

**TOWN COUNCIL "PUBLIC DIALOGUE"
ON OI-4 ZONING DISTRICT**

UNC Proposed Changes 5/4/05	Refinements 5/19/05
<p>1. Shorten Council review period for projects internal to the campus from 90 to 60 days.</p>	<p>1. The University is willing to allow up to 120 days to review all Development Plans and Major Modifications but would request an expedited review for buildings without significant transportation, stormwater or public utility impacts external to the boundaries of the zone.</p>
<p>2. Require the University to present DP applications to Town review boards during the 60 or 120 day Council review period.</p>	<p>2. The University is willing to appear before review boards during the 120 day review period to assure that they have the opportunity to contribute their input to the Council's deliberations.</p>
<p>3. Spell out the specific criteria to be used by Town staff to declare UNC's DP submissions "complete."</p>	<p>3. Although there is on-going communication between UNC and Town staff in advance of an application package, there are often delays in declaring a package "complete" because of uncertainties about what the Council might want to know. These uncertainties make it difficult to anticipate an endpoint when projects will be approved and can be initiated. Although the "clock does not start to run" until the package is declared complete, precious construction time is lost when the Town staff need to seek guidance from the Council because review criteria do not exist. Modification 2, and the associated addendum, is an appropriate model to follow.</p>
<p>4. Define in clear terms what constitutes a "minor" modification to the DP.</p>	<p>4. We would suggest a text amendment that states "For all projects in a development plan, a minor modification is ... (existing text)" This would eliminate proposal 6 below.</p>
<p>5. Limit questions for which a formal University response is required to matters relevant to protection of community property values and health, safety, and welfare.</p>	<p>5. This change addresses the need to use limited budgetary resources and staff time wisely. UNC devotes considerable staff time and often must pay consultants to respond to complex questions concerning topics such as utility needs, how we plan to pay for projects, why we need to build utility capacity instead of conserving energy, etc. Further, such matters are properly the purview of the UNC Trustees and the State. Developing formal and often detailed answers to questions unrelated to community property values and health, safety, and welfare costs UNC money and consumes review time that could be spent addressing community concerns.</p>

**TOWN COUNCIL "PUBLIC DIALOGUE"
ON OI-4 ZONING DISTRICT**

<p>6. Stipulate that minor modifications of projects located in the PTA are subject to the same requirements as minor modifications in other areas of OI-4.</p>	<p>6. See 4 above.</p>
<p>7. Allow minor modifications to be submitted simultaneously with the Site Development Permit (SDP) request.</p>	<p>7. The requirements for a minor modification are stipulated in the LUMO. If a project meets those requirements, a minor modification should be considered with the project SDP application. We request a text amendment that requires that a request for a minor modification be acted on within 15 days of receiving a complete request.</p>
<p>8. Require UNC to involve neighbors in PTA's throughout project development (versus one meeting).</p>	<p>8. We would suggest a text amendment to the Individual Site Development Permit requirements (3.5.2.h.2) that states "Any application for a site Development Permit in a Perimeter Transition Area shall include <u>documentation that the applicant held at least one meeting for neighbors adjacent to the proposed building prior to submission of the SDP and</u> (existing text)." This requirement would be in addition to the design workshop requested by the resolution adopted by the Council on October 3, 2001 (2001-10-03/R-10).</p>