AGENDA #17

MEMORANDUM

TO: Town Council

FROM: Mayor Rosemary Waldorf, Chair
UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel

SUBJECT: Planning Panel's Final Report: Assessment of University's Final Plans for the Horace Williams and Mason Farm Tracts

DATE: January 13, 1997

We are pleased to offer our final report tonight on the two-year cooperative planning process which has resulted in long range land use plans for the University's Horace Williams and Mason Farm tracts.

This report provides an assessment of how the University's final land use plans incorporate the most significant goals and principles for the two properties. These goals and principles were provided in the Planning Panel's September, 1995 report to the Town Council.

If the Council so directs, this report will be forwarded to the University of North Carolina for their information as the Board of Trustees considers adoption of the land use plans. The Board is anticipated to consider the plans at its meeting on January 24, 1997. It would be timely if the report were forwarded to the University in advance of this meeting.

Resolution A would authorize forwarding the report to the University.

Another option would be for the Council to schedule a public forum to take comments on this final report. If the Council chooses this option, I would suggest scheduling the forum for January 21, 1997, with Council action on forwarding the report that same evening. Resolution B would schedule this forum.

Attachments:

1. UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel Final Report (begin new page 1)
2. Letter from UNC Chancellor Michael Hooker (p. 25)
3. Letter from Don Weisenstein (p. 26)

RESOLUTION A

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE FORWARDING THE UNC-CHAPEL HILL PLANNING PANEL'S FINAL REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY FOR THEIR INFORMATION AS THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES CONSIDERS ADOPTING LAND USE PLANS FOR THE HORACE WILLIAMS AND MASON FARM TRACTS (97-1-13/R-17a)

WHEREAS, the UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel has prepared a final report which provides an assessment of how the University's land use plans incorporate the goals and principles for the development of the Horace Williams and Mason Farm tracts; and

WHEREAS, the Town Council has received the Planning Panel's final report and endorses its recommendations;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council authorizes forwarding the UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel's Final Report to the University for their information as the Board of Trustees considers adopting land use plans for the Horace Williams and Mason Farm tracts.

This the 13th day of January, 1997.

RESOLUTION B

A RESOLUTION CALLING A PUBLIC FORUM ON JANUARY 21, 1997 ON THE UNC-CHAPEL HILL PLANNING PANEL'S FINAL REPORT: ASSESSMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S LAND USE PLANS FOR THE HORACE WILLIAMS AND MASON FARM TRACTS (97-1-13/R-17b)

WHEREAS, the UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel has prepared a final report which provides an assessment of how the University's land use plans incorporate the goals and principles for the development of the Horace Williams and Mason Farm tracts; and

WHEREAS, it is appropriate that the Council receive citizen comment on the Planning Panel's final report prior to forwarding the report to the University of North Carolina;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council calls a public forum on January 21, 1997 to receive citizen comment on the UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel's Final Report. The forum will be held at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, 306 N. Columbia Street.

This the 13th day of January, 1997.

UNC-CHAPEL HILL PLANNING PANEL

FINAL REPORT: ASSESSMENT OF UNC'S LAND USE PLANS FOR THE HORACE WILLIAMS AND MASON FARM TRACTS

January 13, 1997

Introduction

The UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel is pleased to present its final report on the collaborative process that has yielded long-range land use plans for the Horace Williams and Mason Farm properties. We offer this final report to the Council and the public in time for discussion and action prior to adoption of the final plan by the UNC Board of Trustees. When conveying your recommendations to the University, we suggest that the Council request that this report become a reference document to be included with the University's plans and used as any future development is contemplated on these two key properties.

This final report provides an assessment of the University's land use plans with respect to the Town's five major planning topics for the Horace Williams and Mason Farm properties: land use, neighborhood and town character, transportation, environment/ecology, and fiscal equity. Though fiscal equity issues were not an explicit part of the consultant's charge, we again direct the Council's attention to our principles of fiscal equity for these two properties which are generally supported by Chancellor Hooker.

The report lists the Planning Panel's goals that have seemed most significant throughout this process. For each goal, we report on how the final land use plans for each property incorporates the planning principles. The goals for these properties are provided in the Planning Panel's September, 1995 report, entitled "Goals and Principles for the Horace Williams and Mason Farm Tracts," and is attached to provide more detailed documentation.

The final land use plans for the two properties, we believe, are exemplary long-range plans that will allow the University to meet its academic and service missions in a way that is flexible, orderly and in harmony with the interests and planning goals of the Chapel Hill-Carrboro community. Throughout this two-year process, the Planning Panel has carefully listened to every citizen and interest group who spoke at forums, at our meetings and at the community meetings organized by the UNC consultants. It has been our intent to respond reasonably and sensibly to all concerns, and we believe we have done so.

It is historic that the final plans for these properties reflect both University and community goals. We are delighted that the University has demonstrated a commitment to long range planning. The challenge is now before the University and Towns to remain committed to this collaborative effort as these plans become reality.

We express our sincere thanks to the Council for allowing us to serve, to all citizens who contributed, and to the Carrboro Community Advisory Committee for their steady collaboration. We especially thank University officials and JJ&R for hearing community concerns with open minds.

HORACE WILLIAMS TRACT

Land Use Goals

Mixed Use: The site is appropriate for a mix of uses, combining academic, research, support services, related commercial, recreational and cultural facilities, and housing.

UNC Plan: The plan for this development accomplishes and extends this goal by including land use districts which incorporate a mix of uses appropriate for the site. The districts include: University Village, Visitor Destination, Independent Use, Housing, Utilitarian, and Active and Passive Recreation uses, and are described in the materials provided by the consultant.

