

F/L/E/O	LUMO Standard	Focus Area Item	Feedback
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Do we REALLY need more shops and offices on this side of town? I don't think so.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 don't agree with additional office retail in this area. it's not like we have a shortage in CH
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 I do not support an additional mixed use area south of Eubanks Road (it would not serve the surrounding neighborhood as it is already served)
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 There is very little housing here and no parks
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 We still need more commercial office space.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 This area has PLENTY of office and retail
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Preserves too little green space.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Other than total teardown of what is already underway in this area, there is nothing to like in this plan. This area should have been zoned solely for commercial and light industrial use, not residential. There should be an IKEA, or similar large retail in this location to take advantage of I40 access!!
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 I don't think we need it. Let's redevelop Timberlyne perhaps. This is hindsight now, but I thought the proper zoning for Eubanks Rd should have been industrial with all the industrial uses out there (landfill, warehouses, dog shelter, storage, transit, public works, RR, recycling, etc. We no longer have a location for construction/services here. This also drives up our costs as these services have to drive here from surrounding communities. But now we have The Edge, so I guess that is a moot point. There will be no light industrial zoning that will be effective in CH.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 No more need for shops. They are drowning in N MLK with shops.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 I think either option for Eubanks Rd. will work, depending on developers' views.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Cap the number of stories at 5 or 6. This will still allow the density needed for BRT.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Allow mixed use residential on Millhouse Rd.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 I want to be sure that long-time, existing homeowners are actively recruited and involved in this discussion and decision for growth and development.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Why are there no parks and green space? How about a splash pad?
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Why can't the orange "shops and offices" category also have some residential...want to avoid dark night spaces....better to have "eyes on the street".
O		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 The geography in these maps is too vague to see what will be where.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 We don't need more homes in Chapel Hill. We can use townhomes and apartments for families.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Same mess as Eubanks Road - 1
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Again, way too much development.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Too congested.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Like the extra commercial & residential spaces here, especially close to the BRT stop. Am concerned by denigration of BRT by those who are deciding how to spend transit \$\$.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 This is better than #1, but we still lose public parks and open spaces.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 2 Needs more housing
O		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision Fine as is.
E		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision More people = more cars and where will they go?
O		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision I'd rate this as acceptable
F		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision My concern is the density of population and the preservation of green space
O		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision "institutional" a better place for that, for the sake of diversity would be southern village.
O		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision I HATE the plan for Estes and MLK. Estes is already a nightmare and you can't widen it realistically. AND it's the only E/W corridor between the mall and Carrboro. This is awful.
O		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision You really need to provide a key to the colors. I would argue with your assumption that the 2020 vision doc calls for this intensity.
E		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision Are you kidding me?? All those townhomes by Barbee Chapel?? And institutional buildings? And leave 54 as 2 lanes? You're out of your mind, you can't get down 54 now!!
E		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision If traffic flow is not improved along 54, this will be a terrible plan.
E		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision NO LIGHT RAIL!!
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Current Vision We need to allocate more greenspace. We can't go back and create it once these decisions for other uses are made.
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Current Vision Dislike. There should be open space/park between the road and any development. Do we need so much commercial development? We are already overwhelmed with commercial spaces yet still have inadequate major shopping available
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Current Vision Far more green spaces needed along this corridor. Plan is overly dense.
O		NC 54	Comment on Current Vision NO light rail!! Light rails increase crime! One of the main reasons people move to CH is because it is extremely safe!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 This is OK. The multifamily, shops and offices should be higher than 4 stories.
F/L	Site Design	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 The longer stretch of public park and open space along 54 is very nice, as long as it doesn't get taken over by a wider road in the future. Isn't more of UNC planning to move out here? Then greater multi-use density will be quite valuable place to live and shop
E		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Needs to look left and right of NC 54. Otherwise "Corridor" is misnomer. What is with "mirroring" Glen Lenox? Here, too, is a rhythm to what happens left and right of NC 54. Reduce NC 54 cross section with increased mass-transit.

F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 This scenario appears to preserve more greens space for parks, which I like, but I think the commercial spaces and apartment buildings should be along 54, rather than the park.
E		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 I like the light rail idea best of it
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 the redevelopment of the Fresh Market could be like Glen Lennox- a mix of mid rise with a 4-story edge. Go bigger here!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Most of this is fine, take the 4+ stories section down to 2-3.
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Why have a park along an active road instead of shops?
E		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 NO LIGHT RAIL!!
O		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Get the greenway to the ATT!
F/E		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 I really do not have enough information or expertise to make intelligent decisions about most of these scenarios. Unfortunately, I cannot visualize these scenarios in a way that is helpful. I favor higher density but not tall buildings. I favor biking, mass transit where possible. I favor small shop and neighborhood walkability, as well as open spaces, parks where possible. Most of all I favor completion of infrastructure to handle future population increases, traffic, and storm damage mitigation. In addition where neighbor hoods exist on the edge of development, these currently quiet neighborhoods need to adequately shielded from noise & light intrusion.
O		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 It says preserve open spaces, though this looks like less open spaces than in the previous plan!
E		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Light rail is a must, it will really cut down on the traffic. And the open space would be great. But where is the parking for the light rail? I would anticipate heavy use of the light rail so there needs to be a LOT of parking (used public trains/subways a lot in the past and loved it).
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 4+ stories will create a canyon effect as we now see downtown.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Transit success requires larger areas of higher intensity development.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Seems like a lot of 4+ story space. More green space in and around development. Also aesthetic of buildings is important
E		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 This corridor can not stand more traffic. The 54 congestions study demonstrated that DOLRT would not reduce congestion at all on NC 54.
F/L	Landscaping	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Not enough green space. Don't forget mature trees provide much needed shade.
O		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Too much wasted open space
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 I would like this option if the buildings were limited to maximum 4 stories. We are already losing the view of the hill of Chapel Hill and turning this into a tunnel-like road.
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 creating open and green space sounds good - the increased density that is suggested, especially the 4+ story part, I dislike.
E		NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 No to light rail; yes to bus transit with is more affordable and flexible
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Why is the green space next to the highway? Is this space meant for people to actually use or is it just there to look nice? It would make more sense to put buildings closer to the road and take advantage of the green space that already exists along the golf course
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Near Fordham Blvd 1 Parks and open spaces need to be at or better than a 1 to 6 ratio of remaining property developments.
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Parks and open spaces need to be at or better than a 1 to 6 ratio of remaining property developments.
E/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 No to light rail; yes to bus transit which is more affordable and flexible. No to 4+ stories
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Need to expand green space to avoid flooding downstream.
E		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Since I oppose the light rail, it is difficult for me to be in favor of redevelopment around light rail
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Not enough green space
O		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Build infrastructure before planning higher intensities.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 No 4+ story high buildings. Presence of LRT station is a questionable assumption.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 No 4+ story high buildings.
F/L/E	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 The light rail is great but that is way too much development in that area without widening 54. And Barbee Chapel will turn into a parking lot (more than it already is).
O		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 NO LIGHT RAIL!!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Too tall.
F		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Not a fan of rapid transit and more homes. Keep Chapel Hill Chapel Hill. We do not need to be a metropolis!
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Would add more green space!
O		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Barber chapel 1 and 2 look the same to me??
F/E		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 I like this idea of creating a mixed used area. However, traffic gets quite bad starting around this area during rush hours. Consider how this would impact traffic prior to the arrival of a light rail.
F		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 1 Far too dense. More green spaces needed.
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2 Much too dense.
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2 Would like to see more retail and services oriented business here.
O		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2 Consider both sides of NC 54!!!
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2 Increased density is better.
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2 High density housing near the light rail station seems to make the best use of that transit
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2 There should be more park and green space, but the general arrangement of residential and commercial spaces is good!

