

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2022 11:18 AM
To: whitakergordon@gmail.com
Cc: Sarah Vinas; Colleen Willger; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Rae Buckley; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh
Subject: FW: Weaver Dairy Residential Development
Attachments: CWRA Concerns.docx

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: gordon whitaker <whitakergordon@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 11:10 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>; Adam Nicholson <anicholson2@townofchapelhill.org>; Jeanette Coffin <jcoffin@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Weaver Dairy Residential Development

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

Please find attached a statement of concerns from the Carol Woods Residents Association regarding the proposed development concept plan currently before the town.

We understand that the town council may review this concept plan at its February 23 meeting. We look forward to that and other opportunities to share our concerns about this proposal.

Thank you!

To: The Chapel Hill Mayor and Town Council

From: The Carol Woods Residents Association Council

Re: Carol Woods Residents' Concerns Regarding the Proposed "Weaver Dairy Residential" Development (P/O 9880564638)

Date: 1 February 2022

The Carol Woods Retirement Community campus and Coventry town homes are both directly east of the 23.6-acre parcel identified in the "Weaver Dairy Residential" concept plan. About 480 members of the Carol Woods Resident Association live on Carol Woods main campus. Another 20 live in the 14 Coventry town houses Carol Woods owns. At least six more of the 43 town houses in Coventry are occupied by owners enrolled in Carol Woods Early Acceptance Program who are also members of our association.

Based on our experiences living here, Carol Woods residents have expressed the following concerns about the proposed development next door:

Traffic. We are concerned that the proposed development would regularly add more than 400 cars to the traffic on Weaver Dairy Road. Moreover, all these vehicles would enter and exit the development through a single street. Traffic on Weaver Dairy is already heavy, especially before and after the school day at East Chapel Hill High less than a mile east of the proposed new street. Will a traffic signal be required so that traffic from the single street into the proposed development can safely enter Weaver Dairy Road?

We are further concerned that the concept plan places this single new street only ten feet from the Coventry property line, providing a very narrow buffer. This single access street will create considerable traffic noise for Coventry residents, especially those whose homes abut that line. A much more substantial buffer would be needed to mitigate this damage.

Crowded town houses. We note that the section of the property fronting on Weaver Dairy Road is only 225 feet wide. With the proposed ten-foot buffer on the Coventry side and a proposed 20-foot buffer on the church side, this leaves only 195 feet of width to accommodate the proposed:

- access street to the apartment building,

- two rows of town houses,
- an alley between the rows of town houses for access to their garages, and
- sidewalks and plantings on the non-garage side of each row of town houses.

Given the available space, these town houses will necessarily have small footprints and be tightly packed. There will also be little or no space left for trees in what is now a forested area. We are concerned that this intensive development immediately next to Coventry will create noise and light pollution for residents of the existing town homes.

Storm water management. We are pleased that this proposal recognizes the Resource Conservation District in the northeast portion of the parcel and commits to leave that area undisturbed. We take that to mean nothing will be constructed in the RCD. However, we are concerned that the proposed impervious surfaces (rooves and parking lots) directly above that area on the west will add substantially to the large amount of water already flowing through that RCD following heavy rains. Building the proposed underground storage for storm water would seem to require excavation into the banks of the RCD and therefore disturb the RCD. Furthermore, that proposed parking lot is atop a steep bank just north of Coventry town houses and apparently separated from Coventry by only a 10-foot buffer. An adequate storm water management plan for the apartment building and parking is required to avoid flooding the RCD and the Coventry town homes downstream.

We are also concerned about stormwater runoff from the intensely developed strip of land proposed along the single access street into the property from Weaver Dairy Road. Almost the entire strip is proposed to be covered with impervious surfaces: rooves, paved street, alley, and sidewalks. As the topographic map indicates, this entire strip drains south and east toward Coventry. The proposed access street is on the low side of this slope. Without careful management of runoff from this narrow strip, storm water will flood both the access street and the adjacent properties in Coventry.

High-tension lines. Duke Power high-tension lines are quite close to the proposed apartment building. The southeast side of that building is only a few feet from the Duke Power easement which passes diagonally across the northeastern corner of

the parcel. The proposed parking lot on that side of the building lies in that easement. Upper floor apartments on that side of the building will look out directly onto those high-tension lines. Similarly, at its west end the apartment building abuts another set of high-tension lines.

I-40 pollution. The proposed apartment building sits above I-40. The proposed apartments on the north side of the building are less than 200 feet from the right-of-way and would look down directly onto the highway. Carol Woods residents live even further from I-40, but we are well aware of the traffic noise we live with from the interstate. Noise levels will only increase after the highway is widened to six lanes. We are concerned that noise and air pollution from the round-the-clock traffic would create health hazards, particularly for residents of the apartment building located so close to I-40.

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Thursday, February 03, 2022 3:48 PM
To: John Quintero
Cc: Colleen Willger; Chelsea Laws; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; 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: Aspen Chapel Heights Proposal 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 Quintero <john.quintero@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 3, 2022 1:34 PM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Aspen Chapel Heights Proposal Plan

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 Aspen Chapel Hill Project working its way through the town review process.

1) While large in acreage, the site envisioned for the Aspen Chapel Hill project (and the adjoining Lullwater one) is a challenging one 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 (an estimated 451 spaces), doesn't negatively impact the adjoining properties by increasing stormwater discharge and allowing problems caused by the development to "flow downhill" to the existing properties and neighborhoods.

2) Similarly, the elimination 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 rezoning of the property seems unwise. The proposal calls for upzoning the property to allow for the construction of 286 apartments in four-story buildings squeezed between the interstate and several existing townhouse and condominium neighborhoods (Weatherstone, Coventry, Carol Woods, & Kensington Trace) While the townhouse component (51 units) of the project seems appropriate to the area, the multifamily component seems to be wildly out of scope with existing conditions.

