

05-19-2021 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions #1

ITEM #11: Evidentiary Hearing Continued: Special Use Permit Modification for University Place, 201 S. Estes Drive

Council Question:

We have heard from some of our affordable housing providers that finding market housing for folks at the 80 percent of AMI level isn't a problem, but that finding housing for folks making less than 65 percent of AMI is. Would the applicant be willing to provide units at the 65 percent level rather than the 80 percent level proposed?

Applicant Response:

We would be willing to include additional language to the affordable housing stipulation that said that we would provide either 15% of all residential units at 80% of AMI or 10% of all residential units at 65% of AMI.

Council Question:

As the applicant presentation included in our packet is from the May 5th meeting, can we get a description of the changes/modifications made to the plan, if any, since that meeting?

Applicant Response:

The proposed changes/modifications include:

- We will agree to remove request for gateway sign on Fordham Blvd.*
- We will agree to provide option of 15% affordable housing at 80% of AMI or 10% at 65% of AMI.*
- We will agree to a "lockout period" on the multifamily conversion rights, to where a building permit could not be obtained for any multifamily units using conversions rights until at least 7/1/24. Based on a typical two-year construction period, that would mean there would not be any more than 300 units delivered until at least the second half of 2026 if conversion rights were utilized.*
- We have included in our Council presentation on 5/19/21 a new dedicated space proposed for the farmer's market.*
- We will agree to extend the Fordham Blvd multi-use path beyond our property north connecting to Willow Dr. pending any approvals required by NCDOT, Binkley Baptist and any other third parties. We think this will be a key connection that will promote alternate modes of transportation not only for Binkley Baptist but for the greater Chapel Hill community.*

05-19-2021 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions #1

- *We will agree to utilize solar energy for the common areas of the proposed multifamily building on Pod A in addition to our other measures proposed towards creating a more sustainable environment.*

These are in addition to the items below that were previously agreed to during the May 5th Council meeting:

- *Add rain gardens to increase stormwater drainage area by min. 30,000 SF over existing conditions*
- *Agree to dedicate 20% of incubator retail for minority owned businesses*
- *Removal of “optional” from green space in cross-section of the Internal Main Street and add a minimum width for the green space of 50’*
- *Require threshold that would need to be met to trigger availability of multifamily conversion rights, where the property would need to contain at least 375,000 SF of commercial (office & retail) space and if conversion rights are utilized, they’ll need to include vertically integrated mixed-use with ground floor commercial space.*
- *To promote the site containing more commercial space, adjust conversion rights for multifamily from 1 unit per 1,000 SF to 1 unit per 800 SF of unused commercial, resulting in an opportunity for additional commercial space (up to additional 40,000 SF). This would be subject to the existing TIA and not exceeding those traffic volumes.*
- *We’ve agreed to require a minimum of 2-story buildings within the ~4.5 acre subdistrict within Pod C (highlighted in red below) after hearing feedback about the desire for that to be a true mixed-use environment.*



05-19-2021 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions #1

Council Question:

During the last hearing for this, a request was made regarding whether the applicant could provide a sheet comparison of what the ways in which this project is varied from Town standards. The applicant indicated this would be done. Will the applicant provide this information prior to Wednesday night?

Applicant Response:

Please see Excel workbook provided.

