

## Amy Harvey

---

**From:** Jeanette Coffin  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2019 10:56 AM  
**To:** Tom Henkel  
**Cc:** Judy Johnson; Becky McDonnell; Allen Buansi; Amy Ryan; Donna Bell; Hongbin Gu; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Nancy Oates; Pam Hemminger; Rachel Schaevitz; Tai Huyn; Amy Harvey; Carolyn Worsley; Catherine Lazorko; Flo Miller; Laura Selmer; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Rae Buckley; Ralph Karpinos; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver  
**Subject:** RE: UNC Healthcare Eastowne Development Agreement

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.

If your email is related to a development application or a particular issue being addressed by the Council, your comments will be made part of the record. If applicable, we encourage you to attend any public meetings related to the items addressed in your email.

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:** Tom Henkel [mailto:thenkel1@nc.rr.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2019 10:06 AM  
**To:** Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>  
**Subject:** UNC Healthcare Eastowne Development Agreement

**External email:** Don't click links or attachments from unknown senders. To check or report forward to [reportspam@townofchapelhill.org](mailto:reportspam@townofchapelhill.org)

Madam Mayor and Council Members –

I attended the meeting last evening of the Joint Advisory Boards committee meeting, and once again we were asked to give input on alternatives #1 and #2 presented by UNC Healthcare. It is my opinion that until at least two major decisions are made, it is premature to examine these alternatives.

The ESAB and other advisory boards have recommended that the National Heritage land be preserved in its entirety, and there seems to be general agreement from the citizens and Council side that green building standards as contained within the AIA-2030 energy performance goals should be adopted. Therefore, UNC Healthcare must first decide if they can build the needed healthcare facilities on that site using the AIA-2030 design goals and also preserving the National Heritage land. If the answer is YES for both issues, then the discussion can continue regarding building heights, number of parking decks, amount of green space, etc.

Why is there a linkage between AIA-2030 design goals and building height? These new buildings are going to be designed for the AIA-2030 energy performance goals listed for 2020 to 2025, and they are certainly going to require the installation of rooftop solar energy systems in order to meet the required carbon reduction goals. This requirement will also limit the conditioned area of the buildings and, hence, the building heights. Since there will be parking decks constructed on the site, rooftop solar energy systems can be installed over the top decks, which will then provide additional energy to adjacent occupied buildings and allow for some increase in building heights.

But if the answer is NO on either of these two issues, then the discussion must follow different paths to achieve some compromises. It seems to me that with the Town about to embark on developing a significant Climate Action Plan, we must find a way to require or incentivize all new construction within the Town to meet the AIA-2030 standards as well as preserving the tree canopy as much as possible. This Development Agreement with UNC Healthcare will be a first test of the Council's resolve on Climate Action.

Regards,

Tom Henkel  
Member ESAB

November 20, 2019

Town Council  
Town of Chapel Hill  
405 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd.  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dear Council Members,

We write to address the UNC Eastowne project. As discussed below, we are highly concerned that affordable housing is becoming an afterthought in the development negotiation process and request your assistance in providing the Housing Advisory Board with an opportunity to make additional recommendations in December 2019, with the input of the Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition and other stakeholders, on the affordable housing plans under discussion.

At the Joint Advisory Board meeting yesterday evening, November 19, 2019, we were asked to comment on certain environmental issues relating to the project, including the potential drainage of a pond, re-establishment of a stream and a natural heritage site. No information was presented concerning an affordable housing project component or how any decisions on the environmental matters would affect it. When asked about this omission, some other members of the Joint Advisory Board stated that the council was considering a wide range of options, there was no consensus and, by implication, the Joint Advisory Board could not consider housing when formulating feedback on the environmental issues.

Until that time, neither we nor the Housing Advisory Board had received any information about the council's deliberations on affordable housing at Eastowne or, indeed, any response whatsoever to the HAB's recommendation for Eastowne – a mixed-use, onsite rental development serving people at 60% area median income or less. As the council is aware, land in Chapel Hill is scarce and expensive. Therefore, Eastowne presents a rare opportunity to serve this portion of your electorate.

If the council prefers other options, we are certain the Housing Advisory Board would welcome an opportunity to provide immediate feedback and recommendations, especially as it appears that the Council will not formally revisit any affordable housing issue until the conclusion of the Phase III “refinement” stage after virtually every other aspect of the project is addressed.

As you are aware, affordable housing remains a top priority for Chapel Hill residents, who overwhelmingly approved a \$10 million housing bond only one year ago. More than 50% of renters pay more than 30% of the their income towards housing, and those earning less pay an even greater percentage, making Chapel Hill (and its many resources)

unaffordable to many, including many who provide essential services to our community and UNC Health Care.

Furthermore, housing is an environmental issue. As some Joint Advisory Board members noted, denser development decreases reliance on cars and related carbon emissions, and may contain sprawl into more sensitive environmental areas.

In light of these facts,

- we have requested that Town staff present a summary of the affordable housing options under discussion at the HAB's next meeting. Also,
- we intend to seek the input of the Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition and other stakeholders to help the HAB formulate feedback.

We thank you in advance for informing staff of the options under discussion and other relevant facts that may assist us provide you with constructive feedback.

We also thank you for your hard work and commitment to representing all the residents of the Town of Chapel Hill.

Best regards,

Jared Brown-Rabinowitz  
Member, Housing Advisory Board

Louie Rivers, III  
Member, Planning Commission