F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	Too tall.
O		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	NO LIGHT RAIL!!
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	why, why does everyone always want to increase commercial and office use? Why is money always the top priority???
F/L/E	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	Light rail is great but 54 would need to be widened to handle all of the traffic from that much development. And do we really need all those homes? How will the schools handle the increase in population?
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	4 stories max. More green space. Affordable and low income units mixed in. Green building.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	No 4+ storied buildings.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	No to light rail; yes to bus transit. No 4+ stories
F/L	Use	NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	Parks and open spaces need to be at or better than a 1 to 6 ratio of remaining property developments.
O		NC 54	Comment on Barbee Chapel Rd 2	This option puts more people and activities near transit and provides more opportunities to people and more options for people to chose from when going places and choosing how to get there.
O		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	This does not reflect the current zoning or discussion of focus areas from 2020.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	Park connecting with current Morgan creek trail is desirable. Not sure about THs, not big enough land.
O		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	Need more green space. Eastgate Crossing is subject to flooding, and should be converted to green space.
F/L/E	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	More public parks and open space, GREAT! More shops and apartments, no! It's already a pain trying to get up Columbia, esp in the morning.
E		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	The current traffic pattern of 15-501 south is already a nightmare. This needs to be corrected before anything else is added or built!
O		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	SOUTH to Chatham Co line needs to be added!!
O		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	A good reflects for chapel hill
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	Great location for walkable housing
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision Gatew	not enough open space
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	Needs much more green (parks, open space and the like, also woodlands.)
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	Not dense enough
F/L/E	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	No more shops and offices please - that means more cars!
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	town homes seems like a more efficient use of space that will be valuable for its close proximity to campus
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	Like this one better. that would be a terrible location for townhomes--quite a bit of traffic
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	I think 5-7 stories would be appropriate right on S Columbia street especially since this is right next to a future BRT station. If allowed to be this high, the buildings should taper down to the existing neighborhood scale. Also more small scale, well designed residential infill should be allowed in the surrounding neighborhoods provided that it is designed in a way to match the existing neighborhood.
O		South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	Only one alternative - no way to evaluate. Where will people go who are currently served by housing in this area?
F/L/E	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	This area has very thick traffic between 430-6pm. I think a better plan would be to avoid placing busniesses and homes there and leaving it undeveloped or as a park.
F/L/E	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	if you are going to build more here, you need to improve the traffic flow, especially around evening rush hour
E		South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	Will definitely need to think about traffic.
F		South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	Fine for this little spot. But I like the idea of the southern gateway down past southern village in the ETJ. A gateway on the same scale, or at least same vision, as the north gateway.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	This would encroach into and be incompatible with existing adjacent neighborhoods. It would create a domino effect north along the entire corridor.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	This is difficult to see. But I support a higher density development that emphasizes the connectivity of this space for low-income folks
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Gateway 1	Have much more shops and office space than multifamily residences and the latter should only be affordable housing
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision PR	Use town owned parcel for dense affordable housing.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision PR	This part of the county should open more opportunities for traditional single family development.
F		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision PR	I always feel a public pool is needed here
O		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision PR	What does "Institutional" mean specifically? Like more parks/open spaces.
O		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision PR	NEED TO EXPAND PLANNING TO CHATHAM CO LINE>
F		South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision PR	Do not want to lose park space and/or undeveloped land.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision PR	we do not need MORE shops in this already very busy area. parking is really hard to find - and i have stopped going to the shops/offices because of no parking. that park-and-ride is VERY popular and the parking lot is needed. people already park illegally in game days.
L	Landscaping	South 15-501	Comment on Current Vision PR	need more trees
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Not dense enough
L	Site Design	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Where is the parking to handle this????
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	The higher the density, the better. Less commuting and driving on narrow trafficky roads for every little thing.
O		South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Depends on what goes in there - is it something useful? Do we really need it?
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	What happened to the green space?

F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Keep the park
F/L	Site Design	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Why the town thinks it needs more unaffordable office and retail space with limited parking makes no sense.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	This area will be next to a future BRT station and should have more people and activity. four stories does not match the existing future surroundings and does not provide enough room for people to support existing local retail at Southern Village. Also, Many businesses in southern village are currently struggling because not enough people live nearby, within walking distance, to support a robust neighborhood business district. Housing and more height would help this dynamic. Also There are not enough places for people to live in Chapel Hill that are near shops and restaurants as well as transit. Not building housing on this site, which the Town owns and could partner with a developer to provide affordable housing seems like a big missed opportunity.
O		South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	There's not enough detail given about this plan to rate it.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	What happens to our parks here?? We need parks.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	This P&R facility is used by so many people. As we increase housing costs in CH and thus force people to live outside of this town, we must not lose these P&R facilities.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Yes. Let's build out the south with commercial growth.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Does the P&R lot become a 4 story parking garage? NO!
F/L	Other	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Need to design in way to preserve vistas.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 1	Open space/green space needed
E		N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	What is the Northern Area task force? The small area plan?? This area has already grown so much and 40 is still the same 2 small lanes; where will all the cars go? Pretty soon we'll be able to walk faster than the cars can move :(And the noise! NOT A FAN.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	I am extremely concerned about the rapid growth of residential building as it relates to overcrowding in the public schools. Please show future development until the town council works with the School Board to create a plan for facilities and staffing of schools.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	Nice of you to add a sliver of public parks and open space
F		N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	The Town ignores the Northern Area task force plan that citizens supported. It is still the right plan for this area that is now compromised by poor decision making.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	A lot of the yellow area north and south of Eubanks should be open space or parkland.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	"Northern area task force". Make that an elected body.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	Stronly opposed. The increase in population density is too great.
F		N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	We have got to eventually do something about the Rural Buffer. It was created for all the right reasons, but has created several major problems namely limited land for development, artificially high priced land, driving up the price of housing, making every in fill project a battleground with neighbors. Lets rethink and perhaps allow some uses in the rural buffer if not drop it entirely or maybe just move it farther out.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	That park section is awfully small!
F/L	Landscaping	N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	Chapel Hill is becoming ugly. The trees are coming down so fast, it is painful.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Current Vision	There is so much housing going in here. How will the town plan for schools for all of the new residents?
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	Open space/green space needed
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	NO to 4+ stories
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	there are enough businesses (grocery, movie, shopping) and also recreation (park) in the southern village community to make it so that density can exist as long as walking and biking are made a safe option.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	Yes. do as much as we can.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	Keep the park
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	Same comment. As we increase housing costs in CH and thus push people out of town, we must not lose these P&R facilities. Especially before we've figured out any real sort of public transit from outside of CH into our town.
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	I am not in favor of increasing the commercial/office node.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	This should be 5-7 stories to match Obey Creek and the new hotel, provided that it is designed to transition down to the existing neighborhood. Also, more height means more people to support local businesses at Southern Village and more options for people who live in Southern Village to walk too. This also needs to include housing. Chapel Hill does not enough places to live that close to shops and grocery stores or near frequent transit service. This needs to be mixed use with residential
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	This should be 5-7 stories to match Obey Creek and the new hotel, provided that it is designed to transition down to the existing neighborhood. Also, more height means more people to support local businesses at Southern Village and more options for people who live in Southern Village to walk too.
O		South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	Loss of green space.
F/E	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	Keep current vision. There already is too much traffic on this road section
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	This should be 5-7 stories to match Obey Creek and the new hotel, provided that it is designed to transition down to the existing neighborhood. Also, more height means more people to support local businesses at Southern Village and more options for people who live in Southern Village to walk too. This also needs to include housing. Chapel Hill does not enough places to live that close to shops and grocery stores or near frequent transit service. This needs to be mixed use with residential. Not building housing on this site, which the Town owns, seems like a big missed opportunity to partner with a developer to provide affordable and market rate housing.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	If Obey Creek development takes place, then the density can be similar on this side of 15-501 as long as the existing Southern Community Park remains
F/L	Use	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	Once again-parking is already tight for park/park and ride.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	South 15-501	Comment on ParkandRide 2	Do not like 4+ story structures and losing park space.
F/E		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	I've seen what is being built there, and it is much taller than 4 stories. Also, what being done in the way of traffic pattern management? It would also be helpful to know what the "institutional" means or references.

