

## **University Place Advisory Board Recommendations**

### **Housing Advisory Board**

**Recommendation:** Approval

### **Transportation and Connectivity Board**

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

#### **Conditions:**

Developer coordinate with Chapel Hill Transit to explore additional bus stop(s) within development.

- **Applicant Response:** Have met with Brian Litchfield and Nicholas Pittman with transit dept. to discuss. Their recommendation was to retain existing single stop in the approximate location that it currently exists. The planned BRT would be an opportunity for an additional transit stop in the future.

Developer meets with community bicycle advocacy groups to determine ideal bicycle parking locations.

- **Applicant Response:** We agree with this condition.

Developer install additional traffic calming treatments on the interior roadway network.

- **Applicant Response:** We agree with this condition.

Developer coordinate with Town Staff to consider pedestrian, bicycle, and non-motorized routes within the development to prioritize safety, directness, and experience for all ages and abilities.

- **Applicant Response:** We agree with this condition.

### **Environmental Stewardship Advisory Board**

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

#### **Conditions:**

Present more detail about energy consumption, types of energy used, rainwater and stormwater.

- **Applicant Response:** An Energy Management Plan (EMP) will be submitted as part of the Zoning Compliance Permit (ZCP) process. Further, additional details regarding stormwater were presented to the Stormwater Management Utility Advisory Board on 4/21/21.

Meet with the Stormwater Management Utility Advisory Board.

- **Applicant Response:** Presented to board on 4/21/21 and received recommendation of approval with conditions (see below for conditions).

Utilize solar energy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

- Applicant Response: We are exploring solar for the multifamily portion of Phase 1 and will also consider for any future phase of office.

Due to heat and environmental health concerns, plant only natural vegetation and if artificial turf is used, avoid crumb rubber base.

- Applicant Response: We can agree not to use crumb rubber base in any limited use of artificial turf at the property.

Support the increase in tree canopy [*that the developer has proposed*] and encourage a higher percentage than the 20%, which is below the 30% standard.

- Applicant Response: Due to the many constraints as a result of having 30+ existing retail tenants with various lease rights that include protected parking fields, view corridors and maintaining specific number of parking spaces, only ~45% of the site would be available to provide the majority of the tree canopy increase. The proposed 20% canopy coverage would be equal to an additional ~250 trees added to the site.

Upon termination of [*the existing retail*] leases, explore opportunities for additional green spaces.

- Applicant Response: We can agree to this in theory, although we would need to understand how this language would be structured since there are many tenants that have overlapping rights, so one tenant vacating would, in some cases, not necessarily unencumber a certain parking lot if other tenants also have rights to that same parking lot.

Support the decrease in impervious surface [*that the developer has proposed*] and encourage a lower percentage than the proposed 75%, which is above the 70% standard.

- Applicant Response: Due to the same site constraints as the tree canopy constrains above, the site is limited to only ~45% of area to provide the majority of the requirements, which creates a true hardship. The 75% proposed would still be equal to a reduction of ~55,000 square feet of impervious area, or approximately 1.2 acres.

Place reflective surfaces on roofs before installing solar.

- Applicant Response: As a part of any potential solar application, we would agree that roofs would include reflective surfaces.

Install rooftop rainwater capture for irrigation and non-potable water use and to reduce stormwater impacts.

- Applicant Response: While this has been given consideration, after analyzing in comparison to other potential environmental improvements to the project, this appears much less cost effective relative to the net benefits and our intent is to focus on addressing stormwater using other methods.

## Planning Commission

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

### Conditions:

Decrease the allowed impervious surface area to meet current ordinance standard of 70% maximum impervious surface ratio.

- Applicant Response: Due to the same site constraints as noted above (ESAB responses), the site is limited to only ~45% of area to provide the majority of the requirements, which creates a true hardship. The 75% proposed would still be equal to a reduction of ~55,000 square feet of impervious area, or approximately 1.2 acres.

Increase the amount of required tree canopy coverage to meet the current required ordinance standard of 30% minimum tree canopy coverage.