4) The size of the development also poses significant road access problems. The concept plan appears to call for only one road in and out, with access to Weaver Dairy Road. That seems likely to add a significant amount of traffic to Weaver Dairy Road, which is increasingly more congested for more of the day (even before the pending detouring of traffic from Estes Drive) and increasingly dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Additionally, due to Chapel Hill Transit cuts, this section of town currently lacks transit service for much of the day, meaning that driving is the only real transit option.

4a) For a second point of road access, the applicant appears to hope that they will be able to tie into the Lullwater Development and extend an access road to the east. That assumes both projects will advance. Additionally, that would place a road directly adjacent to the property line of at least two existing townhome communities.

4b) Both the town designer and some CDC members have raised the possibility of adding a second road access on Weatherstone Drive. As a member of the board of the Weatherstone neighborhood, I will point out that this is a private street owned by our 52-unit condominium association. The road is not a thru-road and really only is wide enough to accommodate one car at a time. Such road access is not a feasible plan, nor do I think our association would cede our property so as to become an access road for apartments.

5) The fact that none of the 337 units, both apartments and townhouses, are intended for ownership is highly problematic. More rental units will not do much to promote opportunities for middle-income households to establish long-term roots in the community. Additionally, working backward from the applicant's affordable housing component suggests that the overwhelming majority of units will be rented to people at particularly high income levels.

6) Last year, the council considered and didn't act on a plan to upzone the entire larger parcel proactively due to all the problems with the site. Taken together with the Lullwater project to the west, this proposal effectively does that very thing while replicating the recent practice of taking proposed projects in isolation. The projects seem dropped down on a site without really considering its relation to the surrounding area, existing uses, and missing/needed amenities.

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: Friday, February 25, 2022 10:53 AM
To: 2gdh4u@gmail.com
Cc: Colleen Willger; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: Rejection of Aspen Heights Proposal
Attachments: Mayor and Council Brief March 9.docx; Highlighted I memo re property west.docx

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: David Hughes <2gdh4u@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2022 10:18 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Rejection of Aspen Heights Proposal

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

February 25, 2022

To: Chapel Hill Mayor and Town Council
From: G. David Hughes, resident since 1972, Carol Woods since 2008, retired professor, UNC Business School.
Subject: Rejection of Aspen Heights Proposal for Student Housing and removal from the March 9th agenda

After my attached analysis of this proposal and my plan for a six-minute presentation to the Council on March 9th, also attached, I learned that on February 23rd the Council rejected another high-rise student apartment building for MLK because it did not fit Chapel Hill's needs. For this reason and for the reasons noted in these attachments, I request that this proposal be rejected now and removed from the March 9th agenda. The proposal ignores the health and safety risks to students, neighbors, and the environment, which cannot be overcome in another proposal.

Prompt rejection would eliminate residents' need to prepare presentations for March 9th.

Thank you

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ASPEN HEIGHTS PARTNERS CHAPEL HILL PROPOSAL EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In this analysis of the proposal from Aspen Heights Partners you will learn that it will have unfavorable health impacts, impossible environmental drainage problems, that the tax revenue, the only benefit, may not offset the town services that the proposal will require. These facts alone are reason to stop any further review of this proposal.

But, after you see reviews from students and their parents who rented from Aspen in other college towns across the country, you will conclude that this company is not focused on family housing or the wellbeing of students, but on giving investors apartments that have a guaranteed income. You will see student reviews about hidden rules that result in exorbitant fines that must be paid in order for them to graduate. Since these apartments are five miles from the campus, they do not provide the student with the full college experience.

Aspen will take its profits back to Texas, leaving Chapel Hill with poor construction, environmental destruction, and possibly class-action suits resulting from exposure to highway air pollution and the effects of electro and magnetic forces from being too close to high-power lines.

In conclusion, the developer and its team members are either unaware of these reasons for rejecting their proposal or they are betting that they will get variances for all of these transgressions in return for generating property taxes. This deal ignores the health of voting neighbors and future students, and it ignores the environment. Furthermore, Chapel Hill voters are no longer accepting only the revenue side of the Town income statement. Town services have a cost, especially when they reach capacity. We want to see estimates of these costs. And there needs to be a plan for when adding apartments exceeds the capacities for providing Town services. For example, the T bus route would need to be expanded. The cost of expanding these capacities should be charged to the developers, not to present taxpayers. Large developments should include a fire station and a police station. Smaller developments should contribute to a fund to build them. In some towns this fund is called *contributions in aid of construction*.

All of this is called “fiscally responsible management”.

DETAILED ANALYSIS

IMPACT OF I-40

Highway Noise

“Sound is created when an object moves—the rustling of leaves as the wind blows, the air passing through our vocal cords, the almost invisible movement of stereo speakers. The movements cause the vibrations of the molecules in the air to move in waves like ripples on water. When the vibrations reach our ears, we hear them. **Noise is unwanted or irritating sound. It is emitted from many sources** including airplanes, factories, railroads, commercial businesses, and **highway vehicles. Steady-state highway traffic noise is predominantly a composite of noises from the vehicles’ engine exhaust, drive train, and tire-roadway interaction.**”¹(Bold added)

¹ North Carolina Department of Transportation Traffic Noise Manual, p. 11.

Federal and State Regulations

“The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 provides broad authority and responsibility for evaluating and mitigating adverse environmental effects including highway traffic noise.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is the agency responsible for administering the Federal-aid highway program in accordance with Federal statutes and regulations. The FHWA developed the noise regulations as required by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-605, 84 Stat. 1713). The regulation, 23 CFR 772 Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise, applies to highway construction projects where a state department of transportation has requested Federal funding for participation in the project. The regulation requires the highway agency to investigate traffic noise impacts in areas adjacent to federally aided highways for proposed construction of a highway on a new location or the reconstruction of an existing highway to either significantly change the horizontal or vertical alignment or increase the number of through-traffic lanes. If the highway agency identifies impacts, it must consider abatement. The highway agency must incorporate all feasible and reasonable noise abatement into the project design.”²

Trees and undergrowth for sound abatement.

