

Public participation in the Central West Focus Area process

Overview from Central West Citizens

Updated November 25, 2013

Quick Summary¹

There are five sections to this report:

- Purpose of this document
- Background
- Shared concerns
- Key points from citizen input not incorporated into the Steering Committee Plan
- Appendix: Public participation in the Central West Focus Area discussion

Purpose of this document

When the Chapel Hill Town Council established a Steering Committee to define a Small Area Plan for the Central West Focus Area, they charged the Committee to reach out to community members to lead an open, participatory community-based process.

Since citizens have been active throughout the process, it is essential to document how the Steering Committee incorporated citizen comments and recommendations in the Central West Focus Area planning process.

Community members involved with the **Alternative Medium-Density Plan for Central West** (previously called the Citizens' Plan and now called the Alternative Plan) have reviewed the Town documents presenting results from various events organized for community members, Steering Committee notes, correspondence and public comments to the Steering Committee, Town Council and media and present below a brief summary of major issues raised by the majority of participants.

Background

The work of the Steering Committee for the Central West Focus Area evolved as part of the implementation of the Chapel Hill 2020 Comprehensive Plan. When the Town Council passed the Comprehensive Plan in June 2012 with goals and a vision for the future, land use decisions were deferred. The Town Council decided that changes to the new land use map would be developed as each of six small area focus groups completed its work. The areas were selected because of their location on major transportation corridors: Downtown, North Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd/I-40, Central West, Highway 54 (Glen Lennox), North 15-501 (Ephesus Church Road/Fordham Blvd) and South 15-501 (Obey Creek).

The Central West focus area was among the first selected by the Town for evaluation for potential future growth. The Central West process began on October 24, 2012, and will

¹ Contributors to, and supporters of, this report include: Mike Albritton, Mary Andersen, Brian Baucom, Carolyn Baucom, Steven and Denise Bevington, Jill and Dick Blackburn, Daniel Bruce, Rob Clark, Maria de Bruyn, John de Figuereido, Jonathan and Pam Drake, Dr. Glen H. Elder Jr., Barbara Graham, Vida and Chris Hakkenberg, E. Thomas Henkel, Samel J. and Marsha A. Horowitz, Debbie Jepson, Rudy Juliano, Fred Lampe, Patty Krebs, Elaine Marcus, Julie McClintock, John Morris, Firoz Mistry, Martha Petty, Theresa Raphael-Grimm, Will Raymond, Alan Snavely, Del Snow, Mickey Jo Sorrell, Alan Tom, Sandy Turbeville, David Tuttle and Mark Weisburd. Source materials are cited in the Appendix.

end with the Council's consideration of the Steering Committee's draft Small Area Plan, scheduled for November 25, 2013.

When the Central West Focus Area Steering Committee was established on October 24, 2012, part of its charge was to engage citizens in their work. The charge included the following relevant points:

- To insure that the process is open and participatory
- To receive and integrate community feedback
- To facilitate communication with the community
- To work with the consultant and staff to develop a process and schedule for reporting to the community (the “accordion model”)
- The Steering Committee is encouraged to work with the consultant and staff to develop a process and schedule that will allow time for data collection and plan review and comment by the community at large at several stages throughout the process (the “accordion model”).

Before the Steering Committee was seated, a group of citizens called on those interested to contribute ideas for a “vision” for possible change for the area. These ideas were shared with the Committee in January 2013.

(<http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/data/vision-statements/>)

Central West residents began a website in 2012 through which citizens could gain and offer information and insights (<http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/>), while the Town’s website began posting community input in June 2013 (<http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251>). Citizens also initiated a Central West Neighbors list-serve to promote discussion on the process and plans under consideration by the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee Small Area Plan states: “The process undertaken in developing a plan for the Central West Focus Area (CWFA) has emphasized an inclusionary, open, community-based effort through the use of a Steering Committee with broad community representation, multiple community workshops and discussions, the public sharing of information and materials throughout the planning process, and opportunities for public comment at Steering Committee meetings and report out sessions.” (SC Plan, page 4)

The Steering Committee was encouraged “to make recommendations that are reflective of the many interests in the focus area.” (Town Council Resolution, http://chapelhill.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=&clip_id=1652&meta_id=74449)

The purpose of the Steering Committee as defined by the Town Council resolution was to: “Create and deliver a small area plan for the Planning Area for Council consideration; create a schedule for the process and milestones for reporting to the community; and gather the necessary data/expertise for making informed decisions.” (SC Plan, page 4)

The Steering Committee Plan states that: “These sessions [community report-out sessions] have provided valuable information that was considered by Steering Committee members in moving forward in development of the Central West Small Area

Plan.” (SC plan, page 5) The Steering Committee document does not indicate, however, how citizen input was integrated into the plan. Perhaps the explicit reference to “reporting to the community” assumes that community representation was achieved through the inclusion of eight neighborhood residents on the Committee. Thus, while the accordion model of community participation was approved by the Council, it became difficult for citizens who actively wished to participate to conduct **dialogues** with the Steering Committee or Town Council. Rather, at various events, citizens were asked to write comments or place dots on maps/sheets of paper; these results were compiled but rarely summarized for in-depth discussion during Steering Committee meetings. As time progressed, and as noted above, some events were also no longer defined as community input sessions but labeled community report-out sessions.

