**Public Information Meeting/Joint Advisory Boards and Commissions**

*Wednesday, March 11, 2015*

**Representatives from the following Boards/Commissions are present:**

* Community Design Commission
* Planning Commission
* Parks, Greenways, and Recreation
* Environmental Stewardship Advisory Board
* Transportation and Connectivity Board
* Stormwater Advisory Board

**Questions:**

**Incorporation of community input**

* Q: Has anything been incorporated in the development agreement that came from community input?
* A: Yes, soil erosion standards from a public meeting, the compass committee was a citizen group, comment at the council meeting to look at stormwater both on and off the site.

**Rezoning**

* Q: Please clarify how the rezoning covers just a portion of the site, yet the development agreement covers the entire site.
* A: that is right – the rezoning is just a portion.
* Q: When you do a rezoning, could there be a subsequent development in the future of the conservation area?
* A: What you would want is to require permanent conservation in the development agreement.
* Q: So when the conservation land is put aside, does this land get dedicated by deed to the Town so that it becomes permanent as a conservation area?
* A: That can happen; that is not a decision the Council and applicant have decided yet.
* Applicant: Yes, it is going to go into a permanent conservation so that it cannot be developed for commercial, for-profit, or non-profit use.

**Boards/Commissions’ Feedback**

* Q: Concern: If the Stormwater board is meeting on the 24th, meanwhile, there are negotiation sessions going on – can you listen to our input while the negotiation sessions are going on?
* A: Yes, other Boards may have a similar question. If an individual has something they would like to communicate, please do so. As Boards, you can also send them to us and/or the Council. We also have the Public Hearings in April and May. There is still a lot of time for us to hear and work on the document.
* Q: Question about the schedule – once the Public Hearing starts, does that change what can be discussed about the development? If the intent that an agreement be reached on June 8th?
* A: This is not like a special use permit. Conservations can continue to happen. The schedule now is for a possible decision on June 8th, but we will see how that goes.
* Q: Is the idea regarding the Advisory Boards for us to comment on individual items or to provide an overview of all the pieces and place in a single document to you and to the Council?
* A: Both types of input are helpful. Being specific and more general are both helpful.
* Q: When do you anticipate having a “final” draft that we can comment on?
* A: What we have out today is pretty complete in terms of topics and content. We will try to highlight where things have changed. A final draft won’t really be until the Council has adopted the development agreement.

**Scale of development**

* Q: Because this is a moving target, we don’t have a sense of how large the project is – we are unsure of the size and scale of the project.
* A: There was substantial amount of conversation at the last negotiation session – also on page 23 of the draft development agreement, there is a chart – Council said we can’t say yes or no now, we need to consider all of this, and see what you are doing on other topics.
* Q: Is that the chart that shows the range? A: Chart shows the minimum and maximums. The language could say that you could go up to these maximums, as long as you don’t exceed the other standards.
* Q: How much traffic can 15-501 handle considering the other traffic in the area? What feedback are you receiving from NCDOT?
* A: We’ve been having lots of conservations with our engineers, the applicant’s, and NCDOT, and we also have the TIA that outlines certain mitigations that needs to be done. One of the Council’s discussions with the applicant has focused on Sumac Drive. The Council Sub-Committee that is meeting tomorrow will really be going through this tomorrow. The limiting factors that are associated with development are from the TIA.
* Q: Where did the mitigation measures come from?
* A: An engineering firm and they have been reviewed by NCDOT; we still need to have additional conversations about this.