“The trees and undergrowth should obstruct vision of the traffic...Although the widely-accepted criteria for sound attenuation is that an area of dense forestation must be 100-feet thick for it to reduce noise levels by ~5 decibels.”³

“Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC): Noise levels for various land uses that, if approached or exceeded, require consideration of noise abatement. For the purpose of calculating the additional square feet / cubic yards credits, the NAC values for Activity Categories A, B, C, D, and E are assumed to be 57 dB(A), 67 dB(A), 67 dB(A), 52 dB(A), and 72 dB(A), respectively.”⁴

NCDOT classified the Carol Woods activity level as B, dwelling. The proposal will probably be classified as B. This means that our noise level and theirs must exceed 67dB to qualify for Federal funding for noise abatement. But the proposal cannot qualify, according to the NHWA, because it is new construction that was built after I-40 was built.

My measurements along Harkness Circle on the north end averaged 52 db. Trucks raised it to 57 dB. I do not feel comfortable checking the noise level on the proposed property. But it will be higher because it is closer to I-40, it is the same elevation as I-40, and there is a curve at the beginning of the site, which will project a higher noise because of the doppler effect.

This projected line-of-site sound will combine with the sound as cars pass, for a double hit. (See Exhibit 1.) This noise level and the poor construction noted by students below, make this building unacceptable as a place to study and converse.

In this case all sound abatement must be paid for by the developer.

² *Ibid.*, various pages

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 71-72.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 6,90.

Exhibit 1. Double Noise Impact on Buildings



Exhibit 2. Row of trees not qualified for sound abatement.



“An optimal noise barrier process strives to develop a barrier that breaks the line-of-sight between receptors and the roadway noise sources.”⁵ The two rows of trees shown in Figure 2 do not qualify for noise abatement.

Thus, the developer must erect a 40- or 50-foot high sound absorbing wall to protect residents in the apartment buildings or sound abatement materials within the apartment walls. Student feedback noted below complained of noise between apartments. A wall must be a sound absorbing wall because sound bounces over and around the usual concrete wall.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

“It is required that exterior noise levels be reduced by at least 5 dB(A) for at least two (2) impacted receptors to meet the NCDOT feasibility criteria. It is required that exterior noise levels be reduced by at least 7 dB(A) for at least one (1) benefited receptor to meet the NCDOT reasonableness criteria.”⁶

It will be seen in Exhibit 2 that the road into the project is only 10 feet from Coventry. A sound-absorbing wall is needed here, but it will not stop air pollution into Coventry. The only solution is to move this entrance road farther away from Coventry. But there does not seem to be space to do this.

But, fighting highway noise is a distraction from the greater problem: the unhealthy effects of highway air pollution.

Highway Air Pollution

“In January 2010, the Health Effects Institute published a major review of the evidence put together by a panel of expert scientists. The panel looked at over 700 studies from around the world, examining the health effects of traffic pollution. They concluded that traffic pollution causes asthma attacks in children and may cause a wide range of other effects including the onset of childhood asthma, impaired lung function, premature death and death from cardiovascular diseases and cardiovascular morbidity. The area most affected, they concluded, was roughly the band within 0.2 to 0.3 miles (300 to 500 meters) of the highway. Children and teenagers are among the most vulnerable—though not the only ones at risk.”⁷ The proposed buildings are within this range.

There is no wall that can block highway air pollution. These known health effects could make the Town of Chapel Hill vulnerable for class action suits. **The only solution is to require the developer to fund an insurance policy to cover settlements. The premium for such a policy could be substantial. Failing to obtain such a policy is a clear message that Chapel Hill should not continue to consider this proposal.**

IMPACT OF HIGH-VOLTAGE LINES

Health Effects

The proposal shows a high-power line close to the apartments. (Exhibit 3) This is not only a poor view for residents on this side of the buildings, but there could also be negative health effects. One carefully designed study in England and Wales concluded that children from birth to 14 years could trace their leukemia to living within 600 meters of a high voltage power line. “If the association is causal, about 1% of childhood leukemia in England and Wales would be attributable to these lines.”⁸

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁷ <https://www.lung.org/clean-air/outdoors/who-is-at-risk/highways#:~:text=Growing%20evidence%20shows%20that%20many,or%20work%20near%20busy%20roads.&text=Studies%20have%20found%20increased%20risk,highway%20or%20an%20urban%20road.>

⁸ *BMJ* 2005; 330 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.330.7503.1290> (Published 02 June 2005) Cite this as: *BMJ* 2005;330:1290

While it is impossible to design a human study to prove causation from this exposure, an aggressive plaintiff lawyer could argue that the Chapel Hill Town Council had prior knowledge of this risk and would use this study to convince a jury that a large settlement is appropriate.

Interference with Electronic Communications

Exhibit 3 shows the proximity of high-power lines to the apartment building.

Exhibit 3. High-Power Lines



“Powerline noise can interfere with radio communications and broadcasting. Essentially, the powerlines or associated hardware improperly generate unwanted radio signals that override or compete with desired radio signals. Powerline noise can impact radio and television reception—including cable TV, head-end pick-up, and internet service. Disruption of radio communications, such as amateur radio, can also occur. Loss of critical communications, such as police, fire, military and other similar users of the radio spectrum can result in even more serious consequences.”⁹ **Imagine students who could not depend on their smart phones.**

STORM-WATER DRAINAGE

The proposal acknowledges a storm-water drainage problem and plans a tank. There is a nearby example of such a tank being rejected. When Carol Woods expanded Building 1 it proposed a tank. It was rejected. An expensive retention basin was required, which included digging out tree stumps, putting in layers of special sands, installing a network of drainage pipes, and a large output in case all of this was not enough. Trees were planted that absorb water. Fences were built to stop wayward cars and pedestrians, and an iron fence was built with close vertical bars so children’s heads could not fit between. And finally, this facility has surprise inspections and must be rebuilt every 20 years. A bond must be posted to assure it will be rebuilt. Finally, there is no place on this proposed site where such a drainage system can be built.

