

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 10:08 AM
To: John Doyle
Cc: Adam Searing; Allen Buansi; Amy Ryan; Andrew Creech; Camille Berry; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jeffrey Hoagland; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Robert Beasley; Tai Huynh; Vimala Rajendran; Zachary Boyce; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Rae Buckley; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: RE: Lullwater Concept Plan

Thank you for your correspondence with the Town of Chapel Hill. The Mayor and Town Council are interested in what you have to say. By way of this email, I am forwarding your message to the Mayor and each of the Council Members, as well as to the appropriate staff person who may be able to assist in providing additional information or otherwise addressing your concerns.

Again, thank you for your message.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Coffin



Jeanette Coffin
Office Assistant
[Town of Chapel Hill Manager's Office](#)
[405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.](#)
[Chapel Hill, NC 27514](#)
(o) 919-968-2743 | (f) 919-969-2063

From: John Doyle [mailto:doylejohn321@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 3:52 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Lullwater Concept Plan

External email: Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to reportspam@townofchapelhill.org

No one in the immediate area likes this one. It would destroy a noise buffer to a major highway for the properties close to it and set a precedent of which Chapel Hill would not want.

John Doyle
141 Schultz Street
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
doylejohn321@gmail.com

919-537-8904

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 11:11 AM
To: Dan.Levine@self-help.org
Cc: Sarah Vinas; Adam Searing; Allen Buansi; Amy Ryan; Andrew Creech; Camille Berry; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jeffrey Hoagland; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Robert Beasley; Tai Huynh; Vimala Rajendran; Zachary Boyce; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Rae Buckley; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: OCAHC Lullwater Letter
Attachments: OCAHC Lullwater Advocacy Letter.pdf
Categories: Agenda Packet Process

Thank you for your correspondence with the Town of Chapel Hill. The Mayor and Town Council are interested in what you have to say. By way of this email, I am forwarding your message to the Mayor and each of the Council Members, as well as to the appropriate staff person who may be able to assist in providing additional information or otherwise addressing your concerns.

Again, thank you for your message.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Coffin



Jeanette Coffin
Office Assistant
[Town of Chapel Hill Manager's Office](#)
[405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.](#)
[Chapel Hill, NC 27514](#)
(o) 919-968-2743 | (f) 919-969-2063

From: Dan Levine [mailto:Dan.Levine@self-help.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 8:46 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>; Advisory Boards <advisoryboards@townofchapelhill.org>; Manager <manager@townofchapelhill.org>
Cc: Jennifer Player <jplayer@orangehabitat.org>
Subject: OCAHC Lullwater Letter

External email: Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to reportspam@townofchapelhill.org

Dear Mayor Hemminger, Town Council, and Housing Advisory Board (Cc Manager Jones),

Please forward this email and the attached Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition (OCAHC) letter related to the housing development proposed at Lullwater to all Council members and members of the Housing Advisory Board.

As detailed in the attachment, OCAHC's support for Lullwater is contingent upon the developer's plan including a meaningful level of truly affordable rental housing, which is not currently the case. We look forward to seeing a revised proposal that incorporates income-restricted housing for non-student households earning less than 60% AMI.

On behalf of the OCAHC,

Dan Levine & Jennifer Player (2021 OCAHC Co-Chairs)

OCAHC

Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition

September 14, 2021

Dear Mayor Hemminger, Town Council, and Housing Advisory Board members (cc Town Manager Jones),

On behalf of the Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition, we are writing to request your support for a meaningful commitment of affordable housing designated for low-income residents in the proposed Lullwater at Chapel Hill residential development located on Adair Drive and Old University Station Road Extension, near Weaver Dairy Road and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

The OCAHC understands that the developer has submitted a concept plan application for a multifamily residential development including 270 apartments and 40 townhomes, with 40 of the apartments set aside for families earning up to 120% of the area median income (AMI). In Orange County, 120% of the area median income is \$103,680 for a family of four. Thus, if housing costs equaled 30% of an 120% AMI household's income, these costs would be \$2,592 per month, surely not affordable by any reasonable definition. Furthermore, the developer's affordable housing plan cites expensive infrastructure extensions and site constraints as barriers to including an affordable townhome component in the project.

While we applaud this proposed addition of new housing units along this walkable transit corridor, we want to see truly affordable rents for income-targeted units at Lullwater, even if it means fewer total subsidized units, since 80-120% AMI rents approximate and may even exceed market rents. Still, we commend the plan for its proposed contributions to the overall housing inventory in our community and hope a reasonable compromise can be reached.