	BLUE HILL DISTRICT - WR	BLUE HILL DISTRICT - WX	UNIVERSITY PLACE	CARRAWAY VILLAGE
Outdoor Amenity Space (min)	0.05 (net land area)	0.05 (net land area)	0.046 (gross land area)	
Rec Space Ratio (min)	0.08 (1-3 story building)	0.08 (1-3 story building)		
*applies to residential portion of building	0.12 (4+ story building) (gross land area)	0.12 (4+ story building) (gross land area)	0.046 (gross land area)	0.015 (gross land area)
Max Block Length	450'	450'	Defined by block plan	Defined by block plan
Max Block Perimeter	1,800'	1,800'	Defined by block plan	Defined by block plan
Mass				
Max Height - 3	3-story / 45'		Pod D - 3-story/34' (Primary)	Block C,D,E,F,G - 44' (Primary)
Max Height - 5	n/a	5-story / 60'	3-story/43' (Secondary)	Block A & B - 5-story/59' (Primary)
Max Height - 7	7-story / 90'	7-story / 90'	Pod A/C - 5-story/75' (Primary)	7-story/90' (Secondary)
Min Height	2-story	2-story	Pod A/C - 7-story/90' (Secondary)	No min.
	10' building step back above 2nd or 3rd floor	10' building step back above 2nd or 3rd floor	10' building step back above 2nd or 3rd floor	
4+ story buildings need to meet one of two reqs:				No Requirement
	Module Offset w/:	Module Offset w/:	Module Offset w/:	
	80' max width of module	80' max width of module	80' max width of module	No Requirement
	6' min depth of offset	6' min depth of offset	6' min depth of offset	No Requirement
	12' min width of offset	12' min width of offset	12' min width of offset	No Requirement
Ground floor height - Residential (min)	9'	9'	9'	Not Specified
Ground floor height - Commercial (min)	n/a	13'	12'	Not Specified
Upper story height (min)	9'	9'	9'	Not Specified
Ground floor elevation - Residential (min/max)	2'/4'	2'/4'	not specified	Not Specified
Ground floor elevation - Commercial (min/max)	n/a	0'/2'	not specified	Not Specified
Form				
Ground Floor Transparency - Residential (min)	20%	20%	20%	30% (Public Facing) 20% (facing parking / service) 40% (Primary elevation)
Ground Floor Transparency - Commercial (min)	n/a	60%	50%	30% (Secondary elevation)
Upper story transparency (min)	20%	20%	20%	Not Specified
Blank wall distance - residential (max)	50'	50'	50'	No Requirement
Blank wall distance - commercial (max)	n/a	30'	50'	No Requirement
Principal entrance facing public realm	Required	Required	Required	Not Specified
Principal entrance spacing along street facing façade - residential (max)	50'	50'	Not Specified	Not Specified
Principal entrance spacing along street facing façade - commercial (max)	n/a	100'	Not Specified	Not Specified
Building pass-through	330' max spacing	330' max spacing	330' max spacing	No Requirement
Width (min)	12'	12'	12'	No Requirement
Height (min)	Equal to height of adjacent first floor ceiling	Equal to height of adjacent first floor ceiling	Equal to height of adjacent first floor ceiling	No Requirement
Signage - Gateway Sign	Not Permitted	Not Permitted	Request Removed. Not Permitted	2 signs - 30' height (no width provided) & 200 SF display area
Tree Canopy Coverage (min)	No Requirement	No Requirement	20%	25%
Impervious Surface (max)	No Requirement	No Requirement	75%	70%
Uses (min)	n/a	n/a	300,000 SF Retail 450,000 SF Retail 150,000 SF Office	140,000 SF Retail/Hotel 60,000 SF Office 400,000 SF Residential
Uses (max)	n/a	n/a	300 Units Residential & 150 Hotel Rooms	416,000 SF Retail/Hotel 270,000 SF Office & 701,000 SF Residential (Max 806 units)

