CENTRAL WEST FOCUS AREA TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2 MAY 18, 2013

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Planning Tools Exercise	Page 2
Planning Principles and Objectives Exercise	Page 3
Break Out Group Notes (Tables 1-9)	Page 15
Workshop Comment Sheet: Response Summary	Page 27
Farmer's Market Comment Sheet: Response Summary	Page 32

CENTRAL WEST FOCUS AREA

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2: MAY 18, 2013

PLANNING TOOLS EXERCISE

Planning Tool	Number of Stars
	Received
Neighborhood Greenway	8
Mixed Use	8
Complete Streets	7
Roundabout	6
Bike Lanes	7
Pedestrian Refuge	5
Multi-use Trails	16
Hawk Beacons	5
Connected Road Network	3
Tree Box Filter	4
Radar Speed Sign	5
Woonerf	5
Cycle Track	8
Right In/Right Out	1
Curb Extension (a.k.a. Bulb Out)	6
Raised Crosswalk	10
Median Island	7
High Visibility Crosswalk	16
Street Trees	13
Sharrow	2
Bioswale	8
Green Alley	7
Speed Hump	8

CENTRAL WEST FOCUS AREA COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2: MAY 18, 2013 PRINCIPLES AND OBJECTIVES EXERCISE

Principles as Revised at the Steering Committee Meetings on April 30 and May 7, 2013 Objectives as of May 14, 2013, based on the SC's Survey Monkey responses (minimum 50% "yes" vote)

Green/Red Dots and Comments from May 18 Community Workshop (Objectives Exercise)

Yes/Maybe/No Vote from SC Survey Monkey 5/14/13

PRINCIPLE 1: Create a Strong Sense of Place	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
The CWFA plan will promote the creation of a vibrant sense of place, respecting its character as a comfortable, tree-lined residential community that is also home to important Chapel Hill institutions and a major gateway to Carolina North.	4	0	
Objectives for Principle 2	1		
A. Minimize the visual impact of parked motor vehicles through the use of underground parking, buildings built over parking, parking located behind structures, and other similar measures.	8 Yes (10) Maybe (4)	9 No (0)	
B. Central West institutions should be visible and easily accessible by foot, bike, transit, and automobile.	8 Yes (10) Maybe (3)	9 No (1)	Keep buffers. Don't want or need street visibility in a residential community. Woods are used for dog walking. Don't want to see commercial or office from the road. Don't like East 54 or Carrboro hotel.
C. Encourage architecture that relates to some aspect of the local vernacular, in terms of style and/or materials.	1 Yes (9) Maybe (5)	0 No (0)	
D. Build distinctive features, use local materials, plants native to area, and use images appropriate for the town of Chapel Hill, and the state of North Carolina.	4 Yes (7) Maybe (6)	0 No (1)	
E. Encourage home-grown businesses in the commercial area.	5 Yes (8) Maybe (3)	0 No (3)	
F. Encourage office development south of the Estes/MLK intersection .	3 Yes (8) Maybe (5)	15 No (1)	Don't encourage office. Don't want tall office buildings, low scale may be ok.
G. Non-residential retail uses should provide services to surrounding neighborhoods.	6 Yes (9) Maybe (3)	1 No (2)	
H. Design for commercial success. Create a shopping area with critical mass, and balance locally useful goods and services to succeed.	6 Yes (7) Maybe (3)	1 No (4)	
I. The Estes and MLK street frontages will maintain different characters, with the area around the intersection marking a	4 Yes (9)	0 No (2)	

PRINCIPLE 1: Create a Strong Sense of Place	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
transition between the two.	Maybe (3)		
J. Develop road/streetscape design standards that can be extended	6	1	
north and south on MLK to give it a more cohesive character.	Yes (10)	No (2)	
	Maybe (2)		
K. The "heart" of CWFA should include public space (indoor or	11	0	
outdoor) with trees/vegetation and places for sitting.	Yes (13)	No (0)	
	Maybe (1)		
L. Include outdoor green spaces in all development.	13	0	
	Yes (7)	No (3)	
	Maybe (4)		
M. Provide a hierarchy of gathering spaces which are connected by a	4	0	
network of paths, sidewalks and streets.	Yes (7)	No (1)	
	Maybe (6)		
N. Locate retail and mixed use developments around public	4	2	
gathering spaces.	Yes (7)	No (0)	
	Maybe (7)		
O. Enhance community space and streetscape with art, quality	4	0	
landscaping, benches, and water features.	Yes (10)	No (0)	
	Maybe (4)		
P. Construct buildings of noteworthy architectural character that are	2	1	
also compatible with the Town, CWFA, and Carolina North.	Yes (7)	No (3)	
	Maybe (4)		
Q. Strive to establish visual linkages/cues between CWFA and the	0	0	
evolving Carolina North campus.	Yes (8)	No (1)	
	Maybe (4)		
R. Place buildings along MLK near the intersection with Estes Drive	3	0	
that architecturally enhance the entranceway to the Carolina	Yes (8)	No (2)	
North campus.	Maybe (4)		
S. Evaluate and provide as necessary the services needed by	2	0	
Carolina North with respect to commerce, recreation, police and	Yes (11)	No (2)	
fire, civic meeting space.	Maybe (1)		
T. Provide tree buffers in all development between new and existing	17	0	
development, and between new development and the street.	Yes (9)	No (2)	
	Maybe (3)		
U. "Trees" are an essential character of this town and all	16	0	
development should work to maintain and enhance this feature.	Yes (9)	No (2)	
	Maybe (3)		

PRINCIPLE 2: Ensure Community Compatibility	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Development will provide a compatible bridge between the well-	1	0	
established residential and institutional uses and the new uses that			
will evolve around the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr.			
Blvd./Estes Drive near the Carolina North campus.			
Objectives for Principle	2		
A. Maintain the qualitative distinctions between Estes Drive and	3	0	
Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.	Yes (12)	No (1)	
	Maybe (1)		
B. Development construction should be coordinated to minimize	3	0	

	PRINCIPLE 2: Ensure Community Compatibility	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
	disruption to CWFA quality of life.	Yes (8)	No (4)	
		Maybe (2)		
C.	Ensure that new development projects won't endanger public	18	0	
	safety or harm surrounding neighborhoods, i.e. lighting, traffic,	Yes (8)	No (4)	
	and noise.	Maybe (2)		
D.	Evaluate "light trespass" impacts for public safety, wildlife and	6	0	
	dark skies, and urge Council to adopt a lighting ordinance.	Yes (8)	No (5)	
		Maybe (1)		
E.	Make a great experience and character distinction between the	3	6	Assumes you have non-
	western end of Estes Drive, near Martin Luther King, Jr.	Yes (7)	No (2)	residential at the other
	Boulevard, and the residential/school segment between	Maybe (4)		end. No non-
	Somerset and Burlage Circle.			residential on Estes.
F.	Allow for gradual height and density transitions between new	3	0	
	development and existing residential areas.	Yes (11)	No (1)	
		Maybe (2)		
G.	Allow variable heights and densities depending upon existing	0	0	
	land use context, natural buffers and topography.	Yes (12)	No (1)	
		Maybe (1)		
Н.	Allow clustered density which preserves existing natural features.	4	0	
		Yes (12)	No (0)	
		Maybe (2)		
I.	Along MLK, Jr. allow for 2 or 3 story buildings.	0	0	
		Yes (7)	No (3)	
		Maybe (4)		
J.	Encourage uses near Somerset that will provide a good transition	2	15	Don't want any
	between the schools and single-family homes on Estes: keep	Yes (8)	No (3)	Don't want any
	commercial near the intersection, transitioning to residential as	Maybe (3)		commercial near
	you get closer to the schools.			Somerset.

