

## Notes from Planning Board’s Discussion about the Draft Central West Small Area Plan Annotated to Show CW Steering Committee Responses

*Planning Board Discussion Held on October 29, 2013*

*Prepared by: Amy Ryan, Steering Committee Co-Chair and Planning Board member, November 2013*

### Planning Board Comments and Steering Committee Responses

At our November 7th meeting, the Central West Steering Committee reviewed the Planning Board’s comments on the draft Small Area Plan. You’ve received an exhaustive memo on the comments we reviewed and final revisions we adopted, but I thought an annotated copy of the original Planning Board comments from the meeting might show the Steering Committee’s responses most clearly.

The numbers in the chart below refer to the item numbers in the document titled “Revisions and Amendments to the Draft Central West Small Area Plan” which is Attachment 2 in the Central West item in the Planning Board packet for the November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

If a change was not made (for instance because the Small Area Plan already addressed that concern), I’ve included the Committee’s rationale. These can be found in more detail in the document titled “Responses to Comments Received about the draft Central West Small Area Plan” which is Attachment 3 in Central West item.

Comments that reflect approval of the draft Central West Small Area Plan are indicated by “OK”; comments of a general nature not asking for specific action from the Committee are labeled “NA.” Some comments would require Council-level decisions and are labeled as such.

<b>Suzanne Haff’s Comments</b>			
<b>Planning Board Member Comment</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 2</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 3</b>	<b>Other Response</b>
A topographic map should be included in the plan.	#6		
Consider the land swap idea.	#20	#40	
The specifics about the Resource Conservation District (i.e., 150 feet, etc.) and steep slopes should be included in the plan so that people in the future will understand why certain decisions were made.		#39	
A stormwater district should be considered for this area. (A district would entail that the properties that have water running through them should pay into a fund).	#21		
Should the stormwater plan be completed before the zoning is rewritten?			Council Decision
Heights on MLK are fine.			OK
Concerned about the appearance of the buildings; they need to be articulated. Do	#22		

not want to have cookie cutter houses. Like the appearance of the homes in Chapel Watch Village – a nice design. Want buildings that have variety.			
Encourages the Town to use sketch-up to draw an image of their proposed plan.			Council Decision
Can we get a written statement from Todd LoFrese that the schools can handle the growth proposed in the Steering Committee’s plan?			See email from Megan Wooley sent 11/18/2013 for information from Todd LoFrese

<b>Melissa McCullough’s Comments</b>			
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 2</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 3</b>	<b>Other Response</b>
Heights on MLK are fine.			OK
<b>Want to be sure to have a critical mass so that we don’t set up businesses to fail here.</b>			Significant construction at the Central West commercial area north of Estes will depend on lifting of the Airport Hazard District, which is likely to remain in place until construction at Carolina North begins. This means that commercial development should occur in step with an increase of potential customers from the CN campus. The residents of new development in the area, as well as existing neighbors, will also help make a robust customer base.)
Like transitions to existing housing in the plan. We need multi-family in Chapel Hill.			OK
Traffic is the biggest concern; I tend to trust the traffic models more than conventional wisdom.			OK
Would like to counter the statement that new urbanism doesn’t work well as infill – it does work well as infill.			N/A
Would like to examine concerns about the rare	#20	#59	

habitat forest.			
A while until we will get rid of cars, but would like people to use them rarely.			N/A

<b>Deborah Fulghieri's Comments</b>			
<b>Planning Board Member Comment</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 2</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 3</b>	<b>Other Response</b>
Small Area Plans don't talk to each other. Other plans have been presented as "gateways" into Chapel Hill; I don't see the integration of all these Small Area Plans together.			Council Decision
Regarding the heights on MLK: I'm in favor of setbacks.			OK
My real estate friends say that condos aren't selling.			N/A
Hope that residential quality of Chapel Hill does not go away.			Current plan proposes 70% residential in the CW area, no commercial space abutting existing single-family homes.

<b>Kimberly Brewer's Comments</b>			
<b>Planning Board Member Comment</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 2</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 3</b>	<b>Other Response</b>
Are the density numbers included in the plan?	#11		
Would be good for the plan to state what the Steering Committee had in mind for "mix of uses."		#42	
Having the existing conditions as the second chapter made the vision statement feel disconnected from the principles and concept plan; should be clearer about how these are connected.	#1 and #4		
Need to vary the heights so that it doesn't look like a uniform mass.	#22		
What a missed opportunity if had senior housing here and not	#23		