There are insufficient parking spaces in the proposal. If sufficient parking is added, the drainage problem will increase.

⁹ <https://www.arrl.org/power-line-noise#:~:text=Power-line%20noise%20can%20interfere,compete%20with%20desired%20radio%20signals.&text=Disruption%20of%20radio%20communications%2C%20such,amateur>

SAFETY AND FIRE PROTECTION

The proposal fails to meet minimum safety and fire protection requirements.

There is only one entrance off Weaver Dairy Road. It appears from Exhibit 1 that there is no room for a second one. It is unlikely that neighboring apartments would give access to the proposal, so the proposal cannot be approved on this assumption.

There is no road between the two rows of apartments along the sole entrance road, making **access of fire trucks difficult**. Perhaps there is no space in the land shown in Exhibit 1. A lack of space would explain why there is no parking for these apartments. Cars parked along the road would interfere with police and fire protection.

Space for turning fire trucks around the apartment buildings is questionable. Using the ladder truck under the high-power lines is also questioned. Cars parked on the north side of the apartment building would interfere with fire trucks.

It must be noted that the space between the apartment buildings and I-40 will diminish as more lanes are added. This will not happen immediately because the proposed two-lane addition will be in the medial strip, not outside the present lanes. (Yes, this will require replacing two bridges.) However, the easement for I-40 allows for two more lanes close to the property.

It also should be noted that the easement for the high-power lines has new restrictions, including that no fence or growing material can be higher than 15 feet above ground level. Duke power will cut them down. This is to avoid fires, a concern of power companies after the fires in California that were found to be caused by faulty electrical equipment.

Traffic lights cannot be added at the entrance to this property because they would back up traffic between these lights and those at Carol Woods, a short distance away. Accidents would occur.

Promoting a walking trail opens the north side of Carol Woods to the public, which would add security problems.

The property owner, developer, architect, and engineers chose to ignore the best interests of the residents, the future neighbors, the environment, and the costs of public services that these new residents will demand. They ignore the requirements of the NHTA, the power companies, the negative health effects on the proposed residents, the negative impact on neighbors, and the environment. They give no support for the unrealistic prices for units. They are throwing an incomplete proposal on the wall to see what sticks, hoping the Chapel Hill officials and residents do not discover these negative effects on the potential occupants, the neighbors, the environment, and the unreported costs for public services that this proposal will demand.

These costs are not insignificant. At some point the many apartments being built in Chapel Hill will exceed the capacity for water, sewers, police protection, fire protection for high-rise apartments, bus services, public schools, and traffic management. Some communities require developers to contribute to a fund called *contributions in aid of construction* to cover the future costs of expanding facilities. Chapel Hill just increases property taxes and issues bonds to expand these facilities. Failing to charge the developer for using these fixed assets increases the profit for the developer. It is no surprise that developers love Chapel Hill.

STUDENT AND PARENT FEEDBACK FROM EXISTING DEVELOPMENTS

This proposal may look good on paper. But do they deliver on these promises? Feedback has been devastating from students and parents who rented Aspen apartments other college towns.

Student Complaints

Jeff Smogolski, January 25, 2018

The building quality is very poor from the quality of construction, HVAC efficiency to regular inconveniences of things like light switch positioning. Summers on the second floor can be brutally hot and make AC out of scale. I assume they have accumulated more debt than expected due to housing unsavory folks the first two years and subsequent empty units later. The issue is they continue to spend on completely unnecessary giveaways, raffles, and events that are generally underwhelming to attend. Spend the money to fix or at least maintain exercise equipment, to have the pool open at regular intervals, or replace common area light bulbs.¹⁰

Jess M.

Alpharetta, GA

-Sketchy utility bills. Fluctuate in rates every month and not accurate to use of water/electricity. \$120/person one month... \$43/person next month.

-Dirty complex. They do not keep the common areas clean.

-The dog park smells TERRIBLE, and nobody cleans up after their animals. Animal feces in hallways as well.

-Price of rent is outrageous for it to be "student living". So many extra costs come along with rent.

Most of the doors used to enter the apartment complex are broken. Anyone can enter. They have not been fixed for a year. It is scary knowing that anyone can come inside.

-Elevators have not worked consistently since move in. One worked the first week, but it broke soon after. The complex is 5 floors... and some people cannot walk those stairs every day. They get TRASHED with dog poop and food when functioning.

-LEASING STAFF/ ADMIN IS RUDE. They do not listen to your problems. They never respond to emails. Or phone calls. Or voicemails.

I can confidently say that I did not get my money worthwhile living here. It is poorly managed, construction was rushed, and dirty. I am embarrassed to say I lived here. If you are considering living here, I strongly recommend you reconsider. Sorry for the bad review... but I feel that others should know the truth.¹¹

Tylicia S.

Let me tell y'all... please don't move here. Take your money elsewhere!! We literally have the noisiest upstairs neighbors, we've complained for 3 months, sent video proof through emails, called security, called the police TWICE and Aspen still opens their nasty mouths to say they can't do anything. SO CANCEL MY LEASE!!! We can't even get ONE peaceful night here. We pay almost \$1k a month to live here and we can't get any peace. The leasing office doesn't give a shit or damn about the tenants as long as they get the money. DO NOT MOVE HERE.¹²

10/23/2019

¹⁰ <https://www.rentable.co/columbia-mo/aspen-heights-columbia>

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

Wish I could give less than 1 star. This "business" makes all their money off of getting students trapped in a lease that they are dishonest about and omit crucial details when signing. Would never want anyone I know to have to go through what I have with them.¹³

Horrible apartment complex. Overpriced. The constant change of policies and the failure to enforce any such policy is terribly annoying. Aspen routinely finds ways to bill you more than what you agreed on and push additional fees on you by forcing you to use third party services.