PRINCIPLE 3: Create Social Connections	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Development should create places that foster a strong sense of	3	1	Don't believe it's
community and allow people to meet, both formally and informally.			necessary
			 Destroying the best
			part of Chapel Hill
Objective for Principle 3			
A. New retail and/or civic space in the area will be necessary to	3	1	Retail and civic don't
create a place for social connections.	Yes (12)	No (1)	necessarily create social
	Maybe (1)		connections—doesn't
			have to be non-
			residential.
B. Future retail/office/civic space near MLK should serve the	4	6	
residents and employees at Carolina North, drawing them into	Yes (11)	No (0)	Meaning not clear
contact with the larger community.	Maybe (3)		
C. A rich variety of attractive and comfortable publicly-used spaces—	8	1	
including streets as well as natural and built places will be	Yes (9)	No (0)	
provided through private and public sector projects, to be used	Maybe (5)		
for individual enjoyment, as well as formal and informal			
community meetings and gatherings.			

PRINCIPLE 3: Create Social Connections	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
D. Create a Town Square like area, blending retail/commercial and	14	6	
green spaces that can become a focus of community interactions	Yes (10)	No (0)	Retail Only
and activity.	Maybe (4)		

PRINCIPLE 4: Improve Physical Connections	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Development should provide multiple means of moving within and through the area; improved physical connections between the area and the Town as whole should be explored.	2	0	-
Objective for Principle 4	i	I.	
A. Ensure CWFA connections to the campus to campus bike route.	3 Yes (12) Maybe (2)	0 No (0)	
B. Ensure connectivity between all modes of transportation (e.g., bike to bus transfers).	3 Yes (11) Maybe (3)	0 No (0)	
C. Local streets should be improved as necessary to provide access to those areas recommended for development in the Small Area Plan.	5 Yes (8) Maybe (3)	28 <i>No (3)</i>	Cut throughs increase development. Want to keep cul-de-sacs for single family homes. • Traffic could hurt walking to school • Keep quiet enclaves • Trails in the neighborhood. • No new roads; walking and biking ok. • Don't make fire lane a road.
D. Locate public spaces for visibility and access from streets, paths and sidewalks.	1 Yes (9) Maybe (4)	0 No (1)	
E. Provide a clear and coordinated identification system using signs, maps and Internet-based information.	0 Yes (7) Maybe (4)	0 No (3)	
F. Build a network of neighborhood paths that lead from the residential areas to the schools, library, YMCA, and to the larger Chapel Hill greenway system.	17 Yes (10) Maybe (4)	0 No (0)	
G. Establish a more permeable street and trail network.	0 Yes (8) Maybe (4)	0 No (2)	
H. Complete a network of transit stops, trails, and sidewalks throughout.	4 Yes (9) Maybe (4)	0 No (1)	
I. Provide better access to Carolina North from multiple locations.	1 Yes (7) Maybe (5)	12 No (2)	

PRINCIPLE 4: Improve Physical Connections	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
J. Make movement between Carolina North across MLK and Estes	4	2	
to its eastern and southern neighbors easier and safer.	Yes (13)	No (1)	
	Maybe (0)		
K. Create additional greenways to allow for a bicycle and foot traffic	9	0	
network separate from streets	Yes (9)	No (1)	
	Maybe (4)		
L. Establish a trail and greenway systems that allows ease of	5	0	
movement between institutions (schools, library, YMCA)	Yes (11)	No (0)	
	Maybe (3)		
M. Tie new paths and greenways into the Carolina North and Town	6	0	
greenway system and the Campus to Campus Connector.	Yes (12)	No (0)	
	Maybe (2)		

PRINCIPLE 5: Minimize Vehicular Traffic Impacts	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Recognize the limited capacity of the existing road network and favor developments that minimize negative impacts on vehicular traffic and quality of life in the area.	0	0	
Objectives for Principle 5	•		
A. Improve streetscape design and planting (e.g., trees and landscaping) to address sound, microclimate and appearance issues on both Estes and MLK.	7 Yes (8) Maybe (5)	0 No (1)	
B. Ensure safe orderly flow around stopped buses, utility trucks, delivery vehicles, etc.	0 Yes (7) Maybe (5)	0 No (2)	
C. Use signage and other visual cues to indicate appropriate speed, behavior on various streets.	2 Yes (13) Maybe (1)	0 No (0)	
D. Maintain safety of quiet child-friendly neighborhood streets	19 Yes (12) Maybe (0)	0 No (2)	
E. Encourage local destination retail (pharmacy, coffee shop, dry cleaner, etc.) in the area to capture neighborhood business and help reduce car use.	13 Yes (11) Maybe (3)	1 No (0)	Model traffic max capacity.
F. Explore ways to keep Estes from becoming a major commuting route to/from Carolina North.	20 Yes (8) Maybe (2)	0 No (4)	
G. Maintain MLK, Jr. as a primary/major entrance into the town	5 Yes (12) Maybe (0)	0 No (2)	
H. Install traffic calming devices liberally around schools and on	10	0	

PRINCIPLE 5: Minimize Vehicular Traffic Impacts	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
roads in the walking to school designated area.	Yes (9) Maybe (3)	No (2)	
I. Use landscaped medians and street trees to indicate that slower	6	0	
traffic is appropriate on MLK and Estes.	Yes (7)	No (1)	
	Maybe		
	(6)		
J. Encourage alternate modes of transportation by providing	2	0	
effective transit and complete bike/ped facilities	Yes (14)	No (0)	
	Maybe		
	(0)		
K. Make a commitment to provide expanded and frequent bus	10	0	
service to reduce car trips.	Yes (12)	No (1)	
	Maybe		
	(1)		
L. Develop Estes as a complete street with a landscaped median,	4	0	
turn lanes, some bus stop pull-offs, street trees and sidewalks.	Yes (7)	No (3)	Get real; not
Look at this street very specifically along its length to add	Maybe		realistic!
features while minimizing additional land needed.	(4)		
M. Boulevard/complete street along MLK, Jr. entrance into Chapel	0	0	
Hill	Yes (10)	No (3)	
	Maybe		
	(1)		
N. Synchronize traffic signals to maximize vehicle flow at reduced	9	0	
speeds	Yes (7)	No (1)	
	Maybe		
	(5)		

PRINCIPLE 6: Enhance the Pedestrian/Bicycle Experience	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Build a high quality bicycle, pedestrian and greenway system that	6	0	
ensures the safe, comfortable, and convenient access for those of all			
ages and abilities to school, residences, and other destinations.			
Objectives for Principle	6		
A. Local destinations should be created to promote biking and	3	0	
walking in the area.	Yes (7)	No (1)	
	Maybe (6)		
B. Plan for different levels of surfaces providing a variety of paved	2	0	
trails near major roads to woodland nature trails through wooded	Yes (7)	No (3)	
stretches.	Maybe (4)		
C. Pursue Safe Routes to School strategies and funding.	8	0	
	Yes (10)	No (1)	
	Maybe (3)		
D. Develop appropriate trails and signage in walk-to-school zone	4	0	
	Yes (12)	No (0)	
	Maybe (2)		
E. Create a network of off-road, well-lit multi-use paths through the	3	1	Natural corridors
area to connect residences, institutions, and other uses.	Yes (10)	No (0)	maintained?