Scale: Buildings should be of similar height, density and scale as the older portions of the current campus.

UNC Plan: The materials provided by the consultant refer to uses within the University Village district contributing to and benefiting from a "pedestrian oriented, human scale 'village' atmosphere." The University will encourage a density and scale of development similar in character to the older portion of central campus by creating public outdoor spaces as development focal points, and fostering a clear pedestrian and transit orientation.

Neighborhood and Town Character Goals

Protection of Existing Neighborhoods: Edges should provide well-defined boundaries adjacent to residential neighborhoods. Natural buffers should be arranged so that desirable neighborhood and campus vistas are maintained; noise and traffic intrusion into neighborhoods should be minimized.

UNC Plan: The plan for this property indicates that 100 foot buffers will be provided between existing neighborhoods and the new developments surrounding them. In addition, the plan calls for 100 to 200 foot buffers along the major thoroughfares adjacent to this development, and to avoid channeling increased traffic volumes onto neighborhood streets.

Preservation of Identity and Character: Entranceway beauty should be enhanced; landscaping similar to the old campus and in older parts of Town should be used as models for this development

UNC Plan: The University's planning principles for this development include enhancing the visual character of community entranceways and projecting a positive campus identity.

Transportation Goals

Transit Corridor and Activity Nodes: A multi-modal transit corridor with activity nodes should be incorporated to enhance the mixed use development. Transportation systems throughout the development should accommodate and emphasize a variety of alternative transit modes.

UNC Plan: The plan calls for a multi-modal transit corridor along the existing Southern Railroad line which could provide a link with the central campus. Alternative transportation facilities are planned throughout the development, incorporating village-style roadways with transit systems, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and an extensive open space network.

Transportation Impact: Overall transportation impacts should be minimized due to the effects of any proposed development.

UNC Plan: A University planning principle for this property is to link the overall development intensity to the traffic carrying capacity of the current and planned transportation system. A variety of trip reduction strategies will also be promoted.

Parking: Parking should be limited so as to promote the efficiency of transit systems within the development. Necessary parking facilities should be located near property boundaries to keep the campus as carless as possible.

UNC Plan: Potential park and ride facilities are planned to be located within the Visitor Destination district at the development's northern entrance from Weaver Dairy Road Extension. Additional small scale parking areas throughout the development are anticipated to provide access to land uses as needed.

Environment/Ecology Goals

Critical Features: Preserve and protect features of critical environmental concern by incorporating these areas into an open space network, and not allowing transportation corridors to create negative impacts on critical features.

UNC Plan: The analysis of this property indicated several areas of environmental sensitivity to be protected from development. Areas of lesser sensitivity are designated to be developed upon, with no roadway crossing of the critical Bolin Creek corridor.

Sensitive Features: Conserve natural resources and energy to protect sensitive environmental features.

UNC Plan: As noted above, a large portion of the site is planned to be preserved and protected from development. 120 of the property's 973 acres were found to be of critical environmental concern and will not be developed upon. Approximately 355 acres, including hardwood forest areas, were additionally found to be sensitive. They are viewed as "last resort" areas for development and will be treated with extreme care if developed upon at all.

Hazardous Waste Sites: Address the current and long-term safety and security of University generated, low-level radioactive waste and/or unknown materials stored at various sites in and around the Horace Williams property.

UNC Plan: The University is continuing its assessment of the UNC Airport Road Waste Disposal Site. The Remedial Investigation document, providing information on the site assessment, is near completion. A Remedial Action Plan is currently being drafted and will provide a conceptual plan on how the University will clean up the waste disposal site. It is our understanding that current federal regulations would prohibit the establishment of future hazardous waste disposal sites.

Open Space Network: Provide an open space network designed to protect the natural environment, establish accessible active and passive recreation sites, protect scenic views and provide linkages among neighborhoods.

UNC Plan: The plan for this development includes a network of open space areas which incorporate many of the sensitive environmental features to be preserved. A 34 acre Active Recreation district is located near the center of the site, north of the existing airport. An 18 acre Passive Recreation district is located south of Bolin Creek. Extensive natural areas (approximately 115 acres) are also preserved to protect critical natural resources, provide buffers and link open space areas across the site.

Landscaped buffers along thoroughfares and the protection of areas along creek corridors are planned to help protect scenic views. Linkages among neighborhoods are anticipated to be provided via pedestrian and bicycle amenities.

Minimizing Impacts: Minimize the impacts of increased active and passive recreational development, such as lighting and parking, on neighboring land uses.

UNC Plan: The Active Recreation district, in its near central location, is surrounded by the Horace Williams Airport and the University Village, Independent Use and Utilitarian districts. These uses seem compatible in terms of possible impacts from potential lighting and parking generated from the Active Recreation area.

Stormwater Management: Commission and fund a stormwater management study for the basin, and develop an area or regional stormwater management plan.

UNC Plan: The Chapel Hill Town Council recently adopted a resolution to ask the North Carolina Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources (DEHNR) to make a request to the Army Corps of Engineers for a comprehensive study of the Booker, Bolin and Morgan Creek drainage basins. This study is to be sponsored by the Towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro, Orange County and the University of North Carolina. Town staff has forwarded this request to the DEHNR for processing.

Fiscal Impact Goals

Fiscal Equity: Although the fiscal impacts of development on this property were not part of the consultant's study, the Planning Panel included issues of fiscal equity in its initial goals and principles. Two significant goals of the Panel were that the University reserve land for a possible future elementary school site, and to allow for the continuation and possible future expansion of the Town's municipal facilities operation.

