

# TRANSPORTATION AND CONNECTIVITY ADVISORY BOARD

## RECOMMENDATION FOR CONDITIONAL ZONING DISTRICT FOR THE BARBEE CHAPEL APARTMENTS

December 13, 2022

**Recommendation to Council:** Approval  Approval with Conditions/Considerations   
Denial  Motion was Defeated

**Motion:** Heather Brutz made a motion, seconded by Stephen Bevington, to recommend that the Council approve the conditional zoning district application for the Barbee Chapel Apartments with the conditions listed below:

**Vote:** 7-1

**Aye:** Heather Brutz, Nikki Abija, Stephen Bevington, Mary Breedon, Brian Hageman, Katie Huge, Denise Matthews, and Noah Upchurch

**Abstain:** Noah Upchurch

### Conditions:

- That the developer work with the Town to connect the proposed multi-use path to NC 54, as the Board feels it is a necessity to support walking, biking, and rolling.
- That the developer work with the Town to provide a crossing to Finley Forest Drive
- That outdoor bicycle parking be dispersed throughout the development
- The developer provide a minimum of 25% of parking as EV-Ready

## HOUSING ADVISORY BOARD

*The charge of the Housing Advisory Board is to assist the Chapel Hill Town Council in promoting and developing a full spectrum of housing opportunities that meet the needs of the Chapel Hill community.*

### RECOMMENDATION BARBEE CHAPEL APARTMENTS 5101 BARBEE CHAPEL ROAD

**Recommendation:** Approval  Approval with Conditions  Denial

**Motion:** A motion was made by Vice-Chair Morande, seconded by Dowling, that the Barbee Chapel Apartments Conditional Zoning Application be recommended for approval by the Town Council with the following conditions:

- if only 10% of units are designated as affordable, a higher percentage of units should be affordable to households earning less than 60% of the area median income (AMI).

- if 15% of units are designated as affordable, half of the units should be affordable to households earning 65% or less of AMI and half of the units should be affordable to households earning 80% or less of AMI.

**Vote:** 6-0

Ayes: Sue Hunter (Chair), Robert Dowling, Anne Hoole, Rex Mercer,  
Dustin Mills, Brandon Morande, Anthony Williams

Nays:

**Additional Comments:**

Prepared by: Emily Holt, Staff

## ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP ADVISORY BOARD

*The charge of the environmental stewardship advisory board will be to assist the Chapel Hill Town Council in strengthening environmentally responsible practices that protect, promote and nurture our community and the natural world through advice and program support.*

### RECOMMENDATION FOR A CONDITIONAL ZONING DISTRICT FOR BARBEE CHAPEL APARTMENTS

December 13, 2022

**Recommendation to Council:** Approval  Approval with Conditions/Considerations   
Denial  Motion was Defeated

**Motion:** Lucy Vanderkamp moved and Judy Gaitens-Arneson seconded a motion to recommend that the Council approve the conditional zoning district application for the property located at 5101 Barbee Chapel Road if the following conditions and special considerations are met:

**Vote:** 5-0

**Aye:** Chair Tom Henkel, Marirosa Molina, Judy Gaitens-Arneson, Stefan Klakovich, Lucy Vanderkamp

**Nay:**

#### Conditions:

- All trees and other plantings should be native
- Protect all “tree-save” areas as shown in the original plan set

#### Special Considerations:

- Move toward the minimum allowable parking
- Look for ways to mitigate the 50-year flood event
- Structures should be solar-ready
- More covered bike storage
- Design, at minimum, for level 1 EV charging for each unit with a designated parking space

Prepared by: Tom Henkel, Chair, Environmental Stewardship Advisory Board  
Anthony Henage, Vice-Chair, Environmental Stewardship Advisory Board  
John Richardson, Community Sustainability Manager, Staff Liaison to ESAB