PRINCIPLE 6: Enhance the Pedestrian/Bicycle Experience	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
	Maybe (4)		
F. Central West institutions should be visible and easily accessible by foot, bike, transit, and automobile.	3 Yes (9) Maybe (4)	2 No (1)	
G. Make sure intersection pedestrian crossings are well marked, especially at the MLK, Estes, Piney Mountain, Franklin and Seawell intersections.	4 Yes (11) Maybe (3)	0 No (0)	
H. Provide a paved sidewalk on at least one side of Estes from Franklin to Sewell School Road.	11 Yes (12) Maybe (2)	0 No (0)	Should go to Umstead at least, maybe to Carrboro.
 Provide paved sidewalks along both sides of MLK throughout the impact area. 	7 Yes (13) Maybe (1)	0 No (0)	
J. Provide adequate bike racks in developments and public spaces	1 Yes (12) Maybe (2)	0 No (0)	
K. Where possible, physically segregate bicycle lanes from automobile traffic.	8 Yes (12) Maybe (1)	0 No (1)	
 Ensure adequate widths for walkers and bikers and for safe two- way bike/pedestrian traffic for all ages. 	6 Yes (9) Maybe (3)	0 No (2)	
M. Commit to building bike and pedestrian facilities and link to development approvals.	3 Yes (8) Maybe (4)	0 No (2)	
N. Develop bike/pedestrian facilities along Elliott Rd. to provide access to the library (via Michaux) and shopping on East Franklin St.	1 Yes (8) Maybe (4)	0 No (2)	
O. There should be continuous (inclusive of street crossings) sidewalks/bike paths on both sides of MLK, Estes, and other major streets.	6 Yes (8) Maybe (4)	0 No (2)	
P. Develop a "ped/bike-scale" system of signage throughout the area	0 Yes (8) Maybe (3)	0 No (3)	
Q. Provide good lighting on all bike and pedestrian paths and walks. Use solar lighting for energy conservation.	3 Yes (8) Maybe (5)	0 No (1)	

PRINCIPLE 7: Improve Transit System	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Improve current service and access, and support increases in density with expanded and convenient transit.	2	1	Don't support increase in density – want to keep low density with woods & parks
Objectives for Principle 7	,		
A. Ensure adequate transit service/options for youth.	3	0	
	Yes (12)	No (0)	

	PRINCIPLE 7: Improve Transit System	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
		Maybe (2)		
В.	Create useful destinations (e.g., retail community activities) that	4	0	
	are accessible to and integrated with the transit system.	Yes (11)	No (1)	
		Maybe (2)		
C.	Align density with evolving transit routes/corridors, especially	4	0	
	along MLK	Yes (14)	No (0)	
		Maybe (0)		
D.	Locate transit stops where they are most convenient for use.	5	0	
		Yes (13)	No (0)	
		Maybe (1)		
E.	The design for final development should be one that encourages	4	0	
	and provides incentives for the use of public transportation.	Yes (8)	No (3)	
		Maybe (3)		
F.	Provide complete transit stops near all public gathering spaces.	6	0	
		Yes (11)	No (2)	
		Maybe (1)		
G.	Connectivity between modes of transportation should be	2	0	
	facilitated (e.g., bike racks at BRT stops).	Yes (8)	No (0)	
		Maybe (6)		
Н.	Provide expanded hours of service to allow for round trip	12	0	
	utilization of transit in the evenings, etc.	Yes (9)	No (1)	
		Maybe (4)		
I.	Provide an east-west cross-connector bus route	3	0	
		Yes (10)	No (1)	
		Maybe (3)		
J.	Provide extended hours of bus service – evenings and weekends	5	0	
		Yes (8)	No (2)	
		Maybe (4)		
K.	Put crosswalks at all bus stops.	5	0	
		Yes (7)	No (0)	
		Maybe (6)		

PRINCIPLE 8: Encourage a Diverse Mix of Uses	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Create a new mix of uses that encourage walkable destinations and attract local patrons.	5	1	Schools are overcrowded already. Don't want student housing.
Objectives for Principle 8			
A. Recognize the importance of economic viability for those who will build in making land use recommendations.	6 Yes (9) Maybe (4)	2 No (1)	Metric? No hotel
B. Take into account the impact of the plan on the Town's fiscal health	4 Yes (9) Maybe (3)	1 No (2)	Turned in as 13 th principle; Need to understand costs and income; Need to think about costs generated by each development.

PRINCIPLE 8: Encourage a Diverse Mix of Uses	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
C. Provide flexibility in recommendations to allow for creativity and changing needs over time	2 Yes (7) Maybe (5)	1 No (2)	
D. Provide a mixture of uses within many buildings, especially an MLK and Estes near MLK.	3 Yes (9) Maybe (4)	3 No (1)	
E. Link different uses with public gathering spaces and paths.	2 Yes (8) Maybe (5)	0 No (1)	
F. Provide a range of housing types (e.g., apartments, condominiums, townhomes, single family homes, retirement/senior housing, rental and for sale)	9 Yes (10) Maybe (4)	14 No (1)	Don't like rental. Don't want students moving in to big hoses. Renters don't take care of property.
G. Since the existing uses are residential and institutional, add diversity by promoting workforce and affordable housing.	6 Yes (10) Maybe (3)	9 No (1)	
H. Provide retail space, especially near the intersection of MLK and Estes.	5 Yes (11) Maybe (2)	6 No (1)	
I. Provide services to encourage residents to shop locally	7 Yes (11) Maybe (2)	0 No (1)	
J. Provide walkable destinations such as small grocery/shops	21 Yes (11) Maybe (1)	0 No (2)	
K. Provide flexible office space.	4 Yes (9) Maybe (2)	0 No (2)	
L. Provide diverse work and retail spaces.	5 Yes (11) Maybe (2)	0 No (1)	
M. Recommend a small-scale retail focus combined with office for areas near MLK/Estes intersection.	3 Yes (8) Maybe (3)	4 No (3)	
N. Build buildings with basic urban, durable, and commercially repurpose-able design.	4 Yes (8) Maybe (3)	1 No (3)	

PRINCIPLE 9: A Diverse Population	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
The area shall serve a broad socio-demographic range of Chapel Hill residents, students, workers, and visitors.	2	0	Don't need diverse community in each development.