UNC Plan: The University is willing to set aside land for a possible future elementary school site, if the future Housing uses on the property create a need for additional school facilities. The Town of Chapel Hill's Municipal Operations site is included as an existing use in the plan's Utilitarian district, and is anticipated to remain in this location with potential for future expansion.

As a final comment, we are gratified by Chancellor Hooker's pledge of fairness and equity, as stated in his letter of January 25, 1996:

> For future University development on the Horace Williams and Mason Farm tracts, the University agrees generally to support to the extent feasible and permitted by law the Town's goal of recovering the capital and operating costs of municipal services required by and directly provided to University development.

The Chancellor's letter is provided as an attachment to this document.

MASON FARM TRACT

Land Use Goals

Appropriate Development: This property is well located for regional access and is appropriate for further development of continuing education facilities. The site is not appropriate for significant patient care facilities.

UNC Plan: New uses planned for this site, prior to the development of the University's land use plans, include the WUNC radio station/tower, the Principals' Executive Program building and a child care facility. The land use plan for this property indicates that the primary development zone (approximately 128 acres) near the Friday Center will contain similar uses as these, with an emphasis on continuing education and office space. Additional acreage on the western portion of the Parker property is identified for possible future residential development.

Neighborhood and Town Character Goals

Protection of Existing Neighborhoods: Provide well-defined boundaries, natural buffers, and minimal noise and traffic intrusion into existing neighborhoods.

UNC Plan: A buffer appears to be intended between the office building on Barbee Chapel Road and Finley Forest. Additional buffers are not anticipated between the future housing development and existing neighborhoods west of Finley Golf Course Road.

Preservation of Identity and Character: Entranceway beauty should be maintained or enhanced; landscaping on the old campus and in older parts of Town should be used as models for this development.

UNC Plan: The University's planning principles for development include enhancing the visual character of community entranceways and projecting a positive campus identity. The plan for this property indicates that the key entranceway parcel on the corner of N.C. 54 and Friday Center Drive will be protected from development.

Transportation Goals

Alternative Transportation: Movement systems should be developed that will encourage transit system use, discourage private vehicle use and reduce the need for valuable campus land to be used for parking and enlarged roadways.

UNC Plan: This property currently contains a park and ride site and is planned to include a future 1100 space parking deck near the primary development zone surrounding the Friday Center and near the future potential rail corridor.

Regional Connectivity: The site should be planned to include efficient linkage to Triangle-wide transportation systems as well as systems internal to Chapel Hill.

UNC Plan: A transportation corridor has been reserved in the northern portion of the property for possible future connection with a Triangle-wide transit system. The recommended alignment of the corridor enters the site near Friday Center Drive, turns west along the northern property line immediately south of the proposed Meadowmont development, and continues west paralleling Raleigh Road.

Environment/Ecology Goals

Environmental Sensitivity: Areas of critical environmental concern should be preserved and protected in perpetuity; conserve natural resources and energy to protect sensitive features of the natural environment.

UNC Plan: The University has committed to preserving environmentally sensitive features including the Biological Reserve, Botanical Garden and associated Arboreta, a portion of the Parker property, and additional areas of sensitivity amounting to more than 627 acres. The Finley Golf Course is located on 239 acres of the property. 184 acres have been identified as suitable for development.

Transportation Facilities: Significant transportation corridors/alignments should not cross the Botanical Garden property or create negative impacts on environmentally sensitive areas.

UNC Plan: The plan for this development indicates that potential transportation corridors will not cross or create negative impacts on the Botanical Garden property. Future transportation facilities and land uses are planned to avert negative impacts on the environmentally sensitive areas within the site.

Hazardous Waste Sites: Address the current and long-term safety and security of the University generated, low-level radioactive waste temporarily stored at the CHYDARU site.

UNC Plan: The University plans to submit its Comprehensive Site Assessment of the low-level radioactive waste disposal site to the Environmental Protection Agency and other regulatory entities. A Corrective Action Plan will then be developed in which the University will investigate ways to remediate the site and return it to wetlands. We understand that current federal regulations would prohibit the establishment of future hazardous waste disposal sites.

Minimize Negative Impacts: Protect scenic and environmentally sensitive views from visual, traffic, noise, reflective and/or transparent glass and night-time lighting impacts.

UNC Plan: Potential land uses on this site are planned to avert negative impacts on the property's environmentally sensitive features.

GOALS AND PRINCIPLES FOR THE HORACE WILLIAMS AND MASON FARM TRACTS

September 11, 1995

Introduction

Development of the University properties should advance the University's mission in teaching, research, and public service. It is the University's role to best determine how that mission can be accomplished. It is the community's role to influence the shape, pattern, and functional relationships of any new development to ensure that it enhances the larger community.

The current zoning of the Horace Williams and Mason Farm tracts, as well as the 1986 Land Use Plan Narrative, are inadequate guides for future planning. This report from the Town of Chapel Hill's UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel recommends goals and planning principles in five major areas that are critical to an effective long-range plan. The recommendations rest on our central belief that a mixed-use development pattern that pairs activity nodes with multi-modal transit facilities is critical to the internal and external integration of University and community development.

We support a sustainable mixed pattern of uses that preserves sensitive environmental areas, relies upon and supports efficient mass transit to connect the campuses and the surrounding areas, and provides a long-term structure to promote University development that is compatible with the larger community.

The five major planning topics that this report addresses are:

- land uses,
- neighborhood and town character concerns,
- transportation plans,
- environment and ecology concerns, and
- fiscal impact issues.