Nevertheless, citizens have been very active from the start of the process, petitioning for a participatory planning process as early as March 2012, offering input during various community input sessions and online surveys organized by the Town, writing letters to newspapers and the Town Council and Steering Committee, and participating in Steering Committee meetings and the Public Hearing that began on October 21, 2013. Residents also attended Town Advisory Board and Commission meetings, offering comments when the meeting included public participation, as was the case for the Planning Board.

The “Central West Focus Area Organizing Committee” (predecessor to the Steering Committee) had proposed that: “the steering committee... request and encourage the formation of small citizen study groups organized around particular issues of importance to the Central West Focus Area (such as transit, traffic impacts, student housing, etc.). These study groups would work independently and become the area experts on their issue, gathering data and holding discussions with the goal of providing their expertise to inform the steering committee’s work.” (October 2, 2012 Letter to Megan Wooley from Amy Ryan on behalf of the Organizing Committee)

This recommendation was not adopted by the Steering Committee, but one group of citizens eventually prepared (and revised after receiving citizen feedback) a medium-density plan with input from a traffic impact analysis consultant and others. They offered this for consideration to the Steering Committee, advisory boards such as those working on planning and transportation, and finally to the Town Council in June 2013 (with revised updates sent in October and November 2013). The Alternative Plan was endorsed in a letter signed by 67 residents on June 2, 2013. In the September 2013 online survey, there were 40 comments of complaint that the Alternative Plan had not been included in the survey and 31 comments asking specifically to see an alternative, lower-density, alternative plan. At the October 21, 2013 Public Hearing at Town Council, 20 of 29 speakers endorsed elements of the Alternative Plan and two speakers noted criticisms of the Steering Committee Plan. As of 8:00 p.m. on November 25, 2013, a petition asking the Town Council to support the Alternative Plan had been signed by 244 residents (<http://www.gopetition.com/petitions/support-the-citizen-plan.html>).

At the community session on April 25, 2013, community members were given the opportunity to comment on and provide edits to the wording of the principles to be adopted by the Steering Committee for the plan. After the input was compiled, the Steering Committee held an in-depth discussion on the proposed changes and fine-tuned

the principles taking into account community input. This successful example of integrating community input was unfortunately not followed in processing the input given at the community workshop in May 2013 and at the community report-out session in September 2013.

Below is a very brief summary of issues raised by the citizens during the process grouped by topic.

Traffic concerns

The traffic impact of development in Central West has been one of the most discussed issues during the process, raised at almost all community events and in the online surveys.

Concerns include traffic congestion and delays, traffic speed and safety, types of mitigation measures proposed, and the idea of widening Estes Drive. It was only at the August 29, 2013 Steering Committee meeting that the Town staff provided an initial traffic analysis, which was updated on October 18, 2013 with proposed traffic mitigation measures. Some citizens have questioned the assumptions used for the calculations, stating that an assumption of 75% of traffic being directed along MLK Blvd and only 25% along Estes is not reasonable since many people use Estes to go from the MLK Blvd/Estes intersection to reach the library, post office, Fordham Blvd/15-501, Eastgate and University Malls, and Franklin Street.

Requests for better transit – public bus transportation – have also featured in community input with suggestions for increased night-time buses, better signage for buses, pull-outs for buses, covered bus stops and more bus stops.

Safety of school children

Child safety was mentioned frequently in the community input on the principles at the April 25, 2013 community drop-in session. Maintaining the safety of quiet child-friendly neighborhood streets and ensuring that new development projects won't endanger public safety or harm surrounding neighborhoods were two of the top objectives endorsed at the May 18, 2013 community workshop. The impact on schools was also raised as a concern at the September 20, 2013 session at Amity Church and in the online survey in September 2013.

Various efforts were made to encourage outreach to the schools.