PRINCIPLE 9: A Diverse Population	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Objectives for Principle 9			
A. Ensure that all plans recognize and address the needs of future	3	0	
generations of "Chapel Hillians"	Yes (7)	No (5)	
	Maybe (2)		
B. Encourage residential and other uses that will accommodate	11	0	
both affordable and market rate housing.	Yes (12)	No (0)	
	Maybe (2)		
C. Encourage multi-family housing to be designed in a manner that	6	0	
integrates into a neighborhood setting and promotes a Village	Yes (9)	No (1)	
character.	Maybe (4)		
D. Provide housing to accommodate different ages and income	8	5	Don't want low
groups.	Yes (11)	No (2)	
	Maybe (1)		income housing.
E. Plan a mix of new housing types including graduate housing	3	16	
combined with retail, office, and service needs.	Yes (10)	No (1)	
	Maybe (3)		
F. Don't target housing toward a single demographic.	5	3	
	Yes (9)	No (2)	Unclear
	Maybe (3)		
G. Provide amenities to attract a variety of ages, income levels,	8	1	
multi-generational family options, and ability groups.	Yes (12)	No (0)	
	Maybe (2)		

PRINCIPLE 10: Respect Existing Neighborhoods	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Development patterns will respect the integrity of the well-	18	0	
established neighborhoods and enhance their character and quality of			
life.			
Objectives for Principle 10			
A. Require appropriate, functional green-space buffers between	20	0	
development and existing neighborhoods	Yes (11)	(0)	
	Maybe (3)		
B. Highest densities should be along MLK and near MLK along Estes	8	13	
Drive	Yes (10)	No (1)	
	Maybe (3)		
C. Development design and scale should reflect environment and	14	0	
architectural character of existing neighborhoods, where	Yes (8)	No (3)	
appropriate	Maybe (3)		
D. Maintain the ability of safe foot & bicycle traffic through	15	0	
residential neighborhoods	Yes (11)	No (1)	
	Maybe (2)		

PRINCIPLE 11: Employ Environmentally Sound Practices	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Development will emphasize environmentally conscious design, development and operations of buildings and sites.	2	0	
Objective for Principle 11			
A. Maintain (or reestablish if needed) riparian buffers along stream	14	1	

PRINCIPLE 11: Employ Environmentally Sound Practices	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
with additional allowance for wildlife corridors.	Yes (9)	No (2)	
	Maybe (3)		
B. Minimize light and noise pollution.	11	0	
	Yes (12)	No (2)	
	Maybe (0)		
C. Minimize air and water pollution	9	0	
	Yes (12)	No (0)	
	Maybe (1)		
D. Plan for maintaining a tree canopy cover in the CWFA area.	10	0	
	Yes (9)	No (2)	
	Maybe (3)		
E. Shade parking lots and paved areas.	9	0	
	Yes (9)	No (2)	
	Maybe (3)		
F. Consider solar orientation and shading in all building design.	6	0	
	Yes (8)	No (3)	
	Maybe (3)		
G. Promote green building/construction standards to the extent	4	0	
possible	Yes (10)	No (0)	
	Maybe (4)		
H. Encourage alternative low-carbon technologies	3	0	
	Yes (10)	No (0)	
	Maybe (4)		
Bury utility/power lines mid street on Estes Drive	7	0	
	Yes (9)	No (2)	
	Maybe (3)		

PRINCIPLE 12: Feature, Repair and Enhance Natural Resources	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
Development will protect and relate to the area's significant and	10	0	
character-contributing natural features.			
Objectives for Principle 12			
A. Consider ways to provide appropriate access to and use of the	1	0	
natural areas as open space amenities.	Yes (12)	No (0)	
	Maybe (2)		
B. Protect wildlife corridors	19	0	
	Yes (7)	No (5)	
	Maybe (2)		
C. Provide walks and trails through the natural areas to connect the	17	0	
developed areas and provide recreational experience.	Yes (11)	No (1)	
	Maybe (2)		
D. Enhance environmental assets by protecting steep slopes, creeks,	11	0	
and ephemeral streams.	Yes (8)	No (2)	
	Maybe (4)		
E. Identify the natural features worthy of protection, such as stream	18	0	
buffers, mature tree stands, wetlands and other environmental	Yes (13)	No (1)	
features.	Maybe (0)		
F. Provide walking trails along the creeks, outside of the riparian	4	0	

PRINCIPLE 12: Feature, Repair and Enhance Natural Resources	Green	Red	Comments at Workshop
buffers.	Yes (7)	No (1)	
	Maybe (6)		
G. Use standards for the trees and vegetation in new / revitalization	5	0	
projects	Yes (8)	No (0)	
	Maybe (6)		
H. Plant new trees where appropriate.	6	0	
	Yes (12)	No (0)	
	Maybe (2)		
Provide sound storm water management systems in new	11	0	
developments.	Yes (13)	No (0)	
	Maybe (1)		
J. Maintain natural hydrologic cycle and water quality: Use "best	6	0	
management practices" for handling and treating stormwater.	Yes (11)	No (0)	
	Maybe (3)		
K. Build boardwalks and bridges for protective greenway access	6	0	
across eroded, sloped, denuded, and clay soils. Replant unstable	Yes (8)	No (1)	
banks with native species.	Maybe (5)		
L. In natural areas, remove invasive, exotic plant species, and	9	2	
replant with native plant species.	Yes (8)	No (2)	
	Maybe (4)		

CENTRAL WEST FOCUS AREA COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2: MAY 18, 2013 BREAK OUT GROUP NOTES

- Concept A Likes:
 - o Preferable to other plans—less traffic, less intense
 - o Senior housing- want affordable model
 - Like lower intensity
 - o Less impact on environment
 - o Like retail on MLK (depends what it looks like), coffee shop is fine
 - o Fewer new roads
- Concept A Dislikes:
 - o Use R1 as a starting point
 - o Concern about parking
 - o Concern about mobility on Estes.
 - o Doesn't generate as much tax revenue as other options.
 - o Concern about students in multifamily (grad students are ok)
- · Concept B Likes:
 - o Mixed use if meets needs of surrounding neighborhoods
 - Mixed use done in a pleasing manner
 - Mixed use creates flexibility and improves tax base
 - o Town green spaces/squares
 - o Flexible community spaces
 - o Right in/ right out
 - o Retail and office appropriate to neighborhood
 - Extra road across creek allows left turn
 - Could be a non vehicular connection across creek
 - o Could go as low as 10' wide- need bus pull out for seniors/older people
 - o Prefer roundabout near MLK
 - o Makes a difference- need to define multi-family
 - o Need retail space that you can walk to from neighborhoods and Carolina North.
- Concept B Dislikes:
 - More traffic coming and going on Estes
 - o Prefer not to cross Cale Spring Branch
 - o Why is an extra stream crossing needed? Bridges may not be needed
 - o Could be a difficult to access high density multi-family south of Estes
 - Switch roundabout location and remove bridge
- Concept B Ideas:
 - o Add bus pull outs on Estes
 - Consider roundabout at other intersection

