

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Chapel Hill Planning Department, April 4, 2023

Engagement by the Numbers:

<p>9 In-person and Virtual PIMs and Community Open Houses.</p> <p>We have reached 146 folks through these events.</p>	<p>13 Neighborhood Meetings, as requested by residents, with total estimated attendance of 350 people</p>	<p>5,550 Visits to PublicInput 868 Survey Participants 342 Comments</p>	<p>471 email subscribers for project updates</p> <p><i>*Emails were collected through PublicInput, community events, and neighborhood meetings</i></p>
---	---	---	--

Summary of Community Feedback:

Staff has received a significant amount of public comment. Common concerns and topics of conversation include:

- Student housing
- Parking/Traffic
- Nuisances
- Infrastructure capacity
- Equity and diversity
- Locations for density
- Housing affordability
- Neighborhood character
- Tree canopy
- Out-of-town investors
- Demolitions and loss of neighborhood character
- Historic designations
- Occupancy
- Stormwater
- Unintended consequences
- Zoning as a promise of expectations


Staff also maintains a [Frequently Asked Questions](#) page with 43 prompts and responses as of Friday, March 24th.

Summary of Public Participation Demographics:


We have detailed demographic data for the PublicInput survey and thematic demographic data for the Community Open House events and stakeholder meetings.

Participation in the PublicInput survey is consistent with findings of Town of Chapel Hill Engagement Study and Shaping Our Future.


- PublicInput survey had 868 participants as of Monday, April 3, 2023.
- The PublicInput survey was made available until March 31st at 5PM to provide staff adequate time to prepare materials for this work session.
- Approximately 55-59% of survey respondents self-reported demographic information as shown below.





These responses are consistent with the S.B. Friedman Demographic Analysis for [Shaping Our Future](#) and the Town of Chapel Hill’s Engagement Study released in March 2023. The Town’s Engagement Study found that students (below age 26) are under-engaged in existing Town practices to solicit input.



The race and ethnicity demographic data of these respondents is consistent with the findings of the Town of Chapel Hill Engagement Study released in March 2023. The Town’s Engagement Study found that Black or African American residents, as well as Immigrant and refugee residents who speak languages other than English, are under-engaged in many Town practices to solicit input.



The educational attainment demographic data of respondents is consistent with the S.B. Friedman Demographic Analysis for [Shaping Our Future](#). This report analyzed available Census data to determine that 77% of Chapel Hill’s adult population (age 25+) held a bachelor’s degree or higher.



Most stakeholder meetings were requested by existing homeowners in neighborhoods throughout Chapel Hill

- Staff hosted thirteen (13) stakeholder meetings with sixteen (16) neighborhood groups between January and early April: Greenwood, Gimghoul, Franklin-Rosemary, Coker Hills, Glendale, Hidden Hills, Laurel Hills, Colony Woods, Clark Lake and Stratford Glen, residents of three Neighborhood Conservation Districts (NCD), Westwood, and Lake Ellen.
- Staff met with two (2) affordable housing developers, Habitat for Humanity Orange County and PeeWee Homes, and plan to attend a future meeting of the Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition.

Community Open House events were an opportunity to capture more perspectives in some familiar locations

- Staff hosted two (2) Public Information Meetings and seven (7) Community Open House events between January and the end of March.
- Staff hosted in-person Community Open House events in locations that would be accessible and convenient for people to reach: Hargraves Community Center, the Chapel Hill Public Library, and the Seymour Senior Center.

- Staff conducted targeted outreach, in coordination with the Community Connections department, to under-engaged populations in Chapel Hill, including students, renters, seniors, and Black or African American community groups. This includes UNC Center for Civic Engagement Action Coalition, UNC Student Life and Community Partnership, Carolina Center for Public Service, El Centro Hispano, Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition, Orange County Department on Aging, Orange County Seymour Senior Center, and EmPOWERment.

Housing Choice LUMOTA

Project Engagement

VIEWS	PARTICIPANTS
5,550	868
RESPONSES	COMMENTS
12,670	342
SUBSCRIBERS	
551	

I am satisfied with the housing choices currently available to me in the community.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Choose one:	18%	19%	12%	21%	30%
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
822 respondents					

Missing middle housing, as described above, meets the needs of a more diverse and inclusive cross section of our community.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	23%	19%	16%	19%	23%
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
787 respondents					

Small-scale residential development could fit into the existing fabric of single-family neighborhoods if carefully designed and integrated.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	37%	16%	8%	15%	24%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
790 respondents					

The introduction of small-scale residential development will be detrimental to neighborhood character.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	21%	10%	7%	18%	44%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
791 respondents					

Missing middle housing, provided through small-scale residential development, should be provided within all neighborhoods for all family sizes, incomes, and stages of life.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	39%	17%	9%	12%	23%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
779 respondents					

Residential development should support vibrant, diverse, pedestrian-friendly, and accessible commercial centers.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	8%	7%	16%	33%	36%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
774 respondents					

Increased density will only benefit developers, contractors, realtors, and the town government that benefits from tax revenues.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	20%	11%	8%	18%	43%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
773 respondents					

Density caps should remain to ensure that zoning districts are developed at appropriate intensities and maintain their suburban character.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	15%	9%	9%	22%	44%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
774 respondents					

Increased density will lead to a loss of trees.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	10%	9%	11%	21%	49%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
783 respondents					

Walkable neighborhoods are important to me.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	3%	3%	9%	30%	56%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
779 respondents					

Increased density will lead to increased traffic, parking, and wear and tear on existing infrastructure.

	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Choose one:	10%	7%	9%	18%	56%
	Strong disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

783 respondents

What new types of housing could be added to your neighborhood as a good way to address the housing shortage?

50%	None	343 ✓
43%	Duplexes	296 ✓
36%	Townhouses	246 ✓
32%	Triplexes	219 ✓
24%	4-6 unit condos (for sale)	166 ✓
22%	4-6 unit apartments (for rent)	149 ✓
15%	Mid-rise (4-10 floors) condo for sale complex	100 ✓
14%	Mid-rise (4-10 floors) apartments for rent complex	98 ✓
8%	High-rise (more than 10 floors) for rent complex	52 ✓
7%	High-rise (10 or more floors) condo for sale complex	48 ✓

683 Respondents

massing... where the mass of a structure doesn't overwhelm the surroundings. But single family homes are SO big these days, you could fit four 1950 homes inside of them

4 days ago

Please increase the diversity and affordability of housing options.

7 days ago

Value of existing homes will decrease, not because of diversity, but because of increased noise and traffic. Quality and character of neighborhood will decline as well. I support diversity but feel this is an excuse to destroy citizen investment in property. There must be another way to support diversity without destroying existing neighborhoods.

8 days ago

The proposed housing solution is not designed for "gentle housing" in our neighborhoods. This is a design for more student housing in the middle of our single family neighborhoods. Middle income families will not want to live among an apartment full of students.

12 days ago

Hi, my preference would be for smaller density housing such as duplexes and potentially triplexes and quads. This would be a bit more organic and preserve trees. However, I think that this change, especially the larger triplexes and quadrplexes would change the neighborhood character. Duplexes not as much and I don't see a reason why one would have to have 1/2 acre to have a duplex. This definitely needs amendment down to a quarter acre or less. Thanks.

13 days ago

We don't need more housing in Chapel Hill. It's a fabrication and a myth. We've reached or exceeded optimal capacity and are on our way to becoming another failed experiment with good intentions, like San Francisco and the whole Bay Area. And, BTW, this questionnaire is either very poorly written or designed with bias towards those who want to build.

17 days ago

None of the above.

18 days ago

How would this impact school capacities?

19 days ago

Please, zone/regulate for local investors - people who live in Chapel Hill - in the development of high density housing; and with regard to residents already here. Right now, Chapel Hill seems to be at the mercy of non-local investors/developers, and at the beck and call of the University for its housing needs. There are no impact fees, or zoning changes requiring local/community minded investment. Seems that if there was a desire to cut out the heart of Chapel Hill, that has been accomplished with the helter skelter mega developments underway. I may be wrong, but that's my perspective as a 38 year resident, trying to stay in my low/middle income condo and trying to get around town on a bike, and walking, taking the bus (which only serves the University's schedule). Car/truck traffic alone is - well, overwhelming and deadly to those on foot and bikes. So there's an environmental impact that has totally disregarded too. Chapel Hill town leaders can do better, and develop well in service to the local community.

28 days ago

None

one month ago

Na

one month ago

With all the high rise and commercial development currently going on the existing roads and drainage needed to be improved before adding more residents.

one month ago

This housing built would be like the new apartments being built--too expensive for the typical person. This would be a developer's dream to build more and make more money. A terrible idea in reality.

one month ago

I don't want college students live in my neighborhood. We have one home rented to students already and they drive over the speed limit, have lots of loud parties and are often publicly intoxicated. I don't want anymore of that around my child

one month ago

We don't want no more houses, Chapel Hill is a small town and it must stay that way.

one month ago

I want more housing options that are affordable. I currently live in Carraway Village apartments and our rent has increased 43% over three years. We cannot afford to buy a house as housing starts at \$500k+. The current options are for wealthy only. I also want development to be mindful. Chapel hill shouldn't turn into a high rise community. It needs to retain its unique character in the process.

one month ago

I really want to make sure any changes lead to changes that will benefit residents (especially families). We do not need more developers flipping houses and developing very expensive housing. We do not need more expensive rentals. We need family housing (3-4 bedrooms) that is for sale at reasonable prices. There is nothing in these changes that would protect current housing from being purchased by developers and converted into huge profits (and reduced single family homes) or prevent houses from being purchased and converted into rental units. While I support increasing housing, I am VERY opposed to the proposed changes without protections in place to make sure it serves its purpose and isn't a huge gift to developers at the expense of families and residents.

one month ago

allowing a Mother-in-law apartment within a single family home is the best way to provide student/cheap housing within existing family neighborhoods. I live in an extremely diverse neighborhood in Chapel Hill, (Davie Circle) and it is not at all a vibe one wants in a family neighborhood, though it is a fun vibe of its own. Retroactively changing existing neighborhoods is breaking faith with the current residents. Have you sent a letter to proposed affected households? I know my elderly mother living near Estes School has absolutely no idea about all these proposals which would decidedly change her neighborhood. Email/Web information does not reach many of the existing residents.

one month ago

It would depend on what you are tearing down to build these residential units. If you're tearing down the existing duplexes that are in disrepair, these would be acceptable. If you are tearing down single-family homes to build these, it would not be acceptable. Our neighborhood is dense enough as it is. Also--parking is a BIG issue. On-street parking is not safe in our neighborhood as the streets are narrow and children play in the yards & streets. Any new housing that is built will need to include off-street parking.

one month ago

There is no housing shortage in Chapel Hill. Please make public the current vacancy rate. The problem is that prices are high, but this proposal will not make housing more affordable. It will destroy beautiful neighborhoods in downtown area. People who can currently afford the high taxes will leave town for other cities with better quality of life, and the town will lose its attractiveness and, eventually revenue. The town should also clarify if taxes will be lower with the increase in density. If the taxes will remain as high as they are now, it won't be worth it to live in Chapel Hill.

one month ago

I have lived in Carrboro and Chapel Hill for the past 15 years and it is devastating to see what is happening to the area. Traffic is terrible, high-rise apartments everywhere, trees cut down, and land destroyed. Why are we trying to turn Chapel Hill into Apex or Cary??

one month ago

Any of these options would destroy the character of my neighborhood and remove trees that are essential for quality of life

one month ago

One of the prime attractors to the area is the type of neighborhoods and housing already in place. All of us chose to live here in our current neighborhoods specifically to avoid the crowded tract homes, Mc Mansions you are proposing to "disperse" within current areas already developed. My immediate neighbor has resided in BriarCliff since its inception; 1967. What you're proposing will turn long desirable homes into middle class homes that people will occupy until they can move into what was already there until you destroyed it.

There's plenty of areas for you to develop without disturbing the existing residential areas. Let's not turn Chapel Hill into a Cary or any place America. Chapel Hills character IS what makes it desirable....don't rip it up!

one month ago

My neighborhood is protected by restrictive covenants. I assume local government will honor any covenants that prohibit the type of housing you are proposing since they are legally binding.

one month ago

None of the above. Mother-in-law suites would be fine, but the higher density housing is not appealing to families. They want single houses with backyards where their children can freely play. I don't see any mention of household size or motivation for living in Chapel Hill in the housing survey. It seems to leave out the fact that families who choose to live in Chapel Hill want live there because of the strong public school system. That's why single family housing is in high demand and more expensive than in neighboring cities and counties with lower performing public schools. Affordability of single family housing is impacted by this demand, but also by the economics of developers, who build very large expensive houses on small lots rather than smaller houses on medium sized lots because they will generate a higher profit. Targeting 'missing middle' housing in neighborhoods without HOAs could erase established neighborhoods and cause some of the more affordable single family housing to disappear over time. This would remove housing stock that is in the middle of the price range in Chapel Hill (and towards the bottom of the price range for single family houses). In addition, the neighborhoods with single family housing and no HOAs tend to have greater diversity of residents, greater biological diversity and ecological importance (due to lack of HOA rules), and many long term residents.

one month ago

This is a good solution if the properties are owner occupied.

one month ago

Why did we tear Glen Lennox down to lose Oakwood Dr/Rogerson Rd Conservation area? Seems Grubb won and we lost after all.

one month ago

Why aren't accessory units (i.e., in-law acts) and tiny homes listed here? I STRONGLY support that option.

one month ago

The exact location of each type of development. Some lots and streets would benefit from duplex/triplex investments in density, while others can support larger development. Missing from this list: accessory units for grandparents! The meadows only has so much space!

one month ago

The increase in housing density would need to include an increase of bus stops in safe and accessible places. A lot of investors are buying out housing making it near impossible for students, young families or people of lower socioeconomic status to buy property in the chapel hill area (especially townhouses and condos), so an increase in density would be a double edged sword. Please consider some restrictions on investor purchases in order to circumvent this.

one month ago

I strongly support this initiative.

one month ago

Old neighborhood, infrastructure does not even support current homes

one month ago

You did not offer my choice in the selection above. My neighborhood could increase density and maintain its character with minimal destruction of trees by having more in-law suites, studio and one-bedroom apartments (detached and attached), and basement / upstairs apartments. The problem with the current proposal: a developer could buy a house in my neighborhood, tear it down and create a high density structure on that lot. We don't have the storm water infrastructure, traffic calming, sidewalks (we have none), etc. to accommodate the extra density. We can't trust developers to do the right thing; their motivation and goal is profits. They'll build housing for student rentals (we are fairly close to campus) and they will charge as much as the market will bear. This will do nothing to improve the missing middle problem.

one month ago

Please make sure that the rules apply to EACH LOT. I worry about developers buying 3 lots in a row and then building something huge. This would NOT be in the spirit of a homeowner adding a small apartment....

one month ago

There are already too many ugly, out of character for Chapel Hill, large apartment type buildings that have been thrown up on my side of town (colony Woods). They are not affordable and have benefited only the developers who did not follow the rules. Traffic is horrible and getting worse. And yet pushy neighborhoods all over town are not having to face this.

one month ago

My neighborhood is not walkable to stores. Increasing density would naturally increase traffic and make the neighborhood less safe for children. I'm worried about traffic, increased impervious surfaces and storm run-off, increased noise, loss of trees and nature, loss of privacy, and more. The lots in my neighborhood are not especially large, but I chose it over 30 years ago for its character and space and relative quiet and traffic safety compared to newer denser neighborhoods. Introducing multi-unit housing to neighborhoods like ours will change the character forever.

one month ago

Duplexes should be feasible. Triplexes - contingent on lot size and availability

one month ago

I would leave single family neighborhoods in chapel Hill alone. If there are specific areas adjacent to the downtown core I would consider that as a site for zoning change.

one month ago

Review of each individual proposed multiunit dwelling is essential, taking the neighborhood character into consideration. Each proposed building should be approved or disapproved on an individual basis. This is not provided for (or even allowed) in the proposed text amendment. For that very reason, the text amendment, if implemented, will be detrimental to the character of Chapel Hill.

one month ago

It would not work in my neighborhood.

one month ago

The proposed plan will clearly harm the peaceful character of Chapel Hill for no benefit

2 months ago

Our neighborhood has older homes on 1-acre lots and is adjacent to MLK Blvd. It would be a lucrative place for developers to tear down our older homes and rebuild. This area cannot support the parking required for high-density housing. Visiting cars typically park in the street or partially on the street and in yards. There is very little room, street parked cars already block passing traffic.

High-density housing will be dangerous for pedestrians in our neighborhood. There are no curbs or sidewalks so pedestrians walk in the street, often moving to the side grass/dirt when cars pass. Cars parked in the street push pedestrians further into the street to get past these cars.

High-density housing will ruin the character of our heavily wooded neighborhood. Developers would have to clear most of a lot to create multi-unit housing. It would be impossible to integrate cleared lots with large parking areas into the neighborhood without compromising its character.

I suspect this change will unfairly target the older and poorer neighborhoods in Chapel Hill that do not have HOAs or restrictive covenants. Student housing and luxury homes are so lucrative. Given the history of developers in Chapel Hill why would anyone think developers would do anything else?

2 months ago

This proposal is problematic. Not only would it change the nature of existing residential neighborhoods, it could lead to investors buying up single family homes to replace them with 4 dwelling units (or the maximum density possible) to sell and/or rent. Yes, we need more housing in Chapel Hill but this isn't the solution. I would rather see some higher density along existing commercial corridors.

2 months ago

New neighborhoods are one thing. Then, diverse planning such as Meadowmont and Southern Village are awesome. Existing neighborhoods are another. If the existing neighborhood is healthy and in good condition it should be left as is. I chose Duplex because least harmful to our little neighborhood but not desirable at all.

2 months ago

I have lived for the past 3 years with construction that is multiplying density in Blue Hill, and I have experienced no benefit. Parking is inadequate, roadways congested, Lack of adequate community information and response time is shameful with this new plan. Experience teaches that speculators will purchase most properties and rent them at high prices to make their money back. You are not solving Chapel Hill's problems this way. Middle housing is not our problem--lack of low income housing is our problem. Your developers don't care about student needs or elder needs. Nor is the Council considering the integrity of the built environment or the quality of life based on the properties as they are now, they way they were planned to be.

2 months ago

There is ample land available for development just outside of the city zones in Orange, Durham, and Chatham counties that would benefit their tax bases and not be detrimental to the town of Chapel Hill with respect to its traffic, environment, service provision, school over-crowding, etc. These options should be explored and developed. Increasing the density of the town when there are other better options just outside of town is highly misguided economically and environmentally.

2 months ago

It is important to preserve the trees, nature and spaces that abound in single family neighborhoods around the university and elsewhere. Very concentrated "village square" type developments which are appearing all over Chapel Hill now must be required to include more affordable units to meet the need.

2 months ago

"Gentle density" seems a misleading term. It seems that if the location parameters that make it attractive to a developer to locate 3-5 units in place of a single house are present, then developers will acquire multiple lots. If all homeowners have the equal opportunity to sell to a developer, then "gentle" could well become "punishing" density, with crowded lots, traffic, loss of parking. I am not sure there are cases of "gentle gentrification" with redevelopment naturally stopping to allow a mix of luxury and affordable houses. Nor can I think of "gentle student rental conversions" with an old residential neighborhood preserved with a naturally restricted number of rentals. "Gentle Density" seems like an effort to cover-up the scale of redevelopment possible with this ordinance.

2 months ago

An occasional duplex here and there is ok, but opening up all neighborhoods to new types of housing with zero controls is a terrible idea.

2 months ago

Very concerned about developers/commercial landlords coming into our neighborhoods, making huge profits, and advocating for their own self interest. All new properties should be designed for OWNERSHIP, not RENTING. Unless it is legitimately owned by someone who lives on the property or in the neighborhood.

2 months ago

There's not a way to prohibit or disincentivize the demolition of Single Family Homes to create these smaller housing forms. That in itself is reason enough not to pursue this method. Instead, I'd like to see more purposeful creation of middle sized housing through new construction rather than a blanket permission to build higher value housing on small lots. There are a lot of large apartments and townhomes already underway in the areas that are slated for higher density per the FLUM. This measure is unnecessary and potentially counter-productive.

2 months ago

I do not believe this is appropriate for all neighborhoods. It seems there could be thoughtful ways in which some of this could be incorporated in areas close to eg uptown or other areas where there are many amenities - where density is already a way of life. I also know how costly this kind of construction is in CH and don't see many of these examples being affordable for so many people. Finally I strongly think this plan should be voted on by the residents of Chapel Hill.

2 months ago

I read that most members of Town Council live in HOA neighborhoods and would not be affected by the proposed change - I hope you think carefully before you inflict it on other neighborhoods that don't have that protection. We bought our house in a single-family neighborhood, Timberlyne (it is NOT an upscale neighborhood) because we wanted trees, land and convenience to the UNC campus at a fairly affordable price. We do not want to live in a denser neighborhood. We and other neighbors have invested a lot of money and effort in maintaining our property and we have a pleasant, diverse neighborhood. There is a duplex a few blocks away (not part of our neighborhood) that is locally owned and is always a mess (waist high weeds, trash, etc.). Please consider other options (and look at the experiences of other cities that have pursued these changes) before you go forward with this. Many homeowners/taxpayers may move out of Chapel Hill if you allow settled neighborhoods to be carved up.

2 months ago

Our neighborhood/subdivision has no buildable lots, and I wouldn't want to see existing SFHs torn down to build a duplex or triplex in their place

2 months ago

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh-in my opinion.

2 months ago

I find the proposed changes shocking in the extreme given our town's previous and ongoing trauma due to development.

The proposed changes have the potential to convert even wider swaths of Chapel Hill down to the lowest common denominator: bedrooms for students and commuters to RTP/Raleigh. It is ludicrous to imagine all of this infill being occupied by people without cars.

2 months ago

We have a few duplexes, so adding more of those would be workable for the neighborhood. Adding anything larger than a duplex would damage the neighborhood.

2 months ago

The size of a lot and the character of a neighborhood makes a huge difference. And there is no plan whatsoever to deal with increased demand on the town's infrastructure for all the existing apartments and high-rise units going up around town, so this proposal would only add to the problem without providing a workable solution for preserving the character of Chapel Hill. I applaud the town's efforts to deal with increased housing demands at various levels, but this piecemeal approach is horrible. As taxpayers who love our community, we deserve better!

2 months ago

Clearly the Council and staff have not thoroughly thought out the ramifications of instituting this missing middle concept. In theory it sounds great. In practice, it would eliminate existing more affordable housing (which isn't that affordable) and totally NOT do one positive thing towards providing affordable housing for those who need it most --- our workers and anyone below 80%AMI, let alone below 60% or 30% AMI. So why would you do this?? It will create very wealthy neighborhoods, dense or not, and very poor areas, with nothing in an economic mid-range. You have already eliminated the possibility of a community park in the eastern part of Chapel Hill --- the densest part of town, and now you want to make it even denser --- with NO green space??? How crazy a plan is that?? Why don't you get to know the people in the various neighborhoods all over town and ask them what is needed. Why don't you "reach out" and snail mail to EVERYONE something to be sure EVERYONE knows the implications of what you are about to do to this town. Please explain why you think there could possibly be anything affordable left to live in in Chapel Hill if you do this ill-thought-out plan. Have you even looked at the rents in all the high apartments you've approved? Have you considered the costs of upgrading the sewer and water systems, electrical lines, roadways to keep all of the pedestrians safe from increased cars (that are needed because we do not have anything close to an adequate bus system), providing new fire trucks and emergency vehicles? Please read Kevin Foy's list of things to consider before imposing greater density and higher rents (and sales) prices. By the way, the attitude of several Council people toward citizens who come to meetings to speak, is reprehensible. Why do several of the Council people do a Maria Palmer and scold citizens for having questions? It's very unpleasant to be lectured by Ms. Stegman and Ms. Anderson when they are the ones laughing disrespectfully at who knows what while a citizen is speaking to them.

2 months ago

There is no world in which removing housing choice from people in Chapel Hill has a positive effect on our communities. Legalizing missing middle housing will be a huge step in the right direction.

2 months ago

If we are to do this, we must also offer multiple alternatives to driving everywhere — walking, biking, more, reliable public transit. The needs of the disabled, elderly, and others with limited mobility should be considered in designing this mix.

2 months ago

The largest of these are not appropriate on all lots, but would be incredible on future BRT lines and connector roads. We desperately need more housing. The majority of traffic in town is people driving to work because only a fraction of people that live here, work here. And we have to import 90% of our employees!!!

2 months ago

Who will rent these structures?!?!? Students more than likely—and park 10 cars in the yard and not clean up after parties.

2 months ago

I agree with added density but not sure of the limits. I live in Colony Woods and think allowing larger ADU's, duplexes and possibly well designed triplexes, and flag lots is a good idea. Over 3 units on our .3 to .5 acre lots and I worry about the owner occupant numbers, the load on streets and trees, greenspace and our overall residential neighborhood. I don't know where the line is that allows for density that I agree should be allowed and over doing it is - I do think four fold growth in this small neighborhood would be detrimental. I am concerned for Colony Woods and the few other neighborhoods that seem targeted with no HOA or Conservation District and our relative price point. I do not want to see the more 'affordable' neighborhoods in Chapel Hill go from mostly owner occupied to too much investor ownership.

2 months ago

So there are a lot of questions that I would like to clarify. I answered the fifth question about adding "middle housing" to ALL neighborhoods based on the word "all". If you do not make this equitable throughout the Chapel Hill community (and no, I don't care about legal restrictions, HOAs, or covenants), then my answer changes to strongly disagree ... don't single certain communities out for this. Also, the question about infrastructure is also very important - is Chapel Hill ready to rebuild water, sewer, roads, schools, parks, greenways as the middle housing is added? Or will it wait until there is a problem and only REACT to problems?