**Transportation**

* Q: Question about the limiting factors – one of these is the AM peak auto trip generation limits? Will this be the same limit depending on the square footage? I would like to know this number.
* A: We need to reference this source in this section of the document. There was a traffic analysis done, and this is where this number would come from. We will get that number to you – it is in the TIA.
* Q: Can you talk about the proposal of the pedestrian bridge?
* A: Aligns with the southernmost parking of the Park and Ride Lot/Southern Community Park and Highland Park.
* Q: Is the image of the bride you’ve been showing still illustrate what you are thinking?
* A: We are thinking of the bridge similar to the one at Vanderbilt and will be 12 foot rail to rail to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.
* Q: Use has a big impact on transportation, and we have seen the use change dramatically. Will the TIA be updated?
* A: We haven’t to date talked about updating the TIA. We are capping uses based on the TIA that we have today. This is a good question; let me take that in and I can ask if we should be considering this.
* Q: I understand that there is a loop proposed for 54 and 15-501 and this is a key piece of the mitigation. I understand the NCDOT has concerns about if this will fit on the site. Where do we stand with NCDOT on this? I understand it would cost a lot.
* A: We are still working on this and having conversations with NCDOT. NCDOT has identified this as a future “TIP” project that would look to provide state funding for improvements on this area. Also, some improvements should be done before development begins, other afterwards. The “menu of options” really assumes after full built-out.
* Q: Is there any plan for future development of the 15-501 corridor from this area to the boundaries of the town/county limit? Obey Creek brings up the question of traffic, but the reality is that if there is future plans for the development of the area, then it is an additive effect. There doesn’t seem to be a plan.
* A: There is existing zoning, the comprehensive plan that has design guidelines for this area, the discussions for this area and the ones across the street at the Southern Village Park and Ride Lot Area. The question depends too on the timeline that is being considered.
* Councilmember Palmer: This will be a walkable area and will address the average 6 trips that people will take. Creating communities that are dense and have commercial cores will allow people to run errands without using their cars. And will provide amenities to those living in Southern Village. Also want the Southern Village Park and Ride Lot to serve the area.

**Parks and Greenways**

* Q: On the greenways and recreation section, for the properties beyond the development, have community gardens, community walkways – what will be the responsibility for covering the costs/maintenance of these? Will everyone in Chapel Hill have access to the parks in Obey Creek?
* A: As a baseline, we would like to see public access – this can be written into the agreement. We have talked about a dedication to the Town, but maintenance of the area is the responsibility of the Master Owners Association – maintenance of the trails, the conservation area.
* Applicant: The land is dedicated to the Town, and maintenance of the conservation area would be the responsibility of the master owners association/the developed part of the property. The community garden would be allowed and would be maintained by the association.
* Q: Gravel trails are one level of maintenance, but if the Town would like to have ADA accessibility, then would the Town have to pay for this?
* A: All of this is still under discussion – one thing both parties have agreed to is the desirability of minimal development of the east side of the creek. When we talk about ADA trails, then this is no longer minimal development – impacts slopes, impervious surfaces, etc. At this time, the staff is not interested in recommending this. We would like to link this development to Southern Village with a pedestrian bridge – this would provide links to the ADA accessible trails near Southern Village. We are not interested at this time in providing paved trails on the east side of the creek. Everything on the west side of the creek would be ADA accessible; everything on the east side would not be. We still need to discuss how the conservation easement would be detailed – the development agreement would require a restoration plan and must address certain topics and is due by a certain date, but the plan may not be fully drafted when the agreement is adopted.
* Q: Would there be any utilities on the east side?
* A: No, I don’t anticipate this.
* Q: What is the proposed size of Highland Park?
* A: An acre and a half-ish.