- Avoid mixed use that is not neighborhood focused
- Not sure eastern Town Square works

· Concept C Likes:

- Larger town square needs to be away from power lines
- o Like Southern Village—office and apartments look fine
- o Town green—consider one large town square as focus
- o Two roundabouts good
- Not much support for this option

Concept Dislikes:

- o Prefer senior to multifamily housing; don't want to lose senior housing idea
- o Increases number of cars
- o Traffic light might be better than roundabout
- o Bridges over RCD
- o Two roundabouts
- o Two bridges
- o Move high density on Estes- too much traffic impact in neighborhood
- o Prefers residential on Estes
- o Non starter because density creates too much traffic
- o If lose senior housing concept, traffic problem increases
- o Prefer R1 existing zoning

Ideas for Concept C:

- Move town square toward MLK
- o Add traffic light on Somerset instead of roundabout
- o Keep north of Estes residential
- Substitute senior housing for multifamily
- o Consider an R1 concept

- Two-three stories is ok for new development
- Safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities is very important
- Developers should pay for the new roads
- R-1 minimum impact
- Question additional roads
- Maintain easy access to existing development
- Affordable housing and workforce housing should be attractive
- Commercial access limited
- Current transportation funding
- Safe walking on Estes
- Bicycle safety
- Two story townhouses with attic as third story
- Glen Lennox- trees

- Townhouse apt Hillsborough
- Developer should pay for new streets
- Bike trails/walking along Estes
- Maintain informal paths
- ADA improvements not feasible on trails
- Plus existing trails/greenways
- Informal trail system
- Concern about increase in noise/people on existing walking paths.
- Trail/bike/walk/take bus to existing commercial
- We don't have enough housing for workers at Carolina North
 - o Could have apartments, condos
 - Could reduce auto trips
- Don't want major retail
- Worried about safety on Estes Drive—safe biking and walking
- Developers should pay for transportation
- Would like to have walking paths, bikes, greenways
- Increase access by bikes and pedestrians to University Mall/ other area retail
- Encourage use of trials—not every trails need to be ADA accessible
- More development, trails are more impacted negatively
- Student housing at 2 or 4 stories
- Need is not student housing, but affordable and workforce housing
- 2 stories is okay
- Maybe similar to Glen Lennox—lighter, but still windy roads
- Like town house apartments
- Not sure if retail would work on Estes—how would people get there? Urban connections may
 fit better in other areas of the Town
- Keep it the way it is—trees
- Don't think there is enough space here to build things that people could walk to
- Minimize change- keep the area more residential
- Just want it to remain the same
- Don't add new retail
- Easy access to retail
- Protecting area—need to be realistic about what's happening

- R-1 next to the Somerset neighborhood. Access to school from this area is very important.
- Multifamily ok on west side of power line, closer to Carolina North. Requires discussion as to why kind of residential/multifamily
- Retail node across from Carolina North

- Retail for neighbors too, not just looking to support UNC
- How can you propose changes to the area given that traffic is already bad? Anything more you put on it is going to make things worse.
- Some commercial on the busy street is good, but keep the residential areas near the schools as R-1
- Keep trail connectivity to schools
- You can't fix Estes. It won't be widened, that won't even solve the problem. You need a new circular route. Maybe Estes isn't the route to 15-501. Need a Town solution, not a small area solution.
- Bike/pedestrian pathways are good
- New road connections to MLK from Somerset might ease some traffic through Estes
- Carolina North is delayed- don't put all this on us now. Don't' give up our current zoning.
- Senior housing- less impact on schools and driving
- Land next to school is valuable as residential- kids can walk to school
- When Carolina North comes in, then put retail on MLK
- Huntington, etc. are nice roads for walking. Don't connect these neighborhood roads to make them through traffic streets
- Consider larger financial implications of development. Do we have the macroeconomic data we need?
- Homestead MLK commercial area/ coffee shop. Dry cleaner on MLK, not down Estes.
- R-1 homes near MLK/Estes- access in and out difficult from these driveways
- Franklin Grove a model for what multifamily on Estes near MLK might be like
- Clustered senior cottages near Estes- denser senior housing on south area- good
- Bike and pedestrian trails through the RCD very good
- Southern residential area good for senior housing also
- Office use along South MLK still good. We're used to it.
- New off-road pathways on Estes are good
- Residential close to MLK- townhouse ok
- Don't need more student housing here
- What's missing- a way to fix congestion on Estes

- Concept A Likes:
 - o Town square
 - YMCA continuing to be located in the CWFA
 - o Improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities on both sides of Estes Drive
- Concept A Concerns:
 - Don't want a large office park on MLK. Make sure to keep the trees mixed with the office buildings.
 - Density of multi-family
 - Vegetated buffers not shown at the school property

- o Traffic
- Don't want to see West 54 development in this location—that seems to serve only rich alumni, not affordable to the average person
- Want to see (in Concept A):
 - o Multi-family that looks like single family.
 - Complete streets so people can walk, bike and easily access transit, as well as limit the increase in traffic on the roadways.
 - Power lines as a divider between residential and mixed-use and multi-family development. Single family to the east of the power lines.
 - o Solar farm within the power line easement area—this is an opportunity
- Other Ideas (for Concept A):
 - o Mixed use could lead to better care of all the facilities. Retailers may have higher standards for maintenance than other property owners/residents.
 - Who is at the public workshop/meetings? The word needs to get out because this is a topic (the future of Central West) that impacts the whole Town. Maybe use the list serves of organizations in the area (autism association, etc.)
 - Don't let mixed-use creep down Estes—keep it west of the power lines. MLK is a natural corridor for retail.

Concept B:

- Want to see a Weaver Market or dry cleaner as part of the mix of uses
- Wish that developers would go somewhere else to develop uses that support the
 University. Why does it need to be on these properties?
- o Look at the road network outside of the study area. These impact the CWFA too.
- o Make sure new development will support the "community." Don't want people who are not invested in the neighborhood because they will leave in 2 or 4 years (e.g. students).
- Look at using R-2 zoning near Somerset. Look at using R-5 zoning closer to the MLK and Estes intersection.
- No hotel because it will bring too much traffic. If a hotel does come, it shouldn't be an
 exclusive hotel that is too expensive for to visitors coming to see residential of the
 neighborhood.
- Want to be an inclusive community that provides workforce and affordable housing
- Major issue: the tradeoff between retail services providing for locals (and therefore the residents don't need to drive) versus attracting new drivers and more traffic because the retail is in that location.

