I petitioned the Council to establish an broad based community advisory/coordination committee for the Old Cemetery in 2002 - which was dismissed out of hand by the Council at their March 25 meeting as unneeded and unnecessary. I think the facts speak for themselves that an organized entity that would have been prepared to provide coordinated and substantive input on matters related to the Old Cemetery and indeed would have already included the University in ongoing discussions on the matter, would have been helpful in the current situation. As it stand now there is disjointed and incremental comments and concerns about the Old Cemetery on an ongoing basis that hopefully you will manage in some appropriate fashion. The fact remains that the cemetery needs some ongoing help to maintain its status. The grounds people do a good job maintaining the grounds but all to frequently the poles that close the driveways to traffic are left tossed aside and traffic is free to and does use the throughways as convenient. There is a continuing need for friends of the Old Cemetery!

With the break in arguing with the University, there does appear to be a possible alternative to the proposed Cobb deck / cooling tower. If the

6/30/2003

(5-66)

University is absolutely convinced that the huge deck and cooling tower are needed, then let them share the discomfort of its presence. With the plan that was presented at the Council meeting, there is a great deal of open space and tennis courts that will remain with the deck. Get this rearranged.

First, keep the current road entrance from Raleigh Street between Joyner and Alexander doors open and let this be the main access to the parking deck. Then, move the location of the proposed monster deck from beside the cemetery to a point in proximity to Cobb / Jackson buildings. If the entire argument about the need for parking near the library and campus are true, this will place the parking deck nearer the need and meeting the need better. When the deck is moved near the Cobb/Jackson area, the green space and tennis courts can then fill the area in proximity to the cemetery to the betterment of all!!!

When this movement is then done, the Theater Drive could essentially function as a service road that will then extend behind Alexander / Connor / Winston and to South Road - no parking and service vehicles only. The deck will still be able to service audiences for Paul Green theaters with only a short walk and the traffic / parking mess in proximity to the cemetery will be over! Let the University live by the traffic that it creates, not the local citizens living off Country Club Road and not the people who use Country Club Road!

There is more to the whole issue to what the University proposed than just accepting or rejecting - there is a need to rethink. No doubt the University is convinced that the cooling tower need to be in the Cobb area - but moving it nearer Cobb and further away from the cemetery would have only incremental costs and inconvenience but immense aesthetic rewards and protection of the Old Cemetery.

Protect the Old Cemetery and the integrity of the immediate areas close to it.

Steve Moore  
Chapel Hill Resident  
Local Taxpayer / Voter  
Old Cemetery Property Owner

6/30/2003

5-67

## Cal Horton

---

**From:** Carol Abernethy on behalf of Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2003 12:40 PM  
**To:** 'Steven Moore'  
**Cc:** Pat Evans; Bill Strom; Dorothy Verkerk; Ed Harrison; Edith Wiggins (sandewiggs@yahoo.com); Flicka Bateman ; Jim Ward (W) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; 'Jim Ward'; 'Edith Wiggins (rr)'; Toni Pendergraph; Cal Horton; Flo Miller; Joyce Smith; Ralph Karpinos; Sonna Loewenthal; Kirsten Olson; Bill Stockard; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** RE: Old Cemetery Protection

As requested, a copy of your email message to UNC officials has been forwarded to each Council Member.

*Carol Abernethy  
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office  
Town of Chapel Hill*

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

**From:** Steven Moore [mailto:smoore@wpo.nccu.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2003 12:16 PM  
**To:** ndsutten@email.unc.edu; bruce\_runberg@unc.edu  
**Cc:** Town Council  
**Subject:** Old Cemetery Protection

As a twice alumnus of UNC, property owner and resident of Chapel Hill and property owner in Old Chapel Hill Cemetery - I have heard the great public pronouncements about the future enhancements for the Cemetery when the University builds its new monster deck, but I would raise the question of why wait until then to exhibit this concern over the Old Cemetery.

Currently, drivers are allowed free access to park on the land bordering Theater Drive (albeit illegal) and bump their cars into the old stone wall without any retribution (a few strategically placed pole barriers could control all of this continuing damage). Also, the parking along the stone wall behind Alexander Connor and Winston readily allows and encourages cars banging into the stone walls and the service uses readily further damage the stone walls there. The University also readily allows / benignly encourages all sort of vehicles to park illegally on the dirt sidewalks along South Road for events in the athletic complex - further damaging the slopes of the cemetery and the stone walls located there. Also, now that the access on Theater Drive is controlled, drivers are using the roads through the cemetery for access / departure from the Cobb parking area. A minimal but continuing effort by the University could show its concern and assistance for the Old Cemetery now!