F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Too many new houses/apartments.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	What happened to the park??
F/L	Other	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	We lost too many trees along Eubanks Rd. To make up for this carbon sink, all new buildings should have rooftop solar energy systems.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	There's already far too much development going in around that area. Is more commercial/office really needed? We are raping the land'
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	I do not support institutional use next to I-40 - why not office use?
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	It would be nice not to break up the neighborhoods too much with shops. It's nice to have shops close by but we don't want to degrade the connections of neighbors by making their neighborhoods too commercial and not connected enough.
F/L	Landscaping	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	This area is already ruined. Who cares now? Took down forest here and on Homestead. Who is in charge? It feels as if no one remembers the old Chapel Hill which was green and forested.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Again, not sure why we would limit building height to 4 stories. Suggest increase to 5 stories if not higher.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	What happened to the open space?
F/L	Site Design	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	New buildings should have green roofs and permeable paving--no clear cutting. preserve as much greenspace and tree canopy as possible
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	No rapid transit and new homes.
F/L	Site Design	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Again, no shared parking as well as no pedestrian and bike connectivity.
F/L	Landscaping	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	The clear cutting of forest for this spaces was troubling for me. It provided sound and visual cushion from the interstate.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Allow mixed use residential on Millhouse Rd.
E		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	This looks good as long as eubanks road is widened to handle the extra traffic. It is starting to get a little congested now.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Please limit the number of stories to 5 or 6. There are examples around the world of transit intensive communities with buildings capped at 5 or 6 stories.
F		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	I can't really tell what is different between these scenarios...I simply oppose more development.
F/L		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	I like buildings around rapid transit but this is too much development. And no green space, ugh.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Unbelievable building already in progress.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	We lose the public parks and open space. Plus this design is awkward. I do like increased transit options.
E		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Too congested.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Land owners on Millhouse rd. have lost value in their properties with imposing Institutional uses only.
F/L	Other	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	I can only feel OK about this version if the housing is affordable. That's always been the argument urging us to vote for BRT and the benighted Light Rail (which I am now heartily sorry I voted the funds for). So if a BRT stop goes in there, then affordable housing must be adjacent.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Only if it is affordable to folks from multiple income levels (actually affordable. Not 60% AMI)
E		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	Please consider the installation of traffic roundabouts in this highly busy area!
E		N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	if population really surge like the census forecasted, most new comers should come from RTP, a hub to connect CH and RTP will be ideal here
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Eubanks Road 1	The emphasis on shops, offices, institutional is good but open space/parks need to be incorporated
F/L	Other	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	No more high-priced condos etc. Only affordable housing
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	Transit success requires larger areas of higher density development.
E		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	Please consider the installation of traffic roundabouts in this highly congested area!
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	Doesn't include any housing!
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	Too noisy for a park to be along i40.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	Does every area have to be full of apartments, houses, etc.?
O		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	This is impossible to comment on without seeing something more concrete. What does it mean to redevelop Timberlyne? Will parks be connected to or integrated into shopping?
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	I like the larger green space
O		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	The Timberlyne shopping center is my life.
F/L	Other	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	This area of town has already become a "dumping ground" of increased traffic and clear cutting and hacked up land use; introduce sanity and aesthetics with more green space and better, more approachable streetscape and enjoyable walking paths
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	I like this option, and I appreciate the amount of public parks and open space.
E		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	What streets are all these cars belonging to the people going to drive on??
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	I appreciate the extra open space along I40
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	It looks like a loss of park acreage.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1	Low density mixed use is essentially what we have. This concept isn't dense enough. Our opportunity locations are severely limited. We need to take advantage of every possible retail/mixed use location. More density needed. That narrow land near I-40 should be developed and not as open space/park. We already can't maintain the parks we have. Go try and play tennis on the Cedar Falls tennis courts! The trails in CF Park are in poor condition. The parking lot in CF Park has mud holes, unpaved and has been like that since it was developed in 1980. We also have two huge open spaces/parks in CH, namely UNC's campus and our Rural Buffer. Inside the Urban Services Boundary we need development, not more open space/parks. [By the way, I like our parks, just don't have enough money to keep them in good working condition. More development will generate more tax dollars and help us maintain our parks.

F/L	Building Design	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 No more ugly condos that don't create any sense of community on MLK. You have done enough damage with the SECU and apartments already constructed there. Otherwise it looks acceptable.
F/L/E	Site Design	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 I don't get it -- ALL of these redevelopments ignore common shared parking as well as bike and pedestrian connectivity. These represent a complete lack of considering mobility needs.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 Condos are always preferable to apartments because owners become stakeholders--however, the proposed population density, the preservation of green space, and affordability for those with 30-60%AMI is a MAJOR concern
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 Not dense enough
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 Thank you protecting the green space
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 More shops and more shops and more shops....
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 Put office use next to I-40 instead of a park. Higher intensity development should be encouraged along Weaver Dairy Road
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 More housing, shorter buildings, and a larger park are all good.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 What is "low density?"
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 It needs more commercial office space and less housing.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 Let Timberlyne and CH North be the shopping centers for the north side of town. Don't freaking redevelop them and then build a DIFFERENT shopping center by Rogers Road. Criminy.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 need explicit plan for displaced low income residents
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 We should encourage heavier development in this area
O		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 These maps are very hard to discern. I currently live on WD and it seems as if you want to build a park in my back yard? There are no landmarks here on this map. Also, there are already shops where you say there will be shops, so that is already currently developed, not a plan for the future.
O		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 Can you please give us a free standing Chick-fil-A!!
E		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 1 The amount of traffic coming across Weaver Dairy is already dangerous. East Chapel Hill High produces large quantities of very young drivers, which along with the already high volume of traffic from folks going to and coming home from work, is a mixture of potential hazard. To add to this flow by creating more living space at Timberlyne, does not make sense unless speed bumps and other traffic calming areas are implemented along Weaver Dairy
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 I'm all for having more shopping nearby but Timberlyne has just about anything a family could want. Don't forget that more and more families are shopping online. It would be a shame to overbuild these shopping areas and not be able to keep the space rented.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Too dense. Chapel hill is running out of green space and that is part of what makes it so pretty.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 no need for 4+ stories in this area
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 We want public parks!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 4-story buildings are high enough.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 More green space is better. I also don't love the taller buildings but this is less important to me here near I-40. I would hate tall buildings downtown.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 I like this plan except it seems silly to put a park next to I-40. Put office use next to I-40 or expand Carolwoods.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Again, please take the 4-story buildings off the table.
F/L/E	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Keep as much open and green space as possible. We need more, not less. Link spaces with walking paths and trails. Provide pedestrian connectivity
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Keep residential zoning as-is near Homestead (R-2) and minimally disturb the tree canopy for best drainage/sound buffer
F/L	Site Design	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Adding BRT stops is a good idea, but where is the parking for residents and the connectivity for pedestrians and bike riders?
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 I stongly oppose this level of increased intensity/density
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Not enough open space and park land
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 See previous comments on WD Rd - 1. Don't need that park/open space in upper right corner. Higher density better than previous option. Wouldn't limit bldg height to 4 stories. Why? We're short on land and redevelopment opportunities. Go taller, more dense.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Again, I think either Option 1 or 2 will work and which is pursued depends on a developer's willingness to undertake the project. Chapel Hill has limited space for expansion, and these options being considered town-wide are worthwhile.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Cap the number of stories at 5 or 6. Do not limit accessibility to commercial developments as was done with redesign of Weaver Dairy Road.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 The last thing we need is another overdeveloped corner.
F/E		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Too congested
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 I don't mind this option, but I would advocate for the same amount of "public parks and open space" as option #1. Also, please ensure there's AMPLE affordable housing. That is my #1 concern with all this development.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 This is absolutely awful--too many tall buildings and too little parks/open space.
F/E		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 Again, am concerned that even enhanced traffic modes will not be able to handle more aggressive growth in this area.
F/L/E	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 This just makes more ugliness, more silos of specific use, and more traffic.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 I would like to see public parks and open space be a priority.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 More green space and family friendly areas needed.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 4+ stories?? For what? At least there is green space. Not a fan.
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2 I don't want any more shopping centers in the area. There are already enough stores for all my wants and needs in the area. Any more will be overkill. Concrete jungle. yuck.