## COMMUNITY DESIGN COMMISSION

### CONDITIONAL ZONING COMMENTS

- Barbee Chapel Apartments -

December 15, 2022

The Community Design Commission conducted a review of the Conditional Zoning application for the Barbee Chapel Apartments at their meeting on December 15, 2022. The presentation that the Commission received was different from the materials attached to the meeting agenda. As a result, the Commission chose to only provide comments but did not want to make a recommendation to Council at this meeting. This Comments and Concerns Document will be forwarded to Council and the Planning Board and CDC will coordinate with the Planning Board. Below is a summary of comments made and concerns of the Commission:

1. The site plan is improved since we reviewed the Concept Plan. It does adhere to some of the CDC's Design Guidance Principles. However, many are not and still more cannot be judged at this time due to a lack of detail. Therefore, it is recommended that the Development Team review the CDC's Principles before appearing before the Planning Board and before returning to the CDC for LUMO-required final plans reviews including elevations.
2. The Site Plan centers on a 400-foot-long apartment structure and a 680-foot-long parking deck. Both structures are much too long and are incompatible with the surrounding area.
3. The amount of at grade parking with impervious surfaces is too extensive; Moreover, approximately 80% of the spaces are located at the properties edges negatively impacting adjacent properties and Barbee Chapel Road.
4. The Site Plan is inwardly focused and there is a lack of articulation among outward-facing building facades. Additional detail and interest should be added to the backside of buildings, including facades that will be visible from NC-54.
5. The scale of some of the buildings appears to be out of sync with the "modern farmhouse" design language that has been proposed for the site.

6. If plantings are included on the parking garage, irrigation systems should be installed.
7. The development team should produce section and perspective drawings that clearly convey the relationship of the parking deck, adjacent buildings, and surrounding topography. And, as the project moves forward special care should be taken to minimize the visual impact of the parking garage.
8. Hanging balconies at the corners of buildings must be avoided. Similar treatments have been used at other projects in town and have not been well-executed.
9. Four-story buildings along Barbee Chapel Road are inappropriate for this location and should be avoided. With Union Chapel Hill as an example, the development team should consider placing its townhome units along Barbee Chapel Road and moving larger buildings to the interior of the site in order to provide a streetscape along Barbee Chapel Road that is more consistent with neighboring properties.
10. The development team should consider the extent to which the proposed plans for new and preserved trees are actually viable and likely to provide the intended impact.
11. Would like to see the number of parking spaces reduced to no more than 450. Also, would like to see EV parking within that number as well as more than eight handicapped spaces.
12. We recommend adherence to the buffers instead of reducing their size.
13. Council asked that this project be coordinated closely with Hillmont project which is adjacent to this site. How was this done?

## PLANNING COMMISSION

*The charge of the Planning Commission is to assist the Council in achieving the Town's Comprehensive Plan for orderly growth and development by analyzing, evaluating, and recommending responsible town policies, ordinances, and planning standards that manage land use and involving the community in long-range planning.*

### RECOMMENDATION FOR CONDITIONAL ZONING APPLICATION FOR BARBEE CHAPEL APRTMENTS AT 5101 Barbee Chapel Road

April 4, 2023

**Recommendation:** Approval  Approval with Conditions  Denial

**Motion:** John Rees moved, and Theodore Nollert seconded a motion to recommend that the Council adopt Resolution A (Resolution of Consistency).

**Vote:** 7 – 0

**Yeas:** Jonathan Mitchell (Chair), Wesley McMahon, Chuck Mills, Theodore Nollert, John Rees, Erik Valera, and Stephen Whitlow

**Nays:**

**Recommendation:** Approval  Approval with Conditions  Denial

**Motion:** John Rees moved, and Theodore Nollert seconded a motion to recommend that the Council adopt Ordinance A (Approving the Application). With the attached matrix and comments as supplements to their recommendation.