Each planning topic is prefaced with a goal statement based on the Town's 1989 Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives.

Land Use Goals and Principles

In the Town's Comprehensive Plan, land use goals are based on the desire to integrate growth and change in the historical fabric of the community in a way that enhances town character. Growth should be managed at a pace that permits the broader community to provide adequate public facilities as development occurs. The 1986 Land Use Plan called for designating separate well-defined areas for different uses along major thoroughfares, with mixed-use development recommended only for two major interchanges (I-40/86 and (I40/15-501).

For the University lands, we recommend a different mixed-use pattern - one that promotes an internal sense of community, connects to the broader community, and minimizes the negative impact of University development on local streets, local neighborhoods, and local government budgets.

Horace Williams Property

Mixed Use

The site is appropriate for a mix of uses, combining academic, research, support services, related commercial, and housing. For example, classrooms, conference facilities, research buildings, University offices, dormitories, faculty and student housing, recreational facilities, child care centers, minor medical facilities, cultural facilities, and commercial areas are considered appropriate. The key is to find uses that complement each other, enhance the efficiencies of transit planning, and are appropriate to the surrounding neighborhoods. The tracts should not be used as a last resort site for campus buildings that do not "fit" on central campus, nor should any significant patient care facilities be located on this site.

Transit Corridor (Rail/Bus) and Activity Nodes

As outlined in the transportation section of this report, the use of multi-mode transit corridors with activity nodes is critical to successful mixed-use development of the Horace Williams tract. Specifically, it should not be necessary to drive a car to move easily between campuses. In fact, development of the activity nodes should provide preferred access to pedestrians, bicyclists, and mass transit riders.

The Panel recommends using the existing rail corridor through the site to connect Horace Williams to the central campus. A dedicated transit corridor that accommodates a variety of alternative transit modes (light rail, fixed guideway or conventional buses, bicycle, pedestrian) must be reserved in initial planning stages. Around each transit stop, cluster University facilities and associated support services.

Key elements of mixed-use appropriate to this site include:

Research Park
Include an emphasis on research uses that complement the academic purposes of the University. Consider placing research and development facilities on the northeast quadrant, which has the most potential for a campus-like environment.

Housing
Clustered, moderate-cost housing for faculty, staff, and students should be an integral part of the development of this land.

Support Services/Related Commercial
Include business and services supportive to campus uses within the development. The support services should be commensurate with site development in that area (i.e., a research area would have services related to the specific research activity). Include related commercial uses, such as grocery, retail, restaurants, dry cleaners, etc., near transit stops.

Shared Recreation and Cultural Facilities
The area could include significant recreation and cultural opportunities that are available both to the university community and the community at large.

Important issues relating to land use on this tract include:

Scale
Buildings should be of similar height, density, and scale as the older portions of the current campus.

Edges
Edges should be carefully designed to protect adjacent neighborhoods and, along streets and thoroughfares, give a good sense of the campus within.

Energy Conservation
Site planning, landscaping, and structure design should maximize potential for energy conservation by reducing the demand for artificial heating, cooling, ventilation, and lighting.

Parking
Limit parking to promote efficient mass transit as detailed in the transportation section. Put necessary parking near property boundaries to keep the campus as carless as possible. Parking should be well-designed to fit in with the surroundings and be non-urban in scale (i.e., of an appropriate scale for the area and screened sufficiently to blend into its surroundings). Some parking could be decentralized for service delivery, handicapped, and special needs parking.

Horace Williams Airport

We endorse the Town Council's current policy on the location of the Horace Williams Airport, namely, that the Town favors relocation of the airport. Until relocation occurs, the airport must not expand in level or type of use.

Mason Farm Property

Land Use and Access

There is limited potential for additional buildings on the property, unless the golf course were to be removed. We recognize that the 31 developable acres are well-located for regional access and may be more desirable for certain types of development activity, such as continuing education. The site is not appropriate for any significant patient care facilities.

It is critical, however, that regional mass transit and direct transit connections to the central campus be minimal conditions for any development at this environmentally sensitive site. We oppose a road system that could form a commuting route from the Bypass to Highway 54, or from the neighborhoods south of Morgan Creek, but we strongly encourage the development of pedestrian and bicycle corridors through this property to the central campus.

The sensitive environmental areas made up by Mason Farm and the Botanical Gardens should be preserved and protected in perpetuity.

Neighborhood and Town Character
Goals and Principles

The neighborhood/town character goal is to protect the integrity of existing neighborhoods on the "edges" of both the Horace Williams and Mason Farm properties.

Proposed principles to protect existing neighborhoods are:

The Horace Williams and Mason Farm campus edges should provide well-defined boundaries adjacent to residential neighborhoods and, when viewed from collector and arterial streets, provide a good sense of campus. Consider the creation of perimeter areas within the tract which would provide vistas to more dense, internally clustered development.

Natural buffers should be arranged so that desirable neighborhood and campus vistas are maintained. Neighborhood residents living next to these properties should participate in the formulation of plans to buffer the neighborhoods from the campuses.

Noise and traffic intrusion into neighborhoods should be minimized. Any campus road system should permit filtration of traffic though the campus, but avoid creating neighborhood cut-throughs. Parking areas and decks located near campus boundaries should be sited away from existing residential neighborhoods.

A network of small parks, open areas, and courtyards linked by foot and bicycle paths would serve as both natural buffers and gathering places.

Proposed principles to preserve and extend the identity and character are:

Entranceway beauty should be maintained or enhanced.

Landscaping evident on the old campus and in older parts of Town, which blends native and non-native plants in a natural design with green open spaces and brick squares as gathering places, should be used as a model on the two tracts.