2 months ago

Prioritization of green space over large parking lots for bigger apartment complexes--make up for parking space loss with easy access to public transit lines.

2 months ago

None of these choices fits into the character of CH. the ones that have been built are an eyesore. Aren't there enough of these already?As has already been proven, the only people who can afford them are students who are here for a couple of years and then leave. They have no interest in preserving CH.

2 months ago

There is available land outside current single family residences areas. Changing the zoning to allow those older areas to be changed so drastically is counterintuitive to population growth. This economic strategy is very shortsighted!!

2 months ago

I live in Southern Village and we already have apartments, townhomes, condos and single family homes and it works great! Wish there were more duplexes (I think there ae pre 2) and some Quadplexes

2 months ago

In our neighborhood (RS-2 zoning), increased density would mainly lead to less single-family housing and more student apartments. On the other hand, the current zoning doesn't do much to deter that. In the end, high property values here would probably prevent much of the higher density that many of my neighbors fear. But who knows? It would all depend on the economics of tearing down existing houses and creating multi-unit dwellings. Question: what has the big increase in Chapel Hill apartment construction in the past few years done to affordability? If it hasn't improved, some caution/humility concerning the current proposal might be in order.

2 months ago

It would depend on the space available in the neighborhood.

2 months ago

Our neighborhood is a rare gem, and critical as is to the community. This plan would be profoundly detrimental.

2 months ago

I believe that affordable housing, green spaces, walkability, sustainable plants and green density are more important than single-family dwellings. At the same time, we all know that affordable is difficult to achieve with new construction and that demand is likely to outstrip any new construction in a small and attractive space like Chapel Hill. Fill-in density from duplexing existing properties seems like a promising strategy. We definitely don't want to drive Chapel Hill into being an investor's paradise.

2 months ago

We're not living up to our town's historical values with any proposal that targets rezoning longstanding, established neighborhoods of our town. Please honor the Neighborhood Conservation Districts residents have worked so hard to have established and approved. Mine is a longstanding neighborhood that has quarter-acre lots of single-family homes. Moreover, our houses are among the most-affordable in town for the demographics this initiative is targeting. On top of that, many of our properties are rentals that have allowed for families that would otherwise not be able to afford to live in town.

This neighborhood is already dense, and has been accomplishing the desired result for a very long time. If we want to create denser areas out of already-developed land, it's more logical to target neighborhoods that have larger lot sizes, and are less established, ones where the citizens haven't taken great time and care to create Neighborhood Conservation Districts. Please consider honoring current NCDs just like HOAs. Please consider preserving jewels like ours that are already shining examples of diversity, equity and inclusion. That's why we fought for an NCD in the first place.

2 months ago

Density, size of the lot, height of the unit, what the unit looks like (that matters a LOT! - the development in CH is all ugly, stock, and unimaginative), number of parking spaces per unit, affordability (at least 50% are for AMI of under 50 for lifetime of development). Stop allowing developers to come in and build expensive places and say they are developing affordable housing. Most of our land has recently gone to high end housing. ENOUGH!

2 months ago

I think it's okay to have some areas zoned for single family homes and some areas closer to town zoned for townhomes or duplexes. I'm concerned that our school system isn't going to be able to support all this new housing. Schools are overcrowded as it is. The thing I wonder is Chapel Hill committed to being a great "town" for families or are we trying to become a city?

2 months ago

In certain zones, this idea makes sense, but every single-family neighborhood should not have to change to allowing 2-4 dwellings per lot. I live in a nice neighborhood with single family homes and that character should be preserved. Some thoroughfares in our neighborhood or housing on the fringes of the neighborhood could be good candidates for rezoning in this manner. But the sheer area of the rezoning plans for this goes too far. I don't want to turn all the nice old neighborhoods in Chapel Hill into multi-family, potentially rental-only zones throughout.

2 months ago

NCDs should have same protection as HOAs in this plan. Our neighborhood already has tiny lots and flooding issues. This would be detrimental to the structure, infrastructure, and nature.

2 months ago

Our neighborhood is tiny with tiny lots and flooding issues. More density would be detrimental to the existing structure, infrastructure and nature. NCDs should have the same protection as HOAs in this plan.

2 months ago

No short-term rentals allowed. Number of occupants per unit. Infrastructure, green space, schools adequate to support increase in density. Rent to own possibility

2 months ago

No short-term tentacle allowed

2 months ago

I simply don't see how the kind of development at issue here will achieve the goals of diversity and affordability, nor do I trust developers to operate with those goals in mind. There's been nothing stopping development to that end already, but I don't see evidence of it having occurred. When I see the apartments and townhouses that have been built recently, I can't help but wonder how much, if at all, those have improved affordability in town, and some of those, on one end of the "missing middle," are even more densely populated than the options proposed here. I'm also wondering whether anyone really envisions conversions of existing houses into duplexes (or in-law-suite-style conversions) rather than new construction. I could maybe see that advancing some of the notions of affordability while preserving certain aspects of a neighborhood, but that doesn't seem to be the idea.

I also don't see evidence of coherent plans for managing higher density, such as drastically increased bus availability along with measures for all the walkability and bikeability that are pitched as attractive elements of increased density. Maybe I'm just not imagining it right, but if my neighborhood were to become substantially more densely populated, it would diminish walkability and bikeability by adding traffic and street parking. I get the notion of creating more housing options for more people, and I don't think the occasional duplex would be especially "detrimental to neighborhood character," but how to define much less enforce "occasional" seems tricky to the point of impossibility.

And the prospect of turning a significant portion of a neighborhood into rentals is worrisome in a college town. I get that it's square to worry about living near students, but certain situations can affect basic quality of life, and the town, as I understand it, doesn't have any levers to pull for the sake of encouraging owner-occupied middle housing as opposed to rentals. I remember being a student and would have been justifiably considered a bad neighbor in the single-family neighborhoods in Chapel Hill.

At any rate, I'm not sure what the right answer is. On the one hand, I can see the occasional conversion to a duplex being the kind of gradual, or "gentle," change that fits and wouldn't be especially disruptive. On the other hand, "gentle" changes don't seem to jibe with the sense of urgency laid out in the videos above.

2 months ago

It is important to not deal with these developments by ignoring the residents directly affected, while placing more and more stress on this area whilst keeping the wealthy areas pristine. The poor are the have nots, the wealthy the care nots, and the middle class the development battleground. Those in favor of these ever increasing influx of people into the neighborhood are those who live elsewhere - NIMBY at it's finest.

2 months ago

This survey is ridiculously biased—you are not looking for answers but for people to rubber stamp your decisions. You will see a reckoning on voting day. You are supposed to represent our values and needs—not those of some hypothetical utopia that never comes to pass. The developers will always get richer.

2 months ago

I have no idea where people would park if my neighborhood were stacked with more types of housing. As it is we have people parking all over the street (talk about reducing walkability!). Beyond that, our closest elementary school is like to burst; traffic on Fordham is becoming untenable. I simply do not trust developers to do this in a good way. Developers are the ones building all these stupid luxury highrises around town, are they not? Don't developers now use algorithms to set rental rates to maximize profits? Can't you pass an ordinance to make 40-50% of those apartments affordable? As it stands I can't imagine who can afford to live there but the solution seems easier than you're making it out to be.

2 months ago

None, our existing neighborhood is perfect. The houses are middle-class valued and the lots are not large.

2 months ago

Changing zoning alone will continue the pattern of rapid development of high-income housing in Chapel Hill. Neighborhoods in Chapel Hill with R1 zoning that are beloved for their green space will lose their trees and charm to luxury developments. Those close to campus may transform from family neighborhoods into student housing. I don't see that this change will actually fill the lower income housing gap, given the past history of development in Chapel Hill, and I strongly oppose this initiative without actual strong affordable housing requirements and measures in place to protect green space. Without such measures, neighborhoods that do not have HOAs in place should be given sufficient time to respond and form a qualifying HOA if they do not wish to participate.

2 months ago

It would depend on if I lived downtown or not, I wouldn't recommend any of those in an historic tree lined historic neighborhood.

2 months ago

Rent control and/or inflation control is needed. These will not solve the problem unless you put a cap on the amount they can sell or rent for. This type of development has started in Durham and the townhouses/single family <1500sqft are going for \$350,000 and UP. They are also often 2 story which doesn't offer an option to the senior population. As the plan and proposal stands now Mayor Hemming and the council have it set to only benefit the developers and the town, not the people who live here or want to live here.

2 months ago

nothing to add

2 months ago

When we bought out our we relied and trusted the R-1 zoning. We expect the town to uphold AND enforce this zoning law.

The character and nature of neighborhoods should not be violated, disrupted and developed outside of the current R-1 laws. Elected officials are elected to uphold the law.

2 months ago

None of these structures are architecturally inline with the character of Chapel Hill!! There are so many high rise apartments which have altered the character of our community. Developers are benefiting financially. The town has to provide services and will need to build more schools, on and on!!

2 months ago

None of the above.

2 months ago

Please

Mail each homeowner a letter that will be impacted to allow people to respond prior to taking a vote. NO to rezoning!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

2 months ago

Our neighborhood needs to be left as-is. The infrastructure cannot handle increased density and traffic. Our natural environment will suffer along with current long-term residents.

2 months ago

We need the Council to confirm in writing that any proposed changes to zoning, density or types of buildings will be in accordance with neighborhood protections - such as the historic district, covenants, etc. etc. (There is a rumor that Michael Parker is suggesting that the Town of Chapel Hill abolish these protections and allow for density everywhere.) Hundreds of people are reading these emails about the changes being done with no notice to taxpayers and property owners. It is time to squash these rumors and be clear, concise and consistent in the communication to those that may be impacted by these proposed changes.

2 months ago

Of these, the duplex is the least terrible. But what will most likely happen is a corporation will swoop in, drive prices higher, buy up all the lots, and turn them into as many units as they can so they can rent them out for \$\$\$\$. They have no reason to sell them and lose rental income, and of course they will charge as much as they can!

I'm also not quite sure what all the questions about a walkable community had to do with anything. I don't feel like my neighborhood is particularly walkable to anything so I'm not sure how building apartments in my neighborhood helps that. And some people value walkability and some people don't care and that's ok.

2 months ago

I live in the Huntington-Somerset neighborhood, which is a beautiful and natural oasis in the middle of what is becoming an over-developed corridor on Estes Dr. I could have purchased a newer house in a more dense neighborhood, but I chose my older home on a large lot because I value the land and trees around me. Chapel Hill needs the break from the noise, light, and traffic, brought by the higher density development on Estes Dr. and the residents who purchased homes here should be able to continue to enjoy its natural character. The Huntington-Somerset neighborhood has borne the brunt of the garish and over-built mid-rise development projects along Estes Dr. for the past few years and will continue to do so into the future. It seems a fair trade that we should at least be able to preserve the single-family character of our neighborhood and keep the higher density construction zones and traffic on the main roads around us.

2 months ago

Nothing

2 months ago

I would like to request that the town mail a letter to each homeowner that is impacted, and allow enough time for people to respond prior to taking a vote. I think more affordable housing is really important in Chapel Hill, but I worry that this will only allow large developers to make a profit at the expense of reducing trees and natural areas, decrease wildlife, and create more traffic while also not actually supporting people that need more affordable housing. I suspect rent will be very high if developers put more "luxury" apartments, as they are want to do.

2 months ago

None would fit in

2 months ago

It seems as though too much is happening without neighborhood knowledge or consent. I would request he town mail a letter to each homeowner that is impacted, and allow enough time for people to respond prior to taking a vote.

2 months ago

So many things. In your question above you use the phrase "if carefully designed and integrated". Well there is the kicker, for sure. While rushing through this change in zoning it is becoming clear that as has happened in other areas of the Triangle, this is exactly what is not being done. How about, slow down, identify the neighborhoods that will have this forced on them, send letters to effected residents, give actual details about things like developer owned properties, rental/owned, and specifically how this will help. Done poorly, as we have already seen happen we will lose the character of neighborhoods and produce little to no mid level housing

2 months ago

I am concerned the new denser housing will not be affordable (many apartments being built are very expensive!) Older communities, those without the HOAs, are currently the most affordable single-family homes in town. This plan could end up reducing affordable housing and starter homes for young families. Also concerned about flooding, already a problem in many areas.

2 months ago

We live in a historic neighborhood near campus. I think there needs to be relaxed restrictions on downtown neighborhoods to allow subdivision of property and accessory buildings and accessory apartments. Creating duplexes is our triplexes near campus would just be high end rentals for students. I think we need to get rid of some of the neighborhood hdc requirements and consevation districts as well which will help with density and still a little more single-family houses. I worry that in a college town development mirror the college will just be more high-end housing that won't deal with the problem of more moderately priced housing for families. One thing I know I am from Palo Alto and I agree that this issue Needs to be addressed. Palo Alto however does not have the same city structure. The town and the campus are farther apart and this is less of an issue.

2 months ago

The proposed changes in the land use ordinance will have detrimental impact to the reason why I moved to Chapel Hill. The historic districts of Chapel Hill directly inform the feel and fabric of the community. Negatively impacting those areas by allowing development of multifamily buildings is short-sighted.

I am concerned that the proposed changes will not protect the historic districts within Chapel Hill. Please consider that those areas were designated with care, and that the structure and appearance of those neighborhoods have significant positive impact on the allure of Chapel Hill.

2 months ago

I don't understand this idea. With all the building that has been going on in Chapel Hill, increasing the need for infrastructure, schools, services and electricity needs (which have been seriously eroded already), why weren't some of the needs surveyed assessed at the time to include middle cost housing? Instead we have mammoth apartment complexes which don't seem to be available for middle income or lower income residents. This idea needs to have considerable additional evaluation and input from local consulting groups, not someone from out of state!

apartment/condos taking up huge tracks of land which could have been used to support middle housing needs.

This seems to be a very poorly designed response to community needs. The Town Council has gone way beyond their

2 months ago

First of all, this is a poorly designed survey. OF COURSE our current housing stock doesn't meet the needs of the missing middle! (And this is because the Town Council lacks the cojones to say no to developers). This plan is being imposed on the citizenry without sufficient time for discussion. Has each homeowner received a notice of the upcoming meetings on the topic? (I have not). Successful introduction of housing density will depend on several things: sufficient time to acquire input from current homeowners; development of a comprehensive plan that wouldn't overwhelm the existing infrastructure; a limit on impermeable surface area; a strict and enforced limit on tree removal; and strict and enforced rules on replanting of removed trees (which does not mean replacement with sticks).

2 months ago

I agree that the town needs to encourage housing opportunities however I think the proposal to remove zoning from neighborhoods that do not have HOA/NCD/Historical puts an burden on older smaller home neighborhood. Many of the neighborhoods that are impacted are already serving "high" middle income families(for example Booker Creek) I am very concerned that those families will be pushed out or find their small lot one story single family home dwarfed by new 3 story quad appt. I think the town presentations have downplayed the potential bad actors(such as builders/landlords skirting requirements and counting on lax enforcement) and presented housing options that are not what representative of infill multi family housing that has actually happened in Chapel Hill recently. I choose None above because I don't believe the options are representative of what would actually happen. Before the city changes the zoning I think they owe the home owners impacted DIRECT notification of the potential changes in their home's zoning and give them a chance to ask questions. I also believe the city should publish a map that shows clearly the homes and neighborhoods impacted. I believe the town should focus on incenting the new development to build for the missing middle income rather than shift the burden to a limited number of individual single family home owners.

2 months ago

These options should be available in all neighborhoods including Neighborhood Conservation Districts.

2 months ago

I can't believe you're even talking about this. Bloated apartment buildings are going up all over Chapel Hill. Seriously? What am I missing here? On every corner. These cruise-ship apartments are lowering the values of our homes, ruining our green spaces, and apparently still not addressing the housing shortage. More "small-space" dwellings are not going to help. I doubt altruistic motives for diversity and opportunity are driving this - it's all about the money.

2 months ago

These plans would likely only happen in existing middle income neighborhoods and decrease the value of these same neighborhoods. The existing middle income neighborhoods tend to have larger lots which gives them a lot of their resale value. It does not make sense to go after middle income neighborhoods.

2 months ago

I have seen the townhouses people build in these infill neighborhoods, . I think we are just going to end up with versions of the expensive townhouses in Meadowmont.

2 months ago

Requesting every homeowner to be notified well in advance of any vote on changing the density of their neighborhood. Requesting that all neighborhoods across this town be subject to the same treatment. HOA or no. It's a question of equity and fairness.

2 months ago

The proposed approach of changing density permitted in R-1 and R-2 is an overly -simplistic approach to addressing the goal of providing better access to affordable housing. Many CH neighborhoods don't have the infrastructure to support additional traffic (especially the in town neighborhoods near the UNC campus), traffic is already a problem, and more cars and delivery trucks (Amazon) as well as curb cuts will put bicyclists and pedestrians at risk. Also, allowing multiple dwelling development on single family lots will result in the loss of many trees that have been preserved by existing homeowners in many neighborhoods. I respectfully recommend that a more thoughtful approach be developed which includes defined zones for higher density housing in pedestrian favorable areas that are proximate to adequate infrastructure and commercial conveniences. Finally, the proposed plan will result in developers (who have no motivation to preserve the characteristics of the town's beautiful neighborhoods) building to maximize profit and ruining our town's unique neighborhoods. I hope the Town of Chapel Hill will step back and be more thoughtful about how to address a need for more housing.

2 months ago

In my neighborhood, there is no logical way to put any of these housing types. The lots are if hood size and there is no unowned property large enough for these structures. If the Town is determined, then they may want to consider offering land purchase to current owners.

2 months ago

We are in the group of active and organized Chapel Hill voters who are strongly AGAINST these projects. The "leaders" in Chapel Hill have already effectively destroyed the charm which our town was known for by all. We will vote AGAINST anyone who votes to pass these measures. It is short sighted, and will only result in destroying the last few oases in Chapel Hill - the historic neighborhoods. Please STOP thinking short term. It may already be too late, but there is no need to put the final nail in the coffin. Keep this up, and the very people who move here and contribute greatly to the economy will stop coming. It is heartbreaking to be a native of Chapel Hill, and see your town systematically be destroyed by those who do not appreciate what brought the growth to Chapel Hill in the first place. STOP THIS MADNESS! (I would like to make sure you know, we are well aware of the challenges facing our beloved Chapel Hill, and many of the constraints which make certain choices an impossibility. We have some of the most accomplished and creative minds in the world living here. There is a better way than taking the places where realtors drive their new clients to see "the beauty of Chapel Hill" and destroying the ambiance, charm and overall feel of the little which is left. Leaders need to listen to the voters, and understand it is time to STOP bowing to the pressure of those who seek to "make cash and dash" - leaving us with a town increasingly known for cheap and horrifying architecture, There is another way, and smart leaders will follow the example of the fabulous folks in the 1950's who looked ahead for 100 years, making decisions which have benefitted us all. Read, and know your history. Thank you.

2 months ago

The town council should not have the right to make changes to the law that will impact the current neighborhoods without the current owners knowledge and approval.

2 months ago

None of these options would fit anywhere in the down town of Chapel Hill currently. Attempts to do so have seriously eroded the character of an historic, quaint college town. Open your eyes!

2 months ago

this increased density will only be beneficial IF the housing is also AFFORDABLE & MODESTLY PRICED for RENT & FOR SALE with rents less than \$900 and FOR SALE not more than \$150,000 otherwise you will just end up with more expensive housing for people with lots of money and run out of town people who live in modestly priced housing and barely making it now. It will destroy some neighborhoods by creating gentrification.

2 months ago

Apartments and infill already exist in my neighborhood to the extent that nearly 50% of housing is multi-family/ student or apartments in owner-occupied homes. Much of this is already in the Franklin Rosemary Historic District where you need a permit to repaint your house a new color, but quad-plex's will be allowed? This proposal will benefit only developers and outside investors. Nothing in this proposal would control prices or rents. I see no up-side for the intended beneficiaries anymore than all the new apartments being built. They have become either investment opportunities or luxury apartments. Face it, CH taxes are too high to attract low and low-middle income folks. Additionally, the town's infrastructure, roads, water, sewer and schools, cannot support such increases in population. I wonder how all these apartments already being constructed will impact our schools and water system. This is a very bad idea for Chapel Hill.

2 months ago

Such developments have recently appeared and are under construction (e.g. Elliot Road, across from Elliot Road, the corner of Martin Luther King and Estes) but what seems, at least by design, to be the same developer. We haven't seen the final design of the Martin Luther King/Estes, but the others are plopped into lots, without thoughtful integration into nearby available retail and restaurants. Its a mess, and yet with better urban planning it could be the opposite! I live in Coker Hills West, and given the terrain, issues with water run-off and flood risks, I don't see how increasing housing density could work. Cutting down the trees to accommodate multiunit dwellings on the existing terrain would be a terrible idea due to environmental costs.

2 months ago

We live adjacent to campus and the proposed changes would cause our family-oriented neighborhood to be all student housing.

2 months ago

It would depend on many factors, including the current neighborhood infrastructure and traffic patterns. It is wrong to assume that every neighborhood could support the middle housing with units more than a duplex. While many neighborhoods could support this, the way this proposal is worded creates a nightmare scenario of being driven by developers and landlords for an opportunity rather than the goal of affordable housing that meets the needs of the future residents and any considerations to the existing home owners and neighborhoods.

2 months ago

We live in a single-family neighborhood next to campus and believe the proposed changes would render our family oriented neighborhood to being all students.

2 months ago

I oppose the plan to change the R1 zoning because I do not see a way to prevent the units from being owned by investors who rent them out, to the detriment of neighborhoods. I might support the small cottages listed on the January update if they are not rentals, but they are not pictured here. The cottages address the problem of developers only wanting to build high-priced luxury units.

2 months ago

Colony woods east is a finished development. It will not accommodate further development. It is also not fair to propose this only for neighborhoods without an HOA (typically lower income). My suggestion is to build further out of town and improve the bus system. The fact that people want to live here is not a reason to destroy the present neighborhoods.

2 months ago

Where the new structures are placed is important. In my neighborhood there are already large, tall multi-family structures. The proposed plan will invite even more. Also, it is unclear whether these new structures will really address missing middle housing. Not sure whether they would be long-term rentals, short-term rentals, or owner-occupied.

2 months ago

It would depend upon whether the duplexes were designed in the general manner pictured, and whether they were distributed around the neighborhood rather than being concentrated block after block.

2 months ago

It would depend on whether the duplexes were designed in the general manner pictured, and whether they were distributed around the neighborhood rather than being concentrated block after block.

2 months ago

It would depend on the affordability of the duplexes and corporate ownership

2 months ago

On what would my response to these proposed text changes depend???

SO MANY THINGS!! I am a resident of Colony Woods and we have lived here for 10 years. I love things the way they are, and it's hard for me to see increasing density will make my environment any better or more pleasant....that's a basic starting point. I would go further and say that actually, the quality of life here has definitely taken a turn for the worse due to the massive recent construction on Eph. Church Road for the massive Apt/Condo Complex being built at the intersection of Legion and Ephesus...and I can't see that the quality of my life will be better than it was 3 years ago, after the construction is complete...it will be denser, noisier, and more congested.

Nevertheless, If further housing density increases are "required" my feelings about it would depend on:

- What percentage of housing would be converted from single family to "missing middle"...and whether these are "concentrated" or spread through the community.
- Increased traffic, without increased transport capacity
- loss of tree cover
- THE HASSLE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR THE COMMUNITY... the construction of apartments on Ephesus, and the perverse "building boom of the pandemic" have been a noise and logistics nightmare for residents who thought they lived in a quiet community
- THE EXTENT OF COMMUNICATION BY THE TOWN COUNCIL AS TO WHAT THE HECK IS GOING ON...which to my mind has been appallingly low, both about the Blue Hill developments, and the discussion of the future Legion Park development.

It seems to me every household that is likely to be significantly impacted needs enough information made to them in a timely and convenient fashion (yes, even mailbox flyers and mailings when the stakes are high enough!) so that they can be constructively engaged in the discussion.

2 months ago

What neighborhood(s) and how close it is to Franklin Street, actually downtown.

The historic neighborhoods where students, workers & town residents like to walk and run should be kept low density so there are less cars & traffic to avoid. This promotes everyone's safety as well.

2 months ago

It would depend on potential changes to transportation infrastructure

2 months ago

This is a naive approach to a problem that is not really one that governments can or should attempt to solve and it will cause more harm than the town anticipates as developers will tear down single family houses and replace them with expensive multiplexes that will in no way alleviate the problem of the missing middle. This will make a fortune for Developers all the while destroying the neighborhoods . no missing middle will be created- this supposed solution is a delusion based on wishful thinking look at what's happened in other cities

2 months ago

Sale and not rentals. The houses that have been rented in our Colony Woods area are easy to pick out: neglected yards, increased cars in yard, poor upkeep. Also none of your choices address the option of additions to existing single family structure to create a smaller cheaper rented (or within family occupied) units. This kind of rental will cause less tree removal and better upkeep due to homeowner being on premises. Also allows seniors to stay in their home or "move in" with their children.

2 months ago

Before offering input on types of additional housing options, I would like hear more input from current residents and see detailed planning with respects to impacts on city infrastructure & services, preservation of greenspace, traffic, schools, and the environment. As a voter and resident of Chapel Hill, I do not propose making any changes to current zoning regulations prior to addressing impacts to the above items. I am watching this matter closely and it will impact my vote.

2 months ago

Problems with this town deciding on increasing/changing anything is that there is little to no thought given infrastructure or environment or the future. Second problem is the quality that is placed on construction.

