

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2019 4:16 PM
To: scott@radwaydesign.com
Cc: Judy Johnson; Becky McDonnell; Allen Buansi; Amy Ryan; Donna Bell; Hongbin Gu; James Levenson; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Nancy Oates; Pam Hemminger; Rachel Schaevitz; Renuka Soll; Sue Hunter; 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: FW: Conditional Zoning LUMO Text Proposal - Nov 13 Public Hearing Comments
Attachments: RDA_CZ_Council.pdf; ATT00001.htm

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: Scott Radway [mailto:scott@radwaydesign.com]
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2019 1:46 PM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Conditional Zoning LUMO Text Proposal - Nov 13 Public Hearing Comments

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

Mayor and Council

Please accept the comments in the attached letter for what they are. Some thoughts and suggestions to consider as you move toward making it possible to accept, process and decide on CZ applications that contain multi-family developments as a use.

I do believe that the CZ process can lead to some better outcomes than the current PD-H / SUP process, but only if the actual base standards to be applied work within the framework of density, FAR, and major street location that are matched with the R-6 District. It has not been a district used but one or two times in the past 30 years and is antiquated in many respects. If we are going to have CZ work in R-6 we need more urban design and unintended consequences research and thought before adopting the process as proposed by staff.

I think the town can reach a very good outcome, but that the information you have before you to date is insufficient. I would not want to make a choice for or against the CZ/R-6 proposal without a much more thorough understanding of how all the pieces will or should fit together.

Please consider utilizing your new Urban Designer to do some additional design thinking and analysis.

Sincerely,

Scott Radway
Former Planning Commission and CDC Member and Chair

Radway Design LLC
2627 Meacham Road
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

919.880.5579 (Office & Cell)
scott@radwaydesign.com



RADWAY DESIGN LLC

2627 MEACHAM ROAD
CHAPEL HILL NC, 27516
(919) 880-5579

NOVEMBER 11, 2019

TO: Chapel Hill Mayor and Town Council

SUBJECT: Proposed Conditional Zoning Text Amendments

As you consider the proposed LUMO text changes I offer the following comments for your consideration. In particular they are about the possibility of using the Conditional Zoning process for considering multi-family uses and development proposals.

Comment 1 – I do believe the conditional zoning process can provide the “opportunity” to achieve better design and development of multi-family proposals. If the zoning standards for development are in themselves are good. This is the point of the following comments and thoughts.

Without a fuller understanding of how the proposed inclusion of the CZ process in the R-6 Multi-Family zoning district works with the antiquated and seldom used standards of the R-6 district to develop successful modern neighborhoods for future residents of all income levels and residential types the town is quite likely to do an incomplete job of evaluating potential outcomes of LUMO changes in a complete manner.

Additional Comments and Thoughts

Based upon the comments by the Planning Staff at a Public Information Meeting and their answers to additional questions, I think it is correct that the standards and regulations of LUMO §6.18 Planned developments and in particular §6.18.4 Planned Development-Housing (PD-H) do not / will not apply to multi-family developments in the R-6/CZ applications and approvals.

With that as my understanding, I think the relationships in items 1-3 below are correct.

1. A multi-family development in the "R-6/CZ" structure could have either 1) all market rate units at a maximum density of 15 dwelling units per acre or 2) market rate and affordable housing units at a density of 17.25 dwelling units per acre.
2. According to my calculations using the definition of multi-family buildings/developments of 8 or more units as multi-family (seven or more in the text of LUMO) the minimum lot size for a development with market rate units would be 23,232 GLA (.53 AC). For a development with affordable housing units the minimum lot size would be 20,202 GLA (.46 AC). In either case, the minimum lot size for a multi-family development via a CZ/R-6 process would be about one-half acre.
3. It also appears that §6.18.1(b) Relation to major transportation facilities would no longer apply. If so, an R-6/CZ application would not have the same locational and traffic impact criteria standards as a PD-H. It would seem that this would provide more opportunities for smaller multi-family housing opportunities as infill development in areas designated as medium or higher density in the Land Use Plan. Perhaps a good outcome.

In addition, on the next 2 pages I have added some of my own thoughts about how I see that some of our current standards will hinder the development of good residential infill development that the



R-6/CZ might produce. I have ideas on what type of changes are needed to some of our other standards from many years of dealing with the ordinance, but they are not included here.

4. Inclusionary Zoning Task Force [2006-2009] work and information - This Council Task Force work led to the creation of the IZ LUMO section and to the ideas of density and floor area bonuses that were adopted. Most of the design and floor area analysis done by the Task Force was done by me and 3 other task force members. It was our conclusion after looking at many design options for smaller parcels of land that the FAR of .303 (R-5 and R-6 Districts) and the impervious surface limitation of 50% for multi-family developments were dysfunctional standards for smaller lots - particularly those less than 2 acres. This in part was why many of us supported the reduction of the PD-H minimum lot size on collector and arterial streets to 2 acres, but not less than 2 acres several years ago.
5. Floor area per dwelling unit - Market rate unit developments. As we knew during the development of the IZ ordinance, by-right rental housing developments cannot require affordable housing. Via the rezoning process the town has leveraged affordable housing, sometimes with success - sometimes not. The R-6 Floor Area Ratio of .303 provides for a maximum average gross amount of SF per dwelling unit of 880 SF per dwelling unit. In buildings with common hallways, stairwells, etc. the average maximum amount of SF per dwelling unit is 700 SF. These SF limitations provide for bad housing options for flats/apartments and virtually eliminate the options for townhomes. I see this as short sighted as we look toward creating housing that will last for another 50+ years with household type & size changes over time.
6. Floor are per dwelling unit - Affordable Housing and Market Rate developments. The density and floor area bonus of the IZ ordinance § 3.10 Inclusionary zoning, increases the average maximum gross floor area per dwelling unit to about 1,300 SF - about 1,035 SF per unit in buildings with comment halls, stairs, lobby, etc. This is a positive outcome of providing the density and housing bonuses and permits the creation of townhomes, flats and single-family detached homes with adequate space for contemporary and future households.

Understanding unintended consequences of not doing further analysis.

I am concerned that in bringing forward the proposed change to permit the R-6/CZ multi-family option that we have not yet completed a vetting step that I think is important and that we have often missed in the past. THAT IS - A DESIGN ANALYSIS THAT REALLY LOOKS AT THE OUTCOME OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES FOR THE EXTREME ENDS OF THE POTENTIAL TYPES AND LOCATIONS OF THE POSSIBLE USES AND DENSITIES. IN THIS CASE THAT IS:

- the combination of our 50% impervious surface maximum with
- the parking requirements for multi-family units,
- the solid waste collection policies for multi-family development,
- the buffer requirements that supersede building setback standards,
- and other current standards that apply to multi-family development —
- when applied to the geometric and size constraints of small lots (1/2 - 1 acre)

The town now has a well-qualified urban designer to assist in examining a variety of potential sites, sizes and locations that might be able to use this new proposed development review and approval



process. I believe that a thorough vetting of the likely best-and-worst case outcomes of the proposed

changes be undertaken by this new staff person and that this process should permit that designer to consult with the designers in the community that know the ins/outs of the ordinance and their effect on design so that the designer's learning curve is expedited. If R-6/CZ is a match and will work for small and large properties, we should know that before adoption of the proposed change. If there are standards that need to be adjusted to provide for good infill design and good living outcomes for the next 50+ years we should learn that now - not after a couple failures.

Last Comment

I believe you should ask the staff to include such a detailed analysis and bring the results back to you at the next public hearing on this matter after reviewing the outcomes of this design analysis with the Planning Board for their recommendations as required by state laws.