**Public Hearing and Advisory Board/Commission Comments   
Obey Creek Development Agreement Process**

*Prepared by: Office of Planning and Sustainability, Town of Chapel Hill*

*Last revised: June 10, 2015*

| **Number  (for reference)** | **Comment** | **Staff Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Public Hearing Comments**  *The following comments were received during the June 8, 2015 Business Meeting. For a video of the meeting,* [*click here*](http://chapelhill.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=7&clip_id=2422)*.[[1]](#footnote-1)* | |
| 1 | Polly Van de Velde: Reporting for CDC - Highlighting points from the CDC memo that was sent to the Council – emphasis on design. Support urban/suburban boulevard. Slip street should be mandatory with minimal interruption. Have landscaped medians. Plan for ped/bike first, cars second. | Staff responses to the Community Design Commission memo can be found below. |
| 2 | Neal Bench: Reporting for Planning Commission – Providing more detailed description of reasoning – Main conversation from the Planning Commission meeting on June 2, 2015: is the rezoning consistent with the comprehensive plan? Listed areas of concern. For the rezoning, ended with a vote of 3-4. Some comments were that Commissioners could vote for the rezoning, but not for the Resolution of Consistency with the comprehensive plan. Also provided comments on the development agreement. Would like staff to put together a feasibility study on a smaller development. Both are beneficial to the Town. Smaller development – less traffic. | Staff responses to the Planning Commission comments can be found below. |
| 3 | Susan Lindsay: Asking that you explicitly commit funding for Dogwood Acres drive in the development agreement. Dogwood Acres Drive will be directly impacted by the traffic from Obey Creek – can see this in the HNTB report. Reasonable to assume that traffic will double or triple on this road. The direct impact that this neighborhood will have literal, physical impacts – someone biking on this road is likely to be hit by a car. In the past, the Town has ignored its impact on adjacent areas until the harm becomes clear. This is a minuscule amount of money – small amount compared to the benefits provided to the Town – encumber money for specific purpose. Can the commitment be conditional on certain requirements being fulfilled? | See Section 5.4(f)(2)(ii) in the proposed Obey Creek Development Agreement. |
| 4 | Dale Coker: This is a petition – Petition is to ask you to forestall your vote on the Obey Creek agreement and to ask to bring NCDOT into a stronger role. Nearby growth and Obey Creek will create traffic and will be on roads owned by NCDOT – will bear the burden of regional growth. | For more information about the correspondence between the Town and NCDOT regarding this proposed development, [click here](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/town-hall/departments-services/planning-and-sustainability/development/development-agreement-projects/obey-creek-/obey-creek-meeting-materials)[[2]](#footnote-2) – materials are provided under the “Additional Materials” heading.  On April 13, 2015, the Council passed a Resolution (R-6) forwarding the following comment to the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Board regarding the draft FY 2015-2025 State Transportation Improvement Program:   * Funding for improvements at the South Columbia/Fordham Blvd. interchange should be prioritized and accelerated into the first four years of the TIP.   For a copy of the Resolution, [click here](http://chapelhill.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=7&clip_id=2369&meta_id=96814).[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| 5 | Joe Buonfiglio – Is there anything I could say right now that would cause you to say ‘I think we should evaluate a smaller development for its benefits on the Town and on the traffic’? Some of the lower sized developments come with benefits while drastically reducing traffic benefits. I never hear that from this dais. I only hear 1.5 million square feet and let’s measure the size of tree trucks. A reasonable person would conclude that you aren’t doing your fiduciary responsibilities. | A fiscal and traffic analysis was conducted on two additional scenarios.   * Scenario A reduces the original development plan by removing the apartment use (300 units) for a total development program of 914,357 square feet. This scenario highlights a less-residential mix. * Scenario B reduces the original development plan by removing the hotel and 226,250 square feet of general office. The total development program is 1,033,025. This scenario shows a higher relative cost, but remains fiscally positive.   [Click here for a link to the “Additional Traffic and Fiscal Impacts Scenarios for Obey Creek” document](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/home/showdocument?id=28182).[[4]](#footnote-4) |