- In December 2012, at a meeting with two Chapel Hill-Carrboro School Board Representatives, it was noted that safety of the children is their primary mission. They said that the Board would have an interest in any plans to develop the site directly to the west of the schools in order to understand what any spillover impacts might be (e.g., parking and traffic patterns) for the school campus.
- On June 19, 2013, a letter was sent to the Chapel Hill-Carrboro City School Board Members proposing that the School Board indicate its support for two informational meetings to be held in Mid-August or early September where Town staff and Steering Committee members would present an overview to educate/inform the public and answer the growing questions.

- On July 1, 2013, a letter was sent to the Steering Committee from the School Improvement Team for Guy B. Phillips Middle School noting that: “It’s a given that the Central West project will add to the traffic volume on Estes Drive. Added to this reality is the future development of nearby Carolina North -- estimated to bring 1500 parking spaces in the first phase alone. We believe that it is paramount that any final approved plan for the Central West project emphasize and respect the well being of the children attending our schools, by addressing the likelihood of even more burdensome traffic on Estes Drive, and by considering the safety of our students on a campus that could be a stone’s throw from any businesses and other establishments that locate within the newly developed zone... We would hope that the Central West steering committee would officially solicit feedback about the project and its likely impact on our schools from our administration, faculty and the parents of our students.”

Many parents of students at Estes Elementary School were upset that the community report-out session held on September 10, 2013 was scheduled on the same evening as the open house at the school, making it difficult for parents to participate.

Town staff talked to school administrators and consulted the School Board representative on the Steering Committee. However, it does not appear that any significant outreach took place to school parents at the Estes Elementary and Phillips Middle Schools despite explicit requests.

Bike and pedestrian safety and amenities

Bike and pedestrian safety and amenities (bike paths, sidewalks, crosswalks, off-road trails and paths) have been of paramount interest to citizens throughout the process.

- March 2, 2013 community workshop, where inadequate sidewalks, better crosswalks, poor connectivity, ability to walk to school, unsafe for bikes and unsafe for pedestrians were prominent issues in the Word Cloud results.
- Sidewalks, bike paths and trails were mentioned frequently in the community input on principles at the April 25, 2013 community drop-in session.
- Top issues raised at the May 18, 2013 community workshop: Build a network of neighborhood paths that lead from the residential areas to the schools, library, YMCA, and to the larger Chapel Hill greenway system; Provide a paved sidewalk on at least one side of Estes from Franklin to Sewell School Road; Provide paved sidewalks along both sides of MLK throughout the impact area; Where possible, physically segregate bicycle lanes from automobile traffic; Maintain the ability of safe foot & bicycle traffic through residential neighborhoods; Provide walks and trails through the natural areas.
- At the September 10, 2013 community report-out session at Amity Church, two top issues were improving the bicycle and pedestrian system and creating a “heart” or walkable destinations.
- Improving the bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure was raised as a concern by 54% of respondents in the September 2013 online survey (one of the top 5 issues).

Environmental preservation

Environmental conditions were raised consistently as a priority value at the early community workshops. There was repeated interest expressed in maintaining the leafy

green character of Estes Drive and to plan parks where people could enjoy the out-of-doors.

In addition, preservation of environmentally-sensitive land, especially south of Estes Drive, was discussed mainly from three perspectives:

- Protecting watersheds and dealing with stormwater issues
- Preserving green space and protecting biodiversity (an old established forest, protecting wildlife)
- Including green space for citizens' well-being and enjoyment (parks, greenways, walking and biking trails that link to other trails).

Environmental experts offered insights into the need to situate buildings away from the granite ridges south of Estes to prevent erosion and stormwater problems. The idea of a possible land swap in order to preserve the area was welcomed by various citizens.

Specific examples of input on the preservation of trees and the environment raised at various community events include:

- 2 March 2013 community workshop, where "Trees and the environment" was the most prominent concern in the Word Cloud results.
- May 18, 2013 community workshop, where the following issues featured among the most chosen options: Include outdoor green spaces in all development; Provide tree buffers in all development; "Trees" are an essential character of this town and all development should work to maintain and enhance this feature; Maintain (or reestablish if needed) riparian buffers along stream with additional allowance for wildlife corridors; Protect wildlife corridors; Identify the natural features worthy of protection, such as stream buffers, mature tree stands, wetlands and other environmental features; Provide sound storm water management systems in new developments.
- July 24, 2013 Roadshow Session, Public Library, where keeping the area green and safe for wildlife as it is now was one of the issues mentioned most.
- September 10, 2013 community report-out session at Amity Church, where top issues were stormwater impacts, maintaining the tree canopy and preserving sensitive areas.
- Stormwater impacts (46%) and preserving sensitive areas (44%) were among the top six issues mentioned in the September 2013 online survey.