Aspen is one of the worst student apartment buildings I have ever lived, sorry I left my last place for here thinking a 'new' luxury apartment building would be great. The place is new, but generally unclean. Furniture is cheap and uncomfortable. Try studying for hours in a chair made of cheap plastic (guess what your back hurts). Place is so cheaply constructed I feel like my apartment is connected with the neighbor.

I would not live here again. The managers do not follow up on issues brought to their attention. The advertised shuttle service that residents pay for is often down. One of the worst places I have lived in my life.¹⁴

Complaints to the Better Business Bureau¹⁵

08/21/2021

My complaint stems from a frankly fed up "overflow of issues." To begin, 1) for the last 6 months I have been left without access to my mailbox, borderline on tampering with the federal mail service. 2) the bus "provided" by Aspen Heights is put under immense stress and is highly pressured to make times at impossible reqs. 3) their pool is almost never accessible due to rainstorms 8 hours prior, or lack of security staff despite it ruling over their advertising. 4) after multiple requests to have my apartments', electrical meter fixed it has not been done, allowing their 3rd party utility company "Simplebills" to charge what they want, unchecked. 5) security here is a revenue generation scheme. After being told BY SECURITY that I "had to be in my house by 22:30 with my friends" they then showed up at 21:45 trying to fine us \$700 a head for being "past curfew". We were going in at 22: All this while remaining on my own easement. This business needs investigated, just ask other residents.

09/15/2020

I am a guarantor in my son's lease with Aspen Heights. They want to charge him a \$280 for move out expenses, \$200 for painting a bedroom and \$80 for cleaning the bedroom/bathroom. I do not see where 200 for painting was even needed, the bathroom and bedroom were spotless. I have tried to call at least 20 times at least, I have emailed and I have emailed the dispute e-mail and no one ever gets back to me. I tried again today to call someone and the numbers I have are no longer working. When I talked to someone a month ago they told me they had pictures and I asked them to email me they never did.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ <https://www.bbb.org/us/ok/stillwater/profile/apartments/aspen-heights-apartments-0995-90038431/complaints>

My son lived in Aspen Height from 08/20-07/2020 I received a bill for outstanding charges for barstool that was damaged when he moved in, bed cleaning, painting and full paint to bed. I called and they gave me an email to send dispute to. I did this on 8/17/2020 and never received a response. I have tried calling Stillwater office and a young lady answered and put me on hold and finally came back and had no idea what she was doing. I have been trying and it said call can't be completed and their website has been down for weeks. Tried calling corporate with no luck. During the time my son lived there the light kit fell off the ceiling fan barely missing him and his roommate

CONCLUSIONS

The developer and its team members are either unaware of these reasons for rejecting their proposal or they are betting that they will get variances for all of these transgression in return for generating property taxes. This deal ignores the neighbors and future student voters, and it ignores the environment. Furthermore, Chapel Hill voters are no longer accepting only the revenue side of the Town income statement. Town services have a cost, especially when they reach their capacity. We want to see estimates of these costs. And there needs to be a plan for when adding apartments exceeds the capacities for providing Town services. Expanding these capacities should be charged to the developers, not to present taxpayers. For example, large developments should include a fire station and a police station. Smaller developments should contribute to a fund to build them. In some towns this fund is called *contributions in aid of construction*. All of this is called “fiscally responsible management.”

G. David Hughes, PhD, MBA, BS

Chapel Hill resident since 1972

Carol Woods resident since 2008

Retired Distinguished Professor of Business, UNC Chapel Hill

Former chief engineer, USNR

February 18, 2022

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ASPEN HEIGHTS PARTNERS CHAPEL HILL PROPOSAL
FROM THE STUDENT, NEIGHBOR, AND ENVIRONMENT VIEWPOINTS
A BRIEF PRESENTATION TO THE MAYOR AND TOWN COUNCIL

MARCH 9, 2022

I am David Hughes, a resident of Chapel Hill since 1972, Carol Woods since 2008, and a retired professor from the UNC Business School, which explains the detailed attached eight-page analysis with three exhibits and 14 footnotes. Think of this short presentation as Cliff Notes.

My research showed that the benefactors of this proposal would include the landowner, the developer, investors in apartments, and the Town of Chapel Hill through property taxes, without deducting the costs of services. For the student occupants, all of the effects were negative –from I-40, from the high-voltage power lines, environmental damage, the loss of college life due to the distance from the campus, high rents relative to options, hidden fees, inadequate parking, poor construction, poor maintenance, and safety problems. Negative effects on this quiet neighborhood and the adjacent church would include noise, air pollution, and safety.

I-40 Noise

I measured the noise level at an adjacent property that is not as close to I-40 as the proposed property. It peaked above the level where the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) would fund a wall. The proposal is not eligible for this funding because it is new construction. Noise abatement in this case must be at the expense of this developer. Such costs are not mentioned in the proposal. The two rows of trees along I-40 do not meet the FHWA requirements.

Highway Air Pollution

Air pollution can impair lung functions and cause death from cardiovascular diseases if the person lived within 0.3 miles of the highway. Proposed buildings are within this range. Approving this proposal could leave Chapel Hill liable in class-action suits.

High-Voltage-Line Health Effects

A carefully designed study in England and Wales concluded that children from birth to 14 years old could trace their leukemia to living within 600 meters of a high voltage power line. This could be another risk of suits.

High-Voltage Lines Interfere with Electronic Communications

Powerline noise can interfere with radio, TV, cable TV, internet service, amateur radio, and critical communications, such as police, fire, and military. Imagine students who could not depend on their smart phones.

To avoid fires, the easement for the high-power lines has a new restriction: no fence or growing material can be higher than 15 feet above ground level. This restriction limits the location of sound absorbing walls.

Storm Water Drainage

The proposal of a tank for storm water collection will be rejected. A retention pond will be required with multiple layers of sands, pipes, fences, special trees, and a bond to assure that it will be rebuilt in 20 years. All of this is irrelevant because there is no room in the site for such a pond, so this environmental problem cannot be solved.

