



TOWN OF CARRBORO

PLANNING BOARD

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2008

MEMBERS	GUESTS	STAFF
Heidi Paulsen	Alderman Lydia Lavelle	Trish McGuire
Matthew Barton	Scott Radway	Thelma Paylor
Rich Bell	Sheila Northern + 8 WLHO	
David Clinton		
Debra Fritz		
Chadbourne		

Absent: Carnahan, Cook, Poulton

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Meeting called to order by Heidi Paulsen, Vice Chair. McGuire noted there were no adjustments to the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A) January 17, 2008 – approved with comments noted on the minutes. Barton moved for approval of the Minutes as amended and seconded by Fritz. **AYES:** Barton, Fritz and Paulsen; **ABSTENTIONS:** Bell, Clinton, and Chadbourne; **ABSENT/EXCUSED:** Carnahan, Cook, and Poulton. The motion carried. (Page 2, 2nd paragraph near the bottom, Fritz was referring to the dark sky report, will it be here in two weeks; #2 correct the spelling of **parking**; page 3, section C, names listed should include Paulsen (Lavelle, Carnahan, **Paulsen** and Poulton); add Robert Kirschner's comment in regarding service vehicles.
- B) February 7, 2008 – postpone discussion until next meeting to get input from other board members. Debra Fritz suggested some editorial changes on page 2, paragraph three.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A) **Election of Officers** – When Paulsen asked if anyone would like to run for President or Vice President, there was no response. Chadbourne moved and Barton seconded the motion to keep the current slate of officers. **AYES:** (5) Barton, Chadbourne, Clinton, Fritz, and Paulsen; **NOES:** (0); **Abstentions:** (1) Bell (he felt everyone should be present); **ABSENT/EXCUSED:** (3) Carnahan, Cook, Poulton. The motion carried.

B) **Required Concept Plan for Tilley Farms Subdivision off Highway 54** – The Concept Plans were examined at the February 7, 2008 meeting. Debra Fritz provided draft comments at that time, based on her participation in the walkabout. Barton suggested opening this up for comments to everyone and Paulsen agreed that it sounded great. Two representatives signed up to speak on the project: Sheila Northern (President, WLHOA) and Scott Radway, designer of Tilