

UW MLC JB



THE UNIVERSITY  
of NORTH CAROLINA  
at CHAPEL HILL

33

MAY 26 2005

VICE CHANCELLOR FOR  
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

BY: *CJA*

300 SOUTH BUILDING  
CAMPUS BOX 1001  
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27599-1001

T 919.962.3701  
F 919.962.0947  
www.unl.edu/finance/admin

**ATTACHMENT 4**

May 23, 2005

Mr. Cal Horton  
Town Manager  
Town of Chapel Hill  
405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-5705

Subject: OI-4 Proposed Text Amendments

Dear Mr. Horton,

We appreciate that our proposed text changes were shared with the public during the "Public Dialogue" held on May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2005. Based on the conversation from that evening, we offer the attached refinements to the University's proposed text amendments. We have attempted to clarify our proposals and respond to some of the comments we heard during the Dialogue.

The attached flow chart shows how our refinements and the town's proposed changes might result in increased review time for an OI-4 Development Plan submission. The chart also illustrates how the Concept Plan would precede the Council's review of the complete Development Plan submission. With the additional front-end time for Concept Plan review and the additional time for review of the application, the community will have gained an increase from 90 to more than 120 days for review and input.

We believe our participation in the Public Dialogue addressed many of the public comments on the proposed text amendments. The refinements we offer here reflect our continuing efforts to respond to comments and concerns. We request that our comments be considered when the Council continues this public hearing process.

Should you or your staff have any questions on the attached proposals or chart, we would be happy to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

Nancy D. Suttentfield  
Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration

CC: Chancellor James Moeser

Enclosures: Refinements of Proposed Text Amendments  
Development Plan Process for OI-4



**TOWN COUNCIL "PUBLIC DIALOGUE"  
ON OI-4 ZONING DISTRICT**

<b>UNC Proposed Changes 5/4/05</b>	<b>Refinements 5/19/05</b>
<p>1. Shorten Council review period for projects internal to the campus from 90 to 60 days.</p>	<p>1. The University is willing to allow up to 120 days to review all Development Plans and Major Modifications but would request an expedited review for buildings without significant transportation, stormwater or public utility impacts external to the boundaries of the zone.</p>
<p>2. Require the University to present DP applications to Town review boards during the 60 or 120 day Council review period.</p>	<p>2. The University is willing to appear before review boards during the 120 day review period to assure that they have the opportunity to contribute their input to the Council's deliberations.</p>
<p>3. Spell out the specific criteria to be used by Town staff to declare UNC's DP submissions "complete."</p>	<p>3. Although there is on-going communication between UNC and Town staff in advance of an application package, there are often delays in declaring a package "complete" because of uncertainties about what the Council might want to know. These uncertainties make it difficult to anticipate an endpoint when projects will be approved and can be initiated. Although the "clock does not start to run" until the package is declared complete, precious construction time is lost when the Town staff need to seek guidance from the Council because review criteria do not exist. Modification 2, and the associated addendum, is an appropriate model to follow.</p>
<p>4. Define in clear terms what constitutes a "minor" modification to the DP.</p>	<p>4. We would suggest a text amendment that states "For all projects in a development plan, a minor modification is ... (existing text) ...". This would eliminate proposal 6 below.</p>

**TOWN COUNCIL "PUBLIC DIALOGUE"  
ON OI-4 ZONING DISTRICT**

<p>5. Limit questions for which a formal University response is required to matters relevant to protection of community property values and health, safety, and welfare.</p>	<p>5. This change addresses the need to use limited budgetary resources and staff time wisely. UNC devotes considerable staff time and often must pay consultants to respond to complex questions concerning topics such as utility needs, how we plan to pay for projects, why we need to build utility capacity instead of conserving energy, etc. Further, such matters are properly the purview of the UNC Trustees and the State. Developing formal and often detailed answers to questions unrelated to community property values and health, safety, and welfare costs UNC money and consumes review time that could be spent addressing community concerns.</p>
<p>6. Stipulate that minor modifications of projects located in the PTA are subject to the same requirements as minor modifications in other areas of OI-4.</p>	<p>6. See 4 above.</p>
<p>7. Allow minor modifications to be submitted simultaneously with the Site Development Permit (SDP) request.</p>	<p>7. The requirements for a minor modification are stipulated in the LUMO. If a project meets those requirements, a minor modification should be considered with the project SDP application. We request a text amendment that requires that a request for a minor modification be acted on within 15 days of receiving a complete request.</p>
<p>8. Require UNC to involve neighbors in PTA's throughout project development (versus one meeting).</p>	<p>8. We would suggest a text amendment to the Individual Site Development Permit requirements (3.5.2.h.2) that states "Any application for a site Development Permit in a Perimeter Transition Area shall include <u>documentation that the applicant held at least one meeting for neighbors adjacent to the proposed building prior to submission of the SDP and (existing text).</u>" This requirement would be in addition to the design workshop requested by the resolution adopted by the Council on October 3, 2001 (2001-10-03/R-1d).</p>

# Development Plan Process for OI-4