**Design Guidelines**

* Q: I would like to have a detailed review of the design guidelines. If there is time, can you walk through these? The agreement refers to the “Town Guidelines” – have these been designed by the Town? (Page 11 of the development agreement)
* A: The Design Guidelines have been developed by the applicant; the Town has the design guidelines for roadways.
* Q: Questions about the model: Do these accurately reflect the heights of the buildings?
* Applicant: Generally speaking it is, but not completely – we have updated the plans since the model was developed.
* Councilmember Palmer: This is an area where feedback from the Advisory Boards is important in many ways – for example, we were asking about the sidewalks and wanting to ensure that the design accommodates many abilities. We don’t have any guidelines about visibility. If Advisory Board members have expertise, we would appreciate that.
* Q: In the design guidelines, where it says “unacceptable” – life changes, things may become acceptable. When it says “recommended,” does that mean it will happen? Does “unacceptable” mean it won’t? How fluid are these terms?
* A: This is a great question – would be helpful to have the CDC’s feedback about this.
* Applicant team member: These design guidelines go beyond many of the Town’s requirements.
* Q: My question wasn’t to say that you weren’t going above and beyond, just more to be anticipatory.
* Applicant: The Council is accepting this similar to how they would accept other standards. If they want to change this, then they would need Council action.
* Councilmember Palmer: I am concerned about this, I don’t want to dictate what awnings my Town allows in 20 years. What is someone wants a psychedelic awning? In 20 years, this may seem to be very over-regulated. But what we put in here is what we are going to get.
* Councilmember Ward: I would defend the current design guidelines – this is creating an area that has a very good feel. From this conversation, I have heard that there is a need to look at the wording and be sure that these can change with the times. This isn’t something that the Town is mandating, rather supporting the developer to be successful.
* Applicant team member: It is very likely that we will be back to the Council in three years or so to request minor changes.
* A: There are items that can be changed administratively, usually minor items. To change anything significant or substantial, then we would need to return to the Council.
* Q: These design guidelines really impact many of the boards, not just the CDC. If the development agreement gets adopted, then what happens when specific pieces come in for development? Will the CDC ever have a role in applying the design guidelines to a specific piece of the project?
* A: We haven’t had that conversation yet. The typical process is that everything is included in the development agreement, and when development comes through, then the applicant would complete a lengthy application and it would be administrative review of the development.

**Affordable Housing**

* Q: What AMI does the housing voucher serve?
* A: The rent is set around 60% AMI, the voucher is set up so that the tenant pays 30% of their income.
* Q: How many of the units would likely be for sale and how many would be for rentals?
* A: The Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance would apply to the for-sale units. Largely a market-driven answer – if all of the housing was built today, most of it would be rental.
* Q: Has there been any feedback about the 5% of the rental housing?
* A: The Sub-Committee had representatives from the Council, staff, and affordable housing providers. We have heard positive comments about
* Councilmember Cianciolo: What we heard from the non-profit providers is that it is hard to get financing if you have too many affordable units. They all agreed that once you get above a certain level, banks don’t want to finance a project. We had to operate within today’s reality.
* Councilmember Ward: Also, there is more of a cost bore by the developer to provide these at 60% and these are the hardest to finance/provide and is one of the greatest needs in our community.

**Retail**

* Q: What does the retail makeup look like for the development?
* A: Section 5.1 has the chart we mentioned earlier – minimums and maximums are listed for retail.

**Stormwater**

* Q: Do any of the design guidelines have guidance about how to contrast a sidewalk or areas outside of buildings that address stormwater?
* A: One item you mentioned was updating the guidelines for low-impact development; yes, there isn’t much in our guidelines about this. For sidewalk paving – you can look at low-impact design to provide some pervious pavement. We haven’t had discussions about including pervious pavements. One of the options from the state guidelines is pervious pavement. The development agreement currently contains technical standards that need to be met.
* Applicant team member: Two-thirds of the site will be left undeveloped which will help reduce stormwater runoff. This is an urban space, so have an opportunity for pervious pavements and suspended pavement.
* Q: Have you looked at the EPA’s new stormwater calculator?
* A: Yes, and the state has additional calculators as well.
* Q: Can you speak to your thoughts about having the building operating as efficiently as possible?
* Applicant: We haven’t fleshed this out fully. We would like to have these operate efficiently and would be interested in having solar here. High level standards still have to be discussed.
* Q: If our Board would like to recommend standards, then we should do that?
* A: Yes!

**Housing**

* Q: are there plans to target certain age groups for housing?
* A: Yes, we do intend to dedicate a significant portion of the housing for 55+ and 65+.