E		N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2	Installation of traffic roundabouts are strongly suggested in this congested area, for everyone's safety!
F/L	Use	N. MLK	Comment on Weaver Dairy Road 2	No more high-priced condos etc. Only affordable housing and more green space/park area
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	limit to 3 stories
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	There should be a 4 floor maximum from existing grade north of Rosemary. Between Rosemary and Franklin there should be an 8 floor maximum. These heights work very well for financial feasibility, but need better parking solutions than existing by code or policy now.
F/L	Other	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	This is a good vision, suffering from some implementation issues. It's also too small. Expand downtown further East into the sorority wastelands.
F/L	Other	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	This is a good vision, suffering from some implementation issues. It's also too small. Expand downtown further East into the sorority corridor of Franklin St.
F/L	Other	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	This is a good vision, suffering from some implementation issues. It's also too small. Expand downtown further East into the fraternity/sorority corridor of Franklin St.
F/L	Landscaping	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	Buildings no taller than 4 stories and back off the street. Keep mature trees for shade along the sidewalk and street.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	This tells me nothing without citing some reference points as to what building(s) currently occupy site designated as Multifamily, Shops and Offices. If you mean, put up more 4+ story buildings along W. Franklin and W. Rosemary, we already have too much, too close to the roadway, and too reflective of sound and light (I am regularly blinded by reflection off Greenbridge and some other buildings while driving on W. Rosemary.
F		Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	This should be a storefront business district consistent with a college main street
F/L/E		Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	Don't build new facilities too close to the roads. Why not make FRanklin Street a pedestrian street- divert traffic around it.
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	Downtown Chapel Hill's best option to create a destination retail/dining/entertainment experience is to fully develop the full length of Rosemary St. This means both sides of the street. The northern side of Rosemary is currently restricted via the Northside Small Area Plan zoning. The southern boundary of that area should be one block back from Rosemary (ie, north). That district also extends to N Columbia which is restrictive. That boundary should be pulled west to say Church St (not N Columbia). This is restricting the redevelopment of DOWntown (ie, via the redevelopment of Rosemary St).
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	Please do not build upwards. Chapel Hill is a lovely town, not an urban center. Let's jerp it that way.
O		Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	More buildings/businesses keep going up but the parking situation is abysmal. I go to Carrboro or Durham before I go downtown. Barnes Towing is notorious for ticketing so why worry about that when I don't have to? I live 2 miles away but no thanks.
O		Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	The way this map is labeled is very confusing. Franklin St. should have two designations: "W" and "E". And "E. Main St." should be replaced by "Carrboro." The use of the term "E" on the west end of the map is likely to throw people off.
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	The current plan is a good way to provide multifamily housing near the university.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	4-story buildings on most of Franklin St.? I don't like how that changes the town's character.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	Please stop building high rises downtown. Chapel Hill is losing its character and starting to look like any other place in America.
F		Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	I support this current plan for downtown
O		Downtown	Comment on Current Vision	Downtown should look at both sides of Franklin Street, in conjunction with UNC. UNC needs to get actively involved in this discussion, embracing the community not sitting on its side lines.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Keeping buildings shorter is better.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	4+ stories may make more sense in these locations.
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Not very clear what this means
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	More office area is necessary.
E		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	This area is needed for a downtown transit terminal.
E		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	still need parking somewhere, though...
E		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	What is the accommodation for the lost parking? Will mass transit be stepped up?
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Why not make space for food trucks and outdoor eating options?
E		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	The roads are not built for the increase in buildings.
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	I'd like to see fewer of the huge condos that are insanely high-priced and don't serve families' needs
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Plans not specific enough. Could be done well - or could be terrible.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Redevelopment of Rosemary St needs to be mid to high density and height, not low density!!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Should be high density, given proximity to downtown.
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	What is "low density?"
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Aim for 6-10 stories here. This is disappointing.
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	NO MORE PIZZA PLACES
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Why limit to 4 stories?
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Oh, and turn parking lots into more high priced housing like West Franklin, submerging parking into another creepy parking garage that NOBODY uses?!
E		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	This option would be okay, if and only if we include parking. Again, as we drive people to live outside of CH, we need to ensure we keep our parking options. Also downtown is a place where many visitors and tourists come--they often drive. We need to make sure this continues. Many local businesses depend on these visitors.
E		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	I like minimizing parking and increasing bike/ped safety
F/L	Building Design	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	If the black outline is new building(s) replacing the ones indicated as pink shadows, I hate it. That's the only part of town that still feels town-y.

F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Downtown needs to be able support more people and activities. This scenario does not match the existing scale of new development in downtown or on UNC's campus. 5-7 seven stories in this area seems more reasonable with appropriate transitions down to Franklin Street and towards neighborhoods. I do like the mixed use focus on multiple uses including residential.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	Downtown needs to be able support more people and activities. This scenario does not match the existing scale of new development in downtown or on UNC's campus. 5-7 seven stories in this area seems more reasonable with appropriate transitions down to Franklin Street and towards neighborhoods.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	I am pro redevelopment of a surface parking lot, but it should be higher density.
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 1	combine structured parking with mixed-use
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Do we need to turn Chapel Hill into a metropolis?
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	This is a step in the right direction.
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	This scenario seems more appropriate for Downtown. Buildings along Rosemary should be scaled to match the recent development as well as the Bank of America building, but be designed to taper back down to the neighborhoods and Franklin Street. Also this is a must: neighborhoods must be allowed to taper up to Downtown - with triplexes, quadplexes, and small apartment buildings. Failure to do this will result in people continuing to be priced out of nearby neighborhoods so that the only people left are ones with relatively more money, with the exception of the families that have benefited from the Town's and UNC's good investments in Northside.
F/L	Landscaping	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Keep open spaces for outdoor use: mature trees. Include affordable and low-income housing.
F/L	Other	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	as long as it there are affordable options.
E		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Again, I don't mind this, but maintaining parking options is essential.
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	NO MORE PIZZA PLACES
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Yes, good planning strategy, but the northern boundary of this zone should be moved north to at least mid-block if not to the next street.
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Review Bolder. It has no development over 4 stories and is very successful.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Higher stories works if you create green roofs and above street walk ways. As they have in Tokyo and the hospital area of UNC.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	The limit on stories should be 5 or 6, not 4+. 4+ seems to allow for a 5 story building or a 25 story building. 5 and 6 story buildings work around the world to support transit and active transportation. There is no reason it cannot work in Chapel Hill.
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	More traffic, more construction - some of us are weary from all the construction, road closures, nothing gets done on time.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Build up, not out
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	I like this kind of development, but it would change the character of the area too much in this instance.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Anything 4+ stories will give more of a city feel than a town feel to the area
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Again, you're missing the point. By 2049, people have to be able to move through the town quickly and easily.
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Limit any more residential.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	higher density mixed-use is reasonable with some consideration and recognition of the historic district. Do not put high density next or in the historic district.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Having 4+ stories is too high. It will make downtown less beautiful and inviting, block the sun, and trap heat.
O		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	Downtown should look at both sides of Franklin Street, in conjunction with UNC. UNC needs to get actively involved in this discussion, embracing the community not sitting on its side lines.
E		Downtown	Comment on East of Columbia St 2	While I recommend increases in high-density mixed-use development around Franklin St., the loss of parking space (and very precious parking structure spaces) would be sorely missed. This is the go-to areas for visitors from outside the downtown/Chapel Hill area to park and visit the downtown-UNC area, so removing the parking decks around here may be harmful to local businesses.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Low-height buildings on northern Rosemary St. allows for easier transition between new developments and historical black neighborhood.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Shorter buildings are better and I don't want development to encroach on the historic Hargraves neighborhood or increase tax value to the point that families have to move.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Higher density next to Northside should be encourage rather than low density. The urban form can transition to the neighborhood
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	A higher-density alternative is better
E		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Maybe turn the west side of Franklin into more of a pedestrian mall like area?
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Just don't mess with Al's and the Beer Study. And the Rosemary street grocery store and bar (if that's where it is).
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	density needs to be more consistent with Carrboro
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Respect the local community
E		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	More traffic, no parking.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Cap the number of stories at 5 or 6. We might as well allow 25 stories if we have a 4+ stories category. What does 4+ mean?
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	I think this scenario provides better transition down to the neighborhood. Also, the Northside and Cameron-McAuley neighborhoods need to be allowed transition up to Downtown. Failure to provide additional options for people to live near downtown will only mean that people will continue to be priced out of their homes with the exception of families who have benefited from the Town and UNC's good investment in Northside. The Town and UNC alone will never have the resources to fully prevent people from being displaced from Northside, Pine Knolls and other nearby neighborhoods. The houses in these neighborhoods must be allowed to be improved and changed over time (duplex, triplex, small apartment building, courtyard apartments, etc...). If we preserve the houses the way they are today and do not allow incremental growth, we will ensure that the people who live in them will change with respect to income. People with more money who want to live near downtown and UNC will outbid people with less money who currently live or would like to live in these neighborhoods near downtown. The only way to change this factor is to allow more people to be able to live in these neighborhoods.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Again with the terrible maps.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	what is the point of downtown if nothing is there and you are encouraging people to open businesses out of downtown. Don't you want vibrancy?