UNIVERSITY PLACE FORDHAM

Frontages	BLUE HILL DISTRICT TYPE A1	BLUE HILL DISTRICT TYPE A2/3	BLUE HILL DISTRICT TYPE B	BLUE HILL DISTRICT TYPE C	BLUE HILL DISTRICT TYPE D	BLVD	UNIVERSITY PLACE WILLOW DR	UNIVERSITY PLACE ESTES DR
Front Setback w/ parking (min/max)	n/a	n/a	0'-85'	n/a	n/a	0-77'	n/a	n/a
Front Setback w/o parking (min/max)	0'-10'	0'-20'	0'-20'	5'	5'-20'	0-20'	0-20'	n/a
BTZ Requirement (min)	80%	60%	60%	n/a	60%	40%	50%	n/a
Sidewalk - Pedestrian Way (min)	n/a	n/a	8'	n/a	n/a	8'	n/a	n/a
Tree Planting Zone - Pedestrian Way (min)	n/a	n/a	8'	n/a	n/a	n/a	8' min	n/a
Sidewalk - Streetscape (min)	10' w/ min 10' clear zone	10' w/ min 10' clear zone	6' w/ min 6' clear zone	6' w/ min 6' clear zone	6' w/ min 6' clear zone	n/a	5' min (existing to remain)	n/a
or Multi-Use Path (min)	n/a	n/a	12' w/ min 14' clear zone	12' w/ min 14' clear zone	n/a	10' w/ min 12' clear zone	n/a	10' w/ min 12' clear zone
Parking Area (max)	n/a	n/a	60'	Unlimited	n/a	62'	n/a	Unlimited
Hedge Planting or wall zone (min 36" height)	n/a	n/a	5' (min width)	5' (min width)	n/a	5' (min width)	n/a	5' (min width)
Tree Planting Zone (min)	8'	8'	8'	8'	4'	8'	3' (existing)	8'
Tree spacing (avg)	40'	40'	40'	40'	20'	40'	40'	40'
On-street parking, where provided	Per thoroughfare standards	Per thoroughfare standards	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Per thoroughfare standards	n/a
Surface Parking	Not permitted in BTZ	Not permitted in BTZ	2 bays permitted between building and street	No restrictions	Not permitted in BTZ	2 bays permitted between building and street	Not permitted in BTZ	No restrictions
Structured Parking	30' min behind front façade	30' min behind front façade	30' min behind front façade	No restrictions	No restrictions	No restrictions	No restrictions	No restrictions



Kirkland Appraisals, LLC

Richard C. Kirkland, Jr., MAI
9408 Northfield Court
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603
Phone (919) 414-8142
rkirkland2@gmail.com
www.kirklandappraisals.com

May 17, 2021

Mr. Ashley Saulpaugh
Ram Realty Advisors
127 W. Worthington Avenue, Suite 290
Charlotte, NC 28203

Mr. Saulpaugh

This letter is a real property appraisal consulting assignment. The scope of this assignment is to address the likely impact of the proposed redevelopment plan for University Place, Chapel Hill, North Carolina on contiguous properties. My client is Ram Realty Advisors represented to me by Mr. Ashley Saulpaugh. The intended use is to provide information as part of the Modification of Special Use Permit application process as to whether the proposal is located, designed, and will be operated to maintain or enhance the value of contiguous properties. The effective date of this consultation is May 17, 2021.

The analysis and data used to form the conclusion is presented on the following pages attached to this summary letter.

Conclusion

The proposed use is consistent with the current existing use as well as the contiguous and nearby commercial, office, and multifamily uses. The only contiguous use is Brinkley Baptist Church. There is existing multi-family use and commercial across Willow Drive and existing single-family uses separated from the site by Fordham Boulevard. None are negatively impacted by the proposed redevelopment of the site.

This opinion is based on the typical factors that cause a negative impact on contiguous property values and assumes that the recommendations of the traffic engineering study to minimize traffic impacts will be followed.

I conclude that the proposed redevelopment of University Place is in harmony with that neighborhood and that the improvements will not have a negative impact on adjoining property values. Discussion regarding this conclusion is shown on the following pages. My curriculum vitae is also attached.

If you have any questions please call me any time.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Kirkland, Jr., MAI
State Certified General Appraiser



Proposed Use Description

The subject property is proposed to be redeveloped to allow for a total of 450,000 s.f. retail facility (420,000 s.f. retail facility existing). It will include up to an additional 150,000 s.f. office, 300 multifamily units, and a 150-room hotel. The additional space will involve some demolition of existing space to allow for more vertical development including a 5-story apartment building fronting on Willow Drive.



The contiguous use is a religious facility and nearby uses include apartments to the north, single family homes across Fordham Boulevard to the east, apartments to the south, and offices and bank branches to the west.

The contiguous and nearby uses are all well suited to proximity to a high density mixed use development with the possible exception of the single-family housing to the east. However, the homes to the east are separated from this development by a very busy, divided thoroughfare and unlikely to be negatively impacted by changes to this property.



Given that this redevelopment will provide superior services to the nearby apartments and superior synergy for the nearby offices and bank branches, the nature of the redevelopment is well suited to the area.