Campuses should be linked to the community by sidewalks, bike and jogging paths, and village-style roads.

Buildings should reflect the height, density, and human scale of the North (old) portion of the current campus.

Utility infrastructure should not be noticeable (wires underground, sewer and water easements utilized as greenways, etc.).

Transportation Goals and Principles

As stated in the Comprehensive Plan, Chapel Hill should strive to develop a comprehensive transportation system that will enhance the mobility of all citizens by offering a variety of transportation options and reducing dependence on the automobile.

Transportation issues should be evaluated comprehensively.

Evaluate the transportation options and impacts for different land use possibilities.

Develop, describe and propose specific movement systems configured to best support proposed land use sets.

Employ comprehensive modeling procedures that can evaluate the impact of different land use scenarios on auto, transit, bike and pedestrian activity.

Overall transportation impacts should be minimized due to the effects of any proposed development.

Compact, dense development patterns (nodes and clusters) are preferable to sprawl to increase efficiencies of mass transit.

A criterion for locating facilities should be to minimize trip generation between separate campuses.

Opportunities for effective mass transit due to development of satellite campuses should be maximized.

Town and University should establish a continuous joint transportation planning group for most efficient use of town-owned transit equipment.

Incorporate the Recommendations from the Special Report on Single Occupancy Vehicle Use Reduction.

Town and University should work together to develop an intermodal transit facility to assist and link internal and external transportation movements.

Movement on "Main Campus" should be studied to effect the most efficient integration of internal transit with future systems to satellites. This may include developing an "inner loop" system within Main Campus.

Movement systems should be developed that will encourage transit system use, discourage private vehicular use and reduce the need for valuable campus land to be used for parking and enlarged roadways.

These two sites should be planned to include efficient linkage to Triangle-wide transportation systems as well as systems internal to Chapel Hill.

Planning for these two sites should incorporate, in general, the policies and plans of the Triangle Transit Authority, including:

Connections to the proposed light rail triangle transit system, and connections to the existing TTA bus system.

Explore using the existing heavy rail corridor for rail, bike and other movement between the Horace Williams Tract and Main Campus.

Pedestrian and bicycle circulation plans need to be developed.

Plans should include dedicated travel areas for each mode.

Recommendations of the Regional Bicycle Plan, Town of Chapel Hill Bikeways Plan, Town of Chapel Hill Pedestrian Plan, and the Town of Chapel Hill Greenways Plan should be integrated into the plans for these two tracts.

Existing and potential greenways should be included as part of the overall transportation pattern.

Following are some suggestions on how we might translate the goals and principles listed above into an actual plan.

Three key elements relating to the Transportation Goals and Principles need to be addressed and extended based on discussion with the Carrboro Committee, the Land Use Committee, and the University Faculty Committee reports.

First, recommendations for an internal road structure for the Horace Williams Property need to be carefully considered in light of overall plans for the two communities and the impact such roads may have on surrounding neighborhoods. The development of major auto thoroughfares bisecting the property will have two major negative impacts.

1) Major arterials will serve to limit the ability of the University to develop internal alternative transportation modes such as pedestrian, bike, and bus networks effectively.

2) Perceived rapid access by vehicle through the property will increase the desirability of driving to the campus thereby increasing congestion throughout the community. Preferred access to the campus by alternative modes is critical in ensuring the efficiency of mass transit.

Second, a fixed guideway route structure is focused on creating sufficient transit use for effective mass transit. This means achieving clustered densities similar to the central campus on portions of the property and requires capitalizing on ridership for the work/home commute and ensuring regional connectivity.

To demonstrate the concept, we have identified proposed stops in the local jurisdictions which would maximize both internal mixed use and the potential for capturing commute ridership. These stops include:

1) North Chapel Hill Park and Ride Lot/Northwest Area Plan
2) Northern end of the Horace Williams Lot across from High School Road (to serve the High School as well as the University property)
3) Southern end of the Horace Williams Lot across from a central entrance to the Carrboro portion of the HW tract (to serve the Carrboro and Chapel Hill portions of the tract)
4) The old Carrboro Town station
5) The UNC Co-Generation Facility on Cameron Avenue
6) The Carolina Inn (to serve the downtown area and the west side of the central campus)
7) UNC Hospitals (to serve predominantly employees, but also patients using the Health Affairs complex.)
8) The Dean Smith facility (to serve sports and entertainment events, as well as South Campus housing)
9) The North Carolina Botanical Garden/Ronald McDonald House
10) The UNC Hospital Administration Center/Friday Center
11) Meadowmont
12) 15-501/I40 (to serve the Blue Cross/Blue Shield and Eastowne Office Complex)
13) Continued access to the regional TTA rail and bus plans via Durham, and the Triangle

Third, given the challenges identified by the University Faculty Committee, land uses for the proposed transit stops should be of a mixed use type with a focus on selecting the uses to reduce trip generation. In particular, it should not be necessary for University employees, students, or visitors to have access to a car to reach all points on all three campuses. It should also be possible for access to be obtained via all the major arteries into the internal system by multiple modes. Finally, land uses such as child care and elder care, university housing, and appropriate commercial development are critical in meeting the challenges that the University identified in its report. In particular, the need to remain competitive in attracting faculty, students, accommodating complex schedules, the demand

Environment/Ecology Goals and Principles

The Natural Environment goal is to encourage development that protects the natural and built environment and provides for appropriate location of land uses.

Critical Features

Preserve and protect features of critical environmental concern.

Recognize the exceptional plant communities and rare plant/animal species as assets and opportunities, through the registry of these sites with the North Carolina Natural Heritage Program[1].