Land use

Opinions on land use have varied in citizen input heard by the Steering Committee but there appears to be widespread agreement that desirable retail includes small shops and services (e.g., dry cleaners), grocery/restaurant space similar to Weaver Street Market in Carrboro with adjacent gathering space, and creating open and public spaces. Orienting shops and businesses to the needs of local neighborhoods and users of Carolina North was a top objective in the May 18, 2013 community workshop.

There is also community support for space for new businesses. While the Steering Committee Plan mentions incubator space, the Alternative Plan includes business start-up space to be located in the upper story(ies) of a business building on MLK Blvd at the Estes intersection. Start-up space is not retail and is classified as "office" use. The Town

and University are already providing incubator space and additional incubator space is not a current need. Flexible start-up space is needed after a business plan developed during "incubation" receives funding to develop the idea and proceed to market. Flexible start-up space does not currently exist in Chapel Hill and thus new businesses are forced to leave town as they begin to grow.

While a few citizens have advocated for higher density, most citizen input has advocated for any new structures being in scale with existing residential uses. Many public comments reiterated concerns with densities that would bring more auto trips than Estes Drive could accommodate. At the March 2, 2013 community workshop, the map with results specifically mentioned 3-story maximum height buildings. There seems to be some agreement that any higher density should be placed along MLK Blvd; in the March 2, 2013 questionnaire, 62% of respondents thought that change should first happen along MLK Blvd.

While many approved of community retail focused on MLK Blvd, a proposal for a hotel (a permit process has already been initiated by one of the Central West landowners) was debated with citizen comment offering differing views. As early as March 2, 2013, citizens both argued for and against a hotel according to a map showing results of community input. It was only at the August 29, 2013 Steering Committee that some attention was given to including a hotel in the plan after a presentation by the two co-chairs on a meeting they had with developers (Presentation: developer thoughts on concept plans; <http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2184>) The Steering Committee did not vote on including a recommendation for a hotel as a specific form of mixed use.

In this regard, it could be noted that community members, like many Steering Committee members, much preferred retail uses. Some thought a hotel would work best along MLK Blvd on the Carolina North property immediately adjacent to the planned "transit hub". A hotel in the Central West focus area would not be necessary, and likely not viable, until Carolina North is in operation and out-of-town visitors come to Carolina North for business reasons. It has been proposed that the "transit hub" and hotel also be combined with a compact convention center/theatre, as well as meeting rooms and restaurant facilities, to achieve the necessary synergy for success. (Bruce Runberg, UNC Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Services. January 30, 2013, Carolina North update session)

Many citizens have noted in public comments that the Steering Committee failed to appreciate in its planning discussion the joint Town/Gown development synergies which offer enormous benefits to UNC and the Town. Instead the focus on the undeveloped portions of the Central West planning area has meant the Plan was developed in isolation from its future surroundings. This observation was repeated at various community events. Many acknowledge that the development of retail and business would develop most successfully in tandem with the Carolina North development.

Housing

Opinions have varied concerning residential options, but two types of housing have been repeatedly recommended: affordable/workforce and senior housing.

Affordable/workforce housing

- March 2, 2013 community workshop results included affordable housing as an option.
- April 25, 2013 community drop-in session mentioned affordable and workforce housing.
- May 18, 2013 community workshop participants called for a plan that would encourage residential and other uses that will accommodate both affordable and market rate housing as well as affordable and workforce housing.
- August 2, 2013 Roadshow session with 5 high school students mentioned affordable housing as a need.

Senior housing

- March 2, 2013 community workshop results included senior housing as an option.
- May 18, 2013 community workshop participants called for a plan that would include senior housing.
- At the July 29, 2013 meeting with Amity Church pastor and parishioners, senior housing was mentioned as a desirable option.

Key points from citizen input not incorporated into the Steering Committee Plan

The Steering Committee was asked to assess a small area (around the MLK Blvd and Estes drive intersection) for form and use within a much larger impact area. The Committee was also asked to evaluate a much larger area for transportation and connections, which includes all of, or a portion of, approximately 17 designated neighborhoods or subdivisions.

Ultimately, however, their main emphasis came to rest on the MLK Blvd/Estes Drive intersection. This focus increasingly received comments that it was too narrow. In the last months of the process, various citizens advocated that issues such as traffic impacts, stormwater control, affordable housing and types of retail built in the Central West area should be assessed by situating those issues within the context of Town development as a whole. Advocates proposed that the various focus areas be discussed by Town Council in conjunction with one another rather than as discrete entities; this point was reiterated, for example, in letters to the Town Council and comments on the November 2013 public petition to the Town Council.

The Town staff provided the Steering Committee with an overview of top issues of concern after the September 10, 2013 community event and September 2013 survey, showing some discrepancies between their views and those of the community. Notably, stormwater impacts featured among citizens' concerns but not among the top issues for the Steering Committee. Environmental issues and the impact on schools were also mentioned by the community but not the Steering Committee as a top concern.