Examples: I've lived in duplexes in other states where I could hear no noise from neighbors. Here, I can hear whispers through the walls. I've also never lost power so frequently in the many places I've lived (with much worse weather), as I experience in this town. Traffic is getting "city-style". It now take double to triple the time to your destination than when I moved here 25 years ago. When I attended meetings for UNC's Eastowne changes, there was much discussion about the trees and traffic. We were told most of trees would stay (I saw that they're now being removed). The traffic is, as I had verbalized: lights are timed for 3-5" long while gas is wasted and all those fumes are being concentrated, as are the ridiculous excuses for carriage lanes and roundabouts that are unusable due to all the other crazy building going on. The answers we got really felt as if no-one was listening with intent; merely to get over the meeting.

Sorry, I might go for plans that are much more well-thought out. There ought be much input from current homeowners and time for well thought-out plan, including the future and ramifications thereof. Your historical lack of care and organization makes me actually Want exclusive neighborhoods. Worst example, building in a flood plain! I've had 3 recent visitors from other towns in NC wondering, and I quote, "What is going on here? This used to be so nice and quiet and beautiful". I choose none of the above housing. I will answer the question that is below, now: I am in a care-taking profession and have gone through some very "slim" times to afford my house, lived in now for 24 years. Yes I am female, 60ish and white.

2 months ago

The Town has approved multiple projects for residential use in the past 10+ years. Tall residential buildings have been built all over Town and the Town still wants more. In all of these buildings, where is the "missing middle housing" that should be included. And now the Town wants to allow our neighborhoods to be used to build multi-family buildings wherever builders can buy a single-family house and demolish it. This is just continued mismanagement by the Town Council.

2 months ago

Zoning changes may possibly introduce very few missing middle housing options. Too much headache for the small improvement you will be making. I suggest to look for more bang for your buck through housing options outside of established R 1 and R2 zoned neighborhoods.

2 months ago

I do not agree with zoning changes that would allow predatory developers to buy up large swaths of single family homes and convert them to high priced rental units. Far too much of this type of development has already been allowed to occur, with the average monthly price of these rentals higher than my monthly mortgage + taxes. Promises to provide "affordable" units have been little more than lip service and it seems there has been little follow up public accountability in terms of whether these complexes have truly met the city's needs.

2 months ago

All of my responses depend on wording in the zoning changes that restrict sales of these new "middle housing" units only to parties who are buying them to use as their primary dwelling. Otherwise, the problem still exists. Chapel Hill will gain only more expensive rental units, and people with moderate incomes will still be priced out of the Chapel Hill real estate market.

2 months ago

Prevention of predatory developers seeking to place maximum density housing in historically single family housing neighborhoods . the problem of affordable housing cannot always be met with increased density. There has already been far too much density added that is unaffordable to the average long term resident in the form of huge apartment building development with mostly "luxury" pricing. If out of neighborhood character development is allowed by corporate developers seeking to buy out single family owned homes and replace with multi-family high priced rental housing, existing homeowners should be compensated for loss of home value in situations where large dwelling units are replacing adjacent single family homes.

2 months ago

The housing shortage is being caused by allowing construction of high density apartment complexes out of financial reach of middle income workers at UNC. Middle income families with young children don't need two or three level townhouses in high density areas where it's unsafe for them to stroll in and ride their beginner bikes. Don't make chapel hill an unlivable town for middle income families with stay at home parent who needs to take out children to safe playgrounds and not high traffic streets.

2 months ago

2 months ago

It would depend on several things: lots of input from current homeowners, enough time to develop a comprehensive plan that didn't overwhelm the existing infrastructure, increasing the existing infrastructure to prepare in advance for the future, a limit on impermeable surface area for the watersheds, a strict limit on tree removal, and strict rules on replanting of removed trees (and I don't mean replacing them with < 1 inch whips!)

2 months ago

Playing the race card against people who appreciate livable places and quality of life is vile and offensive.

2 months ago

The number of mid-rise luxury apartment buildings currently under construction (with more planned) is excessive. In addition to the traffic, flooding, infrastructure problems and environmental damage this gentrification causes, it displaces a lot of affordable housing. The Town Council's current efforts to increase affordable housing are commendable, but very belated. Any new mid-rise proposals should be turned down, and that land used for affordable housing, including "missing middle." The proposal currently before the Council targets neighborhoods that are already "missing middle," since they are the single-family residential neighborhoods with the most inexpensive houses. As written, the proposal will just increase the economic separation between such neighborhoods and wealthier ones, which have HOA's etc.

2 months ago

In addition to these changes denser areas should be targeted for upgrades to public transit to offset additional density and reduce traffic congestion. In particular rapid and frequent bus routes or eventual light rail should be considered for the long term.

2 months ago

UNC Could focus on improving public transportation to develop the area without densifying and without enriching the already rich.

2 months ago

I'm not sure if you received my original note, so am submitting a summary. With the understanding that mid-level housing is greatly needed, Chapel Hill residents implore you to please consider:

- 1) Preservation of our green space and trees that provide us huge temperature and energy cost control, noise buffer, beauty, health benefits, etc. We are chipping away at our greenspaces and with each new big build, people feel the increased heat, traffic noise, and have less rich of a space around them.
- 2) Ensuring the cost of mid-level housing truly stays mid-level / affordable. This often flips up to meet the neighborhood prices after the first sale or after a couple years of increasing rent.
- 3) Needing our infrastructure to match our pace of development, while not turning Chapel Hill into a city. A good example of areas that are already "full" is the Weaver Dairy road congestion, which will compound by the Habitat ~800 units on Sunrise and the new Caraway housing (which is a tree desert, eyesore and sad to look at every day).
- 4) Most importantly, please, please, please make decisions that keep Chapel Hill's township character alive. We are so incredibly fortunate to live here and most of us chose to live here because we don't want to live in a city. We LOVE our trees, green space and community feel. We entrust our future to you and sincerely hope that we will be able to keep things to a town scale while smartly developing spaces that can be re-imagined, such as older office space.

We love Chapel Hill and appreciate you listening. Thank you!

2 months ago

Every major development project the town has approved of late has created expensive "luxury" apartments, which are paradoxically generic and shoddily built, while throwing in a few affordable housing units for appearance's sake. Unless the town can force developers to sell quality housing at reasonable prices to individual owners who intend to live there, the housing market in town will continue to get worse, rather than better, and the "missing middle" that these zoning changes are supposedly for will not be served.

2 months ago

With this initiative and all other Chapel Hill development, your residents implore you to please consider:

- 1) Preservation of our trees and green space, which is getting chipped away year on year. Example: noise and temperature buffer at 86 & Whitfield removed to create the highway interchange and Caraway apartments. Residents nearby can now hear traffic much more and Caraway residents have a markedly higher temperature and no shade.
- 2) Cost of housing, meaning will this housing actually be affordable, especially if we place them in higher income neighborhoods? We have too often seen these projects in other cities where affordable housing is either offered at unaffordable prices up-front or flips to match the higher income of its neighborhood after the first sale.
- 3) Lack of similar developments to infrastructure. For instance, we are adding apartments at the Caraway off 86 and Habitat housing for ~800 units off Sunrise...we are already at stand-still traffic on Weaver Dairy during peak travel times.

Most of all, PLEASE consider the value of Chapel Hill as a "town" v. a city. We are so fortunate to live here and should prioritize preservation of Chapel Hill's character and lifestyle it currently affords its residents. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE don't take this away from us.

Thank you for listening!

2 months ago

All we hear about during elections is the need for more affordable housing in Chapel Hill, but the development and rezoning decisions made by our town government are not accomplishing that -- they just continue benefit private equity, real estate investment firms, and large construction companies.

Please stop telling us these decisions provide social benefits for our community. We know what is going on here.

2 months ago

The question is not "is this a good idea" but "will Chapel Hill do this well in a way that actually achieves more housing equity". Yes, adding more missing middle housing is a good idea. Yes, this should happen across Chapel Hill. No, I am not confident that Chapel Hill will do this well and actually create vibrant, walkable communities with increased housing access while preserving access to green spaces and preserving mature tree cover and keeping housing prices achievable. I'm basing this lack of confidence on observing what is happening right now in the Blue Hill district. So Chapel Hill will mess it up. Does that mean the town should abandon missing middle housing? No. But let's be realistic about the trade offs that will come with developers changing existing neighborhoods. There has been much made of the people vs. trees debate over housing and green space in Chapel Hill. But at the end of the day, losing significant amounts of tree cover ends up affecting community health. No one wants to walk to town or walk around the neighborhood if it is too hot outside and there is no shade. That's means basically May through September in neighborhoods with no mature trees in this region. Walking/wheeling to and Waiting at the bus stop at a location with no trees can be a health hazard for some individuals in the summer months. AC costs more when houses are not shaded. Mature trees in tact on a neighborhood scale can measurably lower local temperatures. This matters. It's not just people vs trees. Chapel Hill has no mechanisms in place to protect mature tree cover in residential neighborhoods. There will be significant losses to mature tree cover. This is already happening as people flip houses to benefit from the rising home prices.

2 months ago

My greatest concern here is that wealthy neighborhoods (like The Oaks) will be exempted whereas less wealthy (areas like Colony Woods) will be subject to the new laws. Ideally, this would mean that homeowners could remodel to add an income apartment or in-law suite. That would be fine but what I predict is that developers will take advantage of the lower housing costs in Colony Woods and buy up smaller homes and tear them down to build as many townhomes as they can fit on these lots. This will result in loss of trees and more impervious surfaces (runoff) issues, plus parking problems. And I rather doubt these new units will be inexpensive to rent (therefore not solving our affordable housing problem). The real answer lies in TRULY requiring the developers of larger scale apartment complexes to have low-cost units that will serve that need. And those rents need to be guaranteed for a long time so families who need them can stay. If the council truly believes that this missing middle housing is the answer, then I implore you to be FAIR and apply it to all Chapel Hill neighborhoods equally, not just those with no HOA.

2 months ago

I'm not sold that "Missing Middle" actually improves housing availability for the targeted groups: a broader economic cross-section of resident. I see "Missing Middle" more as premium high-density housing rather than cheaper low density housing, so adding a little more density is going to have very low impact on the cross section of residents in our town.

The zoning process is meant for city planners to choose where to add density. Redefining R-1 to be more dense is the same as not doing the job they were elected to do. Too much of R-1 isn't walkable at all in Chapel Hill, and the language shared thusfar doesn't make strong guarantees that increased density won't be part-and-parcel with the walkability that density needs.

2 months ago

The introduction of a multi unit dwellings into long established single family communities is damaging to the fabric of these neighborhoods. It's important that every resident gets a voice in these decisions and is mailed regarding these developments in order to have that opportunity.

2 months ago

None of these things would be appropriate in my neighborhood, East Franklin Historical District. Please don't do this to us!

2 months ago

The size of lots in our neighborhood lend themselves better for "grannie homes" than any other options cited above and several neighbors have built these smaller homes already for parents and students.

2 months ago

Don't destroy our neighborhoods.

2 months ago

None of these options would be welcome in our neighborhood that we have chosen to make our home. We have an NCD and worked 2.5 years to put guidelines in place to keep this from happening to our neighborhood.

2 months ago

I do not agree that introduction of small-scale residential development (middle housing) into an existing single family home neighborhood will work. If the neighborhood is planned to include mixed housing (Southern Village) then it can work well. How will public schools be effected by increased density? The Chapel Hill Carrboro schools are already over capacity and there is never any discussion of the impact on schools (and other public services) when housing is expanded.

2 months ago

I treasure the trees in my environment. I don't want to lose them.

2 months ago

This approach is not only misguided but not necessary. We don't need any more people living in Chapel Hill. I only see this as public officials more worried about people that did not vote for them for the simple reason they don't live here, and less worried about the people that already live here and vote. Why?? Why worry about people that don't live here? "Affordable housing" is a smokescreen to enable developers to make money and, in the process, destroy the essence of this town. Why not preserve what we have and stop trying to turn it into something else?

2 months ago

Parking is a major consideration in our neighborhood. Additionally, our neighborhood would not support market-based affordable housing as it's adjacent to the University and to Franklin St. Therefore, there would have to be carrots/regulations to promote affordable housing.

Additionally, as half the neighborhood is a historic preservation district, the other half would only be affected. However, the other half of the neighborhood is just as historic. In fact, my home, which is in the other half, is on the National Historic Register. A clear understanding of what is being proposed on a street/house-by-house level is needed.

2 months ago

The ability to assure that missing middle families can take advantage of new structures and that such structures are not, in turn, repurposed for market rate luxury units.

2 months ago

HOA neighborhoods should not be exempt. It should be all or none. Not sure why an HOA exempts a neighborhood, as that would seem to benefit the more expensive neighborhoods at the expense of the less expensive ones (for example, Colony Woods).

2 months ago

infrastructure upgrades and especially rain/flood water management

2 months ago

Character of historic single-family neighborhoods should be preserved, not modified to serve the profit maximization of developers who will be able to charge higher prices in these neighborhoods. New development should be focused in areas with existing high density building, so it is clustered together and infrastructure impacts are concentrated. If affordable housing increase is the goal, eliminating restrictions in neighborhood conservation districts is a really ham-handed way to go about it.

The town talks a good game about affordable housing but doesn't back it up with policy. Further, adverse infrastructure impacts (e.g., need for road widening and upgrades) are borne by town taxpayers not the developers who make great profits on their building and leave taxpayers holding the bag. This is a foolish set of zoning changes under the guise of increasing affordable housing, but really just allowing developers to ruin more historic neighborhoods that give Chapel Hill its distinctive feel. As someone who lives in one of these neighborhoods, this neighborhood conservation district proposal is so short-sighted.

2 months ago

The proposed changes only affect the lowest income neighborhoods: those without HOAs and nonhistoric. Basically you're giving developers the opportunity to buy the less expensive single family homes in Chapel Hill and turn them into rental properties that can hold 4x as many tenants as a single family rental house. There is no guarantee that ANY of the new development made possible by the proposed zoning change would be sold to residents wanting to buy a first home in order to build equity. There are no rent caps in NC, so there is no way to ensure that any new rental units would be more affordable than the new apartment complexes in the Blue Hill district and other areas of town. I have a teen with special needs who may have difficulty finding housing as an adult; however, even though the proposed zoning changes would allow me to put a cottage in my backyard, the utility easement in my backyard negates that option—so the one aspect of the zoning change that might potentially benefit my family actually doesn't. I chose to move to CH for the public schools, which have markedly declined in caliber, and for the quality of life: the small town feel with less traffic and more trees. Frankly, given the current ill-conceived development and the proposed zoning changes, I'm giving serious consideration to moving some where else.

2 months ago

Some neighborhoods should be kept as single-family home neighborhoods. Adding duplexes, etc. will not materially increase the stock of moderately priced housing in these neighborhoods, but it will ruin the neighborhood character of them. One only needs to drive around the town and see neighborhoods slowly being ruined because the ordinance prohibiting more than 4 unrelated people to occupy a single family house is not being enforced. These neighborhoods foreshadow what will happen if this proposal passes. The council needs to take a very careful, neighborhood by neighborhood approach to making these changes, including getting input from the current residents one neighborhood at a time, not via a blanket approach.

2 months ago

NA

2 months ago

None of these are suitable for Laurel Hill road neighborhood.

2 months ago

Style, transportation options, whether undergrads or adults were living there.

2 months ago

Think before you make decisions that only impact one small area of Chapel Hill- the housing "crisis" if there truly is one and it is not just some greedy developer's dream -should be shared by all areas of Chapel Hill - not singled out for one area. Also, we are skeptical- you tire down what was affordable housing for many people and replaced those units with apartments that start at 1600-1800 for a 1 bedroom apartment- that is hardly affordable for those you displaced. Colony Woods is truly a bird sanctuary and most neighbors interact well. It is friendly (including children that grew up here and came back with their own families, some singles, young couples, young couples with families, neighbors in every way who walk, bike a lot and have community. Do not destroy community.

2 months ago

It would result in the loss of older beautiful homes and tree canopy. We already have quite a bit of rental properties available.

2 months ago

There are already too many residences being built in this area both in Chapel Hill and across the line in Durham. My understanding was that Chapel Hill was supposed to have some assemblance of a green buffer zone around it, but instead the area between Chapel Hill and Durham in particular is being built up densely. We need parks and fields, not dense housing.

2 months ago

Please mail the document to impacted home owners and allow enough time for people to response

2 months ago

It would depend on careful planning and oversight, strict standards, and transparent prioritization of the community's needs and values OVER developers needs and financial gain. I would expect that we stick to the priorities of walkability, pedestrian friendly spaces, community spaces, mixed use development, and, most importantly, high environmental standards. I would also prefer that we prioritize owner occupied spaces over rentals because I don't trust landlords to care for or maintain their properties.

2 months ago

Off street parking.

2 months ago

I'm for middle housing but not in existing single family neighborhoods. Those residents purchased with the understanding that their single family, tree lined streets would always be just that. Mix in middle housing with the apartments or downtown, not in these neighborhoods. And pay greater attention to what this increased density will mean for infrastructure and schools. I know CH must grow but we need trees and stormwater systems to work. Be more mindful. What's with all the pavement? The new roundabout on Ephesus Rd has so much more concrete inside the curb than needed. What is all that for? And how wide do sidewalks need to be downtown? All this concrete is not good for us!

2 months ago

None of the above! They would completely destroy these neighborhoods and lead to huge loss of value for existing residents, and only benefit developers. This is a Hail Mary the council wants to employ to fix years not planning for such types of housing. The emphasis on those without HOAs is discriminatory.

2 months ago

uncertain

2 months ago

It's ridiculous that the council is considering rezoning middle class neighborhoods for medium and high density redevelopment while there is literally a giant golf course insulated by actual mansions directly adjacent to those neighborhoods. It seems the only real reason town council would exclude neighborhoods with existing HOAs from this rezoning effort is to try to avoid legal problems from entities with deep pockets.

CH created this problem for themselves by rubber-stamping several enormous luxury apartment developments instead of requiring those properties to be developed with the very medium-density projects shown above. Don't try to solve this by screwing over the very people you're claiming to help.

2 months ago

It is not up to Chapel Hill to cram more and more high density housing into a very limited infrastructure of roads (15/501) and supporting infrastructure. I think Chapel Hill should maintain the virtues that brought people to it in the first place. Room to move and live without the traffic and congestion of a city. Why do we feel the need to create something that everyone moved here to get away from? Who is driving this destruction of our life style, and why??

2 months ago

The planners have turned Chapel Hill into a city of transients with the over-building of ugly high density institutional apartment buildings that may be bright and shiny now but will look even more hideous and dated in ten years. The housing boom will eventually end and we will be permanently stuck with this architectural garbage. These buildings along with the mid-density housing being proposed only serve the wealthier and will inevitably force poor residents to move out. I have zero faith in the town planners!

2 months ago

This plan can work but loss of tree canopy and increased traffic are almost certainly going to occur. I do not trust developers to do the right thing and produce the green, affordable outcomes you are seeking. We need strong ordinances to conserve a minimum % of tree canopy in each lot and adjacent bike/public transit improvements to be made in conjunction with these plans - and we need to connect with larger Orange County. Otherwise it's just going to be hot, crowded, stressful and loud - and probably still too expensive for most folks. I want to see guarantees on significant conservation of mature trees - people want that. And how do you ensure it's "affordable"? To whom? What's the greater bike and transit plan? Thank you.

2 months ago

I agree with the need for denser, missing middle residential development, but home owners need to have some leverage they can exert when adjacent or near-by properties violate certain guidelines for things like stormwater runoff, lighting, parking, trash and recyclables collection, tree canopy and vegetative borders, and other safety and quality of life issues. What concerns me are the loopholes that developers will be able to exploit that could lead to haphazard, substandard building and blatant profiteering by investment groups and absentee landlords.

2 months ago

Nothing. My neighborhood has no empty lots

You're currently tearing down middle housing in Glenn Lennox. How about helping to improve those places. And stop building expensive high rise residential housing. As you propose this you're currently building several in chapel hill. If you really want to do this start building affordable housing now and stop building the same exact expensive high rise crap all over town.

2 months ago

This survey is so biased... we do not want more construction of low income housing in chapel hill.
Period

2 months ago

Can you do something to prohibit those big garage doors facing the street? They're ugly and shouldn't be allowed on houses either.

2 months ago

The future is not the past. We struggle to find appropriate senior housing and new adult housing. Already our neighborhood supports garage apartments. The pressure of needing housing is great and not going away. The town needs to be aware of increasing public living rooms and gathering spaces. The deer have been fooled by our natural landscaped screens from the roads even if only 6 feet wide. We will not be able to afford to live here without adding an ADU. Not giving our family the option of using our land to support housing for our family that includes young adults and seniors is not helpful and is downright harmful to our family trying to find solutions to our own problems. This area is in great need. The future is not the past.

2 months ago

The destruction of the natural environment by developers in Chapel Hill is horrific and is quickly ruining the character of the town. This is a view shared by many, many residents of Chapel Hill. The ghastly new developments in residential areas (eg Aura) are cheered and championed by out-of-town developers who seem to be the only people who benefit from them. Certainly they are not making housing more affordable in Chapel Hill and they have not resulted in lower taxes for residents.

This new plan that is being considered is not going to address the affordable housing problem in CH. It will only succeed in further diminishing the quality of life of CH residents who are already being crowded by unappealing and poorly conceived development. If the new plan is approved, developers will not be rushing to buy \$500K+ properties in CH to build low-cost triplexes. It makes no sense at all. If a developer is going to be tearing down a house and clear cutting a lot in CH, they will be replacing the house (and the trees around it) with expensive condos.

I am stunned that this plan is being presented without any consideration of its effects on schools, the environment, public services, our rapidly growing traffic problems, our communities, and the town finances. How can anyone support this without knowing more? Much more homework needs to be done before this should be further discussed.

2 months ago

The only thing that matters to the current city council is developing every square inch of this city. They could care less what the folks that live here now think.

2 months ago

Don't mess with our neighborhoods! Sprawl has been happening for 30 years. Focus on more efficient transportation.

2 months ago

Location. If developers PROMISE (in writing) to devote 20% of building projects to be offered as affordable housing g.

2 months ago

Follow Durham's example of single family attached homes to allow for ownership of one side of a two family duplex or 3+ unit townhouse.

2 months ago

The amount of high density development so far has done nothing to curb affordability. Given that there is no way to control purchase of new development for rental purposes, I do not think this is a guaranteed solution and it is against the wishes of many in town to have even further high density development. I have been in the market to buy a house in Chapel Hill for two years now and it only grows further out of reach. My rent has increased 25% in two years, also making it 15% higher than the mortgage (also in Chapel Hill) I previously had. Further high density development does not solve the problem of affordability and will likely only make it worse.

2 months ago

I frankly have a hard time envisioning added density to my neighborhood (Coker Hills), but am in favor of relaxing zoning as areas step down/up towards existing density.

2 months ago

I live on Oakwood Drive. Grubb Properties has a fantastic opportunity to build lots of 2-story middle housing in the form of cottages, town homes and condos in the Glen Lennox neighborhood under the terms of the existing Glen Lennox Development Agreement (DA). I ask that the town council, mayor, and planning department insist that Grubb build out the remaining undeveloped sections of Glen Lennox with middle housing only rather than more large multi-family apartment buildings and luxury condos and town homes. I believe that currently Grubb is targeting meeting the minimum requirement for affordable housing under the DA. I request that the town council and mayor critically look at this redevelopment project and require them to develop only middle housing in the form of affordable cottages, town homes and condos rather than luxury town homes and condos and more multifamily apartments. Three large multi-family apartment buildings with mixed use on the ground floor and large parking decks have already received DA compliance approval from the town planning department. We don't need more apartments, we need the middle housing! Glen Lennox is an amazing neighborhood and building out the rest of the development with middle housing in the form of cottages, condos, and town homes would allow many more people to own homes in Chapel Hill rather than renting. The goal of the DA, which was negotiated by Grubb, the neighborhood and town planning department, was to create a mutual vision of redevelopment of a unique and historic area of Chapel Hill that would maintain the character, tree-cover and walkability of the neighborhood. If the approved mixed use space includes shops, restaurants, bars, etc. and the ease of pedestrian crossing of Raleigh Road were improved, this could be a fantastic neighborhood for homes in a middle housing price range. Given that the existing DA streamlines the approval process, it seems to me that the town council and mayor have an amazing opportunity with Grubb Property to build a lot of middle housing in Glen Lennox in the next few years.

2 months ago

Whether housing would be owner occupied or not.

2 months ago

Tearing down single family homes in a long standing settled family neighborhood to build duplexes, triplexes, apartment buildings, or town homes will destroy our neighborhood.

2 months ago

Disagree with building multiplex housing in single family housing neighborhoods

2 months ago

I think that changing the zoning for single-family home neighborhoods in Chapel Hill. It would be detrimental to everyone involved. Enter those not yet living here. It is a massive mistake.

2 months ago

We worked hard to live in a place like this. We spent a lot to buy into this town. There is no reason to provide everyone access for next to nothing. We do not want our neighborhood and our home devalued by sticking in a bunch of people who did not pay what we did to live here. We want a beachfront property for nothing on the ocean. No one is making that possible! We do not want to just give that to others here. If you cannot afford Chapel Hill, too bad! By increasing density, you are ruining our top rated schools with over population. Our infrastructure is already overtaxed. STOP ruining our city! I am a liberal, and I have had ENOUGH of this liberal nonsense! We do not live in a socialist country! When we do, we can be fair. Until then, if you cannot afford it, too bad! We worked hard to live here, and we do not want to just give it away. Our city government is in cahoots with these developers, and they are all making a lot of money together at the expense of the rest of us.