As far as the future development is concerned - the plan shows a huge parking deck and water tower by the cemetery and primary access from Country Club Road, and a lovely open space with greenery and tennis courts by Cobb and Jackson buildings. Given this acute need for parking and cooler tower by the University, simply reverse the locations of the parking deck / cooler tower and the green space /tennis courts. Access to the parking deck could be kept from Raleigh Street on the road between Joyner and Lewis Dorms, with the Theater Drive serving as a service road only that would exit onto South Road behind Winston as it does now. Your parking and cooler tower would be there and the Cemetery would be protected and buffered, even better that it is now!

Protect the Old Cemetery !!!!!

Steve Moore



5-68

## Cal Horton

---

**From:** Carol Abernethy on behalf of Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2003 11:29 AM  
**To:** 'Steven Moore'  
**Cc:** Pat Evans; Bill Strom; Dorothy Verkerk; Ed Harrison; Edith Wiggins (sandewiggs@yahoo.com); Flicka Bateman ; Jim Ward (W) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; 'Jim Ward'; 'Edith Wiggins (rr)'; Toni Pendergraph; Cal Horton; Flo Miller; Joyce Smith; Ralph Karpinos; Sonna Loewenthal; Kirsten Olson; Bill Stockard; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** RE: Old Cemetery Protection

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member.

*Carol Abernethy  
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office  
Town of Chapel Hill*

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

**From:** Steven Moore [mailto:smoore@wpo.nccu.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2003 10:43 AM  
**To:** Town Council  
**Subject:** Old Cemetery Protection

I watched the debates this week on cable TV and remain concerned over the future of the status of the Old Chapel Hill Cemetery. Although you may not remember, I petitioned the Council to establish an broad based community advisory/coordination committee for the Old Cemetery in 2002 - which was dismissed out of hand by the Council at their March 25 meeting as unneeded and unnecessary. I think the facts speak for themselves that an organized entity that would have been prepared to provide coordinated and substantive input on matters related to the Old Cemetery and indeed would have already included the University in ongoing discussions on the matter, would have been helpful in the current situation. As it stand now there is disjointed and incremental comments and concerns about the Old Cemetery on an ongoing basis that hopefully you will manage in some appropriate fashion. The fact remains that the cemetery needs some ongoing help to maintain its status. The grounds people do a good job maintaining the grounds but all to frequently the poles that close the driveways to traffic are left tossed aside and traffic is free to and does use the throughways as convenient. There is a continuing need for friends of the Old Cemetery!

With the break in arguing with the University, there does appear to be a possible alternative to the proposed Cobb deck / cooling tower. If the University is absolutely convinced that the huge deck and cooling tower are needed, then let them share the discomfort of its presence. With the plan that was presented at the Council meeting, there is a great deal of open space and tennis courts that will remain with the deck. Get this rearranged.

First, keep the current road entrance from Raleigh Street between Joyner and Alexander dorms open and let this be the main access to the parking deck. Then, move the location of the proposed monstor deck from beside the cemetery to a point in proximity to Cobb / Jackson buildings. If the entire argument about the need for parking near the library and campus are true, this will place the parking deck nearer the need and meeting the need better. When the deck is moved near the Cobb/Jackson area, the green space and tennis courts can then fill the area in proximity to the cemetery to the betterment of all!!!

When this movement is then done, the Theater Drive could essentially function as a service road that will then extend behind Alexander / Connor / Winston and to South Road - no parking and service vehicles only. The deck will still be able to service audiences for Paul Green theaters with only a short walk and the traffic / parking mess in proximity to the cemetery will be over! Let the University live by the traffic that it creates, not the local citizens living off Country Club Road and not the people who use Country Club Road!

There is more to the whole issue to what the University proposed than just accepting or rejecting - there is a need to rethink. No doubt the University is convinced that the cooling tower need to be in the Cobb area - but moving it nearer Cobb and further away from the cemetery would have only

5-69

incremental costs and inconvenience but immense aesthetic rewards and protection of the Old Cemetery.

Protect the Old Cemetery and the integrity of the immediate areas close to it.

