To view a complete listing of all questions/comment received at the various Carolina North meetings, please visit <u>Summary of Key Interests - Carolina North Planning Process</u> (pdf) or <u>Summary of Key Interests - Carolina North Planning Process</u> (MS Word).

## Summary of Key Interests Carolina North Informational Meeting April 16, 2009

The following questions/comments were raised during the Carolina North Informational Meeting that was held on Thursday, April 16, 2009:

## Interests Raised by Citizens

- Who is making assumptions for the Traffic Impact Analysis?
- Square footage numbers are floor space, not footprint?
- Is the housing at Carolina North anticipated to be private developer-driven or is it University student housing?
- Regarding the scale of the development, becoming more and more convinced that building 1.5 million square feet of floor area over a 20 year period is a non-starter.
- Based on the richer parking ratios at the start, the University is going to have to participate in the Town's stormwater utility from the start.
- Since this is a public-private development, if there is an influx of private capital, then development could occur faster than anticipated. N.C. State's Centennial Campus, while perhaps not the best example, has grown in bits and spurts.
- How soon does the University anticipate starting construction? Within the next year, or at some later time (e.g. in the next 3-5 years)?
- Concerned about how we continue to water our Town. Eventually we will not be able to water ourselves due to limited supplies. What does the University think about availability of water as Carolina North develops?
- Will Jordan Lake or the abandoned American Stone Quarry be needed to meet Carolina North's water supply needs? If so, will the additional water supply be available in time to link up with anticipated construction?
- Will private development at Carolina North be subject to taxes?
- Can housing at University Square be counted towards residential requirements at Carolina North?
- What is the legal perspective regarding tying the development agreement to the amount of development (floor area) rather than time?
- The transportation section of the development agreement discusses a lot of improvements along Carolina North's Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard frontage. Will these improvements extend beyond the boundaries of Carolina North?

- Is it envisioned that Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard would become a major bike corridor between Carolina North and the main campus?
- Section 12 (Design Standards and Public Art) of the Development Agreement does not include a bullet regarding public art requirements. What is the University's vision for public art at Carolina North?
- Sections 13.5 and 13.6 include specific triggers based on 4 million and 8 million square feet of floor area. What is the rationale behind these numbers since the largest number mentioned to date is 3 million square feet.
- Where are the potential school site locations? Why is the school site distinct and separate from the rest of the proposed plan?
- If an elementary school at Carolina North is not located within the identified 250-acre development footprint, can it be located in the one of the green areas denoted for preservation?
- Regarding lighting, the draft development agreement specifies that increases in illumination on
  off-site property shall not result in lighting levels in excess of 0.3 foot-candles seems very, very
  strict.
- Regarding the 'dark skies" approach, the current thinking is that 0.1 foot-candles at the property line is a best of class standard.
- What was thinking behind why the school and the possible fire/police site do not add to the trigger requirements in the agreement (the 800,000 SF or 1.5 million SF thresholds)? Doesn't this introduce some problems in the development agreement because these sites do not have to adhere to the stricter standards that we want under the development agreement (e.g. water runoff, etc.)? Between the two facilities, it seems like we are talking about 20 or acres or more.
- By what process would an elementary school or a fire/police facility be approved, and what discretion would the Town have if something was not consistent with the standards in the development agreement?
- What stormwater design criteria (G.6.3) are being "agreed upon by Town and University stormwater staff?" Will these be subject to negotiation with each individual site development permit application?
- Regarding the central cogeneration plant that is mentioned in section G.10.4, what are the
  factors that would influence whether or not this facility is built? If it is built, what is it likely to
  be like? What type of fuel is likely to be utilized?
- Why has LEED Silver been selected as the leading criteria for energy efficiency purposes, as opposed to citing ASHRAE standards?
- Concern about not having enough lighting in residential housing areas. We now have energy
  efficient fixtures, seems that good lighting is important for the safety of pedestrians and
  bicyclists. Advice from police department also suggests keeping things illuminated in the vicinity
  of residences to discourage illegal activity.

Carolina North Informational Meeting Summary of Key Interests April 16, 2009 Page 3 of 3

- If a governing body rezones a particular piece of property for a single property owner, it is not illegal spot zoning?
- The greenway section of the development agreement talks about identifying and avoiding regulatory floodplains and stream buffers when locating facilities; however, the Clean Water Management Trust Fund encourages and actually gives grants for locating greenways in floodplains. Why has this choice been made?

## **Interests Raised by University**

- Need to tie review process to actual development, not to the calendar.
- The University is contemplating conservation and reuse efforts in order to promote and maximize available water supply resources.
- Any building (the actual improvements on the land) built by the private sector at Carolina North would be taxable; however, the land underneath the building would continue to be owned by Carolina North and would not be taxable.