Incorporate into an open space network areas of critical environmental concern, including stream floodways, the Town of Chapel Hill Resource Conservation District (RCD), and areas of steep slopes. The network would provide corridors and linkages between designated "protected" areas, protect scenic views, vistas and areas, buffer other land uses from each other, provide recreational opportunities and protect vulnerable areas from development.

Protect, preserve and enhance the existing land uses (biological research, educational and neighborhood quality) by providing adequate forest, visual, noise and watershed buffers.

Significant transportation corridors/alignments (including TTA systems) should not cross Botanical Gardens property or create negative impacts to environmentally sensitive areas.

---

[1] **Environmentally sensitive areas:**

- Rhododendron Bluff populations (4) along Morgan Creek (within the Hunt Arboretum),
- Big Oak woods (within the Mason Farm Biological Reserve),
- Southern Shagbark Hickory slopes (within the Mason Farm Biological Reserve and eastern side of "Parker Property"),
- Alluvial Forest along Morgan Creek (within the Mason Farm Botanical Reserve, Hunt Arboretum, and creek corridor portions of the greater Mason Farm tract),
- Hardwood Forest on the southern slopes of the North Carolina Botanical Garden nature trail area, and
- Bolin Creek floodway and surrounding steep slopes (within the Town of Carrboro portion of the Horace Williams tract).

Sensitive Features

Conserve natural resources and energy to protect sensitive features of the natural environment[2]. Sensitive features include shrink-swell soil, slopes greater than 15%, water quality and air quality.

Consider the expansion limits of the OWASA treatment plant at Mason Farm. The plant has a current finite limit on its expansion of 12 MGD, based on the assimilative capacity of Morgan Creek. Expansion even to this limit may not be granted by the state. There should be no expansion of the plant, required by University needs, that would encroach on the Botanical Gardens.

Golf course management issues have significant environmental implications, in particular water quality. The current environmental impacts of Finley Golf Course are significantly less than national golf course averages[3]. Any future expansion or relocation of University golf course facilities should continue to be constructed and maintained in an environmentally conscious manner.

---

[2] Approximately 40% of the Mason Farm property lies within the 100-year flood plain (with occurrence of several soil series including shrink-swell), which means that an even greater amount is included in the Town of Chapel Hill RCD, thus restricting opportunities for development.

Exemplary populations of Catawba rhododendron (*Rhododendron catawbiense*) occur on steep (in excess of 10%), north-facing bluffs along Morgan Creek and deserve protection.

[3] **National Golf Course Maintenance Levels:** "...an average of 18 pounds of pesticides were applied per treated acre each year, contrasting to the average of 2.7 pounds applied on agricultural lands. There is the additional heavy use of fertilizers." from the article "How Green Are These Fairways?" - *Audubon* magazine, Sept-Oct 1993. "...water - between 500,000 and 800,000 gallons a day per course, according to the National Golf Foundation." from the article "Charting A New Course" - *National Wildlife* magazine, Aug-Oct 1993.

1994-95 Finley Golf Course Maintenance Levels: "An estimated 2-4 pounds per acre (of pesticides) are used each year on the course. Golf course greens (about 3 acres total) are the only areas that receive high intensity (though less than 18 pounds per acre) pesticide treatment ... Currently, there is no irrigation from January-March. For the remaining nine months the average water use per month is 430,000 gallons, ranging from 43,000 to 1,157,000 gallons per month in 1994-95. Nine month average water use per day - 14,187 gallons..." from Ross Fowler, UNC Finley Golf Course Superintendent, fax March 28 and 30, 1995.

Address the current and long-term safety and security of University generated, low-level radioactive waste that is temporarily stored at the:

- Hazardous Materials Facility (located near the intersection of Airport Road and Estes Drive Ext.), and
- CHYDARU[4] ("shad-a-rue") complex and the radioactive animal burial site (located on north side of Morgan Creek, near Friday Center).

Address the current and long-term safety (groundwater quality, etc.) of radioactive waste and/or unknown materials within:

- Old University/Town Landfill (located within the east-central portion of the Horace Williams property)
- Older University/Town Dump (located beneath the "P" parking lot near intersection of Airport Road and Estes Drive Ext., and
- Waste Chemical Storage Area (small fenced area, located within the east-central portion of the Horace Williams property).

Design land uses, transportation corridors, etc. that "reduce, reuse and recycle".

Location of potential "light rail" corridor through Mason Farm property should closely parallel the existing transportation corridors (54 east and Fordham Blvd.) in order to minimize negative impact on existing neighborhoods and sensitive natural areas (North Carolina Botanical Garden and Mason Farm Biological Reserve).

Open Space Network

Provide an open space network designed to protect the natural environment, establish accessible active and passive recreation sites, separate incompatible land uses, protect scenic views, and provide linkages among neighborhoods.

Coordinate the inclusion of accessible, active and passive recreational sites with the Town of Chapel Hill Parks and Recreation Department.

Provide linkages among neighborhoods (a dedicated greenway connecting Glenwood Elementary School to the North Carolina Botanical Garden that would enhance their existing relationship: "Partnership in Education"; public greenways and bikeways that enhance the master plan of the Town of Chapel Hill Parks and Recreation and Transportation Departments).

---

[4] Originally named the Chapel Hill Youth Detention and Rehabilitation Unit when used for these purposes in the 1940's.

Minimize the impacts of increased active and passive recreational development, such as lighting and parking, on neighboring land uses.

Protect scenic and environmentally sensitive views from visual, traffic, noise, reflective and/or transparent glass and night-time lighting impacts.