| 6 | Buffie Webber: Many of your thoughts about voting were going through my head when we were voting [on the Planning Commission]. Clear there were changes being made to the development agreement before us. My comments are from when I was coming to the table with the money – I hope the Town will continue to find ways to make faster decisions about these developments. If there was a way for us to be more agile, there would be more possibility for us to get the things we wanted. When reviewing the small area plan, I thought some of the things people wanted were far more finite. I found them to be far more subjective – had we been making the vote closer to when the plan was written, it would have been easier to say this works. I have faith that the Town and EWP will work out the concerns about traffic.  We could not come up with a clear way to separate the Resolution of Consistency and the rezoning. My two major concerns are the transportation and disappointment in the potential level of commercial in the mix. | Comments referred to staff during consideration of planning processes and support of Planning Commission. |
| 7 | Amy Ryan: The negative impacts are evident in how much traffic the roads will have to support – too much auto traffic/car dominated. My Commission/Board members share my concerns: Concrete jungle with no connectivity. Proposed project is too large. Recommend looking at a smaller plan. Please explore scenarios and listen to Advisory Boards. Create a walkable, bikeable southern Chapel Hill area. | The traffic mitigation measures are outlined in Section 5.4: Transportation of the Development Agreement.  Information about the traffic impacts can be found in the Traffic Impact Study dated April 2014 which can be found [here](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/home/showdocument?id=22726).[[5]](#footnote-5) Information about the specific impacts can be found on page 21, and information about the mitigation measures/recommendations can be found on page 29. |
| 8 | Travis Crayton: Staff has been very responsive. I hope you approve the development agreement tonight. We are getting clear benefits from the Town from this project – affordable housing, retail, transit-oriented development. For TOD, we need dense, compact development. The most walkable places are dense areas – when you make a development smaller, it makes the area less walkable. We need development that is urban in form, compact, and dense fits within the urban growth boundary. The preserve is also a major benefit. The final report from the Obey Creek Compass Committee – I provided an analysis of where the vision fits with this development agreement. The Technical Team’s recommendation to approve this – important to note. They also say that this meets best practices for a new urban, walkable area. | Information about the following topics can be found in the proposed Obey Creek Development Agreement:   * Section 5.1: Scale of Development and Uses Permitted * Section 5.2: Affordable Housing * Section 5.4: Transportation |
| 9 | Terry Vance: Memorandums never have negative recommendations in the packet. Don’t purge the packets of the negative – have to go online to find these. Over the past five years, I have had to change by commuting. It is unbearable to see this big of development, with all the traffic. We do not have NCDOT figuring out what this will do to with other developments. I would no longer think of driving my convertible because of the pollution from idling in traffic. Consider smaller development – look at what the DOT says. | The Planning Commission recommendation was included in the Council packet for the proposed text amendment item. Minutes of the June 2, 2015 Planning Commission meeting were emailed to the Council on June 8, 2015.  Advisory Board/Commission comments are posted on the web [here](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/town-hall/departments-services/planning-and-sustainability/development/development-agreement-projects/obey-creek-/obey-creek-meeting-materials).[[6]](#footnote-6) All Advisory Board action minutes are posted [here](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/town-hall/government/boards-commissions/schedules-agendas-minutes).[[7]](#footnote-7) |
| 10 | Monty Brown: Read the fine print of the 27th version of this. The fine print says no materials are prohibited, no bus stop is required. “Consistent with” has been changed to “generally consistent with.” Scenarios – they could build over 400,000 square feet of occupied space. Different options for what the developer could do. Now the developer can go into the RCD – That’s new. You either value the life of the residents or you value a bunch of investors from Maryland. | A transit stop and other amenities are required by Section 5.4(a)(2).  Section 5.16: Stream Buffers states “Relocation of Wilson Creek Lane into the Wilson Creek Resource Conservation District would require Town Council approval.”  Section 5.1: Scale of Development and Uses Permitted outlines the mix of uses allowed at the site. |
| 11 | Pete Andrews: I am concerned that some of the changes are not trivial, tweakable kind of things. I respect the interest to reach a conclusion on this matter. This is a big choice that you are making. Make sure that you get it right. | Comment received by the Town Council. |