- Applicant Response: Due to the many constraints as a result of having 30+ existing retail tenants with various lease rights that include protected parking fields, view corridors and maintaining specific number of parking spaces, only ~45% of the site would be available to provide the majority of the tree canopy increase. The proposed 20% canopy coverage would be equal to an additional ~250 trees added to the site.

Further reduce parking totals and reduce required minimum parking on-site.

- Applicant Response: This condition aligns with our proposed parking conditions. As part of the application and proposed conditions, a request for up to 30% reduction to parking is being requested for shared uses.

Provide unbundled parking options, granting tenants the option of paying for parking spaces or not.

- Applicant Response: We would consider this approach in the future, although it would not be applicable to the commercial uses.

Engage with the Chapel Hill Farmers Market to provide permanent and shared-use infrastructure that suits their long-term needs.

- Applicant Response: We have been in regular communications with the CHFM throughout this process and continue to try and work on a long-term solution. It is our intent to keep the market on-site long-term.

New constructed stand-alone buildings shall be more than one story in height.

- Applicant Response: We are not in agreement with this condition and feel that this comment is a reaction to certain conditions in the Blue Hill District, which contains dozens of separate owners with only their own interests in mind which has created less than ideal conditions between some adjoining properties. With University Place having the benefit of one owner and a unified vision for the property, buildings of varying heights will all contribute to creating a sense of place.

Reduce the number of proposed signs and sign size along Fordham Boulevard.

- Applicant Response: We would request Council's consideration for the Gateway sign proposed on Fordham Blvd given the size of the property (+350,000 SF retail in Phase 1), the number of retail tenants (~35 today, likely 60-75 as a result of Phase 1 redevelopment), the sign's setback from Fordham Blvd. (~50'), the amount of overall frontage on the three streets (over 5,000 linear feet), and the potential benefit it provides tenants that wouldn't otherwise have visibility from the public ROWs, which in today's difficult retail environment is more important than ever.

### Community Design Commission

**Recommendation:** Approval

### Stormwater Management Utility and Advisory Board

**Recommendation:**

At a minimum, *[the project]* will meet all three of the following general standards:

- Reduced impervious surface, or at least no net increase in impervious surface;
  - Reduced footprint in the floodplain or at least no net increase; and
  - Increased stormwater treatment (water quality)
- Applicant Response: We agree with these conditions.

Staff recommendations:

The Board does not support the request for modification to the regulations for the impervious area ratio (75% proposed by the applicant). The Board supports the reduction of the impervious area ratio to 70% for the 17.5 acre portion of the property that is subject to the SUP modification application. This would still require approval of a modification to the regulations as the overall impervious area ratio would be approximately 72%.

- Applicant Response: Due to the same site constraints as noted above (ESAB & Planning responses), the site is limited to only ~45% of area to provide the majority of the requirements, which creates a true hardship. The 75% proposed would still be equal to a reduction of ~55,000 square feet of impervious area, or approximately 1.2 acres. Also, just to note two clarifications from the language above - the entire property is subject to the SUP Modification request, and the 17.5 acres (or 45%) that's not encumbered by lease restrictions would be equal to a blended impervious of 72.75% (versus 72% noted) based on the Board's proposed condition.

If the 70% impervious area ratio cannot be met for this portion of the site, then the use of green roofs or rainwater harvesting for reuse should be included to account for the difference.

- Applicant Response: While we appreciate the alternative means to achieve this condition, we are still requesting the 75% overall impervious given the proposed reduction of ~55,000 SF or 1.2 acres of impervious area from the existing conditions.

Future phases should incorporate additional measures to further meet the 70% impervious area ratio requirements.

- Applicant Response: Our request for 75% impervious area takes into consideration the future Phase 2 of the redevelopment of University Place.

There should be no loss of effective flood storage on the site, which is in addition to meeting the no-rise in the Base Flood Elevation requirement.

- Applicant Response: We agree with this condition.

The Board supports the use of pervious pavement and the approximately 30,000 SF of additional impervious area that is proposed to be treated in the enlarged and improved bioretention basins.

- Applicant Response: As we proposed to the Board, we would agree to add at least 30,000 SF of additional drainage area of stormwater to be treated using rain gardens or alternative stormwater measures.