

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Board of Commissioners

FROM: Bryan Gruesbeck, Town Manager

**SUBJECT: Chatham Park Proposed Planned Development District Master Plan – Staff, Consultant and Applicant Feedback to Remaining Questions**

DATE: April 14, 2014

**Background:** During your regular meeting held on March 24, 2014, you recommended that Staff, the Consultant and Applicant meet, discuss and provide guidance to the Board regarding seven (7) remaining questions, issues and recommendations raised by the Lawrence Group.

Those questions were identified as #'s 10, 12, 13, 15, 23, 24 and 27 of the Lawrence Report Spreadsheet that was modified and approved at the March 10, 2014 Board of Commissioners meeting.

On April 4, 2014, I met with Craig Lewis (The Lawrence Group, Stuart Bass (Town Planner), Fred Royal (Town Engineer), Philip Culpepper (Applicant), Tim Smith (Applicant) and Bubba Rawl (Applicant) to discuss the questions referenced above. During the meeting, we addressed the questions sequentially, asking both the Applicant and Consultant to describe their respective positions. The meeting was enlightening and the group was able reach a consensus regarding the status of each issue.

The Applicant, Staff and Mr. Lewis will attend the Board meeting on April 14 to answer questions and receive additional direction as appropriate.

After discussion, the Applicant is willing to resubmit a modified Master Plan for your review during a future meeting that is reflective of the narrative discussed in the table attached herein. The Applicant will also consider any additional recommendations.

**Action Requested:** Review the table, ask questions of the Applicant, Staff and Consultant. Discuss next steps and provide direction, as appropriate.

CP PDD MP – Staff, Applicant and Consultant Meeting (4/4/14)	
Q#	Response
10 - The PDD Master Plan should consider incorporation of the 11 principles and buffer widths recommended in the Southwest Shore Conservation Assessment as aspirational goals with the specifics to be considered as each small area plan is developed.	The Applicant accepts these recommendations as a reference to guide future development. The acceptance of these recommendations will be stated in the PDD Master Plan.

<p><b>12</b> - Provide architectural standards, imagery, illustrations, precedent photography, or similar graphics to depict the desired development arrangement for each of the development typologies.</p>	<p>The Applicant will provide illustrations and examples of desired development typologies in the PDD Master Plan. Additional and specific examples will be provided in advance of the approval of each Small Area Plan.</p>
<p><b>13</b> - Clarify how the non-residential and the residential totals combine to create a cohesive community.</p>	<p>The Applicant has agreed to consider the language from the consultant regarding density. Attached to this memo is language pertaining to a revised vision statement. Below please find additional suggested language:</p> <p>As noted in the vision statement, Chatham Park will be differentiated from previous generations of low-rise, sprawling suburban development patterns found elsewhere in the country. Multi-story, mixed-use buildings will be preferred in the activity centers to single-story, single-use structures found in many suburban office parks and shopping areas. Likewise, neighborhoods will contain a variety of housing types in close proximity that are organized around an interconnected network of streets, differentiating them from the low density, sprawling patterns that have caused increased traffic congestion and environmental degradation. Chatham Park’s neighborhoods and activity centers in Chatham Park will be compact, walkable, transit-friendly and mixed-use. The neighborhoods will build on precedents established by Southern Village and Meadowmont (both in Chapel Hill) and the Activity Centers will draw from successful models of walkable urbanism like Reston Town Center (Reston, VA), Bethesda Row (Bethesda, MD), Birkdale Village (Huntersville, NC), North Hills (Raleigh, NC), City Place (West Palm Beach, FL), and Mueller (Austin, TX).</p>
<p><b>15</b> - Amend the map in areas 1.1 and 1.3 to reflect the adopted land use plan for the preservation of this area in a very lightly developed state.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not propose to amend the Master Plan as suggested and offers his reasoning (in italics):</p> <p><i>The maximum number of dwelling units proposed is 4 per acre in Section 1.1 and 2 per acre in Section 1.3. Clustering of development in these Sections allows dwelling units to exist while at the same time providing sufficient protection for environmentally sensitive areas. Clustering of development in these Sections also will make it economically feasible for water and sewer infrastructure to be installed. The adopted land use plan for the portion of Chatham Park in these Sections contemplates 1 dwelling unit for each 5 acres of land, and wells and septic tanks to serve the dwellings. The Chatham Park PDD Master Plan proposes that, unless the Town and the Development Review Committee for Chatham Park otherwise agree, all development in Chatham Park will be served by municipal water and sewer. Construction of municipal water and sewer to serve property at 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres is not</i></p>

	<p><i>economically feasible. Development of these Sections at 1 unit per 5 acres with wells and septic tanks also is not an efficient or sustainable or taxpayer friendly pattern for development. With large lots comes an inefficient service delivery pattern. The miles of travel that school buses, police and waste collectors must travel adds to the expense of servicing that area, not to mention what happens when wells or septic systems fail. Clustering will allow the "footprint" of development to be minimized while making a viable addition to the Town's tax base, unlike the sprawling large lot pattern suggested. Use of wells and septic tanks also is not the best way to protect water quality in Chatham Park.</i></p>
<p><b>23</b> - Given Chatham Park's presence within a protected watershed, a goal of 30% of the total land area should be considered for protection as conservation areas including steep slopes, riparian buffers, natural heritage areas, and otherwise ecologically sensitive land. As an alternative calculation, considering mapping all of the ecologically sensitive areas and then add an additional 5-10% as a minimum standard.</p>	<p>A map will be added in the PDD Master Plan that identifies areas for possible inclusion as Open Space. At full build-out, the total area for Park/Open Space would equal 1,987 acres. This equates to 28% of the total land area.</p> <p>Greenways (e.g., bike trails) will be considered as "Park Land" but will not be counted as both Park Land and Open Space when they are located in Open Space.</p>
<p><b>24</b> - In addition to conservation areas, dedicate active parks using standards calibrated by the town with a goal of 10% of the total land area.</p>	<p>The PDD Master Plan methodology for providing Park Land would result in 9.4% of the total land area being available for "active parks." The consultant confirmed this figure.</p> <p>The scope, location and use of parks shall be determined through the cooperative efforts of the developer and the Town. Such cooperation will allow the creation of parks that best serve the needs of the Town.</p>
<p><b>27</b> - Provide justification for not adhering to the Major Transportation Corridors Overlay district or submit a compatible alternative.</p>	<p>Upon discussion, Staff, Consultant and Applicant agree to recommend eliminating Q#27. With respect to the issue of exemption from the Major Transportation Corridor Overlay, the Overlay language is a vestige of some past documentation, perhaps prior to complete etj area zoning or adoption of site plan standards. In any case, there are no significant requirements in this section of the ordinance that would go beyond what is required in our normal site plan review standards, or beyond what NC DOT would require.</p>