

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

**Summary of Key Interests
Council-Trustees Work Session
December 3, 2008**

The following questions/comments were raised during the Chapel Hill Town Council/UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees Joint Work Session that was held on Wednesday, December 3, 2008:

Interests Raised by Council Members

- Is one of the terms of the underlying zoning district that you cannot do anything by right and everything has to be done with a Development Agreement?
- Is the modification of the Development Agreement a statutory matter, or is the modification written into the agreement itself?
- Need to discuss how to make Carolina North mixed use in nature from the outset.
- Have heard concerns from students that the proposed new Law School building is too far from parking. Believe that Chapel Hill Transit could serve this location and save the University a lot of money.
- Spreading buildings out makes it difficult to create a vibrant place.
- Does a square footage number/limit have to be included in a Development Agreement per the statutes?
- What does 1.5 million square feet of development look like – what is an example of this quantity of development?
- How long does the University anticipate that it would take to build 1.5 million square feet of development at Carolina North?
- Concern that the proposed new Law School building will be isolated from other academic uses, and is potentially being proposed in the wrong place.
- What is the definition of the term “working landscape?”
- Given the University’s reluctance to pursue SUP on individual buildings, the scale of this proposal demands a broader approach. The Development Agreement tool definitely seems to be the right mechanism for regulating development while providing the certainty and predictability that is desired by the University.
- Need to look at rezoning all of the Horace Williams tract acreage in Chapel Hill to require a Development Agreement and then allowing development to occur in phases. Seems that OI-2 zoning is obsolete given the approach the Town wants to take and the Town’s interest in integrated use.

- Seems appropriate that initial development agreement should cover early and middle stages of development, with subsequent approval needed for remaining phases of development.
- Could choose to rezone all of the Horace Williams tract acreage in Chapel Hill with the proposed new zoning district that requires a Development Agreement in order for development to occur, but then only encumber a portion of this acreage with a Development Agreement, thereby limiting the ability to develop the remainder of the tract.
- Is University receptive to having the whole tract (all of the Horace Williams tract that is in Chapel Hill's jurisdiction) subject to the new zoning district that requires a Development Agreement in order for development to occur?
- Uncomfortable with 20 year time frame, given how much things can change in just 5-7 years.
- Believe that a well-designed Development Agreement would include provisions that would be able to capture and incorporate energy innovations, improved approaches, and future standards that evolve.
- The new zoning district for Carolina North would involve unlimited square footage; the Development Agreement would be the mechanism that limits the amount of square footage that can actually be built.
- Town would like to rezone the whole tract (all of the 650+ acres of the Horace Williams tract that are in Chapel Hill's jurisdiction) to the new zoning district that requires a Development Agreement in order for development to occur.
- Hard to discuss the amount of development program that is appropriate without having the results of the transit study, and knowing what types of contributions to Chapel Hill Transit might be involved.
- Concern regarding the proposed location of the new Law School not being readily accessible to students who would be coming from a bus stop on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.
- Is there some way to locate the new Law School internal to the site and have a vibrant campus initially? This would appear to conflict with the goal of having higher density along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.
- For an initial draft of the development agreement and the first phase of the development, how about starting with 3 million square feet, a 10-year term, and including 100 acres.
- Be creative and find ways to attach to the time line various standards that would likely become more rigorous over time.
- What is a recreational commercial use? Need to discuss uses that will be permitted as part of the new zoning district.
- The Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools, and/or the Orange County Commissioners who fund the school system, need to be involved in these discussions.
- Citizen comments – are we answering them and cataloging them from meeting to meeting?
- Meeting notes and citizen comments should be posted on the website next to the meeting agenda for easy reference.
- What is the schedule for the transit analysis?

- Would like to have the transit analysis as soon as possible. If full transit analysis is not going to be ready soon, then is it possible to at least get a preliminary report?
- What should the Council's expectations be for items identified as Group II?
- Interest in Carolina North being exemplary, and therefore exceeding current standards in various areas such as stormwater management and erosion control.
- Appreciate the role of the Joint Staff Work Group and the work that they are doing to help the Council and the University representatives move through the process.

Interests Raised by University Participants

- Can Development Agreement include more than one phase or run for a period of time that is more than one phase?
- Why is there a need for so much individual building specificity? If you have a first phase and you define the mix of uses and the proportion of those mix of uses, and you define the square footage that is going to be built in that phase, and you negotiate the stipulations associated with that program (infrastructure, etc.), then why do you need more specificity?
- University is taking a huge step and a big risk by taking the law school and moving it out to Carolina North.
- Will take time to build the synergy between buildings at Carolina North and create a vibrant place.
- The terms of a Development Agreement need to be tied to square footage, not time.
- Although the authorized time frame for a Development Agreement can vary in length, it cannot exceed 20 years.
- University is willing to have the whole tract (all of the Horace Williams tract that is in Chapel Hill's jurisdiction) subject to the new zoning district that requires a Development Agreement in order for development to occur, assuming that the University can get a sufficient amount of floor area approved for the 230 acres that is proposed for development. The remainder of the tract that is not currently proposed for development can be preserved as open space for the next 50 years, but not longer.
- A long-term development agreement with a lot of square footage is good for both parties, as it provides greater certainty. For example, the University can, per the outcome of the transit study, include a lot more improvements/implementation in accordance with the amount and timing of construction. Different square footage thresholds would trigger specific improvements, ensuring that such improvements occur as the activity generating the need for those improvements is created.
- Would like to be able to go ahead and get zoning in place that approves 8-9 million square feet of development via an approved Development Agreement between the University and the Town.
- The more square footage included in the Development Agreement, the greater the proffers that the University can offer the Town as part of developing Carolina North.