2 months ago

Many of these questions are not agree/disagree but instead have actual answers. The Missing Middle proposal does not go nearly far enough but is at least a start. Not moving forward would confirm the Town is beholden to wealthy homeowners' desire to keep lower income households out.

2 months ago

Here's the deal: I want the availability of middle-class housing to increase in Chapel Hill, but the current plans to do so are NOT going to accomplish that, because the sole change taking place is rezoning to allow developers or buyers more choices in their building---and we know that they will shape their choices SOLELY by market forces, not out of a kind desire to help people build EQUITY and family WEALTH. We know that the builders, as is happening in Wake Forest, for just one example, will charge enormous sums for new homes, and that they will squeeze every penny out of renters, as well. How does this help the MIDDLE? The new homes will *still* be priced out of their range. It seems to me that we need condos and 3 bedroom units FOR SALE. And the Chapel Hill government will have ZERO say over this once a lot is purchased----all building decisions at that point are totally up to the developer. Again, this will not help the very people who need it, unless more controls are placed on the new buildings. I realize that state law limits the control that the town has over the new building types, but perhaps a nonprofit model is needed here. Thank you.

2 months ago

Already the traffic, congestion and loss of a sense of community is very worrying. Please, let's keep Chapel Hill as a viable, safe and affordable community.

2 months ago

It depends on how close it is to good bus infrastructure. Residential development needs to come along with other types of development to mitigate car traffic, such as good bus lines, SAFE bike routes, and greenways.

2 months ago

There should be an analysis of revenue and expense associated with the suggested changes. The changes will require more services (expenses) which probably will exceed the property revenue. The town would have to raise property tax or sales tax to cover the short fall. I do not feel like the repercussions of the suggested changes have been thoroughly or expertly evaluated.

2 months ago

We do not need developers building more high end tall, square, giant apartment buildings. We need more middle income and affordable, smaller units.

2 months ago

Urban style densification is appropriate and needed for the already treeless downtown of Chapel Hill. In other areas, I would love to see small apartments or other rentable, affordable (not targeting a luxury market or those who can afford to own) home options with some outdoor space and the retention of trees and/or greenways around them. The environmental footprint decrease from shared walls is quite significant, and could be even more significant if this densification came from converting many of the overly large, under-occupied multistory homes in the Chapel Hill suburban belts to duplexes etc., as one assumes the occupants of these are heating and cooling large numbers of unoccupied rooms and unneeded space.

2 months ago

Mid rise already being built. Lots of apartment construction has occurred. Keeping current residential preserves trees and lovely homes. Why should lovely residential areas be affected when already much construction has occurred and is on going?

2 months ago

It would depend on a study to determine the need and how the current environment both natural and social would be affected.

2 months ago

We need more housing in this community. Legalizing missing middle has been done in other communities, and it's past time to do it here. Don't listen to the fearmongering!

2 months ago

Housing people is more important than "neighborhood character," whatever that is. I want my kids to be able to live in this town one day, and that won't happen without removing the racist, classist, and absurdly misguided density caps in place right now.

2 months ago

The proposal to change neighborhood zoning is misguided and rushed. This zoning change would not and cannot address whether the "gentle density" housing would be AFFORDABLE, it will ONLY address DIVERSITY of housing size & style by providing for the building of duplexes, triplexes, quadraplexes, and "cottage courts" on small lots, subdivided lots, and backyards and would require 20-40% tree canopy. We do not have the infrastructure that is needed for this kind of sweeping change. How will you address the cost of storm water, traffic, roads, transportation, water & sewer, electricity, police & fire services, 911/EMS services, schools, & more? How will the town & residents pay for this and not cause existing low income & modest income residents to be forced out of the homes they own and/or rent?

What are the transportation/traffic implications of this blanket zoning change for greater density? Has the town planned to accommodate and pay for this? What are the traffic/pedestrian/planning projections for this new infrastructure? What are the potential implications for property tax increases to pay for increased demands on town services? What is the projected budgetary plan for this? What is the basis for these projections? Will residents be able to shoulder the tax increases?

If this is such a good idea, then Chapel Hill citizens should have time to think about it and discuss it, instead of it being rushed through by Council.

As for NCDs: We live in one of the few affordable neighborhoods in Chapel Hill, Elkin Hills. Our house is all of 765 square feet. We spent years to develop our NCD, following the Town's guidelines and jumping through all the hoops. Have you consulted with the Town's lawyers about the legality of revoking a duly developed and majority-homeowner-approved NCD? I recall the red light cameras, texting while driving, and now apparently AirBnB regulations being revoked when subjected to legal scrutiny.

Please rethink this hasty process. Sincerely yours, Molly and Peter Starback

2 months ago

Missing middle housing will only benefit lower income families if the housing is reserved for them. Otherwise, wealthier patrons would snap them up.

2 months ago

Have you driven through and around Eastgate and Ephesus Church recently? Those apartments aren't even done yet. We do not have the infrastructure for the density you are philosophically desiring.

2 months ago

I find this whole proposal preposterous. You are proposing increasing density in intact neighborhoods purely for the sake of increasing density. For what? More tax money? It would completely disrupt neighborhoods and lead to friction between neighbors over suspected sales of their property to developers who will construct multifamily dwellings among single family homes in intact neighborhoods. And do you really believe that the strategy you propose is going to lead developers to lower the costs of these structures? I particularly like the phrase you use: 'if carefully designed and integrated'. It's perfect. It's the phrase developers and town councils always use when proposing a disaster for the community. I feel betrayed that zoning I believed was intact for my neighborhood can be changed by the whim of the town council.

2 months ago

If a neighborhood is designed that way from the start and people "opt in" to the lifestyle, it's fine. To retro-fit neighborhoods into this model and force people into someone else's idea of what "should" be is a joke. The Q&A document provided by Karen Stegman was a complete waste of the digital paper it was written on - completely didn't address any of the actual issues. More density means more traffic, more trash on the street, more demand on infrastructures like cable and Internet and fewer trees. It doesn't matter to me if Grad students need more ragers (see the stupid q&a if you don't get the reference). I bought into a single family neighborhood for a reason. This proposal essentially says "I don't care what you wanted, this is what WE think you should have". I am strongly against adding density to our neighborhoods in this manner.

2 months ago

I strongly resent the fact that the town management has allowed, and indeed encouraged, developers to destroy unique, close-in neighborhoods. We moved here because CH combined the charm of a small town with the sophistication of a big city. Twenty years later, it exhibits the problems of a big(ish) city with the charm of a string of pizza joints. Wrong direction! It has become a miserable place for older adults.

2 months ago

This survey, and this initiative in general, lack sophistication and nuance. Chapel Hill is a complex network of neighborhoods and what may be appropriate for one neighborhood would be inappropriate for another. Targeted zoning changes that promote specific goals – such as permitting denser housing along transit corridors and within walking distance of the more 'urbanized' regions (downtown, near established shopping districts) - could optimize the desired outcomes of creating missing middle residences, reducing reliance on automobiles, and providing for the varied needs of current and future residents, without risking destruction of the character of Chapel Hill's diverse neighborhoods. Blanket deregulation will lead to unanticipated, unintended, and undesirable results.

2 months ago

I don't trust town staff to implement missing middle housing in a way that is truly sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood. They will do what they have done in recent years: make a few minor adjustments to a development in order to appear conciliatory but essential, promote approval of structures that benefit developers. The current council has not followed agreed upon guidelines (eg Central West) and therefore cannot be trusted to follow any guidelines implied in this wrong-headed proposal. We could have had missing middle housing on the corner of Estes & MLK but instead we are getting AURA! Where was your concern for the missing middle then? I have lost all faith in those in public office. My efforts will be spent voting you out of office and getting in folks who will promote missing middle housing in areas of town where it makes sense to do so, not you people who want to do more damage to our community's unique features. It's okay to be unique. Missing middle housing would be great on Buffie Weber's land. Put it there! But wait, would that mean lower profits for the landowner? Maybe so. Greed can't drive every thing and pandering to developers is shameful. Eliminating RI zoning is a wrong headed solution. But one that Pam won't have to deal with in the OAKS. She's protected by HOA. Shame on you.

2 months ago

2 months ago

*The problem in Chapel Hill is NOT a need for "AFFORDABLE HOUSING" - It is letting developers literally demolish affordable housing to put up massive luxury condos like in Blue Hill - across from Eastgate and paying the CITY COUNCIL to not have a portion of the condos affordable. Also WITHOUT IMPROVING / UPGRADING streets to accomodate for additional traffic! We are addressing the WRONG ISSUE and making it look like people don't want affordable housing when it's available and could be made more available. It's all politics and money.

2 months ago

None of these would be appropriate for my neighborhood.

2 months ago

Please have the Town mail a letter to each homeowner that is impacted, explaining the impact, and then allow time for people to respond prior to a vote on the proposal by the Town Council.

2 months ago

In my neighborhood, there are inadequate places for walking or driving safely as it is. It would be extraordinarily dangerous to add more cars or pedestrians in this forested and hilly area. And, I'm concerned that additional paved or hard surfaces would adversely effect the existing problems with stormwater runoff. Are the planners considering the impact to our land-locked elementary and middle schools when housing is added?

2 months ago

I do support plans for higher density if done thoughtfully and if proactive of the impacts that come from increased density. I am neutral on many of the questions because I do not fully believe that this approach will add diversity and families into our neighborhood. I think that this plan will mainly increase housing for students, not for families. I think that the students who will mostly benefit from the added housing options will be from white families with higher incomes and abilities to pay higher rents. It is also likely that landlords will rent to more students in the smaller units than allowed. I don't think this plan will help much with parking in our neighborhood either as every student living here seems to bring their car and their visitors also bring their cars. My family lives in a neighborhood where most of the homes have already been converted to rentals that hold dozens of students. It is common to see a small single family home with 8 or more cars in the driveway/yard and more spilling into the street. Parking, trash overflowing into storm drains, illegal dumping, and noise issues are at times big issues here. It seems that warnings or fines have not incentivized distant landlords/property management companies. I am in support of density, but there needs to be a good plan in place for how the town will update and maintain infrastructure (stormwater, streets, sidewalks, overflowing trash and illegal dumping, parking, etc), and how the town will enforce ordinances and handle the issues that will come from increased density.

2 months ago

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this proposal, but the survey does not accurately capture my concerns. One of my biggest concerns is that there is no way to insure the missing middle would be served by this zoning change. It seems incredibly irresponsible and naive to think otherwise. Another concern is that this proposal came out of nowhere with notice to potentially affected neighborhoods dribbling in by word of mouth. I think each homeowner should be contacted by mail and be allowed to respond before the Town Council rushes through a vote on this proposal. Affordable home ownership and rentals are needed in Chapel Hill, but this proposal is not the answer.

2 months ago

I am a resident of Colony Woods. I have reached out to you the mayor and town council multiple times about how the current drainage system for the area is destroying my home and yard, to the point where it put my family's lives in danger and has cost me thousands of dollars in damage. Currently all the water from Colony Lake is being emptied through a pipe that drains directly into my yard and has created a giant pit that is killing large trees. In the past few years as development has increased it has gotten rapidly worse to the point where if it goes unchecked it will destroy the foundation of my house. In the past 10 years the landscape of this area has drastically changed and yet the town refuses to do anything to upgrade the drainage to meet the current needs. Building apartment buildings in the neighborhood is only going to make this worse and the town has shown that they don't mind destroying homes in Colony Woods for the sake of development. I haven't been given any reason to trust that this would be done in a responsible way. I don't want any other residents of Colony Woods and the surrounding neighborhoods to go through the same thing that is happening to me.

2 months ago

We do not support a zoning change to the current single family requirements in our neighborhood. We also request that an impact study be done before any such decision is made.

2 months ago

It seems unfair to change zoning in existing neighborhoods where folks moved in with certain densities already in place. We have lived in Booker Creek for 28 years and we moved here with this subdivision being a "known entity" and not expecting to have zoning changed and higher densities allowed. In Booker Creek, we already have duplexes around the corner, townhouses on the next block over, and apartments at the end of our street. I also worry about parking with any additional density in Booker Creek. Most of the houses in Booker Creek do not have garages and just have single lane driveways (for one car), so many neighbors regularly park one car on the street. I would like to see the Town mail letters to homeowners who are potentially being impacted, explaining the changes, and allow time for residents to respond prior to a vote on the proposal by the Town Council so we can share our concerns.

2 months ago

Chapel Hill needs more affordable housing (low- and mid-range) for sale so that owners can build equity. We have too many expensive and/or student-oriented rental properties. How can CH prevent any more huge, ugly, rental behemoths from being developed? I know they are cheaper to build but they are destroying the charm and the character of this town. Can the town hire a staff architect, one who is design-oriented, to approve project proposals?

2 months ago

These duplexes, triplexes, quadriplexes, townhouses, etc. are not guaranteed to be "affordable", but they will guarantee loss of neighborhood in existing residential areas. Build these structures in new developments. All the apartments being built currently are not affordable -- what happened to those requirements for providing a percentage at lower cost? Established neighborhoods are already being threatened by corporations that buy properties to be rented for profit, and then there are those who buy a property simply to tear it down to replace a more moderately priced house with a "mansion wanna-be". Colony Woods is a very nice middle-class subdivision -- why destroy it? Isn't that what is desired? Glen Lennox is being destroyed, Colony Apartments has been destroyed, and probably Kings Arms Apartments is next to be razed. If the Town wants affordable housing, why are we allowing destruction of properties that are, or were more affordable? I do have a horse in this race -- I am a homeowner in Colony Woods and have been for almost 40 years. It would be a shame to see it chopped up by profiteers.

2 months ago

This survey really does not get at the heart of the problem. It reads like a push poll, rather than a nuanced survey of Chapel Hill residents's attitudes. The problem with the current plan that the Planning Committee presented the week of January 13 is the failure to prioritize building more affordable owner-resident homes. Instead, the plan opens the door for more of what we already have: high-priced rentals that are aimed at students and high-paid, single or married couples without children. We need more developments like Kirkwood that provide modest, well-planned condominiums and town homes that are owner occupied. Allowing developers to cram rental units into residential neighborhoods that do not have an existing HOA will not provide that sort of owner-occupied housing. There appears to be a rush on the part of the Town Council members to pass the rezoning without allowing time for full discussion of the change with Chapel Hill residents.

2 months ago

Will depend on price and quality of materials.

2 months ago

Spreading such development throughout the town and having guidelines about the extent and type of development is the only responsible way to approach this. Concentrating it in specific neighborhoods with no control over the outcome is not planning.

2 months ago

The town should mail a letter to each homeowner that is impacted, and allow enough time for people to respond prior to taking a vote.

2 months ago

Where it has already been implemented, the result is trashy, poorly-maintained units in an otherwise excellent neighborhood.

2 months ago

Multi-family units are not unreasonable in and of themselves. But they are unreasonable when added to established neighborhoods where they would alter the character, housing style, and flow. Better to require such units in new builds so that they would fit into a not-yet established pattern of housing.

2 months ago

It would depend upon whether the town were able to protect existing homeowners from displacement due to higher property tax rates. Upzoning for greater residential density will likely increase the appraised value, and thus the tax liability, of the upzoned parcels. What steps does the Town plan to take to protect existing homeowners from being displaced by the tax increases related to the zoning change? How have other towns that have ended single-family zoning addressed this issue? It would be tragic indeed if a legislative action undertaken to make housing more affordable ended up making existing housing less affordable and displacing the town's least affluent homeowners.

2 months ago

I strongly object to the town's bulldozing this zoning change through with limited public awareness and input. The inequity is staggering: older neighborhoods will be targeted, while newer, upscale neighborhoods with HOAs and NCDs will be protected. The zoning change will NOT lead to AFFORDABLE missing middle housing. It will be yet another gift to developers exceeding the one bestowed in the Blue Hill district. This major change has not worked in Durham or Raleigh and should NOT BE PROPOSED OR ACTED ON until another municipal election occurs where residents can choose council members who value citizens over developers.

2 months ago

There are already a variety of housing options within our neighborhood. I prefer to maintain existing housing within the neighborhood

2 months ago

There are already a variety of housing options within our neighborhood. I prefer to maintain existing housing within the neighborhood.

2 months ago

I prefer maintain existing neighborhoods. Chapel Hill presently offers housing choices to meet the needs of residents.

2 months ago

It would depend on making sure the multi family housing fits into the existing neighborhood and prevent the loss of tree canopy. Without tree canopy, our stormwater runoff will suffer and some of these new units will contribute to our flooding problem. We must be careful to protect our trees that soak up so much water and provide shade during our increasing warming of the planet. I also strongly believe that before this plan is adopted, residents get a survey to fill out at each of their homes. This online survey is not reaching most residents that will be affected by this change. If you strongly believe in resident input, you will send a survey to each household. If you do not, you will continue to vote on this without allowing all of your citizens to provide input.

2 months ago

Rents and mortgagees are too high and have increased at a far greater pace than wages. That is a huge contributing cause to the housing problem. I am distrustful of the term small scale, as developers seek large scale profits. What are the guarantees that traffic flow, parking congestion, water usage, rainfall drainage and green-space protection will be successfully addressed and managed.

2 months ago

Please send letters to all potentially impacted homeowners

2 months ago

I believe that the changes being proposed are poorly thought-through, and that there are examples elsewhere where these kinds of changes result in bad outcomes. I am certainly in favor of affordable housing, but I do not believe that the changes proposed are truly aligned with "affordable."

2 months ago

A letter or card should be sent to every resident in Booker Creek and Lake Forest to let them know about this zoning change

Both neighborhood's character would be destroyed by the success of this proposal.

2 months ago

None, not sufficient room

2 months ago

As a long time resident of Chapel Hill, I am finding the town more and more unrecognizable. Everything that was attractive to me and my family about the town seems in the crosshairs of the council and their consultants-du-jour who are paid copious amounts of tax dollars to come up with buzzy terms like "missing middle" and "gentle density." One of the reasons Chapel Hill WAS a destination place to be was largely due to its abundance of green spaces, and welcoming neighborhoods. Now we are surrounded by thousands of luxury apartments that consumed acres of woodlands and a downtown that is rapidly losing any semblance of its original charm and small businesses. For all of this, we pay some of the highest property taxes in the state. I believe the result of this zoning change would be irresistible to every out-of-town/state opportunistic developer who would snatch up single-family homes, flatten the dwelling, clear cut the lot and jam as much allowable density on the lot forever altering the fabric of the neighborhood. We don't have the infrastructure to support this endeavor, nor will the community tolerate the predictable reduction of property value that this will bring. It's just a poorly conceived idea. Maybe give all the consultants and developers a rest for a bit, please and work with the community to find out what they really want. Thanks!

2 months ago

The questions are framed to easily mislead people. Moreover, just getting to this survey requires a lot of scrolling and will deter additional people from having a voice. Make this survey broadly available, publicize your plans openly so that a real and honest discussion can take place. Send out the survey in the mail to account for all those not comfortable with email/internet surveys. Will additional schools be built? Will streets get widened to account for this plan? I think it's a terrible idea all around, because it only benefits those in "developed" neighborhoods with an HOA in place and will shortchange those living in the older, organically grown neighborhoods around town. Probably, this idea was put together by those living with HOAs...

2 months ago

-Property owners need to receive individual mailings regarding these proposed zoning changes rather than having the changes buried in text amendments that many do not understand AND then be provided an opportunity to respond. Treat this like a rezoning and notify owners by mail of the proposed changes.

2 months ago

These visuals are not appropriate for my neighborhood. Adding ADUs would be appropriate but not the other pictures.

2 months ago

- It is unfair to impact the existing, established neighborhoods who no longer have restrictive covenants and didn't ask for a Neighborhood Protection District or Historic District designation.
- Adding ADUs to my neighborhood would be appropriate but not the other pictures provided.
- Adding missing middle to areas that are not established neighborhood may be appropriate.

2 months ago

Be careful not to destroy the neighborhoods we already have, the ones people want to live in. It is naive to hope that by forcing people to live together that everybody will find that attractive or make them want to move to Chapel Hill. Just WANTING to live in Chapel Hill does not confer a RIGHT to live here. I might WANT to live in Greenwich, CT, but the does not confer a RIGHT to live there if I can't afford it.

2 months ago

I see no research that demonstrates that the properties currently being developed will actually be occupied. So many cities across the country are investing heavily in this kind of housing development, and it is leading to three things: empty units; foreign investments of empty units; and further segregation within cities due to wealth. Consider the latest high rise being built in Durham, where the upper units remain empty and are selling for over \$2M. The proposals for this to be "mixed income" never actually materialize, and it just becomes an opportunity for developers to cash in and then move on, leaving the town with many many problems as a result.

2 months ago

We welcome diverse housing options, density, and new neighbors. Great work staff & council —
Sincerely, a Lake Forest family

2 months ago

Can the town please send letters to residents who live at or adjacent to properties that would be affected by proposed rule changes and can the town please give the people who would be most affected some time to respond prior to voting on proposals? Most residents are too busy to follow the detailed machinations of town politics and this seems to be a situation where developer-supported initiatives might sneak through without appropriate public attention.

Whether or not the situation is multiple-family housing or single-family housing, I am fully in support of encouraging more owner-occupied housing and less housing that is owned by non-residents. Chapel Hill should encourage and facilitate the chance of renters to transform into owners. So many rental units have been constructed in Chapel Hill and so little discussion has been devoted to proposals that can allow people to improve economic status via building up financial equity. Some of the proposals being discussed in this survey would result in more rental units and some would not. I am very much in favor of more ownership and less rental.

Chapel Hill is the place in North Carolina where I want to live. Please do not ruin it. The trendy and intellectually-flabby hand-wringing about how Chapel Hill has deep flaws is largely a developer-sponsored ploy for short-term gain at the expense of long-term planning.

I am really disappointed that the focus of town leadership has not been on how to preserve natural areas and has instead been on accelerating development in an already quickly-growing area. The most environmentally-friendly long-term solution is not to accelerate development in quickly-growing areas such as our own region. Instead, we need to find a way to use existing infrastructure in small towns and rural areas that have experienced population declines in recent years. Disparity among geographic regions in economic growth rates results in unoccupied housing in some areas and in boom-bust cycles in others. When planners discuss environmental benefits of high-density living in urban areas, they too often neglect the fact that housing in less-urban areas is unoccupied and being allowed to deteriorate. Why not have open discussions about how policies should divert economic development to less-privileged non-urban places that have existing under-utilized infrastructure? Use of existing infrastructure is far more environmentally responsible than building new infrastructure and than encouraging boom areas.

As a scientist who studies population biology, I have thought quite a bit about these issues and I realize that my points differ from the conventional ones made by the real estate industry.

2 months ago

Our neighborhood, near Eastgate, has already been adversely affected by the multiple high density luxury apartment buildings that have been built and continue to be built in this area. I went to several of the public meetings prior to some of these changes and feel that the Town's representations and process itself were intentionally misleading. The Town's plan talks about respecting and preserving the character of Chapel Hill, but everything it is doing is the opposite of that. "Disrupting" zoning by throwing existing codes in the trash may be trendy but it is also profoundly disrespectful and irresponsible. If the Town intends to change zoning in existing neighborhoods, all property owners should be directly informed of the proposed change well in advance of any vote (for example, by mail to each address).

2 months ago

It depends on Council making these changes, which I strongly support. These housing types used to be common within neighborhoods and we need to start building them again.

2 months ago

If depends on building design with designated high quality public spaces and incorporated parks, greenways and public transportations to connect communities with schools, grocery stores etc.

2 months ago

I am troubled by this affecting all the old neighborhoods in Chapel Hill while leaving any home owner association neighborhood untouched. I am not opposed to any middle density housing but this will change the character of my neighborhood without any real input from homeowners. Also, some areas have been designated conservation districts because of the problems this might cause, but there is no provision to revise and perhaps consider making more areas conservation districts. It seems to me that you will create a change that will be quickly followed by a call to make more neighborhoods NCRs. You should write to all those in the town in this zoning and tell them giving adequate time to respond before a council vote.

I will add that I did not answer some questions because they seem like leading the witness.

2 months ago

The key is maintaining character of existing neighborhoods while adding infill. A single framework for the whole town seems unworkable. Break things down and do appropriate development (scale, etc.) on more of a case by case or neighborhood by neighborhood basis.

This isn't a generic discussion. Things have to be worked out for specific plans and specific pieces of property. You're falling into the trap of a one-size-fits-all strategy because you don't want the hassle of figuring things out for real people in real neighborhoods.

2 months ago

Investors will build more housing but it will be very high end expensive housing. Council cannot control that. We will have more luxury housing; not middle market or low income. The national reit securities are destroying housing for individuals. The Gen Assembly forbids you from enacting limits and safeguards to prevent this or to ensure middle housing. This is a bad idea without limits.

2 months ago

I like the cottages approach, especially if they are owner-occupied.

2 months ago

The wording of the survey is both misleading and leading, which reduces the value of this survey. The proposed changes to current zoning language constitutes changes potentially of many rezoning. Rezoning's require signage throughout affected areas that indicate a significant change is being contemplated. Although signage is not required with proposed text amendment this lack of signage is clearly a decision to limit public exposure and knowledge. If one believes these changes are the right course of action than one should be willing to stimulate debate to encourage alternatives leading to the best overall decision.

2 months ago

It would depend on how all this is executed. Giving developers carte blanche to tear down existing houses and replace them by covering more land with buildings is a recipe for disaster unless carefully managed. The proposed amendments eliminate such management by cutting out careful regulation.