Safety and Fire Protection

There is only one entrance off Weaver Dairy Road. Two rows of buildings squeezed along this road without streets or parking spaces may boost tax revenue estimates, but they are inconvenient for residents and a nightmare for emergency vehicles.

There are no roads around the high-rise apartments for fire trucks and using the ladder truck under the high-power lines is questionable.

Risk of Over Building

There is no attempt to match future demand for apartments with the supply of high-rise apartments in Chapel Hill. One should not assume that the growth of UNC and RTP will continue at the same rate. Federal funding is a major source of income for UNC and that could change with politics. There are fads in academic programs. For example, the MBA degree was a *cash cow* for many universities. For a variety of reasons, it fell out of favor and second tier MBA programs were dropped or offered online, eliminating a need for housing.

We see that retail space is overbuilt in Chapel Hill. Spaces have remained empty since they were built. Could overbuilt apartments follow?

The proposal needs estimates of the demand and supply for apartments. The developer should supply these estimates to support its case for approval. These estimates should include the supply of apartment surrounding RTP.

Student and Parent Feedback from Aspen Renters

This proposal may look good on paper, but do they deliver on these promises? Feedback has been devastating from students and parents who rented Aspen apartments in other college towns.

Negative feedback includes cheap construction, inadequate air conditioning, faulty elevators, noise between apartments, insufficient parking, garbage and dog droppings in hallways and elevators, hidden fees, defective front door locks, out of order exercise equipment and pool, and the failure of local management to respond to complaints.

CONCLUSION

The defects in this proposal are insurmountable and cannot be corrected with a revised proposal. I conclude that no more Town resources and time should be spent considering revised proposals from Aspen Partners. It should receive a final rejection now. The net revenue benefit to the Town cannot justify the immeasurable costs to the students, the neighbors, the environment, and the risk of overbuilding.



Proposed road adjacent to Coventry, February 23,2022

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2022 9:40 AM
To: dbellin@davidbellin.com
Cc: Colleen Willger; Chelsea Laws; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: Public Comment RE: Weaver Dairy Residential, Project # 21-090
Attachments: Weaver Dairy Residential public comment 2022-03.pdf

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: dbellin <dbellin@davidbellin.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2022 8:00 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Public Comment RE: Weaver Dairy Residential, Project # 21-090

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

RE: Project Name: Weaver Dairy Residential Project # 21-090 Parcel Identifier: 9880564638

March 1, 2022 (Public Comment Period)

Dear Mayor, Council, and Planning Staff:

Thank you for your recent approval of residential and commercial density in various areas of town and your support for workforce housing.

Regarding this specific project, I submit this comment and specifically request your denial of a variance for increased density over that of current zoning.

My concerns are related to health and safety, traffic, biking and walking, stormwater.

The seniors of Carol Woods (100%) and Coventry (95%), in addition to CW employees, frequently walk and bike to Timberlyne and CH North shopping and restaurants.... How can we argue for their safety when doing so? Signalized crosswalk, a second entry point for the development, would be minimums, neither of which is in the proposal.

We should be concerned that storm water runoff be reduced, not increased. Water quality and volume should be monitored before, during and after, preferably by an independent researcher. We should require the developer to improve drainage along the creek that runs south between Coventry and Carol Woods. An independent third party should monitor runoff before, during, and after development.

Buffers to Coventry West and North should be increased and upgraded for noise reduction and safety. We don't want persons walking in and out of existing subdivisions to the new one. I would suggest 50 foot, impermeable (fenced and vegetative).

Sound reduction to existing developments. The developer should help negotiate with DoT for a sound wall as the interstate is expanded, or even be asked to pay for it.

On site parking is excessive. Facilities for bicycle parking or public electric charging are called for.

Thank you for taking these considerations into account during your deliberations.

Sincerely,

David Bellin

130 Essex Drive, Chapel Hill 27514

Licensed NC RE Broker

Licensed NC Contractor

Project Manager

David Bellin Project Management and Cohousing Assistance

DJ "Tofu Dave" Blue Collar Wisdom on Community Radio Listen-Donate-Support: wcomfm.org

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Friday, March 04, 2022 12:33 PM
To: plindsay2@aol.com
Cc: Colleen Willger; Dwight Bassett; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: Message from Website

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: info@townofchapelhill.org <info@townofchapelhill.org>
Sent: Friday, March 4, 2022 11:59 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Message from Website

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

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name: Contact Mayor and Council
Date & Time: 03/04/2022 11:58 AM
Response #: 548
Submitter ID: 14067
IP address: [207.243.178.122](#)

Time to complete: 2 min. , 18 sec.

Survey Details

Page 1

Submit the form below or email mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org.

1. Name

Paul Lindsay

2. Residency*

I am a resident of Chapel Hill

3. Message

I urge you to reject the proposal of Aspen Heights Partners for a development on Weaver Dairy Rd. There are many problems with the proposal, including serious drainage problems, negative effects on the neighborhood, and more.

4. If you would like us to contact you regarding this issue, please provide an email or telephone number.

plindsay2@aol.com

Note: Mail sent to or received from the Town of Chapel Hill is subject to publication under the provisions of the North Carolina public records law.

Thank you,
Town of Chapel Hill, NC

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Monday, March 07, 2022 9:27 AM
To: Stuart Rosenfeld
Cc: Colleen Willger; Dwight Bassett; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: RE: Question from website

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: Stuart Rosenfeld <stu.rosenfeld@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 6, 2022 7:42 PM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Question from website

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

TO: Mayor and Town of Chapel Hill

RE: Project Name: Weaver Dairy Residential Project # 21-090 Parcel Identifier: 9880564638

March 4, 2022: To the Mayor, Council, and Planning Staff:

Following are my comments on the request for a variance for increased density over that of current zoning related to the proposed corridor, which I believe should be denied.