**Vote:** 7 – 0

**Yeas:** Jonathan Mitchell (Chair), Wesley McMahon, Chuck Mills, Theodore Nollert, John Rees, Erik Valera, and Stephen Whitlow

**Nays:**

Prepared by: Jacob Hunt, Planner II

Planning Commission Complete Community Matrix for Barbee Chapel Apartments

Complete Community Criteria (mostly based on 12/7/22 Keesmaat presentation to Council)	Facts	Analysis	Summary of Concerns
Mix of housing unit sizes/configurations that address affordability goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 342 units, consisting of:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 318 rental apartments (predominantly 1-2brs)</li> <li>○ 24 rental townhouses</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The average 1br and 2br units are 750 and 1,200 square feet, respectively.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The range of sizes and configurations responds to the Town’s housing needs.</li> </ul>	None
Walkable proximity to several daily needs, such as housing, jobs, schools, recreation. Mixed use buildings encouraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East 54 retail is 1 mile away, with a multi-use path the entire length of NC-54 between Barbee Chapel Road and Fresh Market. Toll Brothers proposes to build a greenway connection on Barbee Chapel Road to NC-54.</li> <li>• Meadowmont retail is ~0.6 miles away. There is a below-grade crossing of NC-54 opposite the Friday Center.</li> <li>• The proposal is 100% residential.</li> <li>• Apart from the Meadowmont meadow/pond, the project does not seem nearby to any parks.</li> <li>• We understand the project is in Durham School District.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the proposal is single-use residential, the property has ample retail amenities within reasonable walking or biking distance.</li> <li>• Planning Commission members emphasized the importance of a seamless connection to the NC-54 greenway and a safe, well-executed crossing of Barbee Chapel Road where it intersects NC-54. NCDOT cooperation and approval will be needed.</li> <li>• Planning Commission members also underscored the importance of a safe, well-executed crossing from the project to the opposite sidewalk near Finley Forest Drive.</li> </ul>	The two crossings of Barbee Chapel Road must be safe and well-executed.
Abundant greenway and transit connections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to its proximity to the NC-54 greenway, the property is walking distance from:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The GoTriangle bus that serves both UNC and employers in Durham County (including Southpoint and RTP)</li> <li>○ The Town’s high-frequency bus service to UNC at the Friday Center</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Currently the NC-54 greenway does not go all the way to UNC campus. Cyclists must use roads/sidewalks for part of the trip.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, the parcel is well-connected to bus networks and is expected to be well-connected to the NC-54 greenway. Higher density at this location seems appropriate.</li> <li>• After this parcel and the Hillmont parcel are developed, and with The Morgan already there, Chapel Hill transit should perhaps consider providing bus service to Barbee Chapel Road. For example, the S bus route could extend down Barbee Chapel Road to The Farm.</li> </ul>	See previous row.

Planning Commission Complete Community Matrix for Barbee Chapel Apartments

<p>Place-making and prioritization of the pedestrian realm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular connectivity to the adjacent Hillmont project has been provided for.</li> <li>• The proposed parking ratio is 1.4 spots/unit, which is between the LUMO minimum and maximum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efforts toward place-making and pedestrian orientation (entrance allée, pockets of green space, some tree preservation) are significantly diminished by the predominance of surface parking, which results in the maximum permitted impervious surface ratio (70%).</li> <li>• Structured parking would improve the pedestrian experience but would also involve additional cost. While projects such as Aura and South Creek feature structured parking, Toll Brothers states that it is not economically feasible for this project. Members wondered whether extensive surface parking aligns with the “complete community” vision but did not resolve the question. (Side note: Future discussion and clarification of the Town’s general approach to this trade-off seems warranted.)</li> <li>• We would prefer that the parking ratio not exceed the current LUMO minimum, which is 1 spot for 1-br units and 1.4 spots for 2-br units.</li> <li>• The cost of parking that is not physically attached to specific townhouse units should be fully unbundled from unit rents.</li> <li>• A playground amenity could enhance the overall amenity package. The developer expressed a desire to include one in the next iteration of the site plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking should be reduced and unbundled.</li> <li>• Near-total reliance on surface parking mars the pedestrian experience but might be a defensible cost trade-off.</li> </ul>
<p>Land use efficiency (measured as housing density per acre)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 342 units on ~10.5 acres translates to 33 units/acre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed density seems sufficient.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<p>Respect for topography and natural landscapes, including protected natural areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is relatively flat (10ft of grade change) and currently includes 10 single-family houses, which will be removed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given that the site is relatively flat and already semi-developed, we did not identify any salient concerns here.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>