2 months ago

I am very concerned about increased flooding due to more impervious surface and fewer trees. I live in a neighborhood where most people have left their yards to be forests. This serves everyone downstream. Other concerns are increased traffic. Everyone walks in the street, there are few sidewalks. Too many unanswered questions. People need to be notified via. mail. This is a huge change for single family homeowners. I have not talked to one person who was aware of this. We need answers relevant to the neighborhood that we live in. Please be thoughtful so that we do not have unintended consequences. I do not believe that this will provide affordable housing, you can't control the market price. The town will have no control over the design of the building and there is concern over investors that build to resell or rent and have no vested interest in making a building structurally appealing.

2 months ago

Topology and existing infrastructure are crucial parameters that determine if added density has a negative or positive impact on the community. Nowhere are these considerations mentioned in this survey. WHY? The unintended consequences of just upzoning all residential zones will just result in more expensive development with higher prices and rents with no benefit to residents. This scenario happens whenever increased residential density is implemented. Inexpensive housing only exists where inexpensive land exists.

2 months ago

Very hard to see any of the above examples fitting into the Kings Mill Morgan Creek neighborhood. However, I think that small cottages would be agreeable to most.

2 months ago

ADUs or cottage dwellings added to large lots are a good choice for almost all neighborhoods.

2 months ago

Established neighborhoods with large lots should not be developed to accommodate more student housing. I support density caps and do not think the town has the infrastructure to handle this "complete community" initiative. Chapel Hill will completely lose its small town charm if the council continues to approve large scale development.

2 months ago

Please take more time to study this proposal, inform the community, talk to people in single family neighborhoods, and start with undeveloped lots to introduce middle income housing.

2 months ago

Our neighborhood is generally zoned for single family units, however there are a lot of houses that have in-law units. The lots tend to be smaller (.3 acres) so adding a large structure like a mid-rise or high rise would not be very aesthetically pleasing. We are very close to UNC's campus, although many of the people that own houses in this neighborhood are established families, or retirees. There are a few rental properties scattered throughout.

2 months ago

None. Current population increase is detrimenting services and creating stress on existing infrastructure

2 months ago

We in the Colony Woods neighborhood have all of the above options very close and in fact in our neighborhood as of the last addition of housing.

2 months ago

Much more consideration and public discussion is required for this fundamental change. More differentiation needs to be considered about which type is allowed in which zoning. There is a fundamental difference between allowing accessory dwellings and perhaps duplexes versus larger compounds like triplexes and four-plexes. Consideration should be applied to how this changes how many cars need to be parked on the otherwise same frontage, etc. This all seems extremely fast without need to rush at the cost of public participation. There should be at least a year of truly public discussion with affected neighborhoods. Not much of that seems to have been going on. Town Council should be able to do better than that. This appears to change zoning without the processes that would be required to change zoning. Arguably, that is underhanded. The Town of Chapel Hill should treat its residents better than that.

Middle housing is shown as a type; however, what's missing is the cost aspect. Currently, it seems that developers will maximize profits, so they will build to the maximum pricing level they believe they will be able to sell with the maximum profit margin. They do not have a social responsibility to the Town or its residents to provide middle housing by cost. Only form is regulated. This was already the downfall of the Blue Hill District generating nothing but luxury apartments or eventually luxury condos, no "middle" apartments or condos, and mostly bought out affordable housing requirements. What would prevent the same to happen with middle housing? None of the consultants spoke to that --and my impression is that there is an absolute cluelessness about this aspect, or naivety about how this would happen. Affordable housing only happens when done intentionally. Middle (cost and form) housing will only happen when done intentionally. Otherwise, only maximum profit housing will happen in whatever form.

Clearly, the proposed changes will dramatically increase the development pressure on neighborhoods and drive out the people who have lived there and replace them with whoever can afford whatever developers can extract out of increased density. Property values will be driven up by development expectations, causing tax increases and pricing out current residents. Overall, this will decrease availability of the type of middle housing not just in size but also in pricing that Town Council appears to want to create. For that a price cap would be necessary, which appears impossible in the capitalist society that is the USA. In the end Chapel Hill will drive out the current residents to more affordable areas which will increase pressure on those and drive out their current residents, creating even more commuters, more traffic, more environmental destruction, and in the end a whole bunch of people with no place to call home.

It seems in the face of the opposite effect of what's intended, no change is better than misguided change.

2 months ago

How neighborhood is defined — and understanding the real need in addition to the many new high density housing under construction now. Adding higher density in much of the Oaks would make no sense

2 months ago

We live in an old neighborhood that is already built up. I don't understand why huge projects of single family homes are being built, or luxury apartments, when that area could be used for the same thing. Traffic is already terrible in our area and we have not addressed that basic infrastructure need.

2 months ago

Creating 20% of housing for people below 80AMI

2 months ago

It would depend on where, within a given neighborhood, units would be built (i.e., on the periphery vs within a neighborhood).

2 months ago

Solving the workforce housing and traffic issues involves a simple but unpopular solution. Put the students back in on-campus dorms [WHERE THEY BELONG] and solve a major part of housing and traffic issues. Let the workers and their families back into homes that were effectively stolen by greedhead developers for "student housing". Too simple, yet too obvious.

As to the general notion of "affordable housing", you might want to look at this article from the L.A. Tenants Union:

<https://latenantsunion.medium.com/affordable-housing-is-a-scam-9a4c43ba8149>

2 months ago

I don't know.

2 months ago

Please assure that the proposaal does not apply to the Historic Districts, where single family residences (with accessory and apartment uses) are integral to the special character of the District, especially the Franklin Rosemary District.

2 months ago

It would depend on how this impacts tree canopy and open spaces.

2 months ago

I am very supportive of the efforts to modify the LUMO to allow for a more inclusive Chapel Hill that also takes into consideration the environmental externalities of sprawl that our current land use regulations create.

2 months ago

There should be severe limits on the size and height of additional units, such as 500 square feet and 1 story. This would prevent developers from buying a house, knocking it down, and building some of the huge buildings pictures above. Remember this is "gentle" density, not destroying neighborhoods.

2 months ago

I currently rent a duplex in Chapel Hill, surrounded by single family homes. I'd love to have more options like this in town!

3 months ago

not duplexes with street facing garages like in the pic but otherwise...

3 months ago

Use of full blown Project Planning expertise by people with training, organization, agreed to goals and following the science of this technique including infrastructure implementation with schools, shopping, water and power.

3 months ago

I understand the desire to grow housing stock to support expected population growth, but have serious concerns on the emphasis of multi-unit housing in these presentations with no role for single family homes and even more concern over the prospective role of ADU's. I would like to understand the following (1) is this new housing stock to be owner-occupied or rental units and (2) who is the expected target or end user of this housing - families, singles, childless couples. While it's possible that larger town-homes could service the needs of families the emphasis on small multi-unit dwellings and lack of mention of single-family homes implies that attracting families to reside here is not a priority. I'm concerned this is nothing more than a back door way for UNC to get additional student housing funded by private real estate developers who own and rent that housing. In that scenario, UNC and developers win - and the town loses as the population becomes one of transient renters, turning over every 4 years. The lack of families means a lack of interest in the school system - with a corresponding negative impact there, impacting residents with children. The potential risk from ADU's is even higher - the idea of what are essentially tool shed sized houses is again not built with families in mind. Despite claimed plans for controls and process in place it would be easy to see a scenario where hundreds of random and randomly placed housing units - above garages, built off of the sides of houses, or in back yards become nothing more than AirBnB's - short term rentals populated by people coming in for UNC football or basketball. Again, UNC and developers win - and the town loses. I would like to be optimistic and recognize the need of housing to support growth, but what I've seen implies the town's vision of growth is incompatible with families and a stable, rooted community. Even if regulations could strictly control how this development occurs, the risk due to pressure from UNC and real estate developers would be immense for current and future town governments.

3 months ago

This appears to be nothing more than a plan to build more student housing - owned by real estate investors and rented out so UNC isn't out of pocket. Only winners appear to be UNC getting housing for students for free so they can grow enrollment and the investors who will own the properties. Given this will all be rental housing means this town will have an increasingly transient population. Combined with the desire to build accessory dwelling units - tiny houses dropped in yards or pretty much anywhere, will make the quality of life even worse. It is easy to envision these as being rented to students or worse used as short term rentals for UNC sporting events. Given the focus will on ADU's, apartments means the town is not expecting families to move here. Net result will negatively impact school system as town becomes increasingly populated by renters, singles, or childless couples as new housing is targeting these groups.

3 months ago

Neighborhood has no space for new housing.

5 months ago

Zoning should strongly deter non-local developers and not be attractive to real-estate investors. Adding ADUs and small "tiny" homes is preferable because those are more likely to be owned locally. Adding small condominium/for-sale units makes sense too. The problem is not with renters, to be clear, the problem is with zoning that attracts pernicious non-local investors who drive up housing costs for real people. Chapel Hill also has a habit of allowing density with stupid zoning that results in tree canopy and habitat loss. If you add density, also add rock solid requirements to prevent that.

5 months ago

We need more missing middle housing. I just barely managed to afford a single family house here 8 years ago. Missing middle would have been very attractive then, and the only possibility for me were I moving now. I'd also like my neighborhood (Ridgewood Park/Briarcliff/Colony Woods) to contain more socioeconomic diversity.

5 months ago

4-6 unit apartment is fine, but not the picture used (surrounded by concrete). Hopefully residents could park on the street or have driveway to parking spaces at the rear of their building. I would look forward to more density in my single-family neighborhood, hopefully that would prioritize us for more frequent transit service (current F service is paltry).

5 months ago

It might depend on what you mean by "my neighborhood"- the sites with enough infrastructure to support the larger kinds of housing in this selection are really on the edge of my neighborhood.

5 months ago

I already live in an historic neighborhood that has developed "middle housing" and student housing in our neighborhood. We already have difficulty walking on our narrow streets due to lack of sidewalks, drainage ditches, unenforced speeding, unpermitted parking, and wrong way driving. I was lucky/unlucky to nearly miss a head-on collision due to wrong way driving on a one-way section of our street. The speed table does not curb speeding on our street. During college breaks, the reckless driving is noticeably diminished, but still exists.

5 months ago

Increased density should be done on already developed land, and in particular sprawling car-focused infrastructure such as wide roads or parking. We should use this increased density to embrace conservation of undeveloped areas.

5 months ago

Fit with the neighborhood, which is not about size... (I've seen some single family houses that are the size of small hotels). It's about feeling comfortable and having trees. My grandfather built wonderful duplex to 6-plexes into downtown neighborhoods around the single family homes, and they FIT very well b/c they weren't wildly different. See the # I started: #HistoricMultifamily for good examples of interesting missing middle housing that fit very well into their surroundings.

5 months ago

I came from a neighborhood in Denver with a few duplexes, triplexes, and 4-6 unit apartment buildings that slowly went up on each street and it changed absolutely nothing about the character of the neighborhood. It was still suburban! Just more neighbors and housing options!

5 months ago

chapel hill cannot claim to be a welcoming town if it places limits on growth the necessarily puts most housing out of the reach of people. strongly support increasing density

5 months ago

Density in existing developed areas, the town core, and anywhere else within striking distance of the CBD saves trees on the periphery.

5 months ago

The duplex example is lousy because it is a suburban "snout house" where the garage dominates the front of the building. There are much better existing duplexes in Chapel Hill, Carrboro and Durham today.

5 months ago

These are all great. I think we need all kinds of housing everywhere.

5 months ago

Also change the rules on fencing. So if an adu is built next door you can put a privacy fence up without the large setback. No need for any setback. Sacramento allows this so have much more diverse housing options. Neighbor gets increased value with ADU but harms privacy and decreases value for neighbor. Fences make good neighbors.

5 months ago

Chapel Hill is losing what remains of its economic and racial diversity due to the high cost of housing and low wages. We need green spaces AND more housing.

5 months ago

In my small, older neighborhood that has no sidewalks and is made up of narrow and curvy streets, parked (often illegally) and SPEEDING cars now make walking, biking, and stroller-pushing extremely dangerous all over the neighborhood. Further development here will only make these hazards worse. The town should focus on lowering and enforcing speed limits and parking restrictions, and adding staff to enforce and perhaps revisit existing regulations (and dramatically increase violation fees).

- Four very expensive student duplexes now tower over existing housing on one block alone. More will come--and with fewer density restrictions. These duplexes have been built with NO neighborhood input or notification. How will this change in the new plans? We feel we have been burned by the recent totally inappropriate, in scale and in tree canopy destruction, new duplexes that have sprung up like mushrooms and that haven't matched the plans as we saw them on the models in front of the sites.

- A shocking number of mature trees were felled. More would have been destroyed had neighbors not shown up on a Saturday morning and confronted the demolition crew. The new plans will lower the required tree canopy percentage. Every candidate for town council claimed to promote environmental safety and stewardship. Our tree canopy is the most important weapon we have in the fight against climate change. And now this plan? This town should be increasing the tree canopy not reducing it. And seriously penalizing those who don't abide by stricter regulation. Enlightened communities across the country are doing this, or already have.

- Single family houses are being sold and becoming expensive student rentals, (owned by LLCs, whose only interest is profit), with too many occupants and too little care of the properties. Other homes are being converted into apartments. In one case alone, there is no off-street parking for this increased density so a line of 6 to 8 cars now park on a dangerous curve on a narrow street without a sidewalk. This is terrible and dangerous lack of planning. The new legislation would "remove density limitations in all zoning districts." School buses, delivery trucks, and cars have to travel in the oncoming traffic lane on a blind curve. Parking permits should never have been issued here. How can we trust the town when we see situations like this one?

- The expensive student housing units at the end of our neighborhood already do not follow the existing occupancy, sanitation, and parking restrictions. How will this improve under the new plans? More density, possibly rooming houses? with little oversight from the town will only make this worse.

- I am not against density or affordable housing (there will be less incentive for affordable housing under the new plans) but the development I have experienced in my neighborhood is not affordable, not of appropriate scale, and is insensitive to the existing residents and the appeal of the neighborhood. Also, the town doesn't seem able to hold up its end to enforce existing regulations—even with simple matters like signage. How will this improve under the new plans?

- Our neighborhood has already been irreparably damaged by recent development. I do not trust the town to carefully develop "gentle" density (what's gentle about residential development of up to 4 units and creating boarding houses and not limiting the occupancy of buildings)?

- The town should focus NOW on providing alternative transportation—the traffic is already untenable several hours a day—and finding ways to increase revenue by enforcing and increasing existing regulations. Many of the 6-story (many residents in Chapel Hill are appalled at this change from the 4-story cap) apartment buildings off Elliott Rd. are not yet occupied. We will have traffic gridlock when they are. This fact only increases my skepticism about the new initiatives.

5 months ago

The town being able to "sell it" to my neighborhood! People have a very firm N.I.M.B.Y. feeling throughout much of Chapel Hill. In fact, our neighborhood - Glen Heights - was taken off the FLUM for potential density increase because of our neighbors protests. Much to our chagrin.

5 months ago

A low maximum percentage of lots made available for creation of duplexes or triplexes should be set for existing single-family residential neighborhoods (e.g., 15-20%) so that developers cannot buy up existing houses, tear them down and put up fourplexes so that they can make money. Anything else would ruin the residential neighborhoods that now exist. Neighborhoods should also be informed about whether this revised land use ordinance would affect neighborhood conservation districts and, if so, how.

5 months ago

Our family (2 adults) has rented in the Carrboro-CH area for the last 5+ years and while we love living here, we have been unable to purchase a home where we live, work, and contribute civically. We are currently a single-income family, but even when we were dual-income, purchasing **decent-quality and affordable** housing seemed out of reach. We often do not qualify for affordable housing programs but we also cannot afford homes that start at 500K asking price (which all seem to be at this point) on our own. We would not mind at all living in a townhouse or purchasing a quality apartment, but none of these seem to exist in an accessible way locally. We enjoy living here and had looked forward to continuing to integrate our careers (public health professional, service/skilled tradesperson) and personal lives in this community, but we are seriously considering relocation.

5 months ago

In my walkable neighbourhood, very expensive duplexes now tower over existing housing that has been built with NO neighbourhood input or notification. A shocking number of mature trees have been felled, parked and speeding cars now make walking dangerous. I am not against density nor affordable housing but the development I have experienced is not affordable and extremely insensitive to the people who already live in the community. More importantly, it is environmentally irresponsible to sanction the destruction of our tree canopy - the most important weapon we have in the fight against climate change. So why should I trust you to carefully develop affordable housing or increase density based on my experience.?

5 months ago

I worry about rentals because I think they might just be used for overpriced student rentals rather than affordable rentals for families. I also worry that the landlords won't take care of the property in the same way affordable townhomes and condos would be cared for.

5 months ago

15-501 North is adjacent to the huge Mt Moriah apartment complex project. The traffic potential hazards so near an old bridge on Old Durham Rd over I-40 leading to two traffic circles will be insurmountable in delays and back ups. A DOT plan coordinated with Durham County is essential before any more housing can be built in this area.

5 months ago

How the Legion Road Park space is to be used. It should be kept as a park as so many people currently use and enjoy it and the trees do a fantastic job of flood mitigation.

5 months ago

I favor allowing existing neighborhoods to retain their current density levels and placing higher density development downtown and along high-capacity transportation corridors with good public transit. I also think it's extremely important to provide pedestrian/bicycle access between all existing neighborhoods and nearby schools, shopping areas, and downtown/UNC campus.

6 months ago

I answered that increased density would result in more traffic, wear and tear on infrastructure and less trees because I think that is just a given. I am not necessarily saying it is bad. It is a trade off. Even if higher density means that public transportation is more widely available, people will still need cars to get to things in the wider community. I think adding condos etc. into existing neighborhoods including my own is a great idea as long as it doesn't just become student housing and is actually going to lower income families so that people who work in Chapel Hill can actually live in Chapel Hill. I also think there should be some sort of provision about how many units can be rentals vs. owner occupied.

6 months ago

The duplexes and townhomes should be designed in a way that is classic or fits the homes in the neighborhood. Many of the examples you show here would look ridiculous in my neighborhood and really stick out in a bad way. Southern Village is a good example of what works.

6 months ago

LOWER TAXES is what would bring more low income people to Chapel Hill and keep mid-upper income people. Taxes in Cary, Apex, Raleigh are much lower and seem to directly support citizens more clearly (many more greenways, etc). Chapel Hill needs to stop funding costly initiatives to figure out what is keeping people away - the answer is quite obvious, simple, and powerful. Taxes.

6 months ago

Abolish historic districts and design review

6 months ago

Where the homes are built in our neighborhood is important. The bigger and denser buildings should be closest to our major streets.

6 months ago

Chapel Hill, Carrboro, and the Triangle need more housing and more dense housing options, which I say as a resident of a single family neighborhood in Carrboro. Allowing more housing types at medium densities would actually have helped soften the development boom Chapel Hill is experiencing where demand went unmet for many years and that pressure caused the market conditions for so many high density housing projects to make economic sense (and create political pressure to approve them) all at the same time. There were obviously other factors but this was a root cause.

Also, preventing density to save a few trees on single family lots in high demand housing markets does not actually save trees or help climate change. It causes whole tracts of trees to be cut down in new, large-scale developments further from urban centers, which are less likely to have transit and more likely for people to need to drive further for goods and services. It ultimately creates a heavier carbon footprint per dwelling unit.

6 months ago

I can afford a home in Chapel Hill, although it is difficult to buy. These options tend to be polarizing, with either/or possibilities. Many of these options can be balanced: trees and development, traffic and development. On the latter point, perhaps you should ask how people feel about a future of poor air quality due to the increase in traffic due to commuters and the lack of good, incentivized public transportation options. We can allow more people who work here to live here, or we can deal with heavy traffic and pollution in the area. I know. I moved here 7 years ago after this happened in my town of Alexandria, VA.

6 months ago

My neighborhood currently has single family homes, townhouses, and apartments. Nothing else can fit. Southern village.

Chapel Hill growth needs to slow down.

6 months ago

Available land size. In these amendments, please define "affordable housing" to include disabled people whose income is almost always too low to meet the threshold for affordable housing. Where are these individuals supposed to live? Neither affordable housing nor middle housing is affordable for someone whose only income is their monthly Social Security benefit. I would like to see the town address the housing needs of this population. These needs are currently unmet and there is no part of this feedback survey that recognizes that those needs exist. It's great to provide affordable housing for teachers, nurses, grad students, etc. Please also plan to provide housing for individuals with intellectual disabilities, psychiatric disabilities, physical disabilities who cannot begin to afford "affordable" housing. If you do not, you're going to increase the number of disabled homeless on our streets.

6 months ago

It would depend on whether and how much transportation access were provided to multi-family housing.

6 months ago

I live in a neighborhood with small lots. Would be hard to add much to it. I think townhomes and duplexes are a good idea. But need to be done in a way that is good for the neighborhood.

6 months ago


I would like to select multiple types of housing above but was only allowed one selection

6 months ago

Not many (any?) of these choices seem to be for moderate income folks who work in Chapel Hill.

6 months ago

What is your age?




515 respondents

What is your race/ethnicity?

70%	White	341 ✓
18%	I prefer not to answer	90 ✓
4%	Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish	21 ✓
4%	Other	18 ✓
3%	Asian	17 ✓
3%	Black or African-American	13 ✓
0%	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1 ✓
0%	American Indian or Alaska Native	0 ✓


489 Respondents

What is your gender?




484 respondents

What is your highest formal education level?



472 respondents

What is your marital status?



477 respondents

I am satisfied with the housing choices currently available to me in the community.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
0 respondents				

I am satisfied with the housing choices currently available to me in the community.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
0 respondents				

I am satisfied with the housing choices currently available to me in the community.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
0 respondents				

Revise the allowable size limit for ADUs from 30% of the primary structure (a house, for example) to a maximum size of 800 square feet.

No data to display...

Allow lots with duplexes to have up to one Accessory Dwelling Unit.

No data to display...

Allow a detached ADU to the side of the house, but only along the back or last 1/4 of the house (see example Area "D" on the diagram) while maintaining required setbacks.

No data to display...

Allow ADUs to be built on existing residential non-conforming lots, so long as all other standards are met.

No data to display...

Allow duplexes in all Residential Urban (RU) zoning districts (shown in orange in the map to the right).

No data to display...

Allow duplexes in all Residential Suburban (RS) zoning districts in the Urban Tier (shown in blue in the previous map above).

No data to display...

Adjust the lot dimensional and setback standards of duplexes to be the same as single-family houses, including a reduced minimum lot area.

No data to display...

Allow duplexes to be built on non-conforming lots that are at least 30 feet wide, and were platted prior to 2006 (the year the zoning ordinance was adopted).

No data to display...

Allow the two units of a duplex to be in separate structures.

No data to display...

Incrementally reduce the minimum lot area across all residential zoning districts (except RS-20) in the Urban Tier. Please refer to the Menu of Housing Types below for more information.

No data to display...

Adjust minimum lot widths across all residential zoning districts (except RS-20) in the Urban Tier. Please refer to the Menu of Housing Types below for more information.

No data to display...

Increase maximum densities in residential zoning districts in the Urban Tier. See Maximum Residential Density tables for more information.

No data to display...

Create a new Small House housing type, allowable on a small (minimum 2,000 square foot lot) that would be limited in size to 1,200 square feet (with a building footprint of 800 feet), and 25 feet tall.

No data to display...

Allow the Small House/Small Lot housing type in all residential zoning districts in the Urban Tier (with the exception of the RS-20 district) and in the RU zoning districts in the Suburban Tier. See the areas colored in blue in the map.

No data to display...

Allow a "Small House" to be built on a flag lot with a minimum flag pole width of 12 feet.

No data to display...

Require at least one tree must be planted or preserved to the rear of the primary structure, in addition to required street trees.

No data to display...

Limit driveways (Vehicle Use Areas) to 12 feet wide, but allow expansion up to 24' wide to accommodate garage access or parking under the following conditions:

- It is behind the front building line
- It is further than 20 feet from the front property line, and;
- The parking area does not exceed 400 square feet.

No data to display...

Maintain current height limitations but remove the 25-foot distance exemption.

No data to display...

Remove minimum lot width standards from the Infill section. Default back to base zoning district standards for minimum lot width.

No data to display...

Apply the Infill Standards to property zoned RU in the Suburban Tier.

No data to display...

How do you feel about these proposed changes (please feel free to add any commentary on specific items)?

No data to display...

Comments: Housing Choice LUMOTA - Public Information Session

Value of existing homes will decrease, not because of diversity, but because of increased noise and traffic. Quality and character of neighborhood will decline as well. I support diversity but feel this is an excuse to destroy citizen investment in property. There must be another way to support diversity without destroying existing neighborhoods.

8 days ago

Hi, my preference would be for smaller density housing such as duplexes and potentially triplexes and quads. This would be a bit more organic and preserve trees. However, I think that this change, especially the larger triplexes and quadruplexes would change the neighborhood character. Duplexes not as much and I don't see a reason why one would have to have 1/2 acre to have a duplex. This definitely needs amendment down to a quarter acre or less. Thanks.