| 12 | Jeanne Brown: The information that I handed you is new information – from April 2015; it includes the park and ride lot. The data shows how complex it is to have Obey Creek and the Park and Ride Lot across from one another and using the same intersections. Take the time to think about distributing some of the traffic volume from Obey to the Park and Ride lot. I agree on the importance of the density of place – comes a point when there is too much of a good thing. This isn’t an all or nothing thing. What does it mean that we have said in the development agreement that we would take the road into the RCD.  The section about the stream buffers. I think ceding all the negotiating power to the developer and NCDOT is problematic. This is really worth some thought (road in the RCD). The promise from the developer was that the RCD would be respected. | The Traffic Impact Study for Obey Creek and the possible Southern Village Park and Ride redevelopment can be found [here](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/home/showdocument?id=27273).[[8]](#footnote-8)  Section 5.16: Stream Buffers states “Relocation of Wilson Creek Lane into the Wilson Creek Resource Conservation District would require Town Council approval.” |
| 13 | David Schwartz: Speaking to the issue of scale/overall size. If reduce the number of residential units, can get the same net revenue. One comment is that you need a lot of people there to support the retail – I have never seen research that shows this. Don’t need to have lots of people living on site. Another comment is that we need to go for the larger size to get all the amenities – not true. We are paying for them either way. With a larger build-out, the costs are more hidden. We could float a bond to get all the same amenities and get a lot less traffic. Less build-out is less of a payout for the developer. Are you willing to have more traffic so that the developers can get more money that they might not need? | A fiscal and traffic analysis was conducted on two additional scenarios.   * Scenario A reduces the original development plan by removing the apartment use (300 units) for a total development program of 914,357 square feet. This scenario highlights a less-residential mix. * Scenario B reduces the original development plan by removing the hotel and 226,250 square feet of general office. The total development program is 1,033,025. This scenario shows a higher relative cost, but remains fiscally positive.   [Click here for a link to the “Additional Traffic and Fiscal Impacts Scenarios for Obey Creek” document](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/home/showdocument?id=28182).[[9]](#footnote-9) |
| 14 | Council Member Jim Ward: I would like to understand the nature of those conversations. What are the likely options that we might be able to discuss with NCDOT. A significant part of these traffic issues are details that are out of the purview of the Town staff and Council – that makes me uncomfortable (a conversation between NCDOT and the developer). A few of these that leave things hanging. | The details of future development will be coordinated with NCDOT at the time of any driveway permit application and review. The correspondence the Town has had to date with NCDOT identifies the improvements that will need to be addressed in the future.  Regional transportation improvements will continue to be guided by Council participation in the MPO and TIP process. |
|  | **Community Design Commission Comments**  [Click here for the memo titled “Comments and Recommendations regarding Obey Creek Design Guidelines,*”* May 18, 2015](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/home/showdocument?id=28253)*.”[[10]](#footnote-10)* | |
|  | ***General Comment: The role of the Community Design Commission in reviewing individual building design is described in the Development Agreement, Section 4.9(b)(6).*** | |
| A.1 | Town Council should require the developer to obtain NCDOT permission for design components of Urban/ Suburban Boulevard for any improvements to 15-501. | The Town has been in correspondence with NCDOT regarding improvements in this area. For more information, [click here](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/town-hall/departments-services/planning-and-sustainability/development/development-agreement-projects/obey-creek-/obey-creek-meeting-materials)[[11]](#footnote-11) – materials are provided under the “Additional Materials” heading. |
| A.2 | The one-way frontage road (“slip street”) should be mandatory for the length of the project, wherever possible and with minimal interruption. In addition to establishing an outward-looking development that embraces Southern Village and possible future development on the west side of 15-501, this will provide greater connectivity to sites north and south of this parcel. | Section 5.4(4)(i) of the Development Agreement states that construction of the slip street is required prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy of any building south of Sumac Road. |
| A.3 | Landscaped medians are essential to humane design, therefore road design should use medians to separate through-traffic from local traffic and to provide pedestrian refuges for those who cross 15-501. Language should be added to the Development Agreement and Design Guidelines specifying the use of landscaped medians along 15-501, between through-lanes and frontage roads, and in the two entrance “stem” roads into the development at Sumac Road and Market Street. | Section 5.4(a)(6) of the Development Agreement states “Pedestrian refuge islands shall be provided in crosswalks, subject to NCDOT approval where necessary, for all crossings of 6 lanes or more. |