Stormwater Management

A major issue facing the University in developing such a large area of land, such as the Horace Williams tract, is the regional impact on stormwater. We recommend that University join with Chapel Hill, Carrboro, and Orange County to:

- Commission and fund a stormwater management study for this basin.
- Develop an area or regional stormwater management plan. For example, small drainage retention basins, where possible, might be consolidated into larger ones to become more effective. In addition, these large stormwater management ponds can be pleasant destination points along pedestrian and bicycles corridors into the University.
- Require stormwater impact statements of any new development on either tract.
- Ask the University to comply with the Town's RCD, or develop new zoning that effectively achieves this.

Fiscal Policy Goals and Principles

Fiscal policy issues are not part of the scope of work of the University's land use planning consultants. However, addressing fiscal equity issues is clearly part of the Council's charge to the Planning Panel, and will be a critical concern for the local governments if and when development of these properties proceeds.

Many services issues cannot be resolved in advance, but will have to be negotiated at various future moments when costs and needs can be quantified. It will be very helpful to future leaders of both institutions to have a policy framework within which to operate.

The Planning Panel recommends that this policy framework adhere to principles identified in the Comprehensive Plan:

- Encourage the equitable distribution of the tax burden,
- Take the initiative in identifying and pursuing sources of state, federal, and private financial assistance.
- Plan systematically for the provision of public facilities, and
- Encourage development at a pace that will allow infrastructure to adjust appropriately.

Proposed principles for developing policies and agreements:

Focus on fundamental principles to guide the relationship between the two institutions.

All new UNC development at Horace Williams and Mason Farm should be revenue neutral or positive to the Town. The Town should strive to recover capital and operating costs for municipal services needed specifically because of new development.

In order to measure and assess whether development is revenue neutral or positive to the Town, fiscal impact statements should be prepared as a part of each new development proposal. These statements should estimate the cost of municipal services that would be needed to support the development, and project any revenues that would accrue to the Town as a result of the development. The new zoning district that is created for these properties should include a requirement that any application for development in the zone be accompanied by a fiscal impact statement.

Rules for compensation to the Town for services should be as fair as possible, and mutually agreed upon by UNC and Chapel Hill.

Any third-party development on UNC properties should be revenue neutral or positive. Payment-in-lieu of taxes is recommended as a fair way of recovering municipal service costs incurred by third-party development of housing, research and development facilities or commercial service facilities.

Endorse the existing OWASA policies that require UNC to pay water and sewer availability fees for all new development on Horace Williams and Mason Farm tracts.

As means of payment for municipal services (and related facilities) provided to the University, the two institutions should explore:

- Fees for services provided through contractual agreements,
- Value to the Town of new facilities developed by UNC made available for broad community use, such as recreational facilities,
- Value to the Town of new facilities on UNC property that can also be used by Chapel Hill for local government functions, such as a fueling and vehicle service station, and
- Value of land donated by UNC with favorable long-term lease contracts with local government (Town, county or schools).

Impact Fees

While the Town holds authority to impose impact fees, it has never done so. State properties are not specifically exempt from impact fee authority, but they also are not specifically subject to it. Legal advisors suggest that if the Town does not impose impact fees on other developers, it might have great legal difficulty imposing such fees on the state (UNC). We understand that when impact fees are imposed there must be a well documented connection between a specific impact and a specific charge. At this point, user fees or fees for service appear more flexible and workable.

The Panel discussed whether Orange County's impact fee on new housing to support capital construction for schools would apply to any housing developed on the UNC properties. The Planning Panel believes that this fee should apply to such housing development, but we recognize that this is a legal issue best addressed by Orange County and UNC attorneys.

Payments-in-Lieu of Taxes

All UNC (state) properties are specifically exempt from ad valorem taxes. We believe a third-party developer on state property should not necessarily benefit from such exemption. UNC could enter into agreement with a third-party owner and require that owner to make payments-in-lieu of taxes to the County and the Town. This could be addressed as a condition of the lease agreement. The building could be assessed for tax value like other buildings of its type and size in the jurisdiction, and payment-in-lieu could be calculated on this basis.

The UNC-owned land on which such a building would sit would be tax-exempt. Again, we believe UNC could agree, as a lease condition, that payment-in-lieu could be based on a valuation figure that includes land value.

The Panel believes that we should encourage some third-party development as a means of pursuing fiscal equity.

Potential Areas of Cooperation between UNC and Chapel Hill

It would be useful to identify present service relationships, providers and financial terms. These include transactions that run both ways, such as fire protection, transit, and the Town's lease of land for Public Works Department facilities. We recommend that the Town and UNC develop a comprehensive list of present exchanges.

Listed in the Appendix are examples of facilities and functions that might be cooperatively used by the two institutions and other local governments. It is drawn from public comment made at various meetings, suggestions by Town staff and other local officials, and Panel discussion. It is an idea list, and perhaps will stimulate us all in our search to make linkages between land use maps and daily activities and pursue equity through cooperation.

Appendix

Types of facilities that might be cooperatively used by UNC and Chapel Hill:

Recreational Facilities
Golf course
Open space
General recreational facilities
Playing fields
Skateboard park
Community recreation center

Other Public Facilities
Park/ride lot
Transit corridor/station
Performing arts center (shared with high school)
School site at Horace Williams
Extra land for Glenwood School

Public Works Facilities
Public Works/Physical Plant offices and storage yard
Fueling and vehicle service station
Bus/transit maintenance garage
Car/truck washing facility
Composting site
Recycling/materials handling facility

Other
Subsidized/affordable housing (owner and renter)
Employee/staff housing
Staff training center
Tree/shrub farm and plant nursery
Business incubator building
Fire station
Joint emergency operations center
Indoor pistol range for Police use
Employee health, fitness and safety center
Flexibility for meeting day care and early childhood education needs on site at new housing development.

