

**Planning Commission Complete Community Matrix for 860 Weaver Dairy Road**  
*August 2025*

On August 19, 2025, the Planning Commission reviewed this project and agreed to forward the following analysis and recommendations to the Town Council. The Commission chose not to take a formal vote on approval or denial, citing insufficient information.

	Complete Community Criteria	Facts	Analysis	Recommendations
1	Land use efficiency (measured as housing density per acre)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Proposed 525-575 multifamily rentals (5-story) plus 105-135 for-sale townhomes (3-4 story) on 45 acre parcel. This translates to 14-16 units/acre.</li><li>The site is oddly shaped with multiple RCDs. Project will disturb about 30 of the 45 acres, translating to 21-24 units/disturbed acre.</li></ul>	Appears reasonably dense given unusual site constraints	N/A
2	Mix of housing unit sizes/configurations that address affordability goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Multifamily component includes studio to 3br units</li><li>Townhomes to include 3 to 4 bedroom units (1,200-2,200 sq. ft.)</li><li>10% affordable rentals at 80% AMI (for 30 years), 15% affordable townhomes split evenly between 65% and 80% AMI (for 99 years).</li></ul>	The mix reasonably addresses the affordability needs of the Town	N/A
3	Walkability and bikeability to daily needs, such as housing, jobs, schools, recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Greenway proposed along frontage, connecting Carol Woods to Chapel Hill North shopping center</li><li>Easily walkable to Chapel Hill North, Timberlyne, East Chapel Hill High School, Cedar Falls Park</li></ul>	The site is within walking distance of multiple daily needs	N/A
4	Mixed use (commercial)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Central area (7 acres) reserved for future commercial development</li><li>Developer also mentioned possibility that multifamily buildings could have ground-level retail</li></ul>	The parcel is tucked back from Weaver Dairy Road, making it a suboptimal location for retail uses. The developer proposes a wait-and-see approach, where future commercial uses of the central flex space will be evaluated as greenway usage patterns and potential redevelopment of surrounding parcels unfolds. PC members agreed that it isn't yet clear what kind of commercial uses, if any, could work on this parcel and therefore deemed this approach reasonable.	N/A

	Complete Community Criteria	Facts	Analysis	Recommendations
5	Access to transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within 10 min. walk of NS bus and 5 min. walk of T bus</li> <li>• Proposed ordinance requires developer to improve existing bus stop</li> </ul>	The project has good access to bus transit.	N/A
6	Parking aligned with Planning Commission recommendations (from 6/21/23 petition to Council)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 950-1100 multifamily parking spaces shown in District Specific Plan, which translates to 1.8-1.9 spaces per unit</li> <li>• 30-40 surface parking spaces (small lots, street side) for townhomes, plus driveways and garages</li> </ul>	Multifamily parking ratio of 1.8-1.9 is well above LUMO minimums. For reference, the LUMO minimums for 1br, 2br, 3br, and 4br apartments are 1, 1.4, 1.75, and 2 spaces, respectively. Excessive parking drives up housing cost and undercuts the Town's multimodal transportation strategy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiate for less parking for the multifamily units.</li> <li>• Negotiate for unbundled parking for the multifamily units. Mr. Brown indicated that he is amenable to this.</li> <li>• Incorporate the result of these negotiations in Ordinance A.</li> </ul>
7	Quality design, place-making, and prioritization of the pedestrian realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed greenway runs separately from the road for much of its length and is generally uninterrupted by driveways or road crossings.</li> <li>• Multiple jogs and median refuge islands in the proposed new road are designed for traffic calming and pedestrian safety.</li> <li>• Per Brian Peterson, the green space south of the multi-family buildings "has the potential to become a gathering space." The developer proposes to determine specific uses for the green space post-construction.</li> <li>• Townhome cluster also includes central green spaces (roughly as large as Southern Village green)</li> <li>• Shade plantings along the greenway are proposed except for areas where the power easement precludes it.</li> <li>• Building elevations and conceptual renderings have not been provided at this stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed greenway is well conceived and represents a key community benefit.</li> <li>• Other aspects of the site design – e.g., the green spaces, building configurations – seem promising from a place-making perspective. That said, the current plans are high-level; much depends on execution details.</li> </ul>	N/A
8	Respectful of surrounding neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Townhouses proposed to border Weatherstone Dr., Coventry, and Kensington Trace neighborhoods. Lakeview mobile home community separated from proposed multi-family structures by recreation/open space on 136' power easement, as well as the new road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would put townhouses next to existing developments containing townhouses. Broadly speaking, this is a compatible use that does not necessitate elaborate transitioning measures beyond the standard landscape buffer requirements provided in the LUMO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research and respond to traffic concerns raised by neighbors.</li> <li>• Consider tree screening concerns raised by neighbors, including any specific relief sought.</li> </ul>