- The town square at MLK and Estes is a non-starter. It is too close to the busy roads.
- There should be one larger square away from the power lines rather than several small squares
- Prefer MLK and part of Estes close to MLK for small scale retail aimed to fulfill neighborhood needs

- Multifamily should be townhouses—generally 2 stories, but three stories is ok if the architecture is excellent
- Bus pull offs should be provided so that stopped buses do not slow down the traffic
- The vegetated buffer widths should be wider between the existing single family and new development. Also there should be a buffer to the school property.
- Concern about the hotel idea—should be limited to 3-4 stories
- Support for the two roundabouts on Estes Drive

Range of opinions within the group, such as:

- 1. Wants senior housing next to shops so they don't need to cross Estes. Should be switched with multi-family to south and senior housing to the north.
- 2. Concern about water quality and impervious surfaces.
- 3. Wants to keep existing zoning because of density increase. Develop elsewhere. Only develop things for neighbors to walk to. Concern about density due to congestion, change of character from residential, removing greenery.
- 4. Concept C is least favored. Even A is too much change.
- Concept A Strengths:
 - o Buffers are part of the plan
 - o Transition spaces very important
 - o Quality as much as quantity
 - Positive greenways
 - o Like concept of senior housing. Wants to make sure it is done well.
 - Need better pedestrian crossings—bridges and tunnels
 - o Buffer sizes and qualities—need buffer next to the school
 - Like park, but not good on busy corner
 - Larger green square is better—needs to be appealing and used, engaging
 - o Focus commercial on MLK
 - Concern about density
 - o Senior housing. Wants it to be well done, not just plain multi-family.
 - Pedestrian connectivity—like trails and bridges
- Concept B:
 - o Incorporate a preschool play area in the green area
 - Likes iteration of green areas
 - Wants lower density
 - o Prefers mixed-use over hotel
 - Does not like hotel
 - o Likes places to walk to a market, other small commercial
 - o More transport connections in A and B needed
 - o Two roundabouts too much, one is ok

Concept C:

- o Generations have different needs
- Like multi-generational and rental housing
- Value pedestrian and bicycle connections
- Not the numbers, but the quality
- Like A and B because concerns about density. Low density is unattractive to younger generations. The more dense the better.
- o Prefers C
- o Prefers things to walk to and public transportation
- o Improve school safety if development is dense
- Improve physical connections—local street access from small area, no fire lanes opened
- No increased traffic on residential streets
- Create strong sense of place
- Encourage office development south of Estes/MLK intersection
- Concern about this density as a threat to YMCA
- Concern about this office being too far south on MLK
- Central West institutions should be visible and accessible
- Concern about being "visible" and what that means—only if buildings are attractive and well
 designed
- Connections are not good when topography is steep. Add qualifier "where feasible."
- Review: major focus on all quality of development, not density
 - Strengths: buffer zones, greenways and multiple green spaces, multigenerational, pedestrian connectivity and bridges
 - o Need more public transportation
 - Switch multifamily and senior housing to blend density
- Concept A and B- like them
 - Concern about density
 - o Concern about traffic
 - Youngest person in group was unconcerned about density and traffic. Wanted density and connectivity.
 - o Many felt C too dense, but youngest person liked this concept the best.
- Request to develop concept D that forms a bridge of density (intensity), form and use between current zoning and A, B, C
- Pedestrian access at MLK and Estes is inadequate and dangerous.
- Love change if it enhances life
- Make green space inviting and engaging
- Commercial on the west side of MLK

- Must consider expansion on other side of the street. Will bring new demand for resources
- School capacity concern

- A is the least objectionable
- Residential north of Estes—nothing else
- Concerns about runoff into Bolin Creek and East Lake (Huntington Road). Rivers wash away roads.
- Resource needs for fire, police, and schools
- Need to better define mixed-use
- Don't open fire roads
- Given choice between "cancer, ALS, and Alzheimer's"
- Before we talk of new concepts, we need to see impact of Carolina North on Central West
- We need CN to be in the picture in all discussions—traffic impact, public spaces
- Multi-family is too general/vague
- Currently traffic on Estes is backed up to the library
- How do we get to Carrboro?
- We have to look at the whole area intelligently
- We need a new concept that addresses impact of CN, at current zoning density
- How dense is multi-family housing? Need a definition.
- Gradient of density on Estes toward MLK; protect existing neighborhood
- Need active school representative on the steering committee
- Impact on existing schools from new development
- Refine vegetative buffer—love of pine trees?
- Safety of students
- Bike lanes in all concepts
- No "mixed use" on Somerset
 - o Define mixed use—what is allowed and not allowed
- Preferable development in mixed use
 - Art center (to serve schools)
 - Walk from schools
 - After-school activities
 - o If it has to be developed
- Need school grounds for children to play
- Parents not allowed to stay at school—hence walking to school not encouraged
- Traffic studies do not include traffic at local peak time (when school is let out)
- Westward traffic on Estes is backed up to Library/Franklin
- A bigger buffer between schools and new development
- Do we need to clear-cut and then re-plant?
- Like idea of town square park
- Town square <u>next</u> to school

Don't Like

CN note being taken into account

- Tall buildings above 2 stories
- Separate bike and pedestrian paths
- Define mixed use, tree buffers and multi-family
- Do not open fire lane
- No connection to neighborhood
- Removal of land that perks (run-off) due to development north of Estes
- Drainage
- Effect on schools
- Need permeable parking lot
- Extra costs for EMS, Fire- response time for EMS vehicle.

Like

- Town park—put next to the school
- Sidewalks down Estes
- Keep current R1 zoning
- Single family north of Estes
- Retail ok along MLK
- Senior housing ok south of Estes
- Traffic circle at Somerset/Estes

- Everyone likes:
 - o Senior housing
 - o Pedestrian and bike improvements
 - o Greenways
 - Mixed use on MLK, south of Estes (Concept C)
 - o Pedestrian safety is paramount
- Everyone asked:
 - o Can/how do roundabouts work?
 - o How will proposed office/missed use have an impact on traffic?
 - o What is fiscal impact on Chapel Hill transit?
- Concept A Likes:
 - o Office
 - o Retail shown on MLK, north of Estes
 - o Multifamily
 - o RCD and Jordan Lake buffer with trail
- Concept A Dislikes:
 - o Traffic
 - o Retail
 - Town square at corner of MLK and Estes—not big enough to be worth the trouble
- Concept B Likes:

- o Senior housing—aging in place
- o Mixed-use in northeast corner of MLK/Estes intersection—appropriate
- This plan helps aging-in-place by providing retail and transit for seniors and families. It helps provide services to Carolina North!
- Concept B Dislikes:
 - Closing of Shadowood Drive connection to MLK
- Concept C Likes:
 - Mixed use south of Estes and the RCD buffer is better than office only because it provides options for residents.
 - o Green space on the south side of Estes (buffers area)
- Concept C Dislikes:
 - Senior housing
 - Multifamily
- Additional Ideas:
 - Incubator space across from MLK
 - o Pedestrian improvement above/below MLK
 - o Requiring some senior housing be affordable
 - o Multi-family east of the power lines north of Estes, rather than mixed-use
- Strong Feelings:
 - o Green space
 - o Residential
 - o Housing affordability town-wide
 - o Flexibility