Comparison Between Dot Exercise Responses

Ranking	Steering Committee Responses	Community Session Responses	Survey Responses
1 st	Creating a “heart” or walkable destinations	Development’s effect on traffic	Development’s effect on traffic
2 nd	Compatibility with existing neighborhoods	Compatibility with existing neighborhoods	Compatibility with existing neighborhoods
3 rd	Economic viability	Stormwater impacts	Improving the bicycle and pedestrian system
4 th	Improving the bicycle and pedestrian system	Maintaining the tree canopy	Stormwater impacts
5 th	Development’s effect on traffic	Improving the bicycle and pedestrian system	Impact on schools

As **traffic issues** are a top concern for the community, the Central West Focus Area Small Plan should recommend further traffic impact analysis studies be done before any development takes place in the area. The Planning Board’s recommendation specifically addressed this concern: “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.” Responding to the community and Planning Board recommendations merits serious attention. As the Town has already received \$2.5 million in MPO resources for bike/pedestrian and other improvements on Estes Drive, the Steering Committee Plan could also include a list of the priorities for these funds and a description of what these would entail so that community members are aware of such changes in the near future.

Since insufficient outreach and **involvement of school staff and parents** at Estes Elementary and Phillips Middle School has taken place, the Small Area Plan should call for further discussions with this constituency before any development takes place. This is particularly important in connection with **improving bike and pedestrian amenities and safety**. For example, in an e-mail to the Steering Committee, one parent commented on poor crosswalks and speeding traffic, offering to partner with the Steering Committee and/or Town to discuss and implement measures (signage, traffic calming, painted bike lanes, etc.) to ensure a safe route to the schools. (e-mail from Carolyn Brookhart, 20 July 2013) While the Steering Committee Plan mentions crosswalk improvements in its Vision and Principles, recommendations about crosswalks are cursory and do not discuss them in relation to child safety (mentioned under Additional Transportation Recommendations, page 50; Streetscapes, page 58 and 60; Estes Drive—From Schools to Library, page 61).

In addition, while a bike and pedestrian plan is a key part of the Committee recommendations, it should be supplemented with additions, such as the use of buffered sidewalks (recommendation from the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Board) and inclusion of existing dedicated woodland paths which are well-used paths to the schools. Further,

the addition of a bike and pedestrian bridge to link Central West with Carolina North would help meet community concerns.

Regarding **environmental issues**, the Steering Committee Plan includes a recommendation for a Small Area Stormwater Management Master Plan. Given the importance of stormwater issues to the community, the Committee should consider a stormwater special assessment stormwater district and calling for state-of-the-art, best-management practices consistent with federal, state, and local regulations for any development in this area. The Planning Board also addressed this community concern: “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.”

In addition, the Committee could respond to community input by prioritizing a land swap for the environmentally-sensitive, old forest area south of Estes. They should also recommend strongly placing any structures away from the ridge and steep slopes, utilizing flatter land and allowing greater heights **only** if a smaller footprint with less impervious surface is guaranteed. Any construction in this sensitive area should have construction plans and methods reviewed by experts to ensure that the construction process (for high-rise structures utilizing heavy machinery) will not degrade/destroy the surrounding land. In addition, their plan should stipulate a minimum percentage of green space (not open space), with a recommendation to developers to exceed this percentage.

Land use: much community input has recommended that any higher density (e.g., up to 4 stories) be placed along MLK Blvd using comparable setbacks to plans for Carolina North. The Committee discussed but did not decide setbacks for Estes. The consistent preference from the public was for setbacks that would appear unlike East 54 and provide the ambience of a residential street with community retail, rather than a dense urban center. The Town Council asked the Committee to describe their density preferences. The Steering Committee Plan is in agreement with community input requesting small retail that is oriented toward use by neighborhood residents and users of Carolina North. There is no outspoken request from the community for a hotel and some explicit requests to not have a hotel, so a recommendation for this type of anchor business should be removed from the plan.

Community input was clear in recommending the inclusion of **affordable and workforce housing, as well as senior housing**. Since the *raison d'être* for this development includes providing housing for younger generations, it is important that the proportion of affordable housing should be higher than the minimum (15%) required. While workforce housing was mentioned as early as April 25th by the community, the Steering Committee Plan only mentions it once in its vision statement. (Steering Committee Plan, page v) In contrast, the Alternative Plan includes a high percentage of such residential use and supports a partnership with the University of North Carolina to develop workforce housing (also supported by the Planning Board). Both of these options should be adopted for the Steering Committee plan.”