Our support of the affordable housing plan proposed at Lullwater is contingent on the Town and developer executing an enforceable agreement that affordable units will not be rented to full-time student households and income-restricted units be set at rent levels that are truly affordable to tenants below 60% AMI, accounting for utility allowances as is typical for subsidized housing programs. Further, the Town should set an expectation that the owner will accept Housing Choice Vouchers (also known as "Section 8") and similar vouchers to increase access to these new rental units. Finally, there should be long-term covenants or other enforcement mechanisms for income restricted units that survive sale to new investors. Similar standards apply to federal housing programs such as the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit and HOME.

Thank you for your attention and for your service to the community,



Jennifer Player
OCAHC Co-Chair



Dan Levine
OCAHC Co-Chair

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2021 11:05 AM
To: John Quintero
Cc: Colleen Willger; Chelsea Laws; Adam Searing; Allen Buansi; Amy Ryan; Andrew Creech; Camille Berry; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jeffrey Hoagland; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Robert Beasley; Tai Huynh; Vimala Rajendran; Zachary Boyce; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Rae Buckley; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: RE: Lullwater Concept Plan Review: Sept. 22

Thank you for your correspondence with the Town of Chapel Hill. The Mayor and Town Council are interested in what you have to say. By way of this email, I am forwarding your message to the Mayor and each of the Council Members, as well as to the appropriate staff person who may be able to assist in providing additional information or otherwise addressing your concerns.

Again, thank you for your message.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Coffin



Jeanette Coffin
Office Assistant
[Town of Chapel Hill Manager's Office](#)
[405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.](#)
[Chapel Hill, NC 27514](#)
(o) 919-968-2743 | (f) 919-969-2063

From: John Quintero [mailto:john.quintero@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2021 9:51 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Lullwater Concept Plan Review: Sept. 22

External email: Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to reportspam@townofchapelhill.org

Mayor Hemminger + Council Members: As a resident of the northern part of Chapel Hill, I wanted to share a few observations regarding the concept plan for the Lullwater project that is scheduled to come before you on Sept. 22.

1) As the applicant notes, the underlying parcel is a very challenging one to develop owing to such factors as highway and utility easements, topography, wetlands, stream buffers, and road access. Additionally, the site is at a higher elevation than the already-developed properties to the south. If the site were to be developed, care

must be taken to ensure that the development, especially the extensive amount of impervious parking proposed, doesn't negatively impact the adjoining properties by increasing stormwater discharge and otherwise allowing problems caused by the development to "flow downhill" to the existing properties and neighborhoods.

2) Similarly, the reduction of the existing tree canopy will remove an important buffer to noise pollution from I-40, which, as you know, is slated for expansion. My understanding from past presentations to the council is that any new development along the property would not qualify for DOT investments in sound barriers and other noise reduction investments.

3) The proposed road access seems problematic. The concept plan appears to call for two points of access: one a connection to Old University Station Road, the other a connection to Adair Drive. Both of the roads are currently side streets with one lane in each direction. Additionally, Adair Drive lacks a direct connection to Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. or Weaver Dairy Road. Instead, it connects to Perkins Drive, which also is effectively a side street, (with a turn lane), albeit a very difficult one for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists to navigate due to its sharply curved nature and the sizable number of office and retail locations adjoining the road. Given the amount of parking proposed for Lullwater, these connections seem grossly inadequate and apt to create bottlenecks and more opportunities for accidents, especially those involving pedestrians.

4) The proposed income levels for the affordable housing component of the apartment complex seem much too high, with 80% of the units reserved for households with incomes between 80-120% of area median income. Similarly, the lack of any affordable housing commitment for the flat/townhouse component of the project suggests that it will not deliver "missing middle" units. There is nothing magical about the townhouse form as a source of affordable housing; the units must be priced affordably.

5) The entire plan seems to replicate the recent practice of taking proposed projects in isolation. The envisioned Lullwater project seems to be dropped down on a site without really considering its relation to the surrounding area, existing uses, and missing/needed amenities. Additionally, the inclusion of the townhouse component seems like a "throw-in" or afterthought designed to direct attention away from that fact.

Thanks as always for your service to the town.

John Q.

--

John Quintero
108 Weatherstone Drive, Unit D
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
United States of America

(919) 622-2392

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2021 11:08 AM
To: Del Snow
Cc: Colleen Willger; Sarah Vinas; Adam Searing; Allen Buansi; Amy Ryan; Andrew Creech; Camille Berry; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jeffrey Hoagland; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Robert Beasley; Tai Huynh; Vimala Rajendran; Zachary Boyce; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Rae Buckley; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: RE: Lullwater

Thank you for your correspondence with the Town of Chapel Hill. The Mayor and Town Council are interested in what you have to say. By way of this email, I am forwarding your message to the Mayor and each of the Council Members, as well as to the appropriate staff person who may be able to assist in providing additional information or otherwise addressing your concerns.