The proximity of the planned development to existing housing and traffic poses many problems that threaten the safety and health of both the Coventry and Carol Woods community. The plan as presented will:

- result in substantial increase in anticipated traffic noise and pollution with no proposed barriers to mitigate the anticipated traffic noise and pollution given the scale of the proposed development;
- lack the capacity to handle storm water run-off given the differences in elevation and would dump water directly on the lower-elevation Carol Woods and Coventry owned housing;
- put a very high additional traffic burden on Weaver Dairy Road and on the neighborhood, already quite high during rush hour;
- diminish the green space that had come to define Chapel Hill and contribute to its high desirability (and contributing to climate change); and
- render many housing units unacceptable to primarily retired senior citizens who had expected to live out their retirement years in peace and quiet in a place that had long been known for its support of environmental preservation.

As a resident of both Coventry and Carol Woods who would be directly impacted by noise, loss of foliage, water runoff, and air pollution, and whose back porch would be rendered useless due to the very close proximity of the planned construction (just a fraction of half a football field), I hope that the Council will see fit to reject this proposal.

Stuart Rosenfeld, Resident of Chapel Hill
113 Essex Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Monday, March 07, 2022 9:29 AM
To: deluc50@gmail.com
Cc: Colleen Willger; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: Message from Website

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: info@townofchapelhill.org <info@townofchapelhill.org>
Sent: Friday, March 4, 2022 2:24 PM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Message from Website

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

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name: Contact Mayor and Council
Date & Time: 03/04/2022 2:24 PM
Response #: 549
Submitter ID: 14068
IP address: 2600:1702:ae0:8d60:2933:3efe:862f:2928

Survey Details

Page 1

Submit the form below or email mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org.

1. Name

Dayna Lucas

2. Residency*

I am a resident of Chapel Hill

3. Message

Good afternoon,

I am writing about the proposed development on Weaver Dairy Rd. that will be presented at the March 9 public meeting. I am a resident of Coventry which abuts this property. I am very supportive of additional affordable housing for workers in Chapel Hill and I understand that a high density is necessary to make the development profitable.

However, I have some concerns about the concept plan as presented. I would urge each of you to visit this property and walk through it. Please notice the grade and lay of the land as it descends from north and west to south and east where Coventry lies. Also notice the narrow creek that runs between the east side of Coventry and Carol Woods.

My concerns are several:

- 1) Regarding the proposed town houses and road to the west of Coventry, it is not clear that there is sufficient space to allow for water drainage and a privacy, noise and light buffer for the western units of Coventry.
- 2) Given the size and density of the plan, a second entrance/exit should be mandatory. Possibly this could be between Weatherstone and Kensington Trace or to the west of Kensington trace where there is a new commercial development.
- 3) Given the risk of flooding to the northern, and especially eastern, units of Coventry, the large parking lot should be modified to reduce the amount of impermeable surface.
- 4) Adequate buffers should also be provided to the southern portion of the parking area to limit noise and light nuisances and protect the privacy of the northern units of Coventry.
- 5) Trash and garbage pickup. It is not clear how these will be managed.

I understand how difficult your job is to improve and protect Chapel Hill, and I want to thank you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Dayna Lucas

4. If you would like us to contact you regarding this issue, please provide an email or telephone number.

deluc50@gmail.com

Note: Mail sent to or received from the Town of Chapel Hill is subject to publication under the provisions of the North Carolina public records law.

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Monday, March 07, 2022 3:18 PM
To: Del Snow
Cc: Colleen Willger; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: RE: Aspen Chapel Hill

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 <djdsnow@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 1:10 PM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Re: Aspen Chapel Hill

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

Dear Mayor Hemminger and Council Members,

I am not, and never have been, a "nimby." I actively supported the IFC's Community House (to the dismay of some of my neighbors). I've also suggested the use of the town owned WDR fire station property (visible from my window) as a site for small affordable homes for SALE to let buyers build equity.

I find it disappointing that some projects are approved without regard to the effects on existing Chapel Hill residents. I have concerns about the Aspen Chapel Hill and Lullwater projects. This project is mostly in the Booker Creek Watershed and you well know that the massive amount of impervious surface will have downstream effects. Additionally, The Northern Area Task Force, which I chaired, made the following recommendation regarding the use adjacent to I-40:

8. Limit residential development close to I-40 to protect health and wellbeing of residents. (page 10 of the NATF report) That was *before* I-40 was scheduled to be widened. That recommendation doesn't even mention the noise from a six lane I-40, or that the task force recommends the following implementation strategies: Development protocol that is coordinated and integrates infrastructure, physical improvements and Town services, including schools, with development. Focus area 2 (page 18) includes the following: Central - Residential development should not be permitted in the narrow strip of land adjacent to I-40. The strip should be used as green space and a buffer.

The rest of the report, which was adopted by the Town Council, has many excellent strategies as well:

[NATF Final-Report-08-30-07.pub \(townofchapelhill.org\)](#)

I also question how the loss of so many trees will affect both stormwater issues and your adopted climate plan [ShowDocument \(townofchapelhill.org\)](#).

Traffic is a huge concern. As you know Weaver Dairy Road has too many cars and with short traffic lights on WDR (yielding to MLK, Jr. Blvd) and the backup is considerable. Additionally, as Estes Drive has lane closures and becomes one way during the Estes Drive Connectivity Project, that traffic will most likely go to WDR as the closest east-west road.

It is important to look at the area holistically and not parcel by parcel. Lullwater, for example encompasses the Lakeview Mobile Home Park (LMHP). Lullwater's proposal, thus far, is to offer apartments at 80%-120% of AMI. Where will the LMHP people live???

I hope that you can all weigh my concerns in earnest and consider how it will affect a broad spectrum of Chapel Hill residents.

Thank you for all your work.
Del Snow

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 12:20 PM
Cc: Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: Message from Website

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: info@townofchapelhill.org <info@townofchapelhill.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 11:59 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Message from Website

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

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name: Contact Mayor and Council
Date & Time: 03/08/2022 11:59 AM
Response #: 550
Submitter ID: 14074
IP address: [207.243.178.122](#)
Time to complete: 2 min. , 57 sec.