Economic impact: the issue of economic impact has been raised primarily in citizens' letters and contributions to public participation at Steering Committee meetings. While the Alternative Plan includes a preliminary assessment of tax revenues for the development in their plan, the Steering Committee Plan does not address this issue. Before a final plan is adopted by the Town Council, the Steering Committee should add a section to their document on this in accordance with Principle 13.

Appendix: Public participation input into the Central West Focus Area discussion

Date	Event/type of input	Participants	Record
March 2012	Petition from Estes Hills neighbors	208 signatures	http://www.gopetition.com/petitions/estes-hills-drive-neighbors-petition-town-council.html
March 2012	Presentations to Town Council	Laurie Cousart speaking for neighbors in Estes Hills, Huntington-Somerset, Coker Hills, and Coker Hills West	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/2020-stakeholders/luries-talk-to-town-council/
March 27, 2012	Letter to Council	Julie McClintock	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/2020-stakeholders/letter-to-council/
April 2012	Letter to the Editor CH News	Priscilla C. Murphy Theresa Raphael-Grimm	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/priscillas-letter-to-chapel-hill-news/
May 21, 2012	Petition for a Small Area Plan	Estes Neighbors group (residents of Estes Hills, Huntington-Somerset, Coker Hills, Coker Hills West, Mount Bolus and Coker Woods)	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/petition-for-a-small-area-plan/
June 2012	Statement to Town Council	David Ambaras	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/data/vision-statements/vision-for-our-area-david-ambaras-statement/

Date	Event/type of input	Participants	Record
June 25, 2012	Statement to Town Council	Estes Neighbors group (12 signatures for group)	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/june-25-statement-to-town-council/
June 2012	Statement to Town Council	Gretchen Stroemer	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/gretchen-stroemer/
August 5, 2012	Letter to Town Manager	Estes Neighbors Leadership Group (17 signatures for group)	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/letter-to-town-manager-august-5-2012/
October 2, 2012	Letter to Megan Wooley from Amy Ryan	Recommendations made by the Central West Focus Area Organizing Committee	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/community-recommendations-to-council/
October 22, 2012	Round-table discussion Town Hall	No information found	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/2012-petitions-and-letters/round-table-invitation/
October 24, 2012	Town Council endorsement of Steering Committee	Town Council members	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/data/committee-charge/
October 24, 2012	Town Council resolution on Steering Committee	Town Council members	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2184 http://chapelhill.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=&clip_id=1652&meta_id=74449

Date	Event/type of input	Participants	Record
December 18, 2012	Meeting with 2 Chapel Hill-Carrboro Schools Board Representatives	Mia Burroughs, Member of the Chapel Hill-Carrboro Schools Board & SC member; Todd LoFrese, Assistant Superintendent of Schools	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
November-December 2012	Vision statements	Area residents	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/data/vision-statements/
2013			
2 March 2013	Community workshop, University Mall	Discussion and dots exercises	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2184
March 2-28, 2013	Questionnaire distributed at Community workshop and placed online	23 responses at workshop; 297 responses online	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2185
April 25, 2013	Community drop-in session		http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2184
May 18, 2013	Open discussions at Farmer's Market at University Mall	10 responses	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2184 (June 4th meeting)

Date	Event/type of input	Participants	Record
May 18, 2013	Community workshop at University Mall	9 tables for small-group discussion; 35 comment sheets	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2184 (June 4 th meeting)
June 2013	Town begins posting community input submissions on website	Town staff and citizens	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
June 2, 2013	Letter to CW Steering Committee supporting Citizens' Map	67 Signatures	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/letter-of-support/
June 19, 2013	Letter to the Chapel Hill-Carrboro City School Board Members	16 signatures of parents, including Estes Elementary School officers and parents	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251 http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/schools/schools/letter-from-phillips-middle-school-sit/
June 20, 2013	Letter/petition to Town Council for 24 June meeting	Debbie Jepson & Theresa Raphael-Grimm On behalf of invested Chapel Hill citizens	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/our-voices/june-2013-letter-to-council/ http://chapelhillpublic.novusagenda.com/Bluesheet.aspx?itemid=2345&meetingid=221

Date	Event/type of input	Participants	Record
June 24, 2013	Presentation to Town Council of revised Citizens' map	Fred Lampe on behalf of citizens group	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
July 1, 2013	Letter from School Improvement Team for Guy B. Phillips Middle School to SC	Co-chairs on behalf of Team	http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/schools/schools/letter-from-phillips-middle-school-improvement-team/
July 3, 2013	Explanation of revised Citizens' map	Fred Lampe on behalf of citizens group	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
July 20, 2013	e-mail about safety of school walk zone to Town Staff as input for SC meeting	Carolyn Brookhart	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251 http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/schools/parents-speak-out/
July 21, 2013	Public participation comment for SC	Erin Schwie Langston and Shauna Farmer	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251 http://centralwestcitizens.wordpress.com/schools/parents-speak-out/
July 24, 2013	Roadshow Session, Public Library	25-30 people in conversation with Megan Wooley and Mickey Jo Sorrel	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251

