

Comparison of Some Key Points in the Alternate Plan and Central West Small Area Plan

November 23, 2013

Topics	Alternate Plan		Central West Small Area Plan	Board Recommendations ¹
1. Traffic	1-A	Fewer additional daily auto trips. Estimated 3533	More additional daily auto trips. Estimated 6668	
	1-B	Less traffic mitigation required (fewer people and cars)	8 lanes on MLK 5 lanes on Estes	
	1-C	Conduct an up-to-date traffic analysis of the Central West Area including impact of the other focus areas.	No additional traffic impact studies suggested	Planning Board, item #2 Planning Board, item #3
	1-D	Limit amount of parking	No parking limitations	
2. Housing	2-A	42% affordable/workforce housing ² (15% inclusionary zoning would apply)	15% inclusionary affordable units	Planning Board, item #7
	2-B	155 new residential units	620 new residential units	
	2-C	Residential - 260,000 square feet	Residential - 558,000 square feet	
3. Economic Impact	3-A	200,000 sq. ft. of business space (including flexible-use, start-up offices)	270,000 sq. ft. of business space	
	3-B	Estimated positive economic benefit ³	Estimated negative economic benefit ⁴	
4. Environment	4-A	Develop a Stormwater Master Plan and district applying highest, best practice standards before development begins, and ensure low impact development	Develop a Master Stormwater Plan (timeline not specified, Town Council decision)	Planning Board, item #4 Planning Board, item #5
	4-B	Community Park Market on corner of MLK/Estes; gathering space on interior side	Urban Town Square Hotel proposed on corner of MLK and Estes ⁵	Parks and Recreation Commission, item #1
	4-C	Green Space: 15% north of Estes and 15% south of Estes in addition to RCD (40%) and consideration of unique features	Green Space: 15% north of Estes existing RCD (40%) south of Estes. ⁶	
5. Appearance	5-A	Landscaped streetscapes with 50 ft. to 75 ft. setbacks to match Carolina North	Building frontage near streets	
	5-B	3-story maximum building heights (within tree canopy)	8-story maximum building heights (above tree canopy)	Planning Board, item #6

¹ See attached (page 2) Board Recommendations from the Planning Board (11/19/13) and from the Parks and Recreation Commission (11/20/13).

² Defined as two thirds (2/3) of the assessed value or less for an average residence in Chapel Hill.

³ Sufficient business space to cover Town services cost of 155 residential units.

⁴ Insufficient business space to cover Town services cost of 620 residential units.

⁵ Economic analysis is based on a hotel. Hotel mentioned in the Small Area Plan and shown on the map.

⁶ "Green space" includes open space such as plazas, parks, and RCD. Over 40% of the land south of Estes is Resource Conservation District land that cannot be developed.

Planning Board Recommendation, November 19, 2013

Prepared by: Kimberley Brewer, Planning Board Member, November 2013

The Planning Board recommended that the Council approve the Central West Small Area Plan with the following revisions and conditions:

1. Create a stronger statement of purpose for the Small Area Plan that explains the key drivers for design (e.g. relationship to Carolina North; sustainability of walkable, bikable, transit friendly design; density that recognizes existing land prices and project economic viability; fiscal impacts to the Town; respect for existing neighborhoods through edge design; and environmental conservation).
2. Before approval of any construction, conduct a Town-wide modeling analysis of the cumulative traffic impacts from the proposed development in all of the Focus Areas.
3. In 2015, UNC is scheduled to conduct a new Traffic Impact Analysis for Carolina North. At that time, reevaluate the proposed widenings of the Martin Luther King and Estes Drive intersection (in light of both the Central West and Carolina North Plan and the Bus Rapid Transit study) to improve overall mobility, make it more pedestrian/bike friendly, and a more attractive area than envisioned in the existing proposed plans.
4. Where the Focus Areas (considered together) are proposing significant cumulative development in a given watershed, conduct a watershed stormwater impact analysis of the potential cumulative stormwater volume impacts.
5. The stormwater management objective (Principle 11, Objective C) regarding use of Low Impact Development techniques is isolated and disconnected from the stormwater management recommendations. To make the connection, repeat the elements of Objective 11 C in the stormwater recommendations of Section 6, particularly the reference to the Small Area Stormwater Management Master Plan. [Note: Objective 11 C reads: Require new development to capture additional runoff on site and have landscape designs that use low-impact techniques for controlling stormwater and site water, such as raingardens.]
6. The tree canopy along Estes Drive and in the Central West planning area adds beauty to area as well as significant economic (e.g. property value) and environmental benefits. Add a stronger statement to the Small Area Plan about preservation of existing tree canopy.
7. Given Central West's proximity to and potential relationship with Carolina North, make a stronger statement in the plan about a UNC-town partnership on affordable workforce housing.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Town Council

FROM: Erin Crouse, Chair, Parks and Recreation Commission

SUBJECT: Parks and Recreation Commission Comments on the Central West Small Area Plan

DATE: November 20, 2013

At their November 20, 2013 meeting, the Parks and Recreation Commission voted unanimously (6-0) to endorse the Central West Small Area Plan. The Commission would like to make the following statements about the plan:

1. We recommend that the Steering Committee's statement regarding public green space be changed to read: ***The percentage of public green space for each new project in the plan will be at least 15%. Currently developed land, if redeveloped, should have at least 15% public open space, or no less than the existing percentage of public open space, whichever is lower.*** We believe that the green space requirements south of Estes Drive can be strengthened, while allowing that some currently developed areas may not have 15% of their acreage in open space available on their property.
2. We strongly support the proposed plan's bicycle, pedestrian, and greenway improvements, and stress the importance of including as much connectivity for bicycles and pedestrians as possible.
3. We support the area adjacent to Phillips Middle School being utilized for civic use, and encourage the Council to develop the property as a new cultural arts and/or administrative building for Parks and Recreation when the opportunity arises.

Present: Erin Crouse (Chair), Betsey Anderson, Joseph Battle, Mary Musacchia (Orange County), Susan Pedersen, and Raymond Wong

Absent: Regina Blalock (Vice chair), Laney Dale, Steve Price, Neil Newcomb, and Chris Harris