Survey Details

Page 1

Submit the form below or email mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org.

1. Name

Jeffrey Lang

2. Residency*

(o) I am a resident of Chapel Hill

3. Message

The Council should reject the application for a permit to construct a housing development on Weaver Dairy Rd near the Carol Woods Retirement Community because there is too much risk to surface water management and intersecting power and other utilities on the property. The highest and best use of this property is as parkland.

4. If you would like us to contact you regarding this issue, please provide an email or telephone number.

Not answered

Note: Mail sent to or received from the Town of Chapel Hill is subject to publication under the provisions of the North Carolina public records law.

Thank you,
Town of Chapel Hill, NC

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2022 10:14 AM
To: harrymrosenberg@aol.com
Cc: Dwight Bassett; Colleen Willger; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; James Baker; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: Weaver Dairy Road Project N. 16

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: Sa <harrymrosenberg@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 11:07 AM
To: Amy Harvey <aharvey@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Weaver Dairy Road Project N. 16

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

Dear City Council of Chapel Hill, Mayor, and Concerned Citizens:

As a resident of the Coventry town home community, I would like to support the concerns expressed earlier by Gordon Whitaker, a resident of the nearby Carol Woods Continuing Care Residential Community.

My home would be directly affected by the proposed project inasmuch as my townhouse is adjacent to the proposed multi-story apartment house and parking lot. I am particularly concerned about water run-off from the large impervious surface created by the proposed apartment house, parking lot, and roadways. The prospect of flooding my immediate yard and other homes in the Coventry subdivision is alarming, and needs to be addressed by Chapel Hill. Other concerns include traffic, light pollution, and the security of our neighborhood which is heavily populated by senior citizens.

Thank you for taking into account my concerns.

Harry M. Rosenberg, Ph.D.
141 Essex Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
tel. 919-675-7144

Amy Harvey

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2022 10:15 AM
To: John Quintero
Cc: Dwight Bassett; Colleen Willger; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; James Baker; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: RE: Weaver Dairy Road Residential Project / Aspen CH 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 Quintero <john.quintero@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 9:35 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Weaver Dairy Road Residential Project / Aspen CH Concept Plan

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

Mayor Hemminger + Council Members: On Feb. 3,, I wrote to you expressing concerns about the Weaver Dairy Road Residential / Aspen Chapel Hill concept plan that is on your agenda to review this week. I also have reached out on numerous occasions over the past few years to express concerns about the potential development of this site and the larger "bow-tie" area it is part of.

Without reviewing the points I previously shared, I will say that this proposal remains a highly problematic one. The plan seems intent on cramming a primarily high-density, market-rate rental apartment complex (supplemented by some rental townhouses) surrounded by extensive amounts of impervious parking surface onto a site with limited

development potential due to differences in elevation to surrounding neighborhoods, a tangle of utility and highway easements, the presence of environmentally sensitive areas, and the lack of any real road access.

Attempting to build a project of this scope and scale on such a problematic site only will impose costs on adjoining neighborhoods for no clear benefit to the larger community. I ask you to take a critical view of this project and to use the concept review period to discourage the applicant from moving forward with this project.

I am happy to discuss this matter further or to show any of you the potential problems from the point of view of the adjoining neighborhoods if you wish to see them firsthand.

All the best, and thank you 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

From: Jeanette Coffin
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2022 10:35 AM
To: Dwight Bassett; Colleen Willger; Adam Searing; Amy Ryan; Camille Berry; Jeanne Brown; Jess Anderson; Karen Stegman; Michael Parker; Pam Hemminger; Paris Miller-Foushee; Tai Huynh; Amy Harvey; Ann Anderson; Carolyn Worsley; James Baker; Laura Selmer; Loryn Clark; Mary Jane Nirdlinger; Maurice Jones; Ran Northam; Ross Tompkins; Sabrina Oliver
Subject: FW: Message from Website



Jeanette Coffin
 Office Assistant
Manager's Office
Town of Chapel Hill
 405 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
 Chapel Hill, NC 27514-5705

Phone: (919) 968-2743
 Fax: (919) 969-2063



Spring Time

From: info@townofchapelhill.org <info@townofchapelhill.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 10:22 AM
To: Town Council <mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org>
Subject: Message from Website

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

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name: Contact Mayor and Council
Date & Time: 03/09/2022 10:22 AM
Response #: 551
Submitter ID: 14083
IP address: 2603:6080:5805:f000:8d35:976:a81:ca08
Time to complete: 11 min. , 46 sec.

Survey Details

Page 1

Submit the form below or email mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org.

1. Name

Marsha Long

2. Residency*

I am a resident of Chapel Hill

3. Message

This letter is in reference to weaver dairy residential project number 21-090

I am writing this to oppose the present plans of the increased density over the current zoning.

My main concern is the stormwater runoff. I live at 111 Essex Dr. at the bottom of the steep proposed development. The plan does not show adequate plans for the runoff and drainage. I live in Coventry and the development proposed is only about 25 feet from my porch.

There is a definite need for a buffer with a sound absorbing wall to help with the runoff, noise and safety. The plan shows only a few trees as shown on map for a barrier.

The plan shows almost all impervious surfaces with apartments crammed into a small area with sidewalks and only one road.

There should be two roads to help with safety and noise. The plan shows one road with two lanes and parallel parking on each side. This will hinder firetrucks, trash, recycling trucks etc.

In conclusion, this is an ill developed plan not caring about the land, adjacent property, safety of citizens and traffic impact on the town of Chapel Hill. I am asking you to decline the plan.

4. If you would like us to contact you regarding this issue, please provide an email or telephone number.

Not answered

Note: Mail sent to or received from the Town of Chapel Hill is subject to publication under the provisions of the North Carolina public records law.

Thank you,
Town of Chapel Hill, NC

This is an automated message generated by Granicus. Please do not reply directly to this email.