Again, thank you for your message.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Coffin



Jeanette Coffin
Office Assistant
[Town of Chapel Hill Manager's Office](#)
[405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.](#)
[Chapel Hill, NC 27514](#)
(o) 919-968-2743 | (f) 919-969-2063

From: Del Snow [mailto:djdsnow@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2021 5:17 PM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Lullwater

External email: Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to reportspam@townofchapelhill.org

[NCDOT Noise Procedures Manual Draft 08-18-11](#)
[Near Roadway Air Pollution and Health: Frequently Asked Questions \(EPA-420-F-14-014, August 2014\)](#)
[Living Near Highways and Air Pollution | American Lung Association](#)
[Proximity To Major Roadways | US Department of Transportation](#)

Dear Mayor and Council,

Do you believe people who need affordable and “missing middle” housing should be discriminated against? Should they be put in medical danger simply because they need affordable housing afford to live in Chapel Hill?

Your track record on representing residents who are not rich does not stand up to scrutiny. Council approved Weavers Grove knowing that the affordable units were abutting I-40. You are now faced with the same dilemma with Lullwater and I am hoping, possibly against hope, that precedent won't set the standard. You know that traffic noise **will increase by 50%** with the addition of two more lanes. My worries don't even begin to mention the effects of particulate matter which include particulates produced from the wearing down of brakes, tires and road surfaces as well as exhaust.

The need for affordable housing is critical. Chapel Hill's police officers, fire department personnel, teachers and more cannot afford to live where they work. I'm not telling you anything you don't already know. But placing affordable housing in an area that penalizes those who need affordable housing is not forward thinking and is immoral.

I've attached NC DOT noise manual , “EPA frequently asked questions,” the American Lung Association Living near Highways, and the US Department of Transportation Proximity to Major Roadways at the top of this letter to enable your due diligence.

Please note:

For example, one study estimated that 8% of childhood asthma cases in Los Angeles County, California, could be partly attributed to living close to a major road (Perez et al., 2012). Living near a major road also has been associated with decreased lung function in adults with asthma (Balmes et al., 2009). **Increasing the distance from the road to more than 150 meters, or approximately 500 feet, might decrease concentrations of some air pollutants by at least 50% (Karner et al., 2010).** Also, research has demonstrated that traffic noise at normal urban levels can also lead to stress and sleep disturbances, both of which can lead to a higher risk for type 2 diabetes (Sørensen et al, 2013). (US Dept of Transportation)

Thank you,

Del Snow

Amy Harvey

From: Julie McClintock <mcclintock.julie@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 22, 2021 2:16 PM
To: Pam Hemminger; Michael Parker; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Allen Buansi; Hongbin Gu; Amy Ryan; Tai Huynh
Cc: Amy Harvey
Subject: Comment Lullwater
Attachments: lullwater1.docx

External email: Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to reportspam@townofchapelhill.org

All

Here is a letter on the Lullwater concept plan before you tonight.

—Julie McClintock

September 22, 2021

Dear Mayor Hemminger and Chapel Hill Town Council Members,

The Lullwater concept plan is similar to previous proposals discussed by the Council at your Economic Sustainability meetings but contains even more intensity and less pervious surfaces than previous concepts. CHALT asks the Town Council to remember our prior concerns about the unsuitability of this land for development and the lack of appropriate affordable housing achieved. This article in the Local Reporter summarizes those concerns.

<https://thelocalreporter.press/north-chapel-hill-project-comes-full-circle/>

We urgently request that you discourage this applicant from going forward with this plan for northern Chapel Hill in this problematic location because:

- Residential density placed next to highway is unhealthy. Proximity to I – 40 causes high decibel noise and poor air quality (exposure to particulate matter fine);
- Wetlands and stormwater challenges remain on this site; inevitable exceptions made will increase off site flooding; one road crosses the RCD;
- OWASA main would need to be moved at great expense and presently there is no alternative plan about where it would be moved or who would pay;
- The Town's urban designer has recommended a pavilion at the very place where the nicest stand of trees would be cut down. Creating "active living design" next to a highway is impractical and unwise;
- No encouragement should be made to the applicant until the fate of the adjacent mobile home park is decided;
- There are better uses for this property such as storage units;

After a fair amount of committee discussion and input from residents over a 1 – 2 year period, **the Council committee decided not to adopt a plan for this area.**

One can only conclude this is not a project to be encouraged.

Thank you.

Julie McClintock, Gordon Whitaker

For CHALT