	Complete Community Criteria	Facts	Analysis	Recommendations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many neighboring residents, particularly from Coventry, attended the PC's meeting and voiced concerns about neighborhood impacts, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient tree preservation and planting along property boundary</li> <li>Siting of new road directly next to Coventry instead of on the opposite (western) side of the "leg"</li> <li>Traffic impacts, with one intersection showing as LOS "F"</li> <li>Potential construction nuisances</li> <li>Highway noise impacts to neighboring properties of the proposed incursion(s) into the standard highway buffer zone</li> <li>Stormwater impacts (discussed in separate row below)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some existing units may face unusually harsh effects of new development due to the adjacent power easement (on which landscape plantings are prohibited). In this case, it would be useful for neighbors to propose a specific solution for other stakeholders to consider.</li> <li>Regarding the suggestion to move the road away from Coventry, Mr. Brown observed that this would require the proposed greenway to intersect with the road, which would increase potential for vehicle/bike/pedestrian conflicts.</li> <li>The PC did not specifically discuss traffic impacts, highway noise, or potential construction nuisance issues. (Note that the Code of Ordinances currently regulates hours of construction and certain related matters. Construction impacts are not usually negotiated at the initial approval stage.)</li> <li>Overall, the PC felt that it lacked sufficient information to fully adjudicate concerns about impacts on neighboring properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider road location concerns raised by Coventry residents.</li> <li>Consider highway noise concerns raised by Coventry residents.</li> </ul>
9	Maintain natural landscapes (tree canopy, green space, topography), including protected natural areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several streams occur in the middle of the property.</li> <li>RCD incursions needed for road and greenway</li> <li>Significant portions of site were graded many years ago</li> <li>17% of the parcel will be newly impervious</li> <li>According to the natural features viewer, this site is of potential "moderate influence" of natural features. The hydrology sub-model reflects the presence of perennial and intermittent streams running through the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally the proposed development seems to stay out of protected natural areas, except for unavoidable road and greenway crossings.</li> </ul>	N/A
10	Responsive to stormwater concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water from much of the property drains toward I-40</li> <li>Project includes a combination of underground retention/detention basins and ponds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town recently amended its stormwater regulations to incorporate the 100-year flood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the potentially sensitive hydrological impact of this property and its impact on downstream</li> </ul>

	Complete Community Criteria	Facts	Analysis	Recommendations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● 17% of the land is new impervious</li><li>● Many neighboring residents raised stormwater concerns, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ General concerns about stormwater impacts</li><li>○ Objections to proposed variances related to steep slope disturbance</li><li>○ Concerns about the adequacy of stormwater analysis and the mitigation design</li></ul></li><li>● It was noted both by public commenters and by PC members that this parcel sits near the top of the Town’s watershed, with the potential to send considerable quantities of stormwater southward.</li></ul>	<p>standard, which is what the developer proposes to meet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The 100-year standard might be obsolete already.</li><li>● Several public speakers and PC members noted that removal of most of this forest could have outsized impact on downstream flooding via Cedar Forks Stream, Eastwood Lake, and Booker Creek. Since the Town’s stormwater staff have not yet evaluated this project, it is impossible to assess the potential impacts.</li><li>● PC members expressed different views about how to incorporate stormwater concerns into the decision-making process for this particular project. One member expressed concern about the feasibility of project-by-project stormwater negotiation at the PC level. Another expressed interest in considering project-specific mitigation measures such as: going beyond the 100-year standard; reducing the greenway width from 14ft to 10ft (thereby reducing impervious surface while perhaps also providing additional space for shade tree planting); keeping some of the recreation areas forested instead of cut and regraded; reducing surface parking; eliminating driveway pads for individual townhouses; and minimizing steep slope disturbance. Another PC member expressed interest in having stormwater staff participate in such discussions.</li></ul>	<p>flooding, Town stormwater staff should conduct an early review and provide stormwater guidance to the Council and developers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Town staff should respond to community concerns about stormwater impact, in consultation with their stormwater experts.</li></ul>
11	Address sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● All townhome garages EV-ready</li><li>● At least 5% of multifamily parking spaces will have EV chargers</li><li>● All-electric buildings</li></ul>	The PC did not specifically discuss this topic beyond reviewing the facts mentioned.	N/A