Steve Moore

Chapel Hill Resident

Local Taxpayer / Voter

Old Cemetery Property Owner

## Cal Horton

---

**From:** Carol Abernethy on behalf of Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 3:58 PM  
**To:** 'Bev Kawalec'  
**Cc:** Pat Evans; Bill Strom; Dorothy Verkerk; Ed Harrison; Edith Wiggins (sandewiggs@yahoo.com); Flicka Bateman ; Jim Ward (W) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; 'Jim Ward'; 'Edith Wiggins (rr)'; Toni Pendergraph; Cal Horton; Flo Miller; Joyce Smith; Ralph Karpinos; Sonna Loewenthal; Kirsten Olson; Bill Stockard; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** RE: University Master Plan Revisions

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member.

*Carol Abernethy  
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office  
Town of Chapel Hill*

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

**From:** Bev Kawalec [mailto:kawalec@attglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 2:49 PM  
**To:** Town Council  
**Subject:** University Master Plan Revisions

I am writing to once again request that you not permit the University to direct all the foot traffic from the proposed Cobb parking deck through Town property, the Old Chapel Hill Cemetery which is recognized as a National Historic treasure. As proposed all of the pedestrian traffic to Fetzer Gym, Wollen Gym, Carmichael Auditorium, Hooker Field and Fetzer Field will go through the Old Chapel Hill Cemetery. Such a plan does not show proper respect and appreciation for our nationally significant cemetery and the history it represents. Many people, including me, would prefer not to have the parking deck built there at all. If it is built there, then at least don't allow this misuse of the Cemetery in the process.

I understand that University officials have visited the cemetery and did not see the destruction of the grave markers that I spoke of earlier. The newly damaged markers are those along the walkway being proposed as the main cut-through. They include:

grave stone of a Norwood – 1841

grave stone of a 16 year old child

grave stone of Sally Norwood – 1868

grave stone of L.J. Weaver – 1876

gravestone of Sarah Burkhead – 1856

gravestone next to Sarah Burkhead – totally demolished

gravestone of Ann Areanet – 1812 – pushed over.

In addition, parts of a decorative iron fence are missing.

The oldest portion of the cemetery, and the portion which has had the most vandalism, is the area around the path that goes by the gazebo. In this, the oldest area of the cemetery, the graves are so old that there is no one around anymore to advocate for their safekeeping. This path, by the gazebo, is the one that is least suited for a cut-through path because this area is most in need of protection. When vandalism has occurred, it has been the Town, not the University, that has paid for the restoration.

Pedestrian traffic should be directed around, not through the cemetery. The alleyway which runs between the cemetery and Connor and Winston dorms should be devoted to pedestrians and upgraded to be a safe and inviting walkway. If it is not possible to construct a parking deck without using this lane for cars, then the deck should be built elsewhere.

If you do permit the University to build the proposed parking deck, you do not need to permit them to use Town property as the major path to and from the sports facilities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Beverly Kawalec

5-71

**Cal Horton**

---

**From:** Gpease7@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 7:00 AM  
**To:** Town Council  
**Subject:** Cobb Parking Deck

Dear Mayor and Town Council,

I cannot attend the public hearing tonight so I am sending you this note.

My family and I moved to Chapel Hill after twenty years in Los Angeles and have been residents of the Gimghoul neighborhood for the past seven years. We moved to Chapel Hill primarily for its unique atmosphere and ambiance. I'm proud to have recently joined the Tarheel family when my oldest daughter graduated from UNC's school of journalism.

In the past seven years I have observed Chapel Hill getting more crowded with a corresponding significant increase in traffic. This congestion, I believe, is beginning to change the character of our community, much as it did in Los Angeles twenty years ago.

Building a parking near the corner of Country Club and Raleigh Road will add a significant amount of traffic to an area that is already overcrowded during most times of the day. Discussing a reduced structure, installing additional traffic lights, one-way traffic during certain hours, and the like, will not resolve the problem. Building any parking structure in this area will increase congestion and is simply a bad idea.

The Gimghoul neighborhood has lived in peace with the university for almost 80 years. Some of my neighbors have lived in our neighborhood for over 50 years. They cannot recall a proposal by the university that would change the character of the neighborhood as drastically as adding this amount of traffic to our corner.

I encourage you to stress to the university that the concept of park and ride lots is in the best interests of both the university and the local community. It will help preserve the character of this unique town.