Date	Event/type of input	Participants	Record
July 29, 2013	Meeting with Amity Church pastor and parishioners	Conversation with 10 people with Megan Wooley and David Bonk	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
July 31, 2013	Letter to Town Staff	Erin Schwie Langston about CW Parent Safety Comment for Walk Zone	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251 (posted August 2, 2013)
August 2, 2013	Roadshow session, Public Library with high school students	5 students in conversation with Megan Wooley and Eric Feld	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251 (posted August 2, 2013)
August 13, 2013	Young Professional Network event hosted by the Chapel Hill-Carrboro Chamber of Commerce	Conversation with unspecified number of participants by Megan Wooley and Jay Heikes	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
September 5, 2013	e-mail to Megan Wooley	Kathryn Butler	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
September 10, 2013	Community report-out session at Amity Church	195 participants Dot exercises, comments on paper	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2184 (September 19, 2013 Steering Committee Meeting)

Date	Event/type of input	Participants	Record
September 20, 2013	Letter to SC/Town	Chris Hakkenberg	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
September 2013	Online survey	477 responses	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2184 (September 19, 2013 Steering Committee Meeting)
October 10, 2013	Updated Citizens' map and plan	Posted by Alan Tom for citizens' group	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251 http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2185
October 21, 2013	2 "Meet the Draft Plan" Meetings, Public Library		http://2020buzz.org/2013/10/18/meet-the-draft-central-west-small-area-plan/
October 21, 2013	Petition to Town Council to postpone 25 November vote	Presented by Patty Krebs: 150 signatures	http://chapelhill.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=7&clip_id=1947
October 21, 2013	Public Hearing, Town Council	29 citizens had 2 minutes each to make a presentation	http://chapelhill.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=7&clip_id=1947 Full statements by Mickey Jo Sorrell, Michael J. Paul and Chris Hakkenberg: http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do (Central West)
October 29, 2013	Vision - Imagining What Might Be" - PowerPoint Presentation presented to the Planning Board	Presentation by Will Raymond	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251

Date	Event/type of input	Participants	Record
November 8, 2013	E-mail with summary of public participation	Julie McClintock	http://www.ci.chapel-hill.nc.us/index.aspx?page=2251
Ongoing 2012-2013	Letters/commentaries Chapel Hill News		See examples
February-November 2013	Steering Committee meetings	Various speakers	http://www.townofchapelhill.org/index.aspx?page=2184

Examples of letters and commentaries to newspapers, Town Council

For Alternative Plan

- Julie McClintock, Firoz Mistry, Mickey Jo Sorrell and David Tuttle, October 11, 2013; Commentary: Central West committee steering in dangerous direction; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/10/11/3270165/commentary-central-west-committee.html>
- Fred and Nancy Brooks, October 21, 2013: Central West plan is seriously misguided; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Jill Blackburn, October 22, 2013; CW/last night's meeting; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Maria de Bruyn, October 23, 2013: Contribution to Central West discussion; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Julie McClintock, November 11, 2013: Summary of public participation in Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Marsha and Samuel Horowitz, November 18, 2013: Do not endorse the Central West Small Area Plan; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Susan J. Eastman, November 20, 2013: Slow down. Support the Citizens' Plan for Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)

- Chris Lynch, November 20, 2013: Please vote for the Citizens' Alternate Plan for Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Carol & Mitchell Krucoff, November 21, 2013: Central West Citizen; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Will Aldrige, November 22, 2013: Central West development process; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Martha Goldfinch Aldridge, November 22, 2013; Central West development process; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Ian Grimm, November 22, 2013: Central West planning; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Tim Williams, November 22, 2013: Central West plan; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Lawrence E. Feinberg, November 22, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Liz and David DeLong, November 23, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Mickey Jo Sorrell, November 23, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Deborah Hylton, November 23, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Bruce R. Donald, November 23, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Firoz Mistry, Julie McClintock, Mickey Sorrell, and David Tuttle, November 24, 2013: Upcoming consideration of Central West Small Area Plan; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Matthew Arnsberger, November 25, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Watson A. Bowes Jr., November 25, 2013: Central West Steering Committee recommendations for November 26 Council Meeting; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Ruth Ann Groh, November 25, 2013: Central West focus area; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Debbie Jepson, November 25, 2013: Central West focus area Small Area Plan; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Support the Citizens' Plan petition; November 12-26, 2013: <http://www.gopetition.com/petitions/support-the-citizen-plan.html>