workforce housing.			
Need to micromanage stormwater where it falls; use low impact infrastructure.			Such recommendations would be part of the Stormwater Master Plan called for in Chapter 6.
Need a better discussion of the drivers of the Concept Plan.	#1		
To the Council: Need to consider mobility; could have total gridlock in Chapel Hill.			Council Decision
Add a principle that says no widening of Estes Drive.	#13		
Don't have failing intersections and failing air quality.			Intersection flow is addressed in traffic analysis.
Demand management is very important.			Steering committee based many of its land-use choices on minimizing traffic at peak hours.
Consider shared parking, lease parking, payment-in-lieu for parking and other ideas.	#25	#63	
A traffic sensitivity analysis would be helpful.			Council would have to authorize additional budget; no current funds for such analysis.
Need to have a strong statement regarding developing a partnership with UNC for workforce housing.	#23		
Heights are on MLK are fine.			OK
Need to vary/break up the massing.	#22		
Support no tall buildings on the ridge line.	#20		
If there are sensitive species, support a land swap.	#20	#40	
Consider public/private partnerships for shared stormwater management.	#23		
Objectives need to be more specific if two different plans could be developed based on these.			The committee wanted specifically to leave some flexibility in the plan to allow developers room to come up with innovative projects; weighing how well a project meets multiple plan objectives and prioritizing

			some objectives over others will be part of Council's approval process.
--	--	--	---

<b>Amy Ryan's Comments</b>			
<b>Planning Board Member Comment</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 2</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 3</b>	<b>Other Response</b>
The Steering Committee would love to have an endorsement of the plan from the Planning Board.			Requires Planning Board action.
This plan will plug the donut-hole in the center of town for bicycle and pedestrian amenities.			OK
Supports the plan.			OK

<b>John Ager's Comments</b>			
<b>Planning Board Member Comment</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 2</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 3</b>	<b>Other Response</b>
The Steering Committee's plan looks great. I love it. I really do.			OK
Michael Parker said that this looks like an "operations research problem," and I agree.			N/A
Hope the Council will do something with this plan.			Council Decision
We need a lot more connectivity, more bold thinking, and more of an understanding that millennials think different than past generations.			N/A
I think Estes Drive will be widened one day. You need to move large numbers of people. Either done by widening Estes Drive or a complicated set of traffic mitigations.	#19	#8	
We should demand that the Council look at the traffic impacts of the whole Town, of all the focus area plans put together.			Council Decision
Carolina North is absolutely coming.			N/A

<b>Jason Baker's Comments</b>			
<b>Planning Board Member Comment</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 2</b>	<b>Item Number in Attachment 3</b>	<b>Other Response</b>
Could be useful to have the existing conditions as a visualization, in sketch-up (tree heights, etc.).			Council Decision
Comfortable with the heights on MLK.			OK

This is what we will be seeing along MLK.			
Want the buildings to do a good job interfacing with the street.	#22		
Need to say why we are doing all of this. Need a proactive statement at the beginning of the plan.	#3		
There is poor connectivity in the neighborhoods; disappointed that there is not more connectivity, but understand why.			N/A
Most of the area in the impact area is not within a quarter mile of a bus stop.			N/A

## **Economic Development/Fiscal Analysis**

*Prepared By: Chapel Hill Economic Development Office and Planning Department, November 2013*

A fiscal analysis was conducted of the Steering Committee's Concept Plan based upon the density information that was used for the traffic analysis. Based on this data, rough estimates show that this plan would be revenue neutral which means that the costs to the Town would equal the revenue generated by the new development.

The following table provides an overview of the projected value, taxes, and jobs that possible new development would provide:

<b>Central West Economic Impact Potential</b>							
<b>Use</b>	<b>Square Feet</b>	<b>Projected Value per Square Foot</b>	<b>Projected Value</b>	<b>Town of Chapel Hill Taxes</b>	<b>Cost of Services/ Benefit</b>	<b>Benefit to Town</b>	<b>Jobs</b>
Residential (Multi-family, 566 units)	509,400	\$150	\$76,410,000	\$393,511.50	at \$1.14 per \$1	\$5,509.16	
Residential (Single-family, 54 units)	48,600	\$150	\$7,290,000	\$37,543.50	at \$0.85 per \$1	<b>-\$5,631.52</b>	
Office/ Commercial/ Institutional	180,000	\$150.00	\$27,000,000	\$139,050.00	at \$1.14 per \$1	\$1,946.70	720
Hotel	65,000	\$175.00	\$11,375,000	\$58,581.25	at \$1.14 per \$1	\$820.14	
Retail	25,000	\$100.00	\$2,500,000	\$12,875.00	at \$1.14 per \$1	\$180.25	28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>828,000</b>		<b>\$124,575,000</b>	<b>\$641,561.25</b>		<b>\$2,824.72</b>	<b>748</b>
<b>Note:</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residential calculated at 900SF average</li> <li>- Projected values from previously used studies</li> <li>- Town of Chapel Hill tax rate .515</li> <li>- Jobs estimated at 1/250SF office and 1/900SF retail</li> </ul>							

### **Cost of Single-Family Residential Units**

- The Concept Plan has an estimated 54 single-family residential units with 12 units in the southern part of the planning area and 42 units north of Estes Drive in the planning area.
- Single-family units (both detached and attached) provide 80-90¢ for every \$1 of the cost of services that the Town provides.
- Therefore, the estimated 54 single-family houses would provide \$43.20-\$48.60 for every \$54 of services provided by the Town.