Sincerely,

Gene Pease  
President  
Gimghoul Historic District  
208 Glandon Drive  
969-7460  
gpease7@aol.com

**Cal Horton**

---

**From:** James L. Ward [wardjl@email.unc.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 9:33 AM  
**To:** Cal Horton  
**Subject:** Re: CH - Town Operations Ctr (GGGC Building Pennsylvania's First Green Building (SCROB))

Cal, I encourage you and Town staff and Town Op Ctr consultants to take a look at the attached website and it's assoc'd links. I think it is a great example of what gov't can do to lead... I have seen the video about the 'first green bldg' they built, and can get a copy for others to see if anyone is interested and has the time.

Please pass this note on to the rest of the Council. Sincerely, Jim

<http://www.gggc.state.pa.us/building/scrob.html>

**Cal Horton**

---

**From:** James L. Ward [wardjl@email.unc.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 8:35 AM  
**To:** Cal Horton  
**Subject:** [Fwd: Cobb Parking Deck]

Cal, I just rec'd. Pls. forward to other Council mbrs if this has not already been sent to them individually. Thank you, Jim

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

**Subject:** Cobb Parking Deck  
**Date:** Wed, 25 Jun 2003 06:57:08 -0400  
**From:** [Gpease7@aol.com](mailto:Gpease7@aol.com)  
**To:** [wardjl@EMAIL.UNC.EDU](mailto:wardjl@EMAIL.UNC.EDU)

Dear Councilman Ward,

I cannot attend the public hearing tonight so I am sending you this note.

My family and I moved to Chapel Hill after twenty years in Los Angeles and have been residents of the Gimghoul neighborhood for the past seven years. We moved to Chapel Hill primarily for its unique atmosphere and ambiance. I'm proud to have recently joined the Tarheel family when my oldest daughter graduated from UNC's school of journalism.

In the past seven years I have observed Chapel Hill getting more crowded with a corresponding significant increase in traffic. This congestion, I believe, is beginning to change the charter of our community, much as it did in Los Angeles twenty years ago.

Building a parking near the corner of Country Club and Raleigh Road will add a significant amount of traffic to an area that is already overcrowded during most times of the day. Discussing a reduced structure, installing additional traffic lights, one-way traffic during certain hours, and the like, will not resolve the problem. Building any parking structure in this area will increase congestion and is simply a bad idea.

The Gimghoul neighborhood has lived in peace with the university for almost 80 years. Some

of my neighbors have lived in our neighborhood for over 50 years. They cannot recall a proposal by the university that would change the character of the neighborhood as drastically as adding this amount of traffic to our corner.

I encourage you to stress to the university that the concept of park and ride lots is in the best interests of both the university and the local community. It will help preserve the character of this unique town.

Sincerely,

Gene Pease  
President  
Gimghoul Historic District  
208 Glandon Drive  
969-7460  
[gpease7@aol.com](mailto:gpease7@aol.com)

S-74

**Cal Horton**

---

**From:** Ericplow1@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 2:17 PM  
**To:** Cal Horton; Tina Vaughn  
**Cc:** louise.beck@realtor.com; jeallen@mindspring.com; mrthnsn@juno.com; dannyr@brandfuel.com  
**Subject:** fence

Mr. Horton and Ms. Vaughn,

I noticed today that the fence has been made solid. A couple of my tenants have already reported that it is making a big difference in the sound level, and as a result the basketball playing is much less disturbing to our residents, many of whom are students and need quiet time to study.

So, on behalf of myself, the Univ. Gardens Board of Directors, as well as at least 36 residents who live in the C building, thank you! We really appreciate it!

Sincerely,

Eric Plow

**Cal Horton**

---

**From:** James L. Ward [wardjl@email.unc.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 4:00 PM  
**To:** Kevin Foy  
**Cc:** FBateman@unch.unc.edu; patevans@bellsouth.net; ed.harrison@mindspring.com; mark@cdpl.org; billstrom@nc.rr.com; Dorothy Verkerk; windsorcircle@mindspring.com; edithwiggins@nc.rr.com; Cal Horton; Ralph Karpinos; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** Re: This evening's meeting and UNC application

Kevin, Thank you for carrying the council's concerns about the modifications to the dev plan, in particular about the changes related to parking. I am willing to follow your suggestion to carry these elements of the plan over until our 25 Aug mtg. I am somewhat concerned about allowing the council to go beyond the 90 day period w/out a full decision (approval or not) on all aspects of the modification application unless we rec. from the University an explicit request in writing or orally during tonight's continued public hearing, to modify this time frame provision.