13 days ago

Na

one month ago

allowing a Mother-in-law apartment within a single family home is the best way to provide student/cheap housing within existing family neighborhoods. I live in an extremely diverse neighborhood in Chapel Hill, (Davie Circle) and it is not at all a vibe one wants in a family neighborhood, though it is a fun vibe of its own. Retroactively changing existing neighborhoods is breaking faith with the current residents. Have you sent a letter to proposed affected households? I know my elderly mother living near Estes School has absolutely no idea about all these proposals which would decidedly change her neighborhood. Email/Web information does not reach many of the existing residents.

one month ago

This is a good solution if the properties are owner occupied.

one month ago

Why aren't accessory units (i.e., in-law acts) and tiny homes listed here? I STRONGLY support that option.

one month ago

Old neighborhood, infrastructure does not even support current homes

one month ago

There are already too many ugly, out of character for Chapel Hill, large apartment type buildings that have been thrown up on my side of town (colony Woods). They are not affordable and have benefited only the developers who did not follow the rules. Traffic is horrible and getting worse. And yet pushy neighborhoods all over town are not having to face this.

one month ago

My neighborhood is not walkable to stores. Increasing density would naturally increase traffic and make the neighborhood less safe for children. I'm worried about traffic, increased impervious surfaces and storm run-off, increased noise, loss of trees and nature, loss of privacy, and more. The lots in my neighborhood are not especially large, but I chose it over 30 years ago for its character and space and relative quiet and traffic safety compared to newer denser neighborhoods. Introducing multi-unit housing to neighborhoods like ours will change the character forever.

one month ago

Review of each individual proposed multiunit dwelling is essential, taking the neighborhood character into consideration. Each proposed building should be approved or disapproved on an individual basis. This is not provided for (or even allowed) in the proposed text amendment. For that very reason, the text amendment, if implemented, will be detrimental to the character of Chapel Hill.

one month ago

It would not work in my neighborhood.

one month ago

The proposed plan will clearly harm the peaceful character of Chapel Hill for no benefit

2 months ago

New neighborhoods are one thing. Then, diverse planning such as Meadowmont and Southern Village are awesome. Existing neighborhoods are another. If the existing neighborhood is healthy and in good condition it should be left as is. I chose Duplex because least harmful to our little neighborhood but not desirable at all.

2 months ago

I have lived for the past 3 years with construction that is multiplying density in Blue Hill, and I have experienced no benefit. Parking is inadequate, roadways congested, Lack of adequate community information and response time is shameful with this new plan. Experience teaches that speculators will purchase most properties and rent them at high prices to make their money back. You are not solving Chapel Hill's problems this way. Middle housing is not our problem--lack of low income housing is our problem. Your developers don't care about student needs or elder needs. Nor is the Council considering the integrity of the built environment or the quality of life based on the properties as they are now, they way they were planned to be.

2 months ago

The size of a lot and the character of a neighborhood makes a huge difference. And there is no plan whatsoever to deal with increased demand on the town's infrastructure for all the existing apartments and high-rise units going up around town, so this proposal would only add to the problem without providing a workable solution for preserving the character of Chapel Hill. I applaud the town's efforts to deal with increased housing demands at various levels, but this piecemeal approach is horrible. As taxpayers who love our community, we deserve better!

2 months ago

The largest of these are not appropriate on all lots, but would be incredible on future BRT lines and connector roads. We desperately need more housing. The majority of traffic in town is people driving to work because only a fraction of people that live here, work here. And we have to import 90% of our employees!!!

2 months ago

I agree with added density but not sure of the limits. I live in Colony Woods and think allowing larger ADU's, duplexes and possibly well designed triplexes, and flag lots is a good idea. Over 3 units on our .3 to .5 acre lots and I worry about the owner occupant numbers, the load on streets and trees, greenspace and our overall residential neighborhood. I don't know where the line is that allows for density that I agree should be allowed and over doing it is - I do think four fold growth in this small neighborhood would be detrimental. I am concerned for Colony Woods and the few other neighborhoods that seem targeted with no HOA or Conservation District and our relative price point. I do not want to see the more 'affordable' neighborhoods in Chapel Hill go from mostly owner occupied to too much investor ownership.

2 months ago

So there are a lot of questions that I would like to clarify. I answered the fifth question about adding "middle housing" to ALL neighborhoods based on the word "all". If you do not make this equitable throughout the Chapel Hill community (and no, I don't care about legal restrictions, HOAs, or covenants), then my answer changes to strongly disagree ... don't single certain communities out for this. Also, the question about infrastructure is also very important - is Chapel Hill ready to rebuild water, sewer, roads, schools, parks, greenways as the middle housing is added? Or will it wait until there is a problem and only REACT to problems?

2 months ago

Prioritization of green space over large parking lots for bigger apartment complexes--make up for parking space loss with easy access to public transit lines.

2 months ago

There is available land outside current single family residences areas. Changing the zoning to allow those older areas to be changed so drastically is counterintuitive to population growth. This economic strategy is very shortsighted!!

2 months ago

Our neighborhood is a rare gem, and critical as is to the community. This plan would be profoundly detrimental.

2 months ago

We're not living up to our town's historical values with any proposal that targets rezoning longstanding, established neighborhoods of our town. Please honor the Neighborhood Conservation Districts residents have worked so hard to have established and approved. Mine is a longstanding neighborhood that has quarter-acre lots of single-family homes. Moreover, our houses are among the most-affordable in town for the demographics this initiative is targeting. On top of that, many of our properties are rentals that have allowed for families that would otherwise not be able to afford to live in town.

This neighborhood is already dense, and has been accomplishing the desired result for a very long time. If we want to create denser areas out of already-developed land, it's more logical to target neighborhoods that have larger lot sizes, and are less established, ones where the citizens haven't taken great time and care to create Neighborhood Conservation Districts. Please consider honoring current NCDs just like HOAs. Please consider preserving jewels like ours that are already shining examples of diversity, equity and inclusion. That's why we fought for an NCD in the first place.

2 months ago

In certain zones, this idea makes sense, but every single-family neighborhood should not have to change to allowing 2-4 dwellings per lot. I live in a nice neighborhood with single family homes and that character should be preserved. Some thoroughfares in our neighborhood or housing on the fringes of the neighborhood could be good candidates for rezoning in this manner. But the sheer area of the rezoning plans for this goes too far. I don't want to turn all the nice old neighborhoods in Chapel Hill into multi-family, potentially rental-only zones throughout.

2 months ago

NCDs should have same protection as HOAs in this plan. Our neighborhood already has tiny lots and flooding issues. This would be detrimental to the structure, infrastructure, and nature.

2 months ago

Our neighborhood is tiny with tiny lots and flooding issues. More density would be detrimental to the existing structure, infrastructure and nature. NCDs should have the same protection as HOAs in this plan.

2 months ago

No short-term rentals allowed. Number of occupants per unit. Infrastructure, green space, schools adequate to support increase in density. Rent to own possibility

2 months ago

No short-term tentacle allowed

2 months ago

I simply don't see how the kind of development at issue here will achieve the goals of diversity and affordability, nor do I trust developers to operate with those goals in mind. There's been nothing stopping development to that end already, but I don't see evidence of it having occurred. When I see the apartments and townhouses that have been built recently, I can't help but wonder how much, if at all, those have improved affordability in town, and some of those, on one end of the "missing middle," are even more densely populated than the options proposed here. I'm also wondering whether anyone really envisions conversions of existing houses into duplexes (or in-law-suite-style conversions) rather than new construction. I could maybe see that advancing some of the notions of affordability while preserving certain aspects of a neighborhood, but that doesn't seem to be the idea.

I also don't see evidence of coherent plans for managing higher density, such as drastically increased bus availability along with measures for all the walkability and bikeability that are pitched as attractive elements of increased density. Maybe I'm just not imagining it right, but if my neighborhood were to become substantially more densely populated, it would diminish walkability and bikeability by adding traffic and street parking. I get the notion of creating more housing options for more people, and I don't think the occasional duplex would be especially "detrimental to neighborhood character," but how to define much less enforce "occasional" seems tricky to the point of impossibility.

And the prospect of turning a significant portion of a neighborhood into rentals is worrisome in a college town. I get that it's square to worry about living near students, but certain situations can affect basic quality of life, and the town, as I understand it, doesn't have any levers to pull for the sake of encouraging owner-occupied middle housing as opposed to rentals. I remember being a student and would have been justifiably considered a bad neighbor in the single-family neighborhoods in Chapel Hill.

At any rate, I'm not sure what the right answer is. On the one hand, I can see the occasional conversion to a duplex being the kind of gradual, or "gentle," change that fits and wouldn't be especially disruptive. On the other hand, "gentle" changes don't seem to jibe with the sense of urgency laid out in the videos above.

2 months ago

It is important to not deal with these developments by ignoring the residents directly affected, while placing more and more stress on this area whilst keeping the wealthy areas pristine. The poor are the have nots, the wealthy the care nots, and the middle class the development battleground. Those in favor of these ever increasing influx of people into the neighborhood are those who live elsewhere - NIMBY at it's finest.

2 months ago

This survey is ridiculously biased—you are not looking for answers but for people to rubber stamp your decisions. You will see a reckoning on voting day. You are supposed to represent our values and needs—not those of some hypothetical utopia that never comes to pass. The developers will always get richer.

2 months ago

I have no idea where people would park if my neighborhood were stacked with more types of housing. As it is we have people parking all over the street (talk about reducing walkability!). Beyond that, our closest elementary school is like to burst; traffic on Fordham is becoming untenable. I simply do not trust developers to do this in a good way. Developers are the ones building all these stupid luxury highrises around town, are they not? Don't developers now use algorithms to set rental rates to maximize profits? Can't you pass an ordinance to make 40-50% of those apartments affordable? As it stands I can't imagine who can afford to live there but the solution seems easier than you're making it out to be.

2 months ago

None, our existing neighborhood is perfect. The houses are middle-class valued and the lots are not large.

2 months ago

Changing zoning alone will continue the pattern of rapid development of high-income housing in Chapel Hill. Neighborhoods in Chapel Hill with R1 zoning that are beloved for their green space will lose their trees and charm to luxury developments. Those close to campus may transform from family neighborhoods into student housing. I don't see that this change will actually fill the lower income housing gap, given the past history of development in Chapel Hill, and I strongly oppose this initiative without actual strong affordable housing requirements and measures in place to protect green space. Without such measures, neighborhoods that do not have HOAs in place should be given sufficient time to respond and form a qualifying HOA if they do not wish to participate.

2 months ago

Rent control and/or inflation control is needed. These will not solve the problem unless you put a cap on the amount they can sell or rent for. This type of development has started in Durham and the townhouses/single family <1500sqft are going for \$350,000 and UP. They are also often 2 story which doesn't offer an option to the senior population. As the plan and proposal stands now Mayor Hemming and the council have it set to only benefit the developers and the town, not the people who live here or want to live here.

2 months ago

nothing to add

2 months ago

When we bought out our we relied and trusted the R-1 zoning. We expect the town to uphold AND enforce this zoning law.

The character and nature of neighborhoods should not be violated, disrupted and developed outside of the current R-1 laws. Elected officials are elected to uphold the law.

2 months ago

None of these structures are architecturally inline with the character of Chapel Hill!!! There are so many high rise apartments which have altered the character of our community. Developers are benefiting financially. The town has to provide services and will need to build more schools, on and on!!

2 months ago

None of the above.

2 months ago

Please

Mail each homeowner a letter that will be impacted to allow people to respond prior to taking a vote.

NO to rezoning!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

2 months ago

Our neighborhood needs to be left as-is. The infrastructure cannot handle increased density and traffic. Our natural environment will suffer along with current long-term residents.

2 months ago

Of these, the duplex is the least terrible. But what will most likely happen is a corporation will swoop in, drive prices higher, buy up all the lots, and turn them into as many units as they can so they can rent them out for \$\$\$\$. They have no reason to sell them and lose rental income, and of course they will charge as much as they can!

I'm also not quite sure what all the questions about a walkable community had to do with anything. I don't feel like my neighborhood is particularly walkable to anything so I'm not sure how building apartments in my neighborhood helps that. And some people value walkability and some people don't care and that's ok.

2 months ago

I live in the Huntington-Somerset neighborhood, which is a beautiful and natural oasis in the middle of what is becoming an over-developed corridor on Estes Dr. I could have purchased a newer house in a more dense neighborhood, but I chose my older home on a large lot because I value the land and trees around me. Chapel Hill needs the break from the noise, light, and traffic, brought by the higher density development on Estes Dr. and the residents who purchased homes here should be able to continue to enjoy its natural character. The Huntington-Somerset neighborhood has borne the brunt of the garish and over-built mid-rise development projects along Estes Dr. for the past few years and will continue to do so into the future. It seems a fair trade that we should at least be able to preserve the single-family character of our neighborhood and keep the higher density construction zones and traffic on the main roads around us.

2 months ago

I would like to request that the town mail a letter to each homeowner that is impacted, and allow enough time for people to respond prior to taking a vote. I think more affordable housing is really important in Chapel Hill, but I worry that this will only allow large developers to make a profit at the expense of reducing trees and natural areas, decrease wildlife, and create more traffic while also not actually supporting people that need more affordable housing. I suspect rent will be very high if developers put more "luxury" apartments, as they are want to do.

2 months ago

It seems as though too much is happening without neighborhood knowledge or consent. I would request he town mail a letter to each homeowner that is impacted, and allow enough time for people to respond prior to taking a vote.

2 months ago

So many things. In your question above you use the phrase "if carefully designed and integrated". Well there is the kicker, for sure. While rushing through this change in zoning it is becoming clear that as has happened in other areas of the Triangle, this is exactly what is not being done. How about, slow down, identify the neighborhoods that will have this forced on them, send letters to effected residents, give actual details about things like developer owned properties, rental/owned, and specifically how this will help. Done poorly, as we have already seen happen we will lose the character of neighborhoods and produce little to no mid level housing

2 months ago

I am concerned the new denser housing will not be affordable (many apartments being built are very expensive!) Older communities, those without the HOAs, are currently the most affordable single-family homes in town. This plan could end up reducing affordable housing and starter homes for young families. Also concerned about flooding, already a problem in many areas.

2 months ago

First of all, this is a poorly designed survey. OF COURSE our current housing stock doesn't meet the needs of the missing middle! (And this is because the Town Council lacks the cojones to say no to developers). This plan is being imposed on the citizenry without sufficient time for discussion. Has each homeowner received a notice of the upcoming meetings on the topic? (I have not). Successful introduction of housing density will depend on several things: sufficient time to acquire input from current homeowners; development of a comprehensive plan that wouldn't overwhelm the existing infrastructure; a limit on impermeable surface area; a strict and enforced limit on tree removal; and strict and enforced rules on replanting of removed trees (which does not mean replacement with sticks).

2 months ago

I agree that the town needs to encourage housing opportunities however I think the proposal to remove zoning from neighborhoods that do not have HOA/NCD/Historical puts an burden on older smaller home neighborhood. Many of the neighborhoods that are impacted are already serving "high" middle income families(for example Booker Creek) I am very concerned that those families will be pushed out or find their small lot one story single family home dwarfed by new 3 story quad appt. I think the town presentations have downplayed the potential bad actors(such as builders/landlords skirting requirements and counting on lax enforcement) and presented housing options that are not what representative of infill multi family housing that has actually happened in Chapel Hill recently. I choose None above because I don't believe the options are representative of what would actually happen. Before the city changes the zoning I think they owe the home owners impacted DIRECT notification of the potential changes in their home's zoning and give them a chance to ask questions. I also believe the city should publish a map that shows clearly the homes and neighborhoods impacted. I believe the town should focus on incenting the new development to build for the missing middle income rather than shift the burden to a limited number of individual single family home owners.

2 months ago

These options should be available in all neighborhoods including Neighborhood Conservation Districts.

2 months ago

I can't believe you're even talking about this. Bloated apartment buildings are going up all over Chapel Hill. Seriously? What am I missing here? On every corner. These cruise-ship apartments are lowering the values of our homes, ruining our green spaces, and apparently still not addressing the housing shortage. More "small-space" dwellings are not going to help. I doubt altruistic motives for diversity and opportunity are driving this - it's all about the money.

2 months ago

These plans would likely only happen in existing middle income neighborhoods and decrease the value of these same neighborhoods. The existing middle income neighborhoods tend to have larger lots which gives them a lot of their resale value. It does not make sense to go after middle income neighborhoods.

2 months ago

I have seen the townhouses people build in these infill neighborhoods, . I think we are just going to end up with versions of the expensive townhouses in Meadowmont.

2 months ago

Requesting every homeowner to be notified well in advance of any vote on changing the density of their neighborhood. Requesting that all neighborhoods across this town be subject to the same treatment. HOA or no. It's a question of equity and fairness.

2 months ago

The proposed approach of changing density permitted in R-1 and R-2 is an overly -simplistic approach to addressing the goal of providing better access to affordable housing. Many CH neighborhoods don't have the infrastructure to support additional traffic (especially the in town neighborhoods near the UNC campus), traffic is already a problem, and more cars and delivery trucks (Amazon) as well as curb cuts will put bicyclists and pedestrians at risk. Also, allowing multiple dwelling development on single family lots will result in the loss of many trees that have been preserved by existing homeowners in many neighborhoods. I respectfully recommend that a more thoughtful approach be developed which includes defined zones for higher density housing in pedestrian favorable areas that are proximate to adequate infrastructure and commercial conveniences. Finally, the proposed plan will result in developers (who have no motivation to preserve the characteristics of the town's beautiful neighborhoods) building to maximize profit and ruining our town's unique neighborhoods. I hope the Town of Chapel Hill will step back and be more thoughtful about how to address a need for more housing.

2 months ago

In my neighborhood, there is no logical way to put any of these housing types. The lots are if hood size and there is no unowned property large enough for these structures. If the Town is determined, then they may want to consider offering land purchase to current owners.

2 months ago

None of these options would fit anywhere in the down town of Chapel Hill currently. Attempts to do so have seriously eroded the character of an historic, quaint college town. Open your eyes!

2 months ago

this increased density will only be beneficial IF the housing is also AFFORDABLE & MODESTLY PRICED for RENT & FOR SALE with rents less than \$900 and FOR SALE not more than \$150,000 otherwise you will just end up with more expensive housing for people with lots of money and run out of town people who live in modestly priced housing and barely making it now. It will destroy some neighborhoods by creating gentrification.

2 months ago

Apartments and infill already exist in my neighborhood to the extent that nearly 50% of housing is multi-family/ student or apartments in owner-occupied homes. Much of this is already in the Franklin Rosemary Historic District where you need a permit to repaint your house a new color, but quad-plex's will be allowed? This proposal will benefit only developers and outside investors. Nothing in this proposal would control prices or rents. I see no up-side for the intended beneficiaries anymore than all the new apartments being built. They have become either investment opportunities or luxury apartments. Face it, CH taxes are too high to attract low and low-middle income folks. Additionally, the town's infrastructure, roads, water, sewer and schools, cannot support such increases in population. I wonder how all these apartments already being constructed will impact our schools and water system. This is a very bad idea for Chapel Hill.

2 months ago

Such developments have recently appeared and are under construction (e.g. Elliot Road, across from Elliot Road, the corner of Martin Luther King and Estes) but what seems, at least by design, to be the same developer. We haven't seen the final design of the Martin Luther King/Estes, but the others are plopped into lots, without thoughtful integration into nearby available retail and restaurants. Its a mess, and yet with better urban planning it could be the opposite! I live in Coker Hills West, and given the terrain, issues with water run-off and flood risks, I don't see how increasing housing density could work. Cutting down the trees to accommodate multiunit dwellings on the existing terrain would be a terrible idea due to environmental costs.

2 months ago

It would depend on many factors, including the current neighborhood infrastructure and traffic patterns. It is wrong to assume that every neighborhood could support the middle housing with units more than a duplex. While many neighborhoods could support this, the way this proposal is worded creates a nightmare scenario of being driven by developers and landlords for an opportunity rather than the goal of affordable housing that meets the needs of the future residents and any considerations to the existing home owners and neighborhoods.

2 months ago

I oppose the plan to change the R1 zoning because I do not see a way to prevent the units from being owned by investors who rent them out, to the detriment of neighborhoods. I might support the small cottages listed on the January update if they are not rentals, but they are not pictured here. The cottages address the problem of developers only wanting to build high-priced luxury units.

2 months ago

Colony woods east is a finished development. It will not accommodate further development. It is also not fair to propose this only for neighborhoods without an HOA (typically lower income). My suggestion is to build further out of town and improve the bus system. The fact that people want to live here is not a reason to destroy the present neighborhoods.

2 months ago

Where the new structures are placed is important. In my neighborhood there are already large, tall multi-family structures. The proposed plan will invite even more. Also, it is unclear whether these new structures will really address missing middle housing. Not sure whether they would be long-term rentals, short-term rentals, or owner-occupied.

2 months ago

It would depend upon whether the duplexes were designed in the general manner pictured, and whether they were distributed around the neighborhood rather than being concentrated block after block.

2 months ago

It would depend on whether the duplexes were designed in the general manner pictured, and whether they were distributed around the neighborhood rather than being concentrated block after block.

2 months ago

It would depend on the affordability of the duplexes and corporate ownership

2 months ago

On what would my response to these proposed text changes depend???

SO MANY THINGS!! I am a resident of Colony Woods and we have lived here for 10 years. I love things the way they are, and it's hard for me to see increasing density will make my environment any better or more pleasant....that's a basic starting point. I would go further and say that actually, the quality of life here has definitely taken a turn for the worse due to the massive recent construction on Eph. Church Road for the massive Apt/Condo Complex being built at the intersection of Legion and Ephesus...and I can't see that the quality of my life will be better than it was 3 years ago, after the construction is complete.,,it will be denser, noisier, and more congested.

Nevertheless, If further housing density increases are "required" my feelings about it would depend on:

- What percentage of housing would be converted from single family to "missing middle"...and whether these are "concentrated" or spread through the community.
- Increased traffic, without increased transport capacity
- loss of tree cover
- THE HASSLE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR THE COMMUNITY... the construction of apartments on Ephesus, and the perverse "building boom of the pandemic" have been a noise and logistics nightmare for residents who thought they lived in a quiet community
- THE EXTENT OF COMMUNICATION BY THE TOWN COUNCIL AS TO WHAT THE HECK IS GOING ON...which to my mind has been appallingly low, both about the Blue Hill developments, and the discussion of the future Legion Park development.

It seems to me every household that is likely to be significantly impacted needs enough information made to them in a timely and convenient fashion (yes, even mailbox flyers and mailings when the stakes are high enough!) so that they can be constructively engaged in the discussion.

2 months ago

It would depend on potential changes to transportation infrastructure

2 months ago

This is a naive approach to a problem that is not really one that governments can or should attempt to solve and it will cause more harm than the town anticipates as developers will tear down single family houses and replace them with expensive multiplexes that will in no way alleviate the problem of the missing middle. This will make a fortune for Developers all the while destroying the neighborhoods . no missing middle will be created- this supposed solution is a delusion based on wishful thinking look at what's happened in other cities

2 months ago

Sale and not rentals. The houses that have been rented in our Colony Woods area are easy to pick out: neglected yards, increased cars in yard, poor upkeep. Also none of your choices address the option of additions to existing single family structure to create a smaller cheaper rented (or within family occupied) units. This kind of rental will cause less tree removal and better upkeep due to homeowner being on premises. Also allows seniors to stay in their home or "move in" with their children.

2 months ago

Before offering input on types of additional housing options, I would like hear more input from current residents and see detailed planning with respects to impacts on city infrastructure & services, preservation of greenspace, traffic, schools, and the environment. As a voter and resident of Chapel Hill, I do not propose making any changes to current zoning regulations prior to addressing impacts to the above items. I am watching this matter closely and it will impact my vote.

2 months ago

Problems with this town deciding on increasing/changing anything is that there is little to no thought given infrastructure or environment or the future. Second problem is the quality that is placed on construction.

Examples: I've lived in duplexes in other states where I could hear no noise from neighbors. Here, I can hear whispers through the walls. I've also never lost power so frequently in the many places I've lived (with much worse weather), as I experience in this town. Traffic is getting "city-style". It now take double to triple the time to your destination than when I moved here 25 years ago. When I attended meetings for UNC's Eastowne changes, there was much discussion about the trees and traffic. We were told most of trees would stay (I saw that they're now being removed). The traffic is, as I had verbalized: lights are timed for 3-5" long while gas is wasted and all those fumes are being concentrated, as are the ridiculous excuses for carriage lanes and roundabouts that are unusable due to all the other crazy building going on. The answers we got really felt as if no-one was listening with intent; merely to get over the meeting.

Sorry, I might go for plans that are much more well-thought out. There ought be much input from current homeowners and time for well thought-out plan, including the future and ramifications thereof. Your historical lack of care and organization makes me actually Want exclusive neighborhoods. Worst example, building in a flood plain! I've had 3 recent visitors from other towns in NC wondering, and I quote, "What is going on here? This used to be so nice and quiet and beautiful". I choose none of the above housing. I will answer the question that is below, now: I am in a care-taking profession and have gone through some very "slim" times to afford my house, lived in now for 24 years. Yes I am female, 60ish and white.

2 months ago

The Town has approved multiple projects for residential use in the past 10+ years. Tall residential buildings have been built all over Town and the Town still wants more. In all of these buildings, where is the "missing middle housing" that should be included. And now the Town wants to allow our neighborhoods to be used to build multi-family buildings wherever builders can buy a single-family house and demolish it. This is just continued mismanagement by the Town Council.

2 months ago

Zoning changes may possibly introduce very few missing middle housing options. Too much headache for the small improvement you will be making. I suggest to look for more bang for your buck through housing options outside of established R 1 and R2 zoned neighborhoods.

2 months ago

I do not agree with zoning changes that would allow predatory developers to buy up large swaths of single family homes and convert them to high priced rental units. Far too much of this type of development has already been allowed to occur, with the average monthly price of these rentals higher than my monthly mortgage + taxes. Promises to provide "affordable" units have been little more than lip service and it seems there has been little follow up public accountability in terms of whether these complexes have truly met the city's needs.

2 months ago

All of my responses depend on wording in the zoning changes that restrict sales of these new "middle housing" units only to parties who are buying them to use as their primary dwelling. Otherwise, the problem still exists. Chapel Hill will gain only more expensive rental units, and people with moderate incomes will still be priced out of the Chapel Hill real estate market.