- Concept A:
 - o More dense adjacent to MLK
 - o Add Southern Village type housing west of the power line with the mixed use
 - Mixed reactions to having town square on the corner
 - Like senior housing
 - Need larger buffer with the school
 - o Should be less dense east of the power line
- Concept B:
 - o More dense west of power Line
 - Less dense east of power line
 - o Add buffer with school property
- Concept C:
 - o More dense west of power line
 - o Less dense east of power line
 - o Good internal street networks shown
 - Add buffer with school

- o C is an open ticket- can be anything
- Don't open the fire lane between Wellington and Huntington Drive. Kensington, Wellington, Huntington Drive cannot become thoroughfares.
- Good internal network. Bigger buffer needed between school and development.
- No higher density, keep it R-1
- Do not put new roads/alleys off of Somerset
- Prioritize safety of school children
- We don't need more retail
- We don't need more student housing
- Respect the existing neighborhoods around Estes while keeping traffic contained. Move slowly and carefully in the development of these zones. Don't open fire lane.
- Commercial dense on MLK, west of power line.
- Community gathering spot draws in bike/walking. Lawn/beer garden, summer movies, Weaver Street
- School safety
- Like bike trails

Additional notes from Table 9:

- Residents don't understand the timelines for Horace Williams and Carolina North. Need clarification on when these will develop.
- Current zoning needs to be presented as an alternative
- Can you build on/under the power easement? Roads under the easement? How much in the RCD?
- The multifamily concept is nebulous
- Asking us to approve the lesser of evils (resistance to putting anything on maps)
- Concern for build out near schools
- "density = less safe"
- "Missing opportunity to shape community"
- Each and every concept map represents increase number of school children; another new school will need to be built
- Like concepts with the Town square—larger is better
- Would like neighborhood gathering area—bar/brewery
- No roundabouts on Estes, no roundabouts on MLK/Estes
- Bike lanes and sidewalks both sides of MLK
- Treed median on MLK
- Like insulation from adjacent neighborhoods
- Like internal network/roads on concept C as alternative to MLK/Estes intersection
- Don't like right in/ right out
- Concept C shows roads leading to too much additional traffic to Phillips to avoid MLK/Estes intersection

- "Senior housing is more traffic intensive than student housing"
- "Opposed to student housing" they are not interested in community
- Who decides what "multi-family" turns out to be? Rental, owned, student, grad, etc.
- Challenge- what can be done with existing zoning- hard to visualize (current map)
- Push all retail office MLK front and build to current zoning. What would this look like?
- More density at MLK, less along Estes
- All too dense
- Fullsteam Brewery gathering place where kids are welcome
- Is it realistic to have single family homes on this land (Butler, Rummel)?
- Devalues current homes?
- Pressure to develop, positive versus negative pressure
- Parking- underground? Issue with Walgreens parking
- Make it pedestrian/bike friendly to reduce need for parking
- Not comfortable with discussing any of the concepts without a current zoning concept for comparison
- Want to know when development goes to council
- Increased traffic near MLK will make traffic worse on East Estes
- Picked neighborhood for trees, schools
- East of Power line: R1- single family; West of PowerLine—town square, multi-family housing, worried about parking. Ok with hotel maybe.
- Single family would sell because of schools
- Roundabouts- people don't know how to use them, would people avoid Estes because of roundabout?

CENTRAL WEST FOCUS AREA COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2: MAY 18, 2013 COMMENT SHEET RESPONSE SUMMARY (35 RESPONSES)

Concept Plans: Strengths

- 1. Maintains green, natural spaces, open spaces, natural beauty and biodiversity (5)
 - a. Clear goals for greenways
 - b. Shows respect for green lifestyle
 - c. Vegetated buffers
- 2. Focus on walking, biking and public transportation (6)
 - a. Complete streets
 - b. Ped/bike lane on Estes
- 3. Creates "tasteful destinations" (3)
 - a. Need daycare, fitness center, coffee, small grocery/convenience store
 - b. Commercial space must be appealing to area residents although it also can draw residents from other areas
- 4. Shows respect for families along Estes and in the surrounding area
- 5. Senior housing is good here (6)
 - a. May be acceptable, depending on size of the development
- 6. Prefers Plan A (7)
 - a. Residential focus; low density
 - b. Senior housing, and some retail on MLK
 - c. Like the bike and walking trails near the senior housing
 - d. Like the tree buffers and community park
 - e. Least intrusive
- 7. Likes Concept B (3)
 - a. Mixed use on Estes
 - b. Best balance between desires of local homeowners and pressures that will come with Carolina North
 - c. Offers social spaces, bike paths, and pedestrian walkability all good
- 8. Likes Concept C (3)

- a. Concept C is strongest for the future of the area considers different lifestyles; is multigenerational
- b. Likes retail in this concept
- c. Likes large town square
- 9. Reflects reality that town will grow and will require commercial activity
- 10. Supports higher density; likes multigenerational approach
- 11. Plans seem well thought-out if development has to happen
- 12. The fact that developers are asking for input is fabulous --- thank you!
- 13. "None" or No Response ("None"=6; No Response=11)
 - a. None are compatible with existing character; the densities are too high

Concept Plans: Concerns

- 1. Major concern is traffic on Estes (16)
 - a. Estes needs to be calmed and slowed; use the existing width, narrow the car lanes, and add sidewalks and bike lanes that will truly protect bikers
 - b. Concerned about how traffic will be handled; show numbers
 - c. Traffic in Chapel Hill must be addressed if change is to occur; most of the traffic on Estes is through-traffic
 - d. How will Estes handle the level of development proposed in Concepts B and C?
 - e. Increased traffic congestion will discourage residents on North side of Estes from ever going downtown
 - f. Internal roads should avoid going over streams
 - g. In Concept A, how does one access housing south of Estes if you are coming from the public library?
 - h. Car cut-throughs would have a significant negative impact on lifestyle of people living there; gives more weight to people rushing through town by car
- 2. Traffic circles (5)
 - a. Consider greater use of roundabouts and raised crosswalks
 - b. Will not be effective on Estes; do not help traffic flow
 - c. Traffic lights are safer for pedestrians and children
 - d. Add additional stop lights on Estes instead of traffic circles
- 3. Concerns about types of housing/densities and uses shown (16)