| B.1 | Plan for ped-bike users first and cars second, especially at intersections, which appear dangerous for pedestrians in the current site plan and NCDOT memo dated May 25, 2015. | Pedestrian and bicyclists amenities are outlined in the Development Agreement in the following sections:   * Section 5.4: Transportation – Section5.4(a)(4) states “Layout of roads shall be generally consistent with Exhibit H [site plan dated June 4, 2015]. If improvements are proposed to circulation within the Developed Property, those improvements shall preserve an appropriate balance between bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular traffic. * Section 5.11: Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge Across US Highway 15-501 * Section 5.10: Greenways and Sidepaths * Section 5.22: Specific Site Development Standards |
| B.2 | Restore the continuous greenway/bikeway around the perimeter of the project that was depicted in earlier site plans. A continuous paved path on the east side of Wilson Creek Drive that would connect to the 15-501 sidepath would provide residents with a loop walking/biking system around the project. | Section 5.8(10) of the Development Agreement states: “The paved sidepath, built to AASHTO and NACTO standards, shall be provided along the Developed Property’s entire frontage of US Highway 15-501. In areas where gaps in the property lines exist, the Developer Owner or Representative shall build the sidepath within NCDOT’s right of way, if NCDOT grants permission for such construction. Construction of each segment of the sidepath shall be completed at the same time as adjacent buildings. |
| B.3 | Landscaped medians with pedestrian refuges on stem roads would soften entrances and signal that cars are entering space where pedestrians are primary users. | Specific roadway improvements can be found in Section 5.4(d): Transportation of the Development Agreement. |
| C.1 | The site plan should provide a significant relief in the facade at the point where Park Lane terminates on Main Street in order to break up the massing of Block J. A large pocket park or plaza at this location will provide a focal point at the end of Park Lane and will simulate a smaller block structure that might not be possible because of topography and/or parking deck. | The Design Guidelines address corner conditions and the accentuation of corners as areas to enhance and articulate, to serve as markers, and to help with wayfinding and orientation (see Corner Conditions & Articulation – Building Design Standards). Highland Park, which is opposite Building J provides a plaza at the intersection of Park and Main. |
| C.2 | Locations of additional small public amenities, such as public squares, plazas and pocket parks, should be built into the conceptual site plan shown in Design Guidelines. The locations of these amenities, along with the locations of the streets, should remain generally consistent with the approved plan. | Information about parks and open space can be found in Section 5.8 of the Development Agreement and on pages 29 and 57-63 of the Design Guidelines. |
| D.1 | The Design Guidelines should require a minimum of 8’x10’ recess every 200 ft of streetfront. Two recesses could be combined to make a pocket park or to provide similar relief in the design. For example, a 16’x10’ recess could be placed every 400 ft. | See General Note above, regarding CDC role in reviewing individual buildings.  The building articulation standards are location in “Articulation – Building Design Standards” of the Design Guidelines. |
| D.2 | Design Guidelines should require that upper stories of residential buildings provide a minimum of 4 ft relief with balconies, bays or recesses. | See General Note above, regarding CDC role in reviewing individual buildings.  Balconies, oriels and terraces are encouraged in “Articulation – Building Design Standards” of the Design Guidelines. |
| E.1 | The design principles articulated in previous versions of the Design Guidelines should be reinstated. | The “planning principles” are located in Section 2: Land Use + Planning Principles of the Design Guidelines. |
| E.2 | All parking garages should be faced with buildings, to minimize visibility of decks. Where not possible, decks must have vegetated screening and/or receive appropriate architectural treatment. | See General Note above, regarding CDC role in reviewing individual buildings.  Also see build typology and Uses and Building Design Standards for additional information. |
| F.1 | Maximum building heights should be established and expressed to reflect Town Council’s preference. This would allow greater predictability for maximum building heights while allowing for generous floor-to-ceiling heights at each story. Parapets and pitched roofs proposed for mechanical equipment purposes and included as part of the allowable height, but not counted as a story. | Information about building typologies can be found on pages 19-24 of the Design Guidelines. |
| F.2 | Create a table that reflects the building, building type and min./max. heights allowed, at the appropriate roads. This would serve as the controlling item in the Development Agreement and eliminate any confusion created by discrepancies between text and illustrations.  For an example of a table, see the Community Design Commission’s memo – a link can be found above. | See updated building typologies, heights and sections in the Design Guidelines.  See also General Note above, regarding CDC role in reviewing individual buildings. |