### **Cost of Multi-Family Residential Units**

- The Concept Plan has an estimated 566 multi-family residential units.
- Multi-family units (including apartments, condominiums, and senior housing) provide \$1.07-\$1.20 for every \$1 of the cost of services that the Town provides.
- Therefore, the estimated 566 multi-family houses would provide \$605.62-\$679.20 for every \$566 of services provided by the Town.

The Steering Committee's Concept Plan provides a guide for future development; the actual fiscal impact of new development in this area will depend upon market conditions over time. Based on what is known today, these are the best estimates we can provide.





Date: November 18, 2013

To: Megan Wooley, Housing and Neighborhood Planner

From: Todd LoFrese, Assistant Superintendent for Support Services

Re: Draft Central West Small Area Plan

The draft Central West Small Area Plan has been publicly shared and is currently being reviewed by planning boards and the community. It is our understanding that this draft plan will be discussed at an upcoming Town Council meeting. District administration has reviewed the draft plan and would like to offer comments and feedback for consideration.

The small area plan document is broken into eight sections. This review is limited to the impact of the plans development on future student enrollment levels and Section 5: Transportation.

**Future Student Enrollment:**

Annually, the district updates 10 year enrollment projections. These projections are used to determine when new schools will be needed to keep up with enrollment growth and are described in the Schools Adequate Facilities Ordinance (SAPFO). New development approval processes require a Certificate of Adequate Public Schools (CAPS) from the district. The district calculates the expected impact of new development on enrollment levels and determines whether there is sufficient space within the schools, and if there is, the district issues a CAPS. The draft Central West Small Area Plan proposes the following types and quantity of units; 566 multifamily units, 12 single family unit, and 42 townhome units.

Based on this proposal information and the current formula used to calculate the impact (student generation rates), we would expect that the number of students generated across all school levels (K-12) would total 62 students. Please see the chart below:

Housing Style	# Units	Gen. Rate	New Students
Apt.	566	0.07	40
Single Family	12	0.603	7
Townhouse	42	0.35	15
		Total	62

We currently have available capacity in our schools for this type of development. It should be noted that recently approved and constructed multifamily developments have been exceeding the anticipated number of students predicted by the student generation rates. The district has requested that Orange County Commissioners consider conducting a new study to determine if the rates should be updated.

### **Section 5: Transportation**

The district recognizes and is concerned about traffic levels on Estes Drive and some of the streets surrounding our schools. Each day a significant number of students walk, bike, or are dropped off at Phillips Middle School and Estes Hills Elementary School. The district is concerned about traffic levels and safe routes for students to get to school. Recently we have added an additional crossing guard at Estes Hills Elementary School and required that the school resource officer at Phillips Middle School provide traffic control when students are arriving and dismissing from school. This is in direct response to rising traffic levels and safety concerns.

New development in the immediate area and across the community will likely increase traffic levels on Estes Drive. The draft report makes several recommendations to improve safety in the area and these measures would be supported by the district. Specifically the following sections and recommendations of the report are noteworthy:

Page 50:

- Improving the bicycle and pedestrian amenities in the area
- Work with the Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools, including parents and administrators, to consider road crossing improvements at the intersection of the schools and Estes Drive.
- Implement crosswalk improvements throughout the entire area, with particular attention being paid to intersections and bus stops.

Page 51:

- Providing more bicycle lanes, both on-road and off-road
- Building new sidewalks
- Nurturing the greenway system
- Increasing the safety and visibility of pedestrian and bicyclists
- Implementing traffic calming measures
- Having conversations with the North Carolina Department of Transportation about lowering the speed on Estes Drive
- Providing more passing room for vehicles, buses, and bicycles

Pages 51 to 56:

- A multiuse trail along Estes Drive is proposed. The draft plan provides several cross sections that depict improvements in pedestrian safety, including bicycle lanes and wider natural barriers between the road way and the sidewalks. A 10'-12' multi use trail is proposed on the school side of the Estes Drive that would further enhance safety and walk ability.

The district is also in the process of developing long term plans for facility improvements. Bus and student drop off configuration improvements at Phillips and Estes Hills will be part of our long term plans. These efforts, along with the recommendations in the report should improve safety and mitigate traffic. Finally, please know that district administration will continue to work closely with Town staff and we are available as a resource for future discussions on this and other development areas. Thank you for considering this feedback.