- a. Multifamily: needs to be better defined apartments will increase density and resource requirements (schools, traffic) much more than town homes or condos
- b. Keep some R-1 on plan instead of multifamily for all of the residential (Alternative A)
- c. Keep single family homes as an option for part of the area; perhaps only develop a portion of the area as high density
- d. Concept A is too crowded -- too many families
- e. "High density": will adversely affect traffic oppose Concepts B and C
- f. All of the plans seem to assume that the area will develop at high densities
- g. Proposals are too dense (look at R-2 and R-3 intermediate densities)
- h. No 4-story apartments
- i. Put senior housing next to retail so older people can get to stores
- j. North of Estes should be residential, low density (single family homes would be most consistent with adjacent neighborhoods, or possibly townhomes). No student housing.
- k. Don't like mixed use on Estes
- I. Mixed use in Concept C is an "open ticket" for unsure development; is too vague
- m. All of the plans have too much retail and office; one even has a hotel these uses do not fit on this small island of land that is surrounded by Carolina North and residential areas; this is too small an area to become a viable commercial and office sector. That type of mix needs better road access and a larger area.
- n. Concepts B and C show too many businesses close to busy MLK/Estes corner
- o. "If I wanted to live in Southern Village, I would move there" don't want retail, mixed use or student housing
- 4. Encourage provisions for multi-ages: senior housing and families
- 5. Leave current zoning in place wherever possible (10)
 - a. Why is "non-development" not on the table?
 - b. Why should developers who bought R-1 land be rewarded with the ability to raise the density, just to enrich themselves but greatly diminish the quality of life for the rest of us (developers should pay for any new streets going through their developments).
 - c. Would the developer of the land between Somerset and the schools be willing to sell the land to the neighborhood? This land should remain R-1.
 - d. Against any development in this area the corner of MLK and Estes is green and important ecologically, and shouldn't be turned into an urban area
- 6. Address stormwater run-off (4)
 - a. Resulting from more impermeable surfaces
- 7. Study impact on Chapel Hill finances (2)
 - a. Will increase the need for additional resources: schools, traffic, public services (police, fire, EMS); increase run-off

- 8. Target retail to neighborhood needs (2)
 - a. Some of the commercial development assumes a lifestyle that doesn't reflect that of the people who live there (e.g., coffee shop to meet friends)
- 9. Want "quality" development (3)
 - a. Do not want "soul-less" development (e.g., Shadowood, which is a car park)
 - b. Quality construction and aesthetically pleasing
 - c. Don't trust developers to build the kinds of environments that are shown in the precedents
- 10. Plans do not do enough to protect neighborhoods from effects of development (3)
 - a. Increased traffic on Estes: detrimental to schools and adjacent neighborhoods
 - b. Opening the parcels on either side of Somerset to dense housing (a total of 1,000 people in two parcels!) will overwhelm the schools; and there is not enough room to put in roads, alleys, and multifamily housing.
- 11. Build so that people can rethink car-based living
- 12. More peripheral neighborhoods should connect to MLK-Estes corner via connected side streets
- 13. Affordable housing
 - a. Do not include affordable housing that will lower the value of existing homes
- 14. Open space issues (3)
 - a. Need more trees, vegetated buffers; more green space
 - b. Encourage a pre-school playground in the area
 - c. Keep open space away from power lines
 - d. Do not like the town square in Concept A at corner of Estes and MLK
- 15. Start off with existing conditions map, not current intentions
 - a. Compare current intentions with current zoning
- 16. No response = 3

Additional Comments

- 1. How will the addition of new families impact the census at our Estes schools; will they become more crowded? (9)
 - a. How will the increased traffic impact school safety for biking and walking?
 - b. Protect our schools

- c. Apartment owners do not pay taxes but get access to schools that are known for their excellence. Their free access to our schools will put significant stress on their existence.
- 2. Consider ways to make it safer to cross MLK (6)
 - a. Pedestrian/bike bridge
 - b. Better crosswalks/yields
- 3. Don't open the fire lane between Wellington and Huntington (6)
- 4. All density should be moved to MLK
- 5. Accommodate business incubators
- 6. Provide bus pull-outs along Estes
- 7. Workshop attendees are skewed to retirees or near-retirees. Make sure families living in the area (who don't have time to attend meetings) can weigh in; or figure out what will attract young people and families with school age children to the area and plan for what is important to them (2)
- 8. Focus on long-term generational changes --- in 20 years, the currently "younger" generation still might not be driving cars
- 9. More "town square space" north of Estes (green)
- 10. OK to have low density commercial along MLK (ground level and small scale); no hotel
- 11. We should have been informed that maintaining the current residential zoning is an option
- 12. Provide a sidewalk on north side of Estes to the schools (2)
- 13. Encourage conversion of existing space in neighborhood homes to small apartments to increase density slightly while preserving neighborhood character. This can be done through tax breaks/incentives.
- 14. Don't turn MLK or Estes into a "building tunnel". Limit building heights, and set them back so they are not directly on the street, but rather have green space, limited height and visibility into the interior of the site.
- 15. The area is suitable for work force and affordable housing, a mix of apartments and condominiums at various price levels. The amount of development should be constrained to avoid excessive traffic impacts --- some senior housing and some R-1.
- 16. Carolina North is not happening soon please do not put the cart before the horse (3)
 - a. Why disrupt neighborhoods and put additional stress on town budgets with development plans when CN may not happen for many years?
- 17. No new commercial is needed
- 18. Address parking
- 19. Address impacts on wild animals
- 20. Improve transportation town-wide
- 21. Don't like Concepts B or C: no businesses on Estes please.
- 22. "You are not representing the community, but only the developers and land owners" (2)
 - a. The process has been very "pro-development" and not representative of the existing community
- 23. Parks, recreational space, walking trails, a botanical garden or outdoor gallery would all be OK

CENTRAL WEST FOCUS AREA FARMER'S MARKET INFORMATION BOOTH: MAY 18, 2013 COMMENT SHEET RESPONSE SUMMARY (10 responses)

CONCEPT PLAN: STRENGTHS

- 1. Creating bike paths on Estes/MLK connector (2)
- 2. Keeping RCD buffers look for recreation/environmental opportunities
- 3. Like senior housing Concepts A and B (2)
- 4. Liked mixed uses (2)
 - a. Prefer Concept B if it would provide shopping and restaurant options for multifamily and senior residents
- 5. Like Plan B best Southern Village concept
- 6. Like the idea of roundabouts to help traffic flow
- 7. Prefer Concept C, with senior housing
- 8. Love the vegetated buffer in all the concept plans

CONCEPT PLAN: CONCERNS

- 1. Missing existing bike path along Estes
- 2. Need a bike/ped path that goes to destinations
- 3. Concern with traffic on Estes toward Franklin, especially during school "in/out" periods
- 4. Want to maximize possible road connections in Concept C
- 5. Will the roundabouts work on Estes?
- 6. Is design-based coding allowed under North Carolina law (first priority of homebuilders is to disallow design standards)?

ADDITIONAL IDEAS

- 1. Focus on bike/ped connectivity that links Estes to Carolina North, Bolin Greenway/campus to campus connector (3)
 - a. Need "real" bike lanes and sidewalks; crossings at schools
 - b. Want a safe bike route from this area to Carolina North (also need one from the Durham boundary (Pope Road))
- 2. Phillips Middle School is in a walk/bike zone and there are no sidewalks and the sides of the roads are very dangerous with curves and blind spots. So, students who should walk or bike to school are being driven. Need to accommodate this group with safe bike/ped, but am concerned that the neighborhood will not agree to sidewalks being installed.
- 3. Live in Summerfield Crossing and want a good bike option to get to Carrboro/Warren St. and area.
- 4. Include a permanent spot for a Farmers' Market (3)
 - a. Rival Carrboro!