UNC-Chapel Hill Planning Panel Members

Mayor Rosemary Waldorf, Chair
Flicka Bateman
John Bell
Joe Capowski
Nancy Gabriel
Alice Gordon
Josh Gurlitz
Alice Ingram
Lee Pavão
Scott Radway
Larry Reid
Alan Rimer
Pearson Stewart
James Ward
Don Weisenstein
Rachel Willis
Bob Woodruff

Planning Department Staff

Lorie Tekiele, Long Range Planner
Chris S. Berndt, Long Range Planning Coordinator

University Liaisons

Ted Hoskins, Consulting Architect
Bruce Runberg, Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Management

25

Attachment 1

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL
Office of the Chancellor

Michael Hooker
Chancellor

103 South Building
Campus Box 9100
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-9100
(919) 962-1365 FAX: (919) 962-1647

January 25, 1996

Mayor Rosemary Waldorf
Town of Chapel Hill
306 North Columbia Street
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27516

Dear Mayor Waldorf:

I am responding to your request of January 22, 1996, asking that I extend Paul Hardin's commitment as expressed in his letter of October 4, 1994, to refrain from submitting development applications at the Horace Williams property.

I strongly support earlier initiatives for an open and cooperative planning process for our outlying properties. I hereby reaffirm that the University will not submit any application for development on its property at Horace Williams, north of Estes Drive Extension, until at least 90 days after adoption of the land use plan by the University's Board of Trustees. In exchange, and per the original October 4, 1994, agreement, the Town agrees to continue to hold in abeyance actions associated with a rezoning of the property.

In regard to the area south of Estes Drive, we reserve the right to submit applications for certain structures on this parcel.

For future University development on the Horace Williams and the Mason Farm tracts, the University agrees generally to support to the extent feasible and permitted by law the Town's goal of recovering the capital and operating costs of municipal services required by and directly provided to University development.

I hope this will help to allay any concerns and continue our efforts to build trust between the Town and the University.

Sincerely,

Michael Hooker

Attachment 2

Rosemary Waldorf
Mayor, Town of Chapel Hill

(26)

April 28, 1996

Dear Rosemary:

I thought the meeting with Dwight Merriam on Saturday was very constructive in helping to establish a framework for a Zoning Plan. However, there is one concern that I have with regard to the plan. So, I wanted to share my thoughts with you.

My concern is that under this zoning plan, the goals or principles contained in the Comprehensive Plan (or Master Plan) would be "etched in stone" and could not be changed, without a change in the ordinance. Also, as I see it, this would essentially end any collaborative planning between the Town and the University, following completion of the JJR study. Both the Town and the University would be bound by the goals or principles established in the Comprehensive Plan.

Immediately, this poses a problem to the Town as to how specific the goals should be. (I listened to your discussion of this at a recent Council meeting.) If you are not specific enough, it may give the University too much leeway in interpreting a goal. Conversely, if you are too specific, you may hamper the design effort and provide no flexibility in handling unusual situations or conditions that are almost certain to arise.

One way to solve this problem would be to enter into an agreement with the University that an ongoing Planning Panel would be established, made up of an equal number of representatives from the Town and the University. This would be an advisory working committee (not a policy making committee), whose responsibility would be to provide an ongoing review of University development plans to ensure that these plans were compatible with the goals or principles established in the Comprehensive Plan.

The committee would function only in the Precinct planning process and would meet periodically, reviewing each precinct plan (from beginning to end), consulting with University planners and architects and Town planning personnel, and also providing input to both the Town Council and to the University as to problems and concerns being encountered during the planning process.

In the event that a major problem was encountered in meeting the goals in the Comprehensive Plan, the committee could petition the Town Council for relief (either prior to completion of the Precinct Plan or at the time the Precinct Plan was submitted to the Council for approval.) The Council could either agree or disagree (by a simple vote) as to whether to grant relief. Each such request for relief would have to be supported by well documented reasons set forth by by the planning committee. Such an arrangement would provide a means of addressing situations where there is an obvious need to alter a goal for a particular development.

One of the difficulties in the goal concept in the Comprehensive Plan is that there is probably no one in the community who has sufficient insight into the development process to establish goals that will effectively serve the needs of both the Town and the University over a long period of time. This does not mean that the goals that are established are considered frivolous or not really meaningful. It merely means that there would be a mechanism in place to take care of legitimate concerns when they arise.

Also, I think that both the Town and the University would benefit enormously from having an ongoing input regarding the needs and concerns of each party. This kind of liason might also be useful in getting University cooperation in areas where there is a community interest (such as affordable housing and shared recreational facilities).

As you will recall, Dwight Merriam was very complimentary about the collaborative planning that has been done to-date. I feel that much could be gained through a continuation of this kind of planning. Whether it is done through the mechanism that I have described (or in some other way), I believe that it would be worthwhile.

With the exception of the one change in procedure that I have outlined above, all other aspects of the Plan that Dwight Merriam presented would remain as outlined -- i.e. a Comprehensive Plan (with goals, as described), a Precinct Development Plan (with approval by the Town Council), and individual building plans (with expeditious approval by the Planning Board).

Whether any of these ideas prove useful or not, I certainly recognize the difficulties that you face in trying to bring everyone together on this project. I'm sure you will persevere and will be successful.

Best wishes,

Don

Don Weisenstein