Additionally, while the family student housing is less contentious, the issue of ped/bike/vehicular access needs to be improved to allow for safe and reasonable connectivity to the bypass, in both directions.

Sincerely, Jim

Kevin Foy wrote:

June 25, 2003

To the Council:

I have had the opportunity, as you requested, to speak with Chancellor Moeser regarding the university's application to modify the development plan. During that conversation, I relayed the substance of Councilmembers' concerns about the plan. The primary areas of concern that I noted include the changes to the parking plan. It was my impression, however, that there was support for the modifications that include Family Housing, the utility plan, and the I.T. building.

In response to those concerns, the Chancellor suggested that the university would be willing to work with the Council over the next several weeks to continue our conversations about the Cobb parking deck, chiller plant, and Jackson deck; but that the university would request that the Council take action on the other items at its meeting this evening.

I agreed that it would be desirable to continue the conversation, which would be in the form of a small working group consisting of two university trustees and a mayor's committee. The university would then request, based on the efforts of that working group, that the Council take further action at its August 25, 2003 meeting.

Among the issues that the Chancellor and I discussed is the fact that the Town ordinance requires the Council to take action on a modification application within 90 days. This timeframe represented an important part of the assurances provided in the OI-4 zone. I do not believe that either the university or the town has any intention of abrogating this part of the zoning agreement. However, given the extenuating circumstances of this application (primarily that both the university and the town are entering the summer break), the better choice at this time is to continue the conversation even though it will extend beyond the 90 days.

I believe that the Chancellor's offer to continue working with the Council represents a good-faith effort on the part of the university to reach an agreement that is acceptable both to the university and to the community. I encourage the Council to go forward with this plan of action at this evening's meeting.

Kevin



## Cal Horton

5-76

**From:** Kevin Foy  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 3:37 PM  
**To:** 'FBateman@unch.unc.edu'; 'patevans@bellsouth.net'; 'Ed Harrison (ed.harrison@mindspring.com)'; 'mark@cdpl.org'; 'Bill Strom (billstrom@nc.rr.com)'; 'Dorothy Verkerk'; 'Jim Ward (windsorcircle@mindspring.com)'; 'Edith Wiggins (edithwiggins@nc.rr.com)'; 'wardjl@email.unc.edu'  
**Cc:** Cal Horton; Ralph Karpinos; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** This evening's meeting and UNC application

June 25, 2003

To the Council:

I have had the opportunity, as you requested, to speak with Chancellor Moeser regarding the university's application to modify the development plan. During that conversation, I relayed the substance of Councilmembers' concerns about the plan. The primary areas of concern that I noted include the changes to the parking plan. It was my impression, however, that there was support for the modifications that include Family Housing, the utility plan, and the I.T. building.

In response to those concerns, the Chancellor suggested that the university would be willing to work with the Council over the next several weeks to continue our conversations about the Cobb parking deck, chiller plant, and Jackson deck; but that the university would request that the Council take action on the other items at its meeting this evening.

I agreed that it would be desirable to continue the conversation, which would be in the form of a small working group consisting of two university trustees and a mayor's committee. The university would then request, based on the efforts of that working group, that the Council take further action at its August 25, 2003 meeting.

Among the issues that the Chancellor and I discussed is the fact that the Town ordinance requires the Council to take action on a modification application within 90 days. This timeframe represented an important part of the assurances provided in the OI-4 zone. I do not believe that either the university or the town has any intention of abrogating this part of the zoning agreement. However, given the extenuating circumstances of this application (primarily that both the university and the town are entering the summer break), the better choice at this time is to continue the conversation even though it will extend beyond the 90 days.

I believe that the Chancellor's offer to continue working with the Council represents a good-faith effort on the part of the university to reach an agreement that is acceptable both to the university and to the community. I encourage the Council to go forward with this plan of action at this evening's meeting.

Kevin

**Cal Horton**

---

**From:** Mark Kleinschmidt [mark@CDPL.ORG]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 4:25 PM  
**To:** Kevin Foy; FBateman@unch.unc.edu; patevans@bellsouth.net;  
ed.harrison@mindspring.com; billstrom@nc.rr.com; Dorothy Verkerk;  
windsorcircle@mindspring.com; edithwiggins@nc.rr.com; wardjl@email.unc.edu  
**Cc:** Cal Horton; Ralph Karpinos; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** RE: This evening's meeting and UNC application

Kevin,

Thank you for doing this.