2 months ago

Prevention of predatory developers seeking to place maximum density housing in historically single family housing neighborhoods . the problem of affordable housing cannot always be met with increased density. There has already been far too much density added that is unaffordable to the average long term resident in the form of huge apartment building development with mostly "luxury" pricing. If out of neighborhood character development is allowed by corporate developers seeking to buy out single family owned homes and replace with multi-family high priced rental housing, existing homeowners should be compensated for loss of home value in situations where large dwelling units are replacing adjacent single family homes.

2 months ago

The housing shortage is being caused by allowing construction of high density apartment complexes out of financial reach of middle income workers at UNC. Middle income families with young children don't need two or three level townhouses in high density areas where it's unsafe for them to stroll in and ride their beginner bikes. Don't make chapel hill an unlivable town for middle income families with stay at home parent who needs to take out children to safe playgrounds and not high traffic streets.

2 months ago

It would depend on several things: lots of input from current homeowners, enough time to develop a comprehensive plan that didn't overwhelm the existing infrastructure, increasing the existing infrastructure to prepare in advance for the future, a limit on impermeable surface area for the watersheds, a strict limit on tree removal, and strict rules on replanting of removed trees (and I don't mean replacing them with < 1 inch whips!)

2 months ago

Playing the race card against people who appreciate livable places and quality of life is vile and offensive.

2 months ago

The number of mid-rise luxury apartment buildings currently under construction (with more planned) is excessive. In addition to the traffic, flooding, infrastructure problems and environmental damage this gentrification causes, it displaces a lot of affordable housing. The Town Council's current efforts to increase affordable housing are commendable, but very belated. Any new mid-rise proposals should be turned down, and that land used for affordable housing, including "missing middle." The proposal currently before the Council targets neighborhoods that are already "missing middle," since they are the single-family residential neighborhoods with the most inexpensive houses. As written, the proposal will just increase the economic separation between such neighborhoods and wealthier ones, which have HOA's etc.

2 months ago

I'm not sure if you received my original note, so am submitting a summary. With the understanding that mid-level housing is greatly needed, Chapel Hill residents implore you to please consider:

- 1) Preservation of our green space and trees that provide us huge temperature and energy cost control, noise buffer, beauty, health benefits, etc. We are chipping away at our greenspaces and with each new big build, people feel the increased heat, traffic noise, and have less rich of a space around them.
- 2) Ensuring the cost of mid-level housing truly stays mid-level / affordable. This often flips up to meet the neighborhood prices after the first sale or after a couple years of increasing rent.
- 3) Needing our infrastructure to match our pace of development, while not turning Chapel Hill into a city. A good example of areas that are already "full" is the Weaver Dairy road congestion, which will compound by the Habitat ~800 units on Sunrise and the new Caraway housing (which is a tree desert, eyesore and sad to look at every day).
- 4) Most importantly, please, please, please make decisions that keep Chapel Hill's township character alive. We are so incredibly fortunate to live here and most of us chose to live here because we don't want to live in a city. We LOVE our trees, green space and community feel. We entrust our future to you and sincerely hope that we will be able to keep things to a town scale while smartly developing spaces that can be re-imagined, such as older office space.

We love Chapel Hill and appreciate you listening. Thank you!

2 months ago

Every major development project the town has approved of late has created expensive "luxury" apartments, which are paradoxically generic and shoddily built, while throwing in a few affordable housing units for appearance's sake. Unless the town can force developers to sell quality housing at reasonable prices to individual owners who intend to live there, the housing market in town will continue to get worse, rather than better, and the "missing middle" that these zoning changes are supposedly for will not be served.

2 months ago

With this initiative and all other Chapel Hill development, your residents implore you to please consider:

1) Preservation of our trees and green space, which is getting chipped away year on year.

Example: noise and temperature buffer at 86 & Whitfield removed to create the highway interchange and Caraway apartments. Residents nearby can now hear traffic much more and Caraway residents have a markedly higher temperature and no shade.

2) Cost of housing, meaning will this housing actually be affordable, especially if we place them in higher income neighborhoods? We have too often seen these projects in other cities where affordable housing is either offered at unaffordable prices up-front or flips to match the higher income of its neighborhood after the first sale.

3) Lack of similar developments to infrastructure.

For instance, we are adding apartments at the Caraway off 86 and Habitat housing for ~800 units off Sunrise...we are already at stand-still traffic on Weaver Dairy during peak travel times.

Most of all, PLEASE consider the value of Chapel Hill as a "town" v. a city. We are so fortunate to live here and should prioritize preservation of Chapel Hill's character and lifestyle it currently affords its residents. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE don't take this away from us.

Thank you for listening!

2 months ago

All we hear about during elections is the need for more affordable housing in Chapel Hill, but the development and rezoning decisions made by our town government are not accomplishing that -- they just continue benefit private equity, real estate investment firms, and large construction companies.

Please stop telling us these decisions provide social benefits for our community. We know what is going on here.

2 months ago

The question is not "is this a good idea" but "will Chapel Hill do this well in a way that actually achieves more housing equity". Yes, adding more missing middle housing is a good idea. Yes, this should happen across Chapel Hill. No, I am not confident that Chapel Hill will do this well and actually create vibrant, walkable communities with increased housing access while preserving access to green spaces and preserving mature tree cover and keeping housing prices achievable. I'm basing this lack of confidence on observing what is happening right now in the Blue Hill district. So Chapel Hill will mess it up. Does that mean the town should abandon missing middle housing? No. But let's be realistic about the trade offs that will come with developers changing existing neighborhoods. There has been much made of the people vs. trees debate over housing and green space in Chapel Hill. But at the end of the day, losing significant amounts of tree cover ends up affecting community health. No one wants to walk to town or walk around the neighborhood if it is too hot outside and there is no shade. That's means basically May through September in neighborhoods with no mature trees in this region. Walking/wheeling to and Waiting at the bus stop at a location with no trees can be a health hazard for some individuals in the summer months. AC costs more when houses are not shaded. Mature trees in tact on a neighborhood scale can measurably lower local temperatures. This matters. It's not just people vs trees. Chapel Hill has no mechanisms in place to protect mature tree cover in residential neighborhoods. There will be significant losses to mature tree cover. This is already happening as people flip houses to benefit from the rising home prices.

2 months ago

My greatest concern here is that wealthy neighborhoods (like The Oaks) will be exempted whereas less wealthy (areas like Colony Woods) will be subject to the new laws. Ideally, this would mean that homeowners could remodel to add an income apartment or in-law suite. That would be fine but what I predict is that developers will take advantage of the lower housing costs in Colony Woods and buy up smaller homes and tear them down to build as many townhomes as they can fit on these lots. This will result in loss of trees and more impervious surfaces (runoff) issues, plus parking problems. And I rather doubt these new units will be inexpensive to rent (therefore not solving our affordable housing problem). The real answer lies in TRULY requiring the developers of larger scale apartment complexes to have low-cost units that will serve that need. And those rents need to be guaranteed for a long time so families who need them can stay. If the council truly believes that this missing middle housing is the answer, then I implore you to be FAIR and apply it to all Chapel Hill neighborhoods equally, not just those with no HOA.

2 months ago

The introduction of a multi unit dwellings into long established single family communities is damaging to the fabric of these neighborhoods. It's important that every resident gets a voice in these decisions and is mailed regarding these developments in order to have that opportunity.

2 months ago

None of these things would be appropriate in my neighborhood, East Franklin Historical District. Please don't do this to us!

2 months ago

The size of lots in our neighborhood lend themselves better for "grannie homes" than any other options cited above and several neighbors have built these smaller homes already for parents and students.

2 months ago

Don't destroy our neighborhoods.

2 months ago

None of these options would be welcome in our neighborhood that we have chosen to make our home. We have an NCD and worked 2.5 years to put guidelines in place to keep this from happening to our neighborhood.

2 months ago

I do not agree that introduction of small-scale residential development (middle housing) into an existing single family home neighborhood will work. If the neighborhood is planned to include mixed housing (Southern Village) then it can work well. How will public schools be effected by increased density? The Chapel Hill Carrboro schools are already over capacity and there is never any discussion of the impact on schools (and other public services) when housing is expanded.

2 months ago

I treasure the trees in my environment. I don't want to lose them.

2 months ago

This approach is not only misguided but not necessary. We don't need any more people living in Chapel Hill. I only see this as public officials more worried about people that did not vote for them for the simple reason they don't live here, and less worried about the people that already live here and vote. Why?? Why worry about people that don't live here? "Affordable housing" is a smokescreen to enable developers to make money and, in the process, destroy the essence of this town. Why not preserve what we have and stop trying to turn it into something else?

2 months ago

Parking is a major consideration in our neighborhood. Additionally, our neighborhood would not support market-based affordable housing as it's adjacent to the University and to Franklin St. Therefore, there would have to be carrots/regulations to promote affordable housing.

Additionally, as half the neighborhood is a historic preservation district, the other half would only be affected. However, the other half of the neighborhood is just as historic. In fact, my home, which is in the other half, is on the National Historic Register. A clear understanding of what is being proposed on a street/house-by-house level is needed.

2 months ago

HOA neighborhoods should not be exempt. It should be all or none. Not sure why an HOA exempts a neighborhood, as that would seem to benefit the more expensive neighborhoods at the expense of the less expensive ones (for example, Colony Woods).

2 months ago

infrastructure upgrades and especially rain/flood water management

2 months ago

Character of historic single-family neighborhoods should be preserved, not modified to serve the profit maximization of developers who will be able to charge higher prices in these neighborhoods. New development should be focused in areas with existing high density building, so it is clustered together and infrastructure impacts are concentrated. If affordable housing increase is the goal, eliminating restrictions in neighborhood conservation districts is a really ham-handed way to go about it.

The town talks a good game about affordable housing but doesn't back it up with policy. Further, adverse infrastructure impacts (e.g., need for road widening and upgrades) are borne by town taxpayers not the developers who make great profits on their building and leave taxpayers holding the bag. This is a foolish set of zoning changes under the guise of increasing affordable housing, but really just allowing developers to ruin more historic neighborhoods that give Chapel Hill its distinctive feel. As someone who lives in one of these neighborhoods, this neighborhood conservation district proposal is so short-sighted.

2 months ago

The proposed changes only affect the lowest income neighborhoods: those without HOAs and nonhistoric. Basically you're giving developers the opportunity to buy the less expensive single family homes in Chapel Hill and turn them into rental properties that can hold 4x as many tenants as a single family rental house. There is no guarantee that ANY of the new development made possible by the proposed zoning change would be sold to residents wanting to buy a first home in order to build equity. There are no rent caps in NC, so there is no way to ensure that any new rental units would be more affordable than the new apartment complexes in the Blue Hill district and other areas of town. I have a teen with special needs who may have difficulty finding housing as an adult; however, even though the proposed zoning changes would allow me to put a cottage in my backyard, the utility easement in my backyard negates that option—so the one aspect of the zoning change that might potentially benefit my family actually doesn't. I chose to move to CH for the public schools, which have markedly declined in caliber, and for the quality of life: the small town feel with less traffic and more trees. Frankly, given the current ill-conceived development and the proposed zoning changes, I'm giving serious consideration to moving some where else.

2 months ago

Think before you make decisions that only impact one small area of Chapel Hill- the housing "crisis" if there truly is one and it is not just some greedy developer's dream -should be shared by all areas of Chapel Hill - not singled out for one area. Also, we are skeptical- you tire down what was affordable housing for many people and replaced those units with apartments that start at 1600-1800 for a 1 bedroom apartment- that is hardly affordable for those you displaced. Colony Woods is truly a bird sanctuary and most neighbors interact well. It is friendly (including children that grew up here and came back with their own families, some singles, young couples, young couples with families, neighbors in every way who walk, bike a lot and have community. Do not destroy community.

2 months ago

It would result in the loss of older beautiful homes and tree canopy. We already have quite a bit of rental properties available.

2 months ago

There are already too many residences being built in this area both in Chapel Hill and across the line in Durham. My understanding was that Chapel Hill was supposed to have some assemblance of a green buffer zone around it, but instead the area between Chapel Hill and Durham in particular is being built up densely. We need parks and fields, not dense housing.

2 months ago

Please mail the document to impacted home owners and allow enough time for people to response

2 months ago

It would depend on careful planning and oversight, strict standards, and transparent prioritization of the community's needs and values OVER developers needs and financial gain. I would expect that we stick to the priorities of walkability, pedestrian friendly spaces, community spaces, mixed use development, and, most importantly, high environmental standards. I would also prefer that we prioritize owner occupied spaces over rentals because I don't trust landlords to care for or maintain their properties.

2 months ago

Off street parking.

2 months ago

I'm for middle housing but not in existing single family neighborhoods. Those residents purchased with the understanding that their single family, tree lined streets would always be just that. Mix in middle housing with the apartments or downtown, not in these neighborhoods. And pay greater attention to what this increased density will mean for infrastructure and schools. I know CH must grow but we need trees and stormwater systems to work. Be more mindful. What's with all the pavement? The new roundabout on Ephesus Rd has so much more concrete inside the curb than needed. What is all that for? And how wide do sidewalks need to be downtown? All this concrete is not good for us!

2 months ago

None of the above! They would completely destroy these neighborhoods and lead to huge loss of value for existing residents, and only benefit developers. This is a Hail Mary the council wants to employ to fix years not planning for such types of housing. The emphasis on those without HOAs is discriminatory.

2 months ago

uncertain

2 months ago

It's ridiculous that the council is considering rezoning middle class neighborhoods for medium and high density redevelopment while there is literally a giant golf course insulated by actual mansions directly adjacent to those neighborhoods. It seems the only real reason town council would exclude neighborhoods with existing HOAs from this rezoning effort is to try to avoid legal problems from entities with deep pockets.

CH created this problem for themselves by rubber-stamping several enormous luxury apartment developments instead of requiring those properties to be developed with the very medium-density projects shown above. Don't try to solve this by screwing over the very people you're claiming to help.

2 months ago

It is not up to Chapel Hill to cram more and more high density housing into a very limited infrastructure of roads (15/501) and supporting infrastructure. I think Chapel Hill should maintain the virtues that brought people to it in the first place. Room to move and live without the traffic and congestion of a city. Why do we feel the need to create something that everyone moved here to get away from? Who is driving this destruction of our life style, and why??

2 months ago

The planners have turned Chapel Hill into a city of transients with the over-building of ugly high density institutional apartment buildings that may be bright and shiny now but will look even more hideous and dated in ten years. The housing boom will eventually end and we will be permanently stuck with this architectural garbage. These buildings along with the mid-density housing being proposed only serve the wealthier and will inevitably force poor residents to move out. I have zero faith in the town planners!

2 months ago

This plan can work but loss of tree canopy and increased traffic are almost certainly going to occur. I do not trust developers to do the right thing and produce the green, affordable outcomes you are seeking. We need strong ordinances to conserve a minimum % of tree canopy in each lot and adjacent bike/public transit improvements to be made in conjunction with these plans - and we need to connect with larger Orange County. Otherwise it's just going to be hot, crowded, stressful and loud - and probably still too expensive for most folks. I want to see guarantees on significant conservation of mature trees - people want that. And how do you ensure it's "affordable"? To whom? What's the greater bike and transit plan? Thank you.

2 months ago

I agree with the need for denser, missing middle residential development, but home owners need to have some leverage they can exert when adjacent or near-by properties violate certain guidelines for things like stormwater runoff, lighting, parking, trash and recyclables collection, tree canopy and vegetative borders, and other safety and quality of life issues. What concerns me are the loopholes that developers will be able to exploit that could lead to haphazard, substandard building and blatant profiteering by investment groups and absentee landlords.

2 months ago

Nothing. My neighborhood has no empty lots

You're currently tearing down middle housing in Glenn Lennox. How about helping to improve those places. And stop building expensive high rise residential housing. As you propose this you're currently building several in chapel hill. If you really want to do this start building affordable housing now and stop building the same exact expensive high rise crap all over town.

2 months ago

This survey is so biased... we do not want more construction of low income housing in chapel hill.
Period

2 months ago

Can you do something to prohibit those big garage doors facing the street? They're ugly and shouldn't be allowed on houses either.

2 months ago

The future is not the past. We struggle to find appropriate senior housing and new adult housing. Already our neighborhood supports garage apartments. The pressure of needing housing is great and not going away. The town needs to be aware of increasing public living rooms and gathering spaces. The deer have been fooled by our natural landscaped screens from the roads even if only 6 feet wide. We will not be able to afford to live here without adding an ADU. Not giving our family the option of using our land to support housing for our family that includes young adults and seniors is not helpful and is downright harmful to our family trying to find solutions to our own problems. This area is in great need. The future is not the past.

2 months ago

The destruction of the natural environment by developers in Chapel Hill is horrific and is quickly ruining the character of the town. This is a view shared by many, many residents of Chapel Hill. The ghastly new developments in residential areas (eg Aura) are cheered and championed by out-of-town developers who seem to be the only people who benefit from them. Certainly they are not making housing more affordable in Chapel Hill and they have not resulted in lower taxes for residents.

This new plan that is being considered is not going to address the affordable housing problem in CH. It will only succeed in further diminishing the quality of life of CH residents who are already being crowded by unappealing and poorly conceived development. If the new plan is approved, developers will not be rushing to buy \$500K+ properties in CH to build low-cost triplexes. It makes no sense at all. If a developer is going to be tearing down a house and clear cutting a lot in CH, they will be replacing the house (and the trees around it) with expensive condos.

I am stunned that this plan is being presented without any consideration of its effects on schools, the environment, public services, our rapidly growing traffic problems, our communities, and the town finances. How can anyone support this without knowing more? Much more homework needs to be done before this should be further discussed.

2 months ago

The only thing that matters to the current city council is developing every square inch of this city. They could care less what the folks that live here now think.

2 months ago

Don't mess with our neighborhoods! Sprawl has been happening for 30 years. Focus on more efficient transportation.

2 months ago

Location. If developers PROMISE (in writing) to devote 20% of building projects to be offered as affordable housing g.

2 months ago

Follow Durham's example of single family attached homes to allow for ownership of one side of a two family duplex or 3+ unit townhouse.

2 months ago

The amount of high density development so far has done nothing to curb affordability. Given that there is no way to control purchase of new development for rental purposes, I do not think this is a guaranteed solution and it is against the wishes of many in town to have even further high density development. I have been in the market to buy a house in Chapel Hill for two years now and it only grows further out of reach. My rent has increased 25% in two years, also making it 15% higher than the mortgage (also in Chapel Hill) I previously had. Further high density development does not solve the problem of affordability and will likely only make it worse.

2 months ago

I live on Oakwood Drive. Grubb Properties has a fantastic opportunity to build lots of 2-story middle housing in the form of cottages, town homes and condos in the Glen Lennox neighborhood under the terms of the existing Glen Lennox Development Agreement (DA). I ask that the town council, mayor, and planning department insist that Grubb build out the remaining undeveloped sections of Glen Lennox with middle housing only rather than more large multi-family apartment buildings and luxury condos and town homes. I believe that currently Grubb is targeting meeting the minimum requirement for affordable housing under the DA. I request that the town council and mayor critically look at this redevelopment project and require them to develop only middle housing in the form of affordable cottages, town homes and condos rather than luxury town homes and condos and more multifamily apartments. Three large multi-family apartment buildings with mixed use on the ground floor and large parking decks have already received DA compliance approval from the town planning department. We don't need more apartments, we need the middle housing! Glen Lennox is an amazing neighborhood and building out the rest of the development with middle housing in the form of cottages, condos, and town homes would allow many more people to own homes in Chapel Hill rather than renting. The goal of the DA, which was negotiated by Grubb, the neighborhood and town planning department, was to create a mutual vision of redevelopment of a unique and historic area of Chapel Hill that would maintain the character, tree-cover and walkability of the neighborhood. If the approved mixed use space includes shops, restaurants, bars, etc. and the ease of pedestrian crossing of Raleigh Road were improved, this could be a fantastic neighborhood for homes in a middle housing price range. Given that the existing DA streamlines the approval process, it seems to me that the town council and mayor have an amazing opportunity with Grubb Property to build a lot of middle housing in Glen Lennox in the next few years.

2 months ago

Tearing down single family homes in a long standing settled family neighborhood to build duplexes, triplexes, apartment buildings, or town homes will destroy our neighborhood.

2 months ago

I think that changing the zoning for single-family home neighborhoods in Chapel Hill. It would be detrimental to everyone involved. Enter those not yet living here. It is a massive mistake.

2 months ago

Many of these questions are not agree/disagree but instead have actual answers. The Missing Middle proposal does not go nearly far enough but is at least a start. Not moving forward would confirm the Town is beholden to wealthy homeowners' desire to keep lower income households out.

2 months ago

Here's the deal: I want the availability of middle-class housing to increase in Chapel Hill, but the current plans to do so are NOT going to accomplish that, because the sole change taking place is rezoning to allow developers or buyers more choices in their building---and we know that they will shape their choices SOLELY by market forces, not out of a kind desire to help people build EQUITY and family WEALTH. We know that the builders, as is happening in Wake Forest, for just one example, will charge enormous sums for new homes, and that they will squeeze every penny out of renters, as well. How does this help the MIDDLE? The new homes will *still* be priced out of their range. It seems to me that we need condos and 3 bedroom units FOR SALE. And the Chapel Hill government will have ZERO say over this once a lot is purchased----all building decisions at that point are totally up to the developer. Again, this will not help the very people who need it, unless more controls are placed on the new buildings. I realize that state law limits the control that the town has over the new building types, but perhaps a nonprofit model is needed here. Thank you.

2 months ago

It depends on how close it is to good bus infrastructure. Residential development needs to come along with other types of development to mitigate car traffic, such as good bus lines, SAFE bike routes, and greenways.

2 months ago

There should be an analysis of revenue and expense associated with the suggested changes. The changes will require more services (expenses) which probably will exceed the property revenue. The town would have to raise property tax or sales tax to cover the short fall. I do not feel like the repercussions of the suggested changes have been thoroughly or expertly evaluated.

2 months ago

We do not need developers building more high end tall, square, giant apartment buildings. We need more middle income and affordable, smaller units.

2 months ago

Urban style densification is appropriate and needed for the already treeless downtown of Chapel Hill. In other areas, I would love to see small apartments or other rentable, affordable (not targeting a luxury market or those who can afford to own) home options with some outdoor space and the retention of trees and/or greenways around them. The environmental footprint decrease from shared walls is quite significant, and could be even more significant if this densification came from converting many of the overly large, under-occupied multistory homes in the Chapel Hill suburban belts to duplexes etc., as one assumes the occupants of these are heating and cooling large numbers of unoccupied rooms and unneeded space.

2 months ago

Mid rise already being built. Lots of apartment construction has occurred. Keeping current residential preserves trees and lovely homes. Why should lovely residential areas be affected when already much construction has occurred and is on going?

2 months ago

We need more housing in this community. Legalizing missing middle has been done in other communities, and it's past time to do it here. Don't listen to the fearmongering!

2 months ago

Housing people is more important than "neighborhood character," whatever that is. I want my kids to be able to live in this town one day, and that won't happen without removing the racist, classist, and absurdly misguided density caps in place right now.

2 months ago

The proposal to change neighborhood zoning is misguided and rushed. This zoning change would not and cannot address whether the "gentle density" housing would be AFFORDABLE, it will ONLY address DIVERSITY of housing size & style by providing for the building of duplexes, triplexes, quadraplexes, and "cottage courts" on small lots, subdivided lots, and backyards and would require 20-40% tree canopy. We do not have the infrastructure that is needed for this kind of sweeping change. How will you address the cost of storm water, traffic, roads, transportation, water & sewer, electricity, police & fire services, 911/EMS services, schools, & more? How will the town & residents pay for this and not cause existing low income & modest income residents to be forced out of the homes they own and/or rent?

What are the transportation/traffic implications of this blanket zoning change for greater density? Has the town planned to accommodate and pay for this? What are the traffic/pedestrian/planning projections for this new infrastructure? What are the potential implications for property tax increases to pay for increased demands on town services? What is the projected budgetary plan for this? What is the basis for these projections? Will residents be able to shoulder the tax increases?

If this is such a good idea, then Chapel Hill citizens should have time to think about it and discuss it, instead of it being rushed through by Council.

As for NCDs: We live in one of the few affordable neighborhoods in Chapel Hill, Elkin Hills. Our house is all of 765 square feet. We spent years to develop our NCD, following the Town's guidelines and jumping through all the hoops. Have you consulted with the Town's lawyers about the legality of revoking a duly developed and majority-homeowner-approved NCD? I recall the red light cameras, texting while driving, and now apparently AirBnB regulations being revoked when subjected to legal scrutiny.

Please rethink this hasty process. Sincerely yours, Molly and Peter Starback

2 months ago

Missing middle housing will only benefit lower income families if the housing is reserved for them. Otherwise, wealthier patrons would snap them up.

2 months ago

Have you driven through and around Eastgate and Ephesus Church recently? Those apartments aren't even done yet. We do not have the infrastructure for the density you are philosophically desiring.

2 months ago

I find this whole proposal preposterous. You are proposing increasing density in intact neighborhoods purely for the sake of increasing density. For what? More tax money? It would completely disrupt neighborhoods and lead to friction between neighbors over suspected sales of their property to developers who will construct multifamily dwellings among single family homes in intact neighborhoods. And do you really believe that the strategy you propose is going to lead developers to lower the costs of these structures? I particularly like the phrase you use: 'if carefully designed and integrated'. It's perfect. It's the phrase developers and town councils always use when proposing a disaster for the community. I feel betrayed that zoning I believed was intact for my neighborhood can be changed by the whim of the town council.