- Are looking to build a campus that will serve multiple generations. Have to think long-term regarding the placement of various users, such as the Law School, at Carolina North. Do not want to make short-term decisions in the name of convenience or transit.
- The Law School is not going to go on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The Law School does not want to be on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. This is not the right setting or location for a Law School. The University is looking to put higher density development along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, in accordance with the Town's recent input regarding significant densities along this frontage.
- University is willing to help with the development of an urban corridor down Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, if that is the Town's goal.
- Receptive to being energy efficient and believe that the University has set a strong precedent in this regard, but cannot agree to requirements that price the University out of being able to develop and thus prevent the University from being able to fulfill its mission.
- Interested in the initial draft of the Development Agreement including 135 acres (the amount of acreage occupied by the illustrated footprint for the initial 3 million square feet). Also, would like to have up to 20 years to actually construct this initial 3 million square feet.

Interests Raised by Citizens

- Encourage Carolina North to be bike-able and walk-able from the neighborhoods located north of Homestead Road, such as Larkspur.
- Carolina North will benefit Chapel Hill because it will bring jobs to the community.
- Concern about proposed northern vehicular access point at the intersection of Homestead Road and Weaver Dairy Road Extension. Even if there are no other access points other than Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, it looks as if the proposed connection to Homestead and Weaver Dairy Road Extension will be the shortest route to and from I-40. All that this particular point of northern access does is cuts off distance to I-40 and provides the ability to avoid at least three traffic light signals on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. Thus, such a connection would provide the shortest distance in commuting time and an increased volume of traffic pm Weaver Dairy Road Extension. The potentially high volume of traffic associate with such a connection will be so excessive that it will pose pedestrian safety concerns, cause congestion issues, and exacerbate the speeding problem on WD Road Extension.
- Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. is designed to handle a high volume of traffic, and this is where Carolina North traffic should stay. The Martin Luther King Jr. corridor has 4 lanes and a large landscaped buffer, and is designed to handle a lot of traffic. By comparison, Weaver Dairy Road Extension is not designed to handle heavy volumes of commuter traffic. Weaver Dairy Road Extension only has two lanes, has a speed limit of 25 mph, and was built for the purpose of serving several neighborhoods.
- Weaver Dairy Road Extension currently has a speeding problem. Concerned that safety on this road will be further compromised by adding many thousands of additional trips to Weaver Dairy Road Extension. Also, Weaver Dairy Road Extension has line of sight issues, and this is why the Town Council previously decided to approve the posted 25 mph speed limit. Need to pay close attention to the transportation plan for Carolina North so that we don't have unintended consequences. If there is going to be a northern access point for Carolina North to Weaver Dairy

Road Extension, would encourage the Town and the University not to make it a full vehicular access point.

- Carolina North will have ripple effects of large scale changes in population, density and housing, that will not just affect Chapel Hill, but will also affect central and much of western Orange County. Need to be cognizant of these concerns on behalf of the greater community.
- More input from the Orange County BOD and other interested parties should be considered as part of this ongoing process.
- Concerned that the apparent slippage of the fiscal and transit studies is not reflected in the current schedule.
- Questions and answers from the meetings are not making it online.
- Appreciates the agenda getting online.
- Need to provide the manager with the resources to get the material out there in order to get the community involved in this process.
- Concerned that given the schedule, several of the issues will be touched upon and not revisited again later in the process. Noise and light pollution standards for Carolina North are examples of this concern.
- Concerned that citizen comments regarding the possibility of applying provisions above and beyond those found in the Town's Land Use Management Ordinance have not made it into the written materials. If we do not take a more active approach, then this opportunity may fall by the wayside.
- Recommendation that the Town pursue a robust underlying zoning district - perhaps an enhanced OI-2 district? Stricter standards regarding noise and light could be incorporated into a stronger OI-2 district.
- Carolina North is a chance to learn from our mistakes on the main campus and get everything right.
- Regarding road maintenance, the roads on the UNC main campus, which are maintained by NCDOT, are in terrible condition due to buses and construction vehicles. Anticipates that the roads built at Carolina North will eventually be deeded to the Town and will be the responsibility of the Town to maintain. For the next 50 years, buses and construction vehicles will also be prevalent at Carolina North. Recommendation that the Town insists on some severe, heavy duty road standards for the streets at Carolina North. If enhanced standards are not employed, then University needs to be responsible for maintenance costs.
- For all industrial uses, require that a Special Use Permit is needed so that the Town retains control over uses such as power plants.
- If Carolina North is a mixed use project, then phasing is important. The development should be mixed use from the beginning.
- For mass transit to succeed, parking needs to be inadequate with regard to the number of employees and students. Recommends that this approach be pursued at all times during the life of Carolina North.

- Regarding the northern road that will go up to Weaver Dairy Road Extension, needs to be defined by date or conditions as to when this road will occur.
- The proposed northern access road would alleviate some of the congestion on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, as you would get people immediately moving in the direction that they need to go. Diverting traffic in multiple directions would be a good thing.
- Need to accept that construction activity is a natural part of development.
- If land has to be taken for a new airport location because the Horace Williams airport is being displaced by Carolina North, would hope that residential land could be avoided.