| F.3 | Review sections of the Design Guidelines and check thoroughly for consistency regarding building heights. Illustrations are not always consistent with the Building Heights map on p.30 or with the principles listed in the Building Typologies in the Design Standards. | See updated building typologies, heights and sections in the Design Guidelines. |
| G.1 | Create detailed building phasing plan as an attachment to the Development Agreement that ensures streets and public amenities are constructed and dedicated at appropriate times. | See process for review and approval of individual buildings as described in the Development Agreement. Phasing and timing is provided for public amenities in Sections 5.3, 5.4 and 5.8 – 5.13 of the Development Agreement |
| G.2 | Building designs should relate proportionally to each other, and materials should be compatible. The context of surrounding buildings, both existing and planned, should be shown as each building is brought to the Community Design Commission for approval. | See updated building typologies, heights and sections in the Design Guidelines. |
| H.1 | Language should be added to the Design Guidelines to make it clear that the principles are mandatory requirements, rather than optional. | Language on the “Contents” page of the Design Guidelines states: “These guidelines are ‘Exhibit J,’ or a component, of the Obey Creek Development Agreement which contains additional regulations and standards for the property. |
| H.2 | In the Ephesus Fordham District, the 60 percent glazing requirement has already caused design problems. That number should be flexible depending on design and use of building, but in no cases should it be less than 50 percent. | Information about glazing percentages can be found in the building typologies section of the Design Guidelines on pages 19-24. |
| H.3 | All lighting should be LED or other high-efficiency lighting. | Information about lighting can be found on page 76 of the Design Guidelines and in Section 5.21 of the Development Agreement.  The Design Guidelines state: “Light will be generated by efficient light sources to save energy and minimize operating costs. |
| H.4 | Buildings should meet high-efficiency building standards established by the US Green Building Council or similar organization. | Section 7: Sustainability Standards of the Design Guidelines states: “Commitment: The Village at Obey Creek will be designed to meet or exceed the requirements for the USGBC LEED Core and Shell, or LEED New Construction standards” (Page 113). |
| H.5 | Because this project abuts a nature preserve, Dark Skies need to be established as a guideline and massive glass expansions need to include bird protection. | Section 5.21 of the Development Agreement states: “Lighting design for the Property will be consistent with IES Standards with respect to illumination levels.”  Additional information about lighting can be found on page 76 of the Design Guidelines and in Section 5.21 of the Development Agreement.  Language about bird protection is proposed for the Design Guidelines. See the proposed language in the attachment to the staff memorandum titled “Consider the Obey Creek Development Agreement” and dated June 15, 2015. |
| H.6 | Hard line protection, such as a chain-linked fence, is needed for the RCD during construction, and consequences for violations need to be significant. | Section 5.18(b): Sediment and Erosion Control of the Development Agreement states that, in regards to perimeter silt fencing, a chain link fence will be used. This surpasses the Orange County requirement of a wire fence. |
| H.7 | Plantings of any material on NC invasive species list should be forbidden. | The following sections in the proposed Development Agreement addresses invasive species at the Obey Creek site:   * Section 5.17(a): Landscaping Standards states: “Landscaping shall be non-invasive.” * Section 5.13(d)(2): Quarry Restoration states that the “restoration plan must include”: “An invasive species management plan – Including target species, methods of control, timelines and schedules, monitoring, potential adaptive management and duration, and responsible parties.” * Section 5.12(e)(vii): Wilson Creek Preserve states that “all uses described shall be consistent with plans and procedures approved by the Town Manager” this includes “invasive plant species management.” |
|  | **Planning Commission Comments**  [Click here for the memo titled “*Update of Commission comments on Obey Creek draft Development Agreement materials,” dated June 5, 2015*](http://www.townofchapelhill.org/home/showdocument?id=28235)*.”[[12]](#footnote-12)*  *Note: Items listed as “Resolved” in the Planning Commission’s “Status” column are not included in this list.* | |
| 1 | Regarding Section 5.1 – The Planning Commission supports the staff recommendation of excluding cemetery, college/university, fraternity/sorority, and rooming houses, and single-family house as allowable uses at Obey Creek as long as that still allows for townhouse units.  This language has been added to the June 3 revision (section 4.6) of the Development Agreement, though the townhouse issue is not mentioned specifically. | Section 5.1(e) of the Development Agreement states that single-family homes are an excluded use, but “not including townhomes.” |