2 months ago

If a neighborhood is designed that way from the start and people "opt in" to the lifestyle, it's fine. To retro-fit neighborhoods into this model and force people into someone else's idea of what "should" be is a joke. The Q&A document provided by Karen Stegman was a complete waste of the digital paper it was written on - completely didn't address any of the actual issues. More density means more traffic, more trash on the street, more demand on infrastructures like cable and Internet and fewer trees. It doesn't matter to me if Grad students need more ragers (see the stupid q&a if you don't get the reference). I bought into a single family neighborhood for a reason. This proposal essentially says "I don't care what you wanted, this is what WE think you should have". I am strongly against adding density to our neighborhoods in this manner.

2 months ago

I strongly resent the fact that the town management has allowed, and indeed encouraged, developers to destroy unique, close-in neighborhoods. We moved here because CH combined the charm of a small town with the sophistication of a big city. Twenty years later, it exhibits the problems of a big(ish) city with the charm of a string of pizza joints. Wrong direction! It has become a miserable place for older adults.

2 months ago

This survey, and this initiative in general, lack sophistication and nuance. Chapel Hill is a complex network of neighborhoods and what may be appropriate for one neighborhood would be inappropriate for another. Targeted zoning changes that promote specific goals - such as permitting denser housing along transit corridors and within walking distance of the more 'urbanized' regions (downtown, near established shopping districts) - could optimize the desired outcomes of creating missing middle residences, reducing reliance on automobiles, and providing for the varied needs of current and future residents, without risking destruction of the character of Chapel Hill's diverse neighborhoods. Blanket deregulation will lead to unanticipated, unintended, and undesirable results.

2 months ago

I don't trust town staff to implement missing middle housing in a way that is truly sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood. They will do what they have done in recent years: make a few minor adjustments to a development in order to appear conciliatory but essential, promote approval of structures that benefit developers. The current council has not followed agreed upon guidelines (eg Central West) and therefore cannot be trusted to follow any guidelines implied in this wrong-headed proposal. We could have had missing middle housing on the corner of Estes & MLK but instead we are getting AURA! Where was your concern for the missing middle then? I have lost all faith in those in public office. My efforts will be spent voting you out of office and getting in folks who will promote missing middle housing in areas of town where it makes sense to do so, not you people who want to do more damage to our community's unique features. It's okay to be unique. Missing middle housing would be great on Buffie Weber's land. Put it there! But wait, would that mean lower profits for the landowner? Maybe so. Greed can't drive every thing and pandering to developers is shameful. Eliminating RI zoning is a wrong headed solution. But one that Pam won't have to deal with in the OAKS. She's protected by HOA. Shame on you.

2 months ago

2 months ago

None of these would be appropriate for my neighborhood.

2 months ago

Please have the Town mail a letter to each homeowner that is impacted, explaining the impact, and then allow time for people to respond prior to a vote on the proposal by the Town Council.

2 months ago

In my neighborhood, there are inadequate places for walking or driving safely as it is. It would be extraordinarily dangerous to add more cars or pedestrians in this forested and hilly area. And, I'm concerned that additional paved or hard surfaces would adversely effect the existing problems with stormwater runoff. Are the planners considering the impact to our land-locked elementary and middle schools when housing is added?

2 months ago

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this proposal, but the survey does not accurately capture my concerns. One of my biggest concerns is that there is no way to insure the missing middle would be served by this zoning change. It seems incredibly irresponsible and naive to think otherwise. Another concern is that this proposal came out of nowhere with notice to potentially affected neighborhoods dribbling in by word of mouth. I think each homeowner should be contacted by mail and be allowed to respond before the Town Council rushes through a vote on this proposal. Affordable home ownership and rentals are needed in Chapel Hill, but this proposal is not the answer.

2 months ago

I am a resident of Colony Woods. I have reached out to you he mayor and town council multiple times about how the current drainage system for the area is destroying my home and yard, to the point where it put my family's lives in danger and has cost me thousands of dollars in damage. Currently all the water from Colony Lake is being emptied though a pipe that drains directly into my yard and has created a giant pit that is killing large trees. In the past few years as development has increased it has gotten rapidly worse to the point where if it goes unchecked it will destroy the foundation of my house. In the past 10 years the landscape of this area has drastically changed and yet the town refuses to do anything to upgrade the drainage to meet the current needs. Building apartment buildings in the neighborhood is only going to make this worse and the town has shown that they don't mind destroying homes in Colony Woods for the sake of development. I haven't been given any reason to trust that this would be done in a responsible way. I don't want any other residents of Colony Woods and the surrounding neighborhoods to go through the same thing that is happening to me.

2 months ago

We do not support a zoning change to the current single family requirements in our neighborhood. We also request that an impact study be done before any such decision is made.

2 months ago

It seems unfair to change zoning in existing neighborhoods where folks moved in with certain densities already in place. We have lived in Booker Creek for 28 years and we moved here with this subdivision being a "known entity" and not expecting to have zoning changed and higher densities allowed. In Booker Creek, we already have duplexes around the corner, townhouses on the next block over, and apartments at the end of our street. I also worry about parking with any additional density in Booker Creek. Most of the houses in Booker Creek do not have garages and just have single lane driveways (for one car), so many neighbors regularly park one car on the street. I would like to see the Town mail letters to homeowners who are potentially being impacted, explaining the changes, and allow time for residents to respond prior to a vote on the proposal by the Town Council so we can share our concerns.

2 months ago

Chapel Hill needs more affordable housing (low- and mid-range) for sale so that owners can build equity. We have too many expensive and/or student-oriented rental properties. How can CH prevent any more huge, ugly, rental behemoths from being developed? I know they are cheaper to build but they are destroying the charm and the character of this town. Can the town hire a staff architect, one who is design-oriented, to approve project proposals?

2 months ago

These duplexes, triplexes, quadriplexes, townhouses, etc. are not guaranteed to be "affordable", but they will guarantee loss of neighborhood in existing residential areas. Build these structures in new developments. All the apartments being built currently are not affordable -- what happened to those requirements for providing a percentage at lower cost? Established neighborhoods are already being threatened by corporations that buy properties to be rented for profit, and then there are those who buy a property simply to tear it down to replace a more moderately priced house with a "mansion wanna-be". Colony Woods is a very nice middle-class subdivision -- why destroy it? Isn't that what is desired? Glen Lennox is being destroyed, Colony Apartments has been destroyed, and probably Kings Arms Apartments is next to be razed. If the Town wants affordable housing, why are we allowing destruction of properties that are, or were more affordable? I do have a horse in this race -- I am a homeowner in Colony Woods and have been for almost 40 years. It would be a shame to see it chopped up by profiteers.

2 months ago

This survey really does not get at the heart of the problem. It reads like a push poll, rather than a nuanced survey of Chapel Hill residents's attitudes. The problem with the current plan that the Planning Committee presented the week of January 13 is the failure to prioritize building more affordable owner-resident homes. Instead, the plan opens the door for more of what we already have: high-priced rentals that are aimed at students and high-paid, single or married couples without children. We need more developments like Kirkwood that provide modest, well-planned condominiums and town homes that are owner occupied. Allowing developers to cram rental units into residential neighborhoods that do not have an existing HOA will not provide that sort of owner-occupied housing. There appears to be a rush on the part of the Town Council members to pass the rezoning without allowing time for full discussion of the change with Chapel Hill residents.

2 months ago

Will depend on price and quality of materials.

2 months ago

Spreading such development throughout the town and having guidelines about the extent and type of development is the only responsible way to approach this. Concentrating it in specific neighborhoods with no control over the outcome is not planning.

2 months ago

The town should mail a letter to each homeowner that is impacted, and allow enough time for people to respond prior to taking a vote.

2 months ago

Where it has already been implemented, the result is trashy, poorly-maintained units in an otherwise excellent neighborhood.

2 months ago

Multi-family units are not unreasonable in and of themselves. But they are unreasonable when added to established neighborhoods where they would alter the character, housing style, and flow. Better to require such units in new builds so that they would fit into a not-yet established pattern of housing.

2 months ago

It would depend upon whether the town were able to protect existing homeowners from displacement due to higher property tax rates. Upzoning for greater residential density will likely increase the appraised value, and thus the tax liability, of the upzoned parcels. What steps does the Town plan to take to protect existing homeowners from being displaced by the tax increases related to the zoning change? How have other towns that have ended single-family zoning addressed this issue? It would be tragic indeed if a legislative action undertaken to make housing more affordable ended up making existing housing less affordable and displacing the town's least affluent homeowners.

2 months ago

I strongly object to the town's bulldozing this zoning change through with limited public awareness and input. The inequity is staggering: older neighborhoods will be targeted, while newer, upscale neighborhoods with HOAs and NCDs will be protected. The zoning change will NOT lead to AFFORDABLE missing middle housing. It will be yet another gift to developers exceeding the one bestowed in the Blue Hill district. This major change has not worked in Durham or Raleigh and should NOT BE PROPOSED OR ACTED ON until another municipal election occurs where residents can choose council members who value citizens over developers.

2 months ago

There are already a variety of housing options within our neighborhood. I prefer to maintain existing housing within the neighborhood

2 months ago

There are already a variety of housing options within our neighborhood. I prefer to maintain existing housing within the neighborhood.

2 months ago

I prefer maintain existing neighborhoods. Chapel Hill presently offers housing choices to meet the needs of residents.

2 months ago

It would depend on making sure the multi family housing fits into the existing neighborhood and prevent the loss of tree canopy. Without tree canopy, our stormwater runoff will suffer and some of these new units will contribute to our flooding problem. We must be careful to protect our trees that soak up so much water and provide shade during our increasing warming of the planet. I also strongly believe that before this plan is adopted, residents get a survey to fill out at each of their homes. This online survey is not reaching most residents that will be affected by this change. If you strongly believe in resident input, you will send a survey to each household. If you do not, you will continue to vote on this without allowing all of your citizens to provide input.

2 months ago

Rents and mortgagees are too high and have increased at a far greater pace than wages. That is a huge contributing cause to the housing problem. I am distrustful of the term small scale, as developers seek large scale profits. What are the guarantees that traffic flow, parking congestion, water usage, rainfall drainage and green-space protection will be successfully addressed and managed.

2 months ago

Please send letters to all potentially impacted homeowners

2 months ago

I believe that the changes being proposed are poorly thought-through, and that there are examples elsewhere where these kinds of changes result in bad outcomes. I am certainly in favor of affordable housing, but I do not believe that the changes proposed are truly aligned with "affordable."

2 months ago

A letter or card should be sent to every resident in Booker Creek and Lake Forest to let them know about this zoning change

Both neighborhood's character would be destroyed by the success of this proposal.

2 months ago

None, not sufficient room

2 months ago

As a long time resident of Chapel Hill, I am finding the town more and more unrecognizable. Everything that was attractive to me and my family about the town seems in the crosshairs of the council and their consultants-du-jour who are paid copious amounts of tax dollars to come up with buzzy terms like "missing middle" and "gentle density." One of the reasons Chapel Hill WAS a destination place to be was largely due to its abundance of green spaces, and welcoming neighborhoods. Now we are surrounded by thousands of luxury apartments that consumed acres of woodlands and a downtown that is rapidly losing any semblance of its original charm and small businesses. For all of this, we pay some of the highest property taxes in the state. I believe the result of this zoning change would be irresistible to every out-of-town/state opportunistic developer who would snatch up single-family homes, flatten the dwelling, clear cut the lot and jam as much allowable density on the lot forever altering the fabric of the neighborhood. We don't have the infrastructure to support this endeavor, nor will the community tolerate the predictable reduction of property value that this will bring. It's just a poorly conceived idea. Maybe give all the consultants and developers a rest for a bit, please and work with the community to find out what they really want. Thanks!

2 months ago

The questions are framed to easily mislead people. Moreover, just getting to this survey requires a lot of scrolling and will deter additional people from having a voice. Make this survey broadly available, publicize your plans openly so that a real and honest discussion can take place. Send out the survey in the mail to account for all those not comfortable with email/internet surveys. Will additional schools be built? Will streets get widened to account for this plan? I think it's a terrible idea all around, because it only benefits those in "developed" neighborhoods with an HOA in place and will shortchange those living in the older, organically grown neighborhoods around town. Probably, this idea was put together by those living with HOAs...

2 months ago

-Property owners need to receive individual mailings regarding these proposed zoning changes rather than having the changes buried in text amendments that many do not understand AND then be provided an opportunity to respond. Treat this like a rezoning and notify owners by mail of the proposed changes.

2 months ago

These visuals are not appropriate for my neighborhood. Adding ADUs would be appropriate but not the other pictures.

2 months ago

- It is unfair to impact the existing, established neighborhoods who no longer have restrictive covenants and didn't ask for a Neighborhood Protection District or Historic District designation.
 - Adding ADUs to my neighborhood would be appropriate but not the other pictures provided.
 - Adding missing middle to areas that are not established neighborhood may be appropriate.

2 months ago

Be careful not to destroy the neighborhoods we already have, the ones people want to live in. It is naive to hope that by forcing people to live together that everybody will find that attractive or make them want to move to Chapel Hill. Just WANTING to live in Chapel Hill does not confer a RIGHT to live here. I might WANT to live in Greenwich, CT, but the does not confer a RIGHT to live there if I can't afford it.

2 months ago

I see no research that demonstrates that the properties currently being developed will actually be occupied. So many cities across the country are investing heavily in this kind of housing development, and it is leading to three things: empty units; foreign investments of empty units; and further segregation within cities due to wealth. Consider the latest high rise being built in Durham, where the upper units remain empty and are selling for over \$2M. The proposals for this to be "mixed income" never actually materialize, and it just becomes an opportunity for developers to cash in and then move on, leaving the town with many many problems as a result.

2 months ago

We welcome diverse housing options, density, and new neighbors. Great work staff & council —
 Sincerely, a Lake Forest family

2 months ago

Can the town please send letters to residents who live at or adjacent to properties that would be affected by proposed rule changes and can the town please give the people who would be most affected some time to respond prior to voting on proposals? Most residents are too busy to follow the detailed machinations of town politics and this seems to be a situation where developer-supported initiatives might sneak through without appropriate public attention.

Whether or not the situation is multiple-family housing or single-family housing, I am fully in support of encouraging more owner-occupied housing and less housing that is owned by non-residents. Chapel Hill should encourage and facilitate the chance of renters to transform into owners. So many rental units have been constructed in Chapel Hill and so little discussion has been devoted to proposals that can allow people to improve economic status via building up financial equity. Some of the proposals being discussed in this survey would result in more rental units and some would not. I am very much in favor of more ownership and less rental.

Chapel Hill is the place in North Carolina where I want to live. Please do not ruin it. The trendy and intellectually-flabby hand-wringing about how Chapel Hill has deep flaws is largely a developer-sponsored ploy for short-term gain at the expense of long-term planning.

I am really disappointed that the focus of town leadership has not been on how to preserve natural areas and has instead been on accelerating development in an already quickly-growing area. The most environmentally-friendly long-term solution is not to accelerate development in quickly-growing areas such as our own region. Instead, we need to find a way to use existing infrastructure in small towns and rural areas that have experienced population declines in recent years. Disparity among geographic regions in economic growth rates results in unoccupied housing in some areas and in boom-bust cycles in others. When planners discuss environmental benefits of high-density living in urban areas, they too often neglect the fact that housing in less-urban areas is unoccupied and being allowed to deteriorate. Why not have open discussions about how policies should divert economic development to less-privileged non-urban places that have existing under-utilized infrastructure? Use of existing infrastructure is far more environmentally responsible than building new infrastructure and than encouraging boom areas.

As a scientist who studies population biology, I have thought quite a bit about these issues and I realize that my points differ from the conventional ones made by the real estate industry.

2 months ago

Our neighborhood, near Eastgate, has already been adversely affected by the multiple high density luxury apartment buildings that have been built and continue to be built in this area. I went to several of the public meetings prior to some of these changes and feel that the Town's representations and process itself were intentionally misleading. The Town's plan talks about respecting and preserving the character of Chapel Hill, but everything it is doing is the opposite of that. "Disrupting" zoning by throwing existing codes in the trash may be trendy but it is also profoundly disrespectful and irresponsible. If the Town intends to change zoning in existing neighborhoods, all property owners should be directly informed of the proposed change well in advance of any vote (for example, by mail to each address).

2 months ago

It depends on Council making these changes, which I strongly support. These housing types used to be common within neighborhoods and we need to start building them again.

2 months ago

If depends on building design with designated high quality public spaces and incorporated parks, greenways and public transportations to connect communities with schools, grocery stores etc.

2 months ago

I am troubled by this affecting all the old neighborhoods in Chapel Hill while leaving any home owner association neighborhood untouched. I am not opposed to any middle density housing but this will change the character of my neighborhood without any real input from homeowners. Also, some areas have been designated conservation districts because of the problems this might cause, but there is no provision to revise and perhaps consider making more areas conservation districts. It seems to me that you will create a change that will be quickly followed by a call to make more neighborhoods NCRs. You should write to all those in the town in this zoning and tell them giving adequate time to respond before a council vote.

I will add that I did not answer some questions because they seem like leading the witness.

2 months ago

The key is maintaining character of existing neighborhoods while adding infill. A single framework for the whole town seems unworkable. Break things down and do appropriate development (scale, etc.) on more of a case by case or neighborhood by neighborhood basis.

This isn't a generic discussion. Things have to be worked out for specific plans and specific pieces of property. You're falling into the trap of a one-size-fits-all strategy because you don't want the hassle of figuring things out for real people in real neighborhoods.

2 months ago

Investors will build more housing but it will be very high end expensive housing. Council cannot control that. We will have more luxury housing; not middle market or low income. The national reit securities are destroying housing for individuals. The Gen Assembly forbids you from enacting limits and safeguards to prevent this or to ensure middle housing. This is a bad idea without limits.

2 months ago

I like the cottages approach, especially if they are owner-occupied.

2 months ago

The wording of the survey is both misleading and leading, which reduces the value of this survey. The proposed changes to current zoning language constitutes changes potentially of many rezoning. Rezoning's require signage throughout affected areas that indicate a significant change is being contemplated. Although signage is not required with proposed text amendment this lack of signage is clearly a decision to limit public exposure and knowledge. If one believes these changes are the right course of action than one should be willing to stimulate debate to encourage alternatives leading to the best overall decision.

2 months ago

Very hard to see any of the above examples fitting into the Kings Mill Morgan Creek neighborhood. However, I think that small cottages would be agreeable to most.

2 months ago

We're having some technical issues with the live stream. You can join the webinar directly through Zoom using this link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86464530666?pwd=NvJ4U2lTXBhbGQydkQrSVBTazVCUT09>

2 months ago

how do we get into this meeting virtually?

2 months ago

ADUs or cottage dwellings added to large lots are a good choice for almost all neighborhoods.

2 months ago

Established neighborhoods with large lots should not be developed to accommodate more student housing. I support density caps and do not think the town has the infrastructure to handle this "complete community" initiative. Chapel Hill will completely lose its small town charm if the council continues to approve large scale development.

2 months ago

Please take more time to study this proposal, inform the community, talk to people in single family neighborhoods, and start with undeveloped lots to introduce middle income housing.

2 months ago

Our neighborhood is generally zoned for single family units, however there are a lot of houses that have in-law units. The lots tend to be smaller (.3 acres) so adding a large structure like a mid-rise or high rise would not be very aesthetically pleasing. We are very close to UNC's campus, although many of the people that own houses in this neighborhood are established families, or retirees. There are a few rental properties scattered throughout.

2 months ago

None. Current population increase is detrimenting services and creating stress on existing infrastructure

2 months ago

Why with all the changes in the area around our small community neighborhood would you ever think of changing our restrictions? The only reason is that we do not have an HOA and so you the council feels you won't have as much legal push back on this proposal.

2 months ago

We in the Colony Woods neighborhood have all of the above options very close and in fact in our neighborhood as of the last addition of housing.

2 months ago

How quickly will any unanswered questions / concerns brought up in the upcoming meeting be answered?

Will ALL the questions and answers be posted publicly and if so where and when?

Also will the Town Council be able to see ALL of questions, answers, and concerns from the meeting?

Will the Town Council have plenty of time to review, thoughtfully consider, and address the residents' questions and concerns BEFORE voting?

At what date will the public at large get to review the notes, questions & answers, comments from this meeting?

At what date will the Town Council get to see them?

Why is there such a rush to vote on this?

How come there wasn't a more concerted effort to make the town's residents FULLY aware of this agenda and the upcoming vote?

2 months ago

How quickly will any unanswered questions / concerns brought up in the upcoming meeting be answered?

Will ALL the questions and answers be posted to publicly and if so where? And if so when?

Also will the Town Council be able to see ALL of questions, answers, and concerns from the meeting?

Will the Town Council have plenty of time to review, thoughtfully consider, and address the residents' questions and concerns BEFORE voting?

At what date will the public at large get to review the notes, questions & answers, comments from this meeting?

At what date will the Town Council get to see them?

Why is there such a rush to vote on this?

How come there wasn't a more concerted effort to make the town's residents FULLY aware of this agenda and the upcoming vote?

2 months ago

Much more consideration and public discussion is required for this fundamental change. More differentiation needs to be considered about which type is allowed in which zoning. There is a fundamental difference between allowing accessory dwellings and perhaps duplexes versus larger compounds like triplexes and four-plexes. Consideration should be applied to how this changes how many cars need to be parked on the otherwise same frontage, etc. This all seems extremely fast without need to rush at the cost of public participation. There should be at least a year of truly public discussion with affected neighborhoods. Not much of that seems to have been going on. Town Council should be able to do better than that. This appears to change zoning without the processes that would be required to change zoning. Arguably, that is underhanded. The Town of Chapel Hill should treat its residents better than that.

Middle housing is shown as a type; however, what's missing is the cost aspect. Currently, it seems that developers will maximize profits, so they will build to the maximum pricing level they believe they will be able to sell with the maximum profit margin. They do not have a social responsibility to the Town or its residents to provide middle housing by cost. Only form is regulated. This was already the downfall of the Blue Hill District generating nothing but luxury apartments or eventually luxury condos, no "middle" apartments or condos, and mostly bought out affordable housing requirements. What would prevent the same to happen with middle housing? None of the consultants spoke to that --and my impression is that there is an absolute cluelessness about this aspect, or naivety about how this would happen. Affordable housing only happens when done intentionally. Middle (cost and form) housing will only happen when done intentionally. Otherwise, only maximum profit housing will happen in whatever form.

Clearly, the proposed changes will dramatically increase the development pressure on neighborhoods and drive out the people who have lived there and replace them with whoever can afford whatever developers can extract out of increased density. Property values will be driven up by development expectations, causing tax increases and pricing out current residents. Overall, this will decrease availability of the type of middle housing not just in size but also in pricing that Town Council appears to want to create. For that a price cap would be necessary, which appears impossible in the capitalist society that is the USA. In the end Chapel Hill will drive out the current residents to more affordable areas which will increase pressure on those and drive out their current residents, creating even more commuters, more traffic, more environmental destruction, and in the end a whole bunch of people with no place to call home.

It seems in the face of the opposite effect of what's intended, no change is better than misguided change.

2 months ago

How neighborhood is defined — and understanding the real need in addition to the many new high density housing under construction now. Adding higher density in much of the Oaks would make no sense

2 months ago

We live in an old neighborhood that is already built up. I don't understand why huge projects of single family homes are being built, or luxury apartments, when that area could be used for the same thing. Traffic is already terrible in our area and we have not addressed that basic infrastructure need.

2 months ago

Creating 20% of housing for people below 80AMI

2 months ago

It would depend on where, within a given neighborhood, units would be built (i.e., on the periphery vs within a neighborhood).

2 months ago

Solving the workforce housing and traffic issues involves a simple but unpopular solution. Put the students back in on-campus dorms [WHERE THEY BELONG] and solve a major part of housing and traffic issues. Let the workers and their families back into homes that were effectively stolen by greedhead developers for "student housing". Too simple, yet too obvious.

As to the general notion of "affordable housing", you might want to look at this article from the L.A. Tenants Union:

<https://latenantsunion.medium.com/affordable-housing-is-a-scam-9a4c43ba8149>

2 months ago

I don't know.

2 months ago

Please assure that the proposaal does not apply to the Historic Districts, where single family residences (with accessory and apartment uses) are integral to the special character of the District, especially the Franklin Rosemary District.

2 months ago

How will this impact the number of canopy trees on each property? Will this be considered.

2 months ago

It would depend on how this impacts tree canopy and open spaces.

2 months ago

I am very supportive of the efforts to modify the LUMO to allow for a more inclusive Chapel Hill that also takes into consideration the environmental externalities of sprawl that our current land use regulations create.

2 months ago

There should be severe limits on the size and height of additional units, such as 500 square feet and 1 story. This would prevent developers from buying a house, knocking it down, and building some of the huge buildings pictures above. Remember this is "gentle" density, not destroying neighborhoods.

2 months ago

I currently rent a duplex in Chapel Hill, surrounded by single family homes. I'd love to have more options like this in town!

3 months ago

The initial staff presentation omitted the important fact that neighborhoods with HOA's will be exempt, which means the newer, wealthy neighborhoods will not be impacted while older lower class neighborhoods will.

How will this zoning change affect neighborhood conservation districts (NCDs) that also have restrictive covenants? The town needs to state specifically which neighborhoods will be impacted before any final vote. It should also be made clear that "small scale development" will likely all be rental units, which could include student housing e.g. for fraternities or sororities. The plan is discriminatory and will not solve the need for owner-occupied housing.

3 months ago

not duplexes with street facing garages like in the pic but otherwise...

3 months ago

Use of full blown Project Planning expertise by people with training, organization, agreed to goals and following the science of this technique including infrastructure implementation with schools, shopping, water and power.

3 months ago