Opposing Steering Committee Plan

- Breandan Dezendorf, November 20, 2013: Central West plan; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Jill Ridky-Blackburn, November 25, 2013: Central West - Do not approve! <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)

For Steering Committee Plan

- Paul Killough, October 17, 2013; Colonial Heights homeowner: I don't agree with "Central West citizens"; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Michael Parker and Amy Ryan, October 20, 2013; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/10/20/3291852/parker-ryan-a-central-west-plan.html>
- Peter deLeon, October 21, 2013; Central West Public Hearing speaking duration; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Jon DeHart, November 25, 2013: Central West Plan; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Cheryle Wicker, November 25, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Peter Bogart, November 25, 2013: Central West Steering Committee & Council meeting Tuesday November 26th; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)

Other suggestions

- Rudy Juliano, October 15, 2013: Central West plans; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Emil Malizia, October 18, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Verla Insko, November 6, 2013: The Central West planning and Estes Drive; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Daniel L. Clarke-Pearson, November 24, 2013: Central West process; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- A. Mark Weisburd, November 25, 2013: Central West fiscal analysis; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Nancy Oates, November 25, 2013: Traffic on Estes; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Loren Hintz, November 25, 2013: Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)

Comments on the process

- Gayatri Surendranathan, January 30, 2013; Central-west Chapel Hill community fails to recruit representative; <http://www.dailytarheel.com/article/2013/01/central-west-chapel-hill-community-fails-to-recruit-representative>
- Editorial Board, February 2, 2013; The Town Council's outreach needs improvement: <http://www.dailytarheel.com/article/2013/02/help-wanted>

- Mark Schultz, June 25, 2013; Chapel Hill growth talks reveal divide; <http://www.newsobserver.com/2013/06/25/2988626/chapel-hill-growth-talks-reveal.html>
- Firoz Mistry: Goals for Central West apply to all Chapel Hill, August 20, 2013; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/08/20/3119615/firoz-mistry-goals-for-central.html>
- John N. Morris, Dan Bruce, Fred Lampe, Alan N. Snavely, Glen H. Elder Jr., Sandy Turbeville and Alan R. Tom, September 8, 2013; Consultant costs; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/09/06/3167350/your-letters-sept-8-congratulations.html>
- R.L. Juliano, September 8, 2013; Financial fiasco; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/09/06/3167350/your-letters-sept-8-congratulations.html>
- Chapel Hill News, September 10, 2013; Roses and Raspberries; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/09/10/3177315/roses-and-raspberries.html>
- Lynne Kane, September 18, 2013; Raspberries undeserved; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/09/17/3201578/your-letters-sept-18.html>
- Ran Northam, September 20, 2013; Central West stalled; <http://chapelboro.com/news/development/central-west-stalled/>
- Tammy Grubb, September 20, 2013: Density, traffic driving Central West discord; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/09/20/3212459/density-traffic-driving-central.html>
- Thomas and Priscilla Murphy, September 23, 2013; Central West planning – costs and citizen inclusion; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Miriam and Larry Slifkin, September 20, 2013; letter to the editor; Committee concerns; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/09/27/3230586/your-letters-sept-29.html>
- Editorial, October 22, 2013: New development plan needs unity moving forward; <http://www.dailytarheel.com/article/2013/10/new-development-plan-needs-unity-moving-forward>
- Nancy Oates, October 28, 2013; Limits on listening; <http://chapelhillwatch.com/>
- Tim Platts Mills, October 29, 2013: Platts-Mills: Leadership needed in Central West debate; <http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/10/29/3318392/platts-mills-leadership-needed.html>
- Kathleen M. Snipes, October 29, 2013: Estes Drive/MLK Intersection Central West; <http://councilmail.townofchapelhill.org/searchform.do> (Central West)
- Paul Kushner, November 3, 2013; Amy Ryan: Candidate for Chapel Hill Town Council; <http://www.dailytarheel.com/article/2013/11/amy-ryan-candidate-for-chapel-hill-town-council>
- Jordan Nash, November 4, 2013: Kleinschmidt sees write-in competitor; <http://www.dailytarheel.com/article/2013/11/kleinschmidt-sees-write-in->

[competitor?utm_source=Sailthru&utm_medium=email&utm_term=Email%20Edition&utm_campaign=Today%27s%20Top%20DTH%20Stories%202013-11-05](#)

- Tammy Grub, Council returns to Estes-MLK plans Tuesday, November 23, 2013:
<http://www.chapelhillnews.com/2013/11/23/3396936/council-returns-to-estes-mlk-plans.html>