The areas of impact that I would typically consider are:

1. Hazardous Material
2. Odor
3. Noise
4. Traffic
5. Stigma
6. Appearance

The redevelopment has no known hazardous material, odor, or stigma concerns by the nature of the relatively consistent use.

Noise related to this property would be uncommon given that the property is already in a similar use, the apartment use is consistent with nearby uses to the north and south and the property will have to work within the Chapel Hill ordinances regarding noise impacts. I therefore conclude that there are no structural/design issues related to the noise in the operation of the property as proposed to be developed.

Traffic impacts have been analyzed in the traffic impact analysis conducted for the proposed project and the required off- and on-site traffic improvements should address the potential increase to traffic as a result of the project; however, this report will defer to traffic engineer studies.

The added height to the property is not such that it would impose any significant shading or other such negative impacts on contiguous or nearby uses. The modernization of this older property will likely be an enhancement in terms of appearance and therefore I see no concerns related to appearance.

I conclude that the proposed project will be in harmony with the area and that it would not have a negative impact on contiguous or nearby property values. It does have the potential to provide a positive impact on contiguous and nearby property values.



Kirkland Appraisals, LLC

Richard C. Kirkland, Jr., MAI
9408 Northfield Court
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603
Mobile (919) 414-8142
rkirkland2@gmail.com
www.kirklandappraisals.com

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Kirkland Appraisals, LLC , Raleigh, N.C. Present Commercial appraiser	2003 –
Hester & Company , Raleigh, N.C. Commercial appraiser	1996 – 2003

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

MAI (Member, Appraisal Institute) designation #11796	2001
NC State Certified General Appraiser # A4359	1999
VA State Certified General Appraiser # 4001017291	
SC State Certified General Appraiser # 6209	
FL State Certified General Appraiser # RZ3950	
GA State Certified General Appraiser # 321885	
MI State Certified General Appraiser # 1201076620	

EDUCATION

Bachelor of Arts in English , University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	1993
--	------

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Michigan Appraisal Law	2020
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2020
Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (Yellow Book)	2019
The Cost Approach	2019
Income Approach Case Studies for Commercial Appraisers	2018
Introduction to Expert Witness Testimony for Appraisers	2018
Appraising Small Apartment Properties	2018
Florida Appraisal Laws and Regulations	2018
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2018
Appraisal of REO and Foreclosure Properties	2017
Appraisal of Self Storage Facilities	2017
Land and Site Valuation	2017
NCDOT Appraisal Principles and Procedures	2017
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2016
Forecasting Revenue	2015
Wind Turbine Effect on Value	2015
Supervisor/Trainee Class	2015
Business Practices and Ethics	2014
Subdivision Valuation	2014
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2014
Introduction to Vineyard and Winery Valuation	2013
Appraising Rural Residential Properties	2012
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2012

Supervisors/Trainees	2011
Rates and Ratios: Making sense of GIMs, OARs, and DCFs	2011
Advanced Internet Search Strategies	2011
Analyzing Distressed Real Estate	2011
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2011
Business Practices and Ethics	2011
Appraisal Curriculum Overview (2 Days – General)	2009
Appraisal Review - General	2009
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2008
Subdivision Valuation: A Comprehensive Guide	2008
Office Building Valuation: A Contemporary Perspective	2008
Valuation of Detrimental Conditions in Real Estate	2007
The Appraisal of Small Subdivisions	2007
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2006
Evaluating Commercial Construction	2005
Conservation Easements	2005
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice Update	2004
Condemnation Appraising	2004
Land Valuation Adjustment Procedures	2004
Supporting Capitalization Rates	2004
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, C	2002
Wells and Septic Systems and Wastewater Irrigation Systems	2002
Appraisals 2002	2002
Analyzing Commercial Lease Clauses	2002
Conservation Easements	2000
Preparation for Litigation	2000
Appraisal of Nonconforming Uses	2000
Advanced Applications	2000
Highest and Best Use and Market Analysis	1999
Advanced Sales Comparison and Cost Approaches	1999
Advanced Income Capitalization	1998
Valuation of Detrimental Conditions in Real Estate	1999
Report Writing and Valuation Analysis	1999
Property Tax Values and Appeals	1997
Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, A & B	1997
Basic Income Capitalization	1996