| 2 | Regarding Section 5.10(d) – Concern that no provision has been made for what happens if the Master Owners Associate becomes insolvent and can no longer maintain the development infrastructure. Also conflicting language on whether the Owners Association or Developer will maintain the greenway. | Section 4.24: Assignment of the Development Agreement states: “In the event the Master Owners Association shall fail to fulfill its obligations under this Agreement, its responsibilities shall be assumed by the Developer Owners or Representative, in which case said responsibilities shall be binding upon the Developer Owners and their successors and assigns, enforceable in accordance with the provisions of Section 4.11 of this Agreement.”  Section 5.10(e) states that the Master Owners Association shall maintain the greenways and sidepaths. Section 5.10(h) clarifies that the Developer Owner/Representative will be responsible for the maintenance of the greenways and sidepaths beyond the expiration of the Development Agreement. |
| 3 | Regarding the Design Guidelines -  Staff will has added language to the Section 5.4.a.1 of the June 3 revision stating that 15-501 be designed to meet DOT Complete Streets guidelines, subject to DOT approval.  This is not the same as the Urban/Suburban Boulevard design guidelines from NCDOT’s *Complete Streets Planning and Design Guidelines* manual, that were endorsed by Victor Dover. The Planning Commission repeats our request to have specific language on the Urban/Suburban Boulevard configuration added to the development agreement document. | The designation of US Highway 15-501 as an “urban/suburban boulevard” is a subject beyond the scope of the Obey Creek Design Guidelines. This designation will continue to be discussed by the Town and NCDOT as conversations continue about transportation improvements in the area. |
| 4 | Regarding the Design Guidelines - The CDC is proposing to add a table of maximum heights for four-, six-, and eight-story buildings as part of the Design Guidelines building heights sections, to resolve inconsistencies in the document. This will also include maximums for roofs and mechanicals. The Planning Commission supports inclusion of this table in the Design Guidelines as the controlling section on building heights.  We refer to Council the separate question of whether the 15-501 building heights proposed by the developer are consistent with Council’s vision for the road frontage. | See response to CDC comments above. |
| 5 | The commission has requested site sections from 15-501 to the Preserve and a 3D computer model of the entire project so that the commission and Council have the visual resources needed to understand the building masses, how the development falls on the land, the views of the project from 15-501, etc.  Status as of June 25:  Sections through the site from 15-501 to the Preserve have now been provided in the most recent Design Guidelines revisions. Council should review. We again encourage Council to request a 3D computer model of the development. | Comment noted. |
| 6 | Regarding Section 5.1(f): Scale of Development and Uses Permitted – Designated in the comments as a “Council issue” - New text specifies that a minimum of half the residences be age restricted, but no maximum is given.  We recommend that Council consider whether there is a town interest in capping the amount of age-restricted housing. | Comment noted. |
| 7 | Regarding Section 5.4(f)(2): Transportation-Related Contributions – Designated in the comments as a “Council issue” - The section specifies a developer contribution of $150,000 (formerly $125,000) and now states that these funds can be used to construct the stacking lanes at the 54/15-501 interchange and pay for restriping of South Columbia Street. In the 4/30 draft, these projects were included in the “Specific Roadway Improvements” that the developer would be making.  We are concerned that given the likely large expense of constructing the stacking lanes, this will not provide sufficient funding for all the improvements the contribution is meant to cover. | The contribution has been increased to $250,000 [see Section 5.4(f)(2)].  In addition, on April 13, 2015, the Council passed a Resolution (R-6) forwarding the following comment to the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Board on the draft FY 2015-2025 State Transportation Improvement Program:   * Funding for improvements at the South Columbia/Fordham Blvd. interchange should be prioritized and accelerated into the first four years of the TIP.   For a copy of the Resolution, [click here](http://chapelhill.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=7&clip_id=2369&meta_id=96814).[[13]](#footnote-13) |
| 8 | Regarding Section 5.22(f)(9)(iv) – Designated in the comments as a “Council issue” - This section says “the maximum number of compact spaces shall not be limited.” This is listed as an exception to town parking standards in Section 5 of the Chapel Hill Design Manual and would appear to apply to all parking in the development.  We call Council’s attention to this provision and the potential for a large amount of compact-only parking in the development. | Staff recommendation is to maintain the standards as reviewed by staff and included in the Development Agreement. |
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