F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	The Town already allowed greed to ruin this area, but don't make it worse with more tall ugly buildings!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Anything/any location along Rosemary and Franklin St should not be limited to "low density" or low height. This is the corridor we need more density and more height to make downtown more attractive for shoppers, diners, event goers, workers.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	This is going to price out homes on the North side, and that's no okay.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	My main problem with this is that it will drive up housing costs and host businesses that are not in line with the local residents. We MUST prepare for this and create policies around the use of this space.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Better than Graham Street-2, but I'm leery of what you're thinking of putting there.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Mixed use includes affordable and low income housing. Green buildings. Mature trees
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	again, affordable options are needed
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Downtown is *definitely* not place for low density development.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Downtown is *definitely* not the place for low density development.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	I cannot take this survey. It is written in urban planning language and not common language that most residents will understand. It is way too complicated, and I am an urban planner by training.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 1	Needs to respect existing scale. 4 plus stories does not--that seems to translate to 8-11 stories. 3-4 stories should be the max.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Limit to 3-4 stories.
E		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Traffic patterns here cannot support higher density.
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	no more "retail" space needed in downtown. "multifamily, shops, and offices" is code for more retail space.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	increased density with the correct facilities and business within walking and biking and on bus route will decrease pollution and increase downtown business vibrancy
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Given the narrowness of the lots on the north side of Rosemary street, I do not think that there is a good way to transition down to the neighborhoods if these buildings are more than four stories in height. However, the Northside and Cameron-McAuley neighborhoods need to be allowed transition up to Downtown. Failure to provide additional options for people to live near downtown will only mean that people will continue to be priced out of their homes with the exception of families who have benefited from the Town and UNC's good investment in Northside. The Town and UNC alone will never have the resources to fully prevent people from being displaced from Northside, Pine Knolls and other nearby neighborhoods. The houses in these neighborhoods must be allowed to be improved and changed over time (duplex, triplex, small apartment building, courtyard apartments, etc...). If we preserve the houses the way they are today and do not allow incremental growth, we will ensure that the people who live in them will change with respect to income. People with more money who want to live near downtown and UNC will outbid people with less money who currently live or would like to live in these neighborhoods near downtown. The only way to change this factor is to allow more people to be able to live in these neighborhoods.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	I'm fine with this, but again, my main concern is how this drives up housing costs and hosts businesses not relevant to local residents.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	This is going to price out homes on the North side, and that's no okay.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	This nap should show all street names.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Yes, this is the direction to go to make downtown a destination and attract more customers. Think downtown Princeton, NJ that CH/UNC visited years ago. Very similar downtown with two long parallel streets. Princeton's downtown has two fully developed streets with cross streets and their downtown is very successful and busy. Our opportunity is Rosemary St. Let's not limit ourselves. That is our best option to improve our downtown.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	No need for any density over 4 stories ANYWHERE in Chapel Hill. High structures just put more profits in developer pockets. Again, review Bolder, CO.
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Can you really not put a family friendly green space in any of these? Why should I bring my kids downtown if there's no where for them to run around?
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	4 stories max. Red brick or similarly blending material. Green buildings. Affordable and low income housing mixed in.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	This should be 4 stories or less
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	STOP WITH THE HIGH DENSITY ANYTHING!!! It is ruining our town!
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	See above comment regarding existing businesses.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Redevelopment on the north side of Rosemary should not exceed 4 stories and should be consistent with the adopted West Rosemary St design guidelines.
E		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Maybe turn the west side of Franklin into more of a pedestrian mall like area?
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	incompatible with neighboring, historical uses
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Having anything that tall front onto Franklin St. blocks sunlight, increases heat, and makes it seem like we live in a city instead of a town. I'm all for 4+ story development in other parts of town, but why does it front directly onto Franklin St?
F/L	Use	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	More commercial office area is needed.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Shorter buildings are better and I don't want development to encroach on the historic Hargraves neighborhood or increase tax value to the point that families have to move.
O		Downtown	Comment on Graham Street 2	Downtown should look at both sides of Franklin Street, in conjunction with UNC. UNC needs to get actively involved in this discussion, embracing the community not sitting on its side lines.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Parks and open spaces need to be at or better than a 1 to 6 ratio of remaining property developments.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	What about traffic??? There are already times of the day when this area is so slow for traffic as to feel hardly passable. How can we allow it to get worse with all the proposed development?
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	This is somewhat confusing vision.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Former administration took buzzwords from CH 2020 to create justification for E-F abomination--despite public opposition. Creating "Blue Hill" from flood plain and lowlands
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	strongly dislike tall buildings built to property line
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	strongly dislike tall buildings built to property line; way too much residential

O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	I have lived in the Ephesus-Fordham area for 20+ years, and the revitalization development is well worth the inconvenience while construction has gone on. Chapel Hill has needed more goods and services available here with the added tax revenue. Residents must accept that everything does not reach fruition at once.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	I don't agree with the under-4 story vision. The buildings should be 3-8 stories, with 3 stories on the street to reduce canyon effect, but, stepped up to taller heights mid-block.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Unless you fix/enlarge 15/501 this looks like a nightmare!
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	The maps are too small to actually see details.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Fordham Blvd is over-capacity. Any development should be required to buy out equal existing development. Any development should be restricted to areas adjacent to light rail stations, so as to reduce traffic on 15-501.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	This is really difficult to read.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Best thing that happened to development is form based code. Unfortunately, CHALT voted them out and it is slowly being dismantled
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Are you sure this is the current vision for the area - where did it come from?
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Are you sure this is the current vision for the area - The current land use plan shows an office emphasis at I-40
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Map is too small to be effective... For 15-501, too, the left-right balance is important. This is the entry-image of Chapel Hill, its first impression, so green should dominate, alternating with brilliant town-appropriate development, showing both sides of Chapel Hill, its green side and its smart side.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Chapel Hill 2020 was deeply flawed and seriously skewed by developer interests. This area was sold out in the form based code. We do NOT WANT high-density many-story buildings infesting a bleak wasteland.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	Frankly, the only thing being built feels like large amounts of apartments. The large apartment complex that bisects Elliott road is an example of what comes to mind
F		North 15-501	Comment on Current Vision	More park and open space. Unites a community.
F		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	I will always prefer the open green space option. In the long term it is the green space that unites a community and keeps the community healthy. Buildings come and go. Businesses come and go. Families come and go. Green space, once protected, lasts throughout.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	More green space would be better
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	I do not want rail. Also, there is no option for reduced development. We do not need more homes and apartments either. Yes they provide tax revenue but they fundamentally change the nature of our community and require greater expenditures too. It is not worth what we lose.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	I do not support more homes or Rabbit Transit. You do not provide that option anywhere.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Suggest not limiting the building height to 4 stories. Why do that if there is an opportunity for higher density and taller buildings? We are limited in CH with land due to Urban Services Boundary. We need to maximize the few locations for commercial and multi-family development.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Townhomes are the minimum density needed out here. We need midrise and highrise in this part of town. No single family houses. The rest of the scenario is pretty good. I'm comfortable with tall buildings out here (10+ stories) to build the tax base.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	There may not be a transit station
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Except that nothing should be more than four stories, this is an improvement.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	The uses are only partially indicative of the urban space that is being formed, of the impression this corridor leaves with those who pass through it. It would be great to develop a rhythm to this entrance corridor, e.g. urban high density, then green, then mid density commercial, then ... I strongly believe that while thinking about uses is important, thinking about the urban form is much more important. Uses may change within decades, urban form tends to stick around much longer.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	15/501 would need to be redesigned to accommodate this. Perhaps to have exits and overpasses.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Eastowne should redevelop at higher density to take advantage of location near I-40
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	We have so little developable land, can we afford only 4 stories?
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Hard to judge. Please do slide Wegman's from Performance lot location closer to my house on Mason Farm Road. Needs much more green (parks, open space and the like, also woodlands.)
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Very strong supporter of the light-rail plan.
F/L	Other	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Need to be sure to keep affordable housing options around here. If you develop a mixed use space, the apartment rents will likely increase. And the townhomes and houses on the west side of 15/501 here are already pricey.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Maintain a verdant gateway area consistent with Chapel Hill's identity as a "tree city" or "city in a park." New development on the Orange County side should emphasize commercial (retail/office/lab) rather than residential.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Too dense. Need more green spaces
F		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	how much institutional land do y'all need? you're already taking over Homestead and Rogers Road and trying to build stuff near the old airport.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Not in favor of Light Rail - not fiscally responsible or defensible
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	I would be happy to see light rail coming to Chapel Hill and the Triangle area.
F		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Placement of open space seems weird.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Strongly urge the construction of traffic roundabouts in this area, to ease congestion, and keep traffic moving.
F/L	Landscaping	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Not enough green space. DO NOT allow developers to rape the land and add saplings. It makes for desert temperatures when walking.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	The map does not define what is being changed to what. Anything that increases traffic at N 15-501 - I-40 junction will require rebuild of that junction to be without lights and allow continuous flow from all 4 major traffic sources to and from the 3 others. In other words, a huge and expensive rebuild of that junction. Check out Salt Lake City UT junction of I-80 and I-15. Otherwise, you will make 15-501 unusable, and push traffic onto NC 54, which is already overcapacity.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	too crowded near Legion Rd
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	The main change is addition of parks/open space, which is good. However, the plan should not assume inclusion of DOLRT, which will likely not (and should not) receive federal funding.