Note: As I told you several weeks ago, I have a hearing in Asheville on Aug 25 and will not be able to attend the meeting that week. The judge has indicated no continuances will be granted. I'd like to participate in this decision, but I understand the need to move quickly. If it's a 4 to 4 decision, I guess it'll have to wait for my return.

mark

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

**From:** Kevin Foy [mailto:kevinfoy@townofchapelhill.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2003 3:37 PM  
**To:** FBateman@unch.unc.edu; patevans@bellsouth.net; ed.harrison@mindspring.com; Mark Kleinschmidt;  
billstrom@nc.rr.com; Dorothy Verkerk; windsorcircle@mindspring.com; edithwiggins@nc.rr.com;  
wardjl@email.unc.edu  
**Cc:** Cal Horton; Ralph Karpinos; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** This evening's meeting and UNC application

June 25, 2003

To the Council:

I have had the opportunity, as you requested, to speak with Chancellor Moeser regarding the university's application to modify the development plan. During that conversation, I relayed the substance of Councilmembers' concerns about the plan. The primary areas of concern that I noted include the changes to the parking plan. It was my impression, however, that there was support for the modifications that include Family Housing, the utility plan, and the I.T. building.

In response to those concerns, the Chancellor suggested that the university would be willing to work with the Council over the next several weeks to continue our conversations about the Cobb parking deck, chiller plant, and Jackson deck; but that the university would request that the Council take action on the other items at its meeting this evening.

I agreed that it would be desirable to continue the conversation, which would be in the form of a small working group consisting of two university trustees and a mayor's committee. The university would then request, based on the efforts of that working group, that the Council take further action at its August 25, 2003 meeting.

Among the issues that the Chancellor and I discussed is the fact that the Town ordinance requires the Council to take action on a modification application within 90 days. This timeframe represented an important part of the assurances provided in the OI-4 zone. I do not believe that either the university or the town has any intention of abrogating this part of the zoning agreement. However, given the extenuating circumstances of this application (primarily that both the university and the town are entering the summer break), the better choice at this time is to continue the conversation even though it will extend beyond the 90 days.

I believe that the Chancellor's offer to continue working with the Council represents a good-faith effort on the part of the university to reach an agreement that is acceptable both to the university and to the community. I encourage the Council to go forward with this plan of action at this evening's meeting.

Kevin

(S-TA)

Sabrina C. Farrar

203 Fan Branch Lane

Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27516

(919)942-3236

[sfarrar@townofchapelhill.org](mailto:sfarrar@townofchapelhill.org)

[brinafarrar@msn.com](mailto:brinafarrar@msn.com)

## **Cal Horton**

---

**From:** Carol Abernethy on behalf of Cal Horton  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2003 4:57 PM  
**To:** 'Pamela P. Kirkpatrick'  
**Cc:** Pat Evans; Bill Strom; Dorothy Verkerk; Ed Harrison; Edith Wiggins (sandewiggs@yahoo.com); Flicka Bateman ; Jim Ward (W) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; 'Jim Ward'; 'Edith Wiggins (rr)'; Toni Pendergraph; Cal Horton; Flo Miller; Joyce Smith; Ralph Karpinos; Sonna Loewenthal; Kirsten Olson; Bill Stockard; Emily Dickens  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed Parking Deck and plant near Graveyard and Gimghoul

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member.

*Carol Abernethy  
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office  
Town of Chapel Hill*

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

**From:** Pamela P. Kirkpatrick [mailto:pampk@bellsouth.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2003 2:40 PM  
**To:** Town Council  
**Subject:** Proposed Parking Deck and plant near Graveyard and Gimghoul

I am writing to ask you not to support the proposed parking deck and plant. The Gimghoul neighborhood has long been a favorite walking and jogging site for residents of many neighborhoods, UNC students, UNC staff and faculty, ROTC early AM work outs, and the Athletic Department for at least the 22 years I have lived in the Gimghoul neighborhood. If this parking deck is added the activities mentioned above would become hazardous. In addition the neighborhood would lose its peaceful quality which has made it a haven for many UNC Professors and staff for years. I am very concerned about the effect of all the increased car emissions on the tombstones in the Chapel Hill grave yard which is already a National historic monument. Please do check out how destructive to the tombstones these emissions would be. Many well