E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Address flooding issues at Eastgate before further development
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	NO LIGHTRAIL!!!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Most of it is fine, but this is a missed opportunity north of 15-501. mix uses and allow or even encourage density.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	I like the addition of light rail, but not not like the 4+ structure plans. Would prefer to keep buildings below tree lines.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Light rail not likely funded. UNC Health development will cause big traffic on 15-501
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	This is absurd. Where do the DOLRT users park? Where is the pedestrian bridge to connect businesses on each side of Fordham? Etc, Etc.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	This is a good idea, but 15/501 will need widening to ensure that new use patterns don't choke access to downtown CH (or Whole Foods etc.)
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	I like the addition of light rail, but not not like the 4+ structure plans. Would like larger public park and open spaces. Would prefer to keep buildings below tree lines.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	This is confusing.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	don't like any 4+ offices, shops, and multifamily units
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Nice to have some things of interest near transit stop but MORE green space! More family friendly areas! Splash pad, Playgrounds, trails please!
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	I realize this is a 2d zoning/land use plan, but is it possible to show more integration across 15-501, including both green-systems and circulation (NMT and road).
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	There is no alternative presented, so can't really say if would prefer this plan to another
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	It is hard to give an opinion with such an abstract graphic. My concerns are traffic, storm water runoff, and whether infrastructure project to deal with these issues are completed before construction of apartments, etc is done. This is my overriding concern for any of these areas.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	There are enough apartment complexes near the high rail area. Increasing the density would make Mt. Moriah Rd intersection impassable.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Too much "Institutional" use right next to Interstate - aka - prime real estate for offices and light high value industrial.
E		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	If you are going to add more retail and housing in this area you need to improve the traffic flow!
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Eastowne should include a mix of uses (UNC, private office, retail, hotel, apartments, affordable housing). There also needs to be a bridge connecting Eastowne to the other side of 15-501
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	When 15-501 was built, Durham and CH agreed that there would *never* be development along either side. Another broken promise.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	This only makes sense with light rail funding. Without it better to concentrate on BRT on 15-501 to Durham.
O		North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Stop the light rail now! Bus transit is more affordable and flexible
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	The emphasis on mixed-use development in some parts of the plan is good, but in some areas residential areas are cordoned off from shops and offices. How pedestrian and bicycle friendly will the development be overall?
F/L	Landscaping	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Park/open space must be green, not a concrete jungle. What about green roofs on some of these buildings?
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	Parks and open spaces need to be at or better than a 1 to 6 ratio of remaining property developments.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	1. I feel like building height along 40 could be increased to take advantage of the fact there are no neighbors and its along a highway. 2. I know Eastowne will be a major employer, but I also like the idea of other anchor employer here, so that more people can work in CH over commute. 3. How about some more green space in the South side of 501? One large block of development looks intimidating.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	1. I feel like building height along 40 could be increased to take advantage of the fact there are no neighbors and its along a highway. 2. I know Eastowne will be a major employer, but I also like the idea of other anchor employer here, so that more people can work in CH over commute. 3. How about some more green space in the South side of 501? One large block of development looks intimidating. For example, a patch of green that can accommodate a greenway with a nice buffer up the middle to encourage bike/ped access to shops and green space on the North. I also anticipate some portion of Legion becoming a destination for people who live up here and we would want to encourage bike/ped transit South.
F/L	Other	North 15-501	Comment on Gateway Station 1	More housing for <50% AMI. Needs to be located close to this future transit line
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	The town needs to address the flooding concerns in the housing in this area. I support dense redevelopment that protects low-income tenants here
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Not dense enough
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Why would townhouses and homes be in an area that floods?
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	1. Yes. We need to take better advantage of height. 2. I feel like we have to do something about flooding and storm water impacts downstream. Conceptually thinking about a visualization of a map that is based on the two creeks as opposed to the two main roads. If we prioritize taking care of these creeks, expanding green space around them, etc. what would that look like? (Imagine Bolin Creek trail continuing to 501 for example). In more concrete terms, I don't see how south of Estes is a place to build homes.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Parks and open spaces need to be at or better than a 1 to 6 ratio of remaining property developments.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	no more townhomes along the creek. This is clearly a flood zone. Keep it a green area
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I like the idea of 4 story or less buildings, but right now I'd prefer NO MORE CONSTRUCTION!
F/L	Landscaping	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I like the idea of 4 story or less buildings, but right now I'd prefer NO MORE CONSTRUCTION or development!!! You are cutting down all our trees that made Chapel Hill the attractive community it was. No more construction!!
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	It's hard to figure out this plan, because so few of the roads are identified. One cannot tell exactly where the designated areas are and thus understand to what extent the town is continuing its adventure in developing in the local flood plain, as it has done before.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	With recent flooding from Hurricane Florence what makes anyone think additional building in the flood plain called University Place makes sense. And who wants parks built in what is currently vacant flood Plains? Is the plan to include tearing down homes in OldRidgefield and Ridgefield Park to create parks?
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	There should be more green space along Bolin Creek and Booker Creek

E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	If you are going to add more retail and housing in this area you need to improve the traffic flow!
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	If you are going to add more retail and housing in this area you need to improve the traffic flow! Need to be mindful of the areas near here that are prone to flooding!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Keeping townhomes and homes in the floodplain is a very bad idea. The low density area in pink needs to be denser to encourage development. You don't need to build a skyscraper there, but don't limit it to max 4 stories.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Keeping townhomes and homes in the floodplain S of Estes is a very bad idea. Zone it as a park. The low density area in pink needs to be denser to encourage development. You don't need to build a skyscraper there, but don't limit it to max 4 stories.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Density should not be increased in this area, which is already subject to much flooding. If anything, condos (Camelot Apts, Brookwood) and Ridegfield Apts. should be torn down and converted to green space, or water retention basins.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	4+ stories is not acceptable. Neither are buildings built right up to the road
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	This looks OK, but how is storm water handled in this area which is a flood plain. I can't give an informed opinion unless I have information about how storm water is to be handled.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I prefer to see this in 3d massing model, which would make it easier to comment. Most people would benefit from that approach.
				I prefer to see these options in 3d massing model, which would make it easier to comment. Most people would benefit from that approach.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I think there should be an intermediate category of 3-5 stories. "Less than 4" will likely end up being too low and "more than 4" can be too dense if there is no bracketing.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	This is a major flood plain. Are you talking about developing on top of it? Don't lose existing trees, greenways.
F/L	Site Design	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	This is equally foolish. Where is the centralized parking serving all new development? How do pedestrians/bike rides get anywhere?
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I'm concerned that University Place is caters to those with a lot of disposable income and that the housing would be undesirable due to noise and traffic. That means that affordable housing here would be punishment for being poor. Can afford a quiet home and can't afford to walk across the street to see a movie.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I don't see how this is any different from the current implementation
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Object to more density in floodplain!!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Do not like the 4+ story buildings and no light rail
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I prefer buildings to be less than 4 stories. I appreciate the public park and open spaces.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Chapel Hill longtime residents tend to fear change and rebel at construction disturbance. However, this central U. Place area will add a lot of convenience and benefits for our growing population.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Address flooding issues along Estes before further development
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	This area is flood-prone already, and does not have the infrastructure to support additional development. Infrastructure and water management must be addressed first.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Address flooding issues or do nothing all
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Tall buildings do not fit with the character of this area of Chapel Hill. I much prefer this scenario to University Place-2
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	4+ stories (really 7 as currently zoned) are not appropriate for this area.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	This does not seem to look toward alleviating flooding issues that happen here. It would be much better if house could be removed from susceptible areas and be replaced with natural areas that can control for flooding
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	concern about adding homes near flood area on Estes, but I prefer this one to University Place - 2
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I do not advocate multi-level structures being built in this highly trafficked area. Also, need installation of traffic roundabouts to control traffic flow.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Fine as is.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Needs much more green (parks, open space and the like, also woodlands.)
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	This alternative is reasonable, but already obsolete because the Blue Hill district already is experiencing redevelopment in excess of 4 stories.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	DO NOT build up! We hate driving around town and seeing multi level buildings going up. It takes away from our town.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	More open space, not less!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I dislike limiting buildings to 4 stories. It wastes valuable land and decreases the tax value by capping the height at 4 stories.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Please acknowledge that University Place is in a flood zone. More intense development should be moved away from the creeks/flood zones
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Look for ways to connect green infrastructure with corridors
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	NOTHING SHOULD BE MORE THAN FOUR STORIES! Single-story buildings are what we want. 2-3 story buildings are tolerable. Four-story buildings are too tall, exceed the height of the tree canopy, reflect road noise throughout the vicinity, block views, and are public nuisances. This is not rocket science. Keep the tall buildings downtown and stop destroying the rest of Chapel Hill.
F/L	Other	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	It seems like this is getting rid of some of the more affordable apartments and townhomes, and that's bad for Chapel Hill.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	I think we can go up to at least 6 stories comfortably along Franklin by the Siena Hotel. I like the parks, but be bolder in placing more residential nearby to take advantage of it.
F/L	Other	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Suggest creating another form-based code zone for this area. The Ephesus-Fordham form-based code has worked well. Exempting the RCD was the key. Only minor face-lifting done in E-F District for 30+ years until the E-F Dist was created.
F/L	Other	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Now many opportunities for redevelopment in that zone. Could generate the same result here with form-based code.
F/L	Other	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Step in the right direction, but may not go far enough. Suggest creating another form-based code zone for this area. The Ephesus-Fordham form-based code has worked well. Exempting the RCD was the key. Only minor face-lifting done in E-F District for 30+ years until the E-F Dist was created. Now many opportunities for redevelopment in that zone. Could generate the same result here with form-based code.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	Floodplain issues need to be addressed! Engineer Bolin and Booker Creek to drain faster from the soccer fields to NC 54 area!
F/L/E	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 1	More townhomes and houses to flood along the creek? Brilliant.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	needs to accommodate multimodal transportation

E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Bolin + Booker Creeks need engineering to prevent flooding along Estes Dr. Clear the blockage past the golf course to allow ater to drain faster past NC 54
F/L	Other	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Yes! This is the way to do it. Either via form-based code or Development Plan. Actually, prefer the former since multiple owners in the district, therefore multiple applications. Form-based code, exempt the RCD from this zone. We will then generate redevelopment of this rather under developed location.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Good to see greater intensity! The park pieces connecting the dense areas are great. well done!
F/L/E	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	4 story development on Franklin? No. None of these plans deal with resulting increased traffic!!! It is though you expect everyone to take the bus or ride a bike. Ludicrous.
F/L	Other	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	It seems like this is getting rid of some of the more affordable apartments and townhomes, and that's bad for Chapel Hill.
		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	I don't have a problem with this plan in particular, but I am not sure if it is feasible in certain parts. Mainly I don't know if that much high density commercial can be supported without more residential and a large part of the 4+ Multifamily that is added in this alternative as opposed to university pl 1 is Willow Terrace which are privately owned condos. I don't know if redevelopment is feasible because of the difficulty of convincing that many property owners to sell or change their community covenants and structure.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	What the devil is wrong with you people. Four stories is MUCH too high. Creates too much traffic, too much noise, too much eyesore. This is a wretched disaster of an idea.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Urban space is formed by what's left and right of streets. This needs to be fairly balanced to make impactful urban space. Perhaps some streets are boundaries between disparate urban forms --however, such streets easily become or remain more severe boundaries to cross-traffic, even become social boundaries (like the proverbial "tracks" in former times).
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	These options are not taking into consideration the natural topography and flood zones - please create more options
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Ideally, this will also allow for easier pedestrian connections between Franklin St. shopping corridor, Rams Head, University Place, and Glen Lennox.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Again just 4 stories is a waste. Maximize the opportunity. We have no LAND. 10 years from now we will regret these decisions.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Yes to 4+ stories and increased density. This is better use of space and better for the tax base.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Office and commercial space within the town of Chapel Hill seems like an amazing waste of living space. If CH had decent mass transit within the town, not just focused on the campus, then folks could take a bus to office spaces in more outlying areas, and leave the central portion of the city for recreation, shopping, living.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	To much 4+ story development
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Franklin St is already impossible to drive on OR park on. How you going to make it MORE dense. It will be like a black hole.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	How might this impact Bolin Creek flooding issues?
F/L/E	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	good location for density, economic development, how to deal with traffic
F/L/E	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Advocate against multi-level structures being built in this area. Also, traffic roundabouts will be needed to control vehicular flow.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	concern about adding homes near flood area on Estes
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	All need more green space. Keep woods near the library, etc.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	A core problem for this area is traffic congestion. Current projects describe rapidly growing backups without adequate allowance for development of other areas along 15-501. Sadly, traffic taxes are dedicated to DOLRT that will have no effect on traffic through this corridor.
F/L/E	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	We can't accommodate more intensity because of traffic.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Again, this does not seem to control for potential flooding near University Place. I think this is a huge issue, this area has flooded multiple times in the past decade and costs extreme amounts of money in loss.
F/L/E	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	We do not need more tall structures like the Berkshire. Why is this plan for Blue Hill being proposed after the fact (Hillstone, Fordham apts etc already being built)? Also, neither plan recognizes the impact of stormwater or transit issues.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Address flooding issues before further development in this area. Bikes are not a panacea for transportation. Consider accessibility issues.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Bedrooms, family rooms, laundry rooms are FILLING with stormwater repeatedly on the south edge of this map. It's NOT OKAY to keep building and ignore this! PLEASE address this!!
F/L/E	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	But don't like more commercial property on Franklin, it's a parking lot before/after work.
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	The extension of roads across 15-501 is badly needed to add to our limited East-West roadways, eliminate some returns to 15-501 to travel a mile for the next entry to an area.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Again, very poorly conceived. How do area residents get to the park on the opposite side of Fordham? Drive? Where do they park? This is not planning -- it is reacting to developer profit maximization as has occurred starting with the ridiculous Berkshire and it's private parking garage.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	I like the larger green space
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Ignores senior care facility and existing businesses; redevelopment will chase them out
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	There is room for "tall" development near the core of CH. It does not make sense to me to try to maintain disparate centers in a town of our size. The S Estes area is a good amenity for those who live nearby, but it's not clear that there is much benefit from "densifying" it.
F/L/E	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	The problem here is that high density means noise and traffic. There's no solution offered to that.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Like the larger public/open spaces; dislike the 4+ story structures. Would like to see a light rail incorporated.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	I prefer an intermediate category of 3-5 stories as a maximum. With optional 5-8 if there is justification at appropriate central locations.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	The 4+ category is too dense along Franklin....but 4 stories is fine. I prefer an intermediate category of 3-5 stories as a maximum. With optional 5-8 if there is justification at appropriate central locations.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	More green space is always good. Approve of higher story buildings especially if garages are on the ground floor to decrease flooding risk.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	4+ stories is not acceptable. Neither are buildings built right up to the road
F/L	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	University Place is dense enough.
F/E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	This is better than University Place - 1. For some reason, there are still townhouses and houses in the flood zone - my vision of future Chapel Hill does not have residents having to escape flooding over there every other year.

F/L/E	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	This is better than University Place - 1 due to density increase. For some reason, there are still townhouses and houses in the flood zone - my vision of future Chapel Hill does not have residents having to escape flooding over there every other year.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	There also needs to be more Green Space along Bolin Creek - maybe shift the residential back away from the creek.
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	At least this version has slightly more green space. My office is at the corner of Franklin and Estes; I am highly resistant to adding more shops and offices in that area. And the prospect of redeveloping U Mall into condos and townhomes is disgusting. Presumably it would entail a parking garage? For shame.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	As in the case of the first map of the University Place area, a larger maps with more streets identified would enable a reader to identify more precisely what construction is planned for which area.
F/E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Don't change anything! It is fine the way it is. Slow down development until you get the traffic and flooding problems under control!!!!
E		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	2 is better than 1; more green space. But please no new development along the creek. This is clearly a flood zone
F/L	Use	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Parks and open spaces need to be at or better than a 1 to 6 ratio of remaining property developments.
F/L/E	Dimensional Standards	North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I like the approach to south of Estes better. 2. All in all I like more density for the town. 501 has traffic problems already, though. Wondering how additional traffic would impact. 2. On that note, I see an opportunity here for a concept like Southern Village. Traffic during commuter times but all in all a self sufficient walking community that has everything residents need. Maybe some sort of open space in the center like So Vill? 3. Better yet, how about envisioning the area east from the community center to Indian Springs Road as an expanded park/community center that could be an anchor/focus to the whole development.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	Overall, redevelopment is needed - but to reflect real market conditions not ideology. Visual images used in this Q&A are not as clear about edges and boundaries as they should be.
O		North 15-501	Comment on University Place 2	why does this not include the brown apartment's area?
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Want more woodland
E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Would really like to see a daily park and ride option near rapid transit stops within town.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Not enough single family homes. Too much town homes and student housing. Not enough open space/parks.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Limit more residential.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Population density and reduction of green space is a major concern.
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	not sure where the new development is going - appears to be on existing homes
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	not sure where the new development is going - appears to be on existing homes; transit stops need to be put where the need is, not the reverse
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Perhaps the land is no longer available, but much more green space or parks are needed in this area.
F/L	Landscaping	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	What about more green spaces and preserving the older trees?
F/L/E	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	There should be no office or commercial development at the MLK/Estes Dr. intersection. Traffic is already horrendous. Keep more open space, walking paths connecting with surrounding areas
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	I can't tell from map what this really means - specifics and pros/cons
F/E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	I have many questions about the increases in density. What are the plans to address stresses on infrastructure and environmental impact? Will the impact on the community at large take precedent over developers? Any development should take place in a planned and careful manner. For example, many areas of Chapel Hill are prone to flooding. How will development in this area impact flooding in other areas?
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Better than Homestead Road-2 option. Can we keep it a fairly pleasant corridor to travel along?
E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Too congested.
F/L/E	Landscaping	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Too much traffic! Huge amounts of trees already destroyed!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Overall, we should be leveraging the future BRT and the possibility with of Carolina North with allowing more places for people to live, work, and shop. Neighborhood businesses need to have a sufficient number of people living near them to help support them. Aaron Lubeck at Duke estimates that number is an average of 35 people per acre within a half mile of the business district.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Too many shops and offices. Concentrate them downtown first, then build out. Nobody to have a business if downtown is going to be the great place you hope it is.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	there has already been so much building on Homestead.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Much more green/open space should be planned here; we don't need dense development at the intersection of MLK and Estes
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	If we have BRT funding this could work.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	I believe it could use more density around transit.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	I believe it could use more density around transit. CH needs growth to stay relevant.
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	Since I am more accepting of rapid bus transit than of light rail, this is acceptable
F/E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 1	If multi-story buildings are to be built at the intersection of MLK Blvd and Estes Dr, I would strongly encourage that a traffic roundabout be built in this area, in lieu of the existing traffic signal system.
F/E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Same comment applies here about the installation of a roundabout, or multiple roundabouts.
F/L	Site Design	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	i assume this incorporates the current airport and that future 4+ building would be after the airport is closed. i am not opposed to this, but 4+ stories would need to blend into the surrounding area and may be hard to sell to some folks in town.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Much more green/open space should be planned here; we don't need dense development at the intersection of MLK and Estes
F/L	Other	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Conceptually increasing density near transit stops is good. This land use drawing needs to refine more specifically which properties would actually be good prospects and which existing neighborhoods with moderate housing should be untouchable. Lower density older apartments 2/3 stories are a valuable housing resource we do not need to discard or replace without very careful thought about how/where dislocated households can go and still remain in Chapel Hill with access to transit. BE CAREFUL
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Much more open and green space should be created here

F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	I like this ONLY if the cap for building height is 5 or 6 stories. 4+ stories leaves the potential for huge variation, most of which is unacceptable and unnecessary.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	I dislike the 4+ story buildings
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	I do not like 4+ story buildings.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Overall, I like that this scenario adds places for people to live and allows density near the BRT stops. I think that 5-7 stories would provide enough space for people to live to support a neighborhood businesses along MLK. There should also be some allowances for small-scale residential infill like appropriately, sized duplexes, triples, etc.. in the neighborhoods closest to MLK. Development should taper down to the surrounding neighborhoods, but the neighborhoods should also be allowed to taper up to the new development.
E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	The water retention pond on Piney Mtn, just east of Timber Hollow apartments, seems crucial for rain management and local wildlife.
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Same scenario as Homestead Road - 1!
E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Too congested.
E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	This will just add more cars to MLK, they won't take public transportation all the time.
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	What's meant by institutional?
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	There isn't much difference between 1 and 2
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Shops on west side of MLK not dense enough.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	I like the dense multipurpose/commercial areas, but it seems like a very risky investment. Similar to how the shopping area on the MLK/Homestead corner is seldom visited, I'm worried about whether it will get enough visitors unless it is properly designed and integrated with local apartments and/or transit.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Increased density close to transit stops is better.
F/E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Bus service is curtailed because of limited ability to support it. Federal support is declining. We need BRT. No rezoning until we have it!
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Absolutely opposed. Too dense.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Keep building heights at 4 stories or less.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Not significantly different from option 1, and I don't think that "tall" development makes sense along MLK. (I can see 4 stories, but not 5; "4+" is a little ambiguous on this front)
F/E		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Make sure we have open space and connections between the open spaces for non motorized transportation
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Not enough open space and parks. Not enough single family homes.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Not enough open space
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	Want more woodland
O		S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	I can't tell from map what this really means.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on Homestead Road 2	All options need to reflect greater density.
O		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	I can't actually tell the difference, from this diagram, between those two plans
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Opposed to the increase in density.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Still no options of preserving green spaces and lower populations.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Keep building height 4-stories or less.
E		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Care must be taken to mitigate potential damages from flooding, increased temperatures, humidity etc. decades into the future (keeping climate change in mind).
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	If the plan is to bring in more people, please bring in shops and services for them so they won't have to travel for everything.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	It would be great if we could keep development to 4 stories or less
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Increased density near transit is better.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Bad location for shops, also offices. Already confusing/congested traffic patterns
O		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Yike! Please don't do this. Oh wait, you already did, didn't you? Those low apartment buildings got knocked down and you've already voted to let them make taller ones, haven't you? Why are you even bothering to ask if you're just going to follow your own vision?
O		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	By the way, I don't think this survey took a short amount of time (as you promised) nor really said much to us about exactly what the town will look like under the various scenarios.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	I like the new street grid that is shown in this area. I think this area could overall support more people and 5 to 7 stories along the BRT seems more appropriate to support BRT, provide places for people to live, and ultimately support downtown. This should show some additional green space along Bolin Creek near Hillsborough Road.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	I like the new street grid that is shown in this area. I think this area could overall support more people and 5 to 7 stories along the BRT seems more appropriate to support BRT, provide places for people to live, and ultimately support downtown.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	No tall buildings! This is not Cary or Raleigh.
E		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Too congested.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	The demand for student housing between Hillsborough and MLK is high. Density here should be maximized.
O		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	I CAN'T SEE THIS TINY MAP, even on my very large screen. This is useless.
E		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	The area near the proposed transit stop is subject to flooding now. Any development must be done based on sound water management science. Also, Hillborough cannot handle CURRENT traffic to UNC, much less the addition of higher density.
O		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2	Would be good to show how this interfaces with downtown in massing model.

F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2 I don't like 4+ story buildings.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2 Seems like it would be OK if brown was mixed into the purple
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	This is the area where density should be increased, not in the areas further from downtown. But, cap building height at 5 or 6 stories and require that the floors actually be used. The walgreens on MLK/Weaver Dairy has the facade of a three-story building but functions as a one-story business.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	three/four story build to building heights need to be encouraged with 1/2 story buildings not permitted for redevelopment. Residential impervious maximums need to be re-examined. Our penchant for wanting added pedestrian and bike connections and facilities is great, but need to be an add on to impervious amounts allowed to permit us to create the type of detailed and functional urban streets and transit corridor amenities we want for adjoining development.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2 yes, density
E		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2 Again, please consider the natural slope of this area before building multi-level structures.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 2 There is no need for single family units. I like the higher density. Expand area range westward.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 This option does not provide enough places for people to live. Downtown and UNC need more places to live nearby to better support them.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 This is an extension to downtown. Discourage single family units. Increase the area further westbound. Be bold!
F/L/E	Other	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Please consider the steep natural slope of this area, before building multistory structures.
F/L/E	Other	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 The town has done a poor job at keeping up infrastructure. People like the small town feel of a university town ad don't want to see ti lost.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 The focus should be on commercial development, offices, stores, businesses
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 This area closer to downtown should be where density is increased the most. Allow 5 or 6 stories in the shops, offices, multifamily areas.
O		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 redevelopment rather than all-out land stripping
E		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Hello...flood plain?
E		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Too congested.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 No 4 stories
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	I think these needs to have room for more people and activities - i.e. be taller, with appropriate transition to existing neighborhoods. If we are thinking out to 2049, we need a lot of places for people to live given the growth that is intended to occur in the Triangle as a whole during that time.
F/L	Building Design	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Franklin street is going to lose its unique charm with so much redevelopment.
O		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Really hard to read these maps. Wasn't able to enlarge them on my phone
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Always putting limits on density is a problem in Chapel Hill. It hurts affordability.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	It's too difficult to see the differences between the two maps. I think more affordable housing and homes is good, and I would prefer for there to be less commercial development because it seems like businesses along Franklin frequently change anyway so maybe more competition would hurt them.
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Depends on the amount of the increase in the density of population. Condos--not apartments are preferred. (Apartments take \$ out of the community and return nothing.)
O		S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Sort of reflects what's there now
F/L	Use	S. MLK	Comment on S of Hillsborough St 1 Too many townhomes, condos, apartments. Not enough single family homes.
F/L	Dimensional Standards	S. MLK	I guess this is the better of the two options, but again, Hillsborough is a narrow-ass road that can't be widened, and it's THE artery to campus from this side of town. Why are you increasing density here? It's already highly dense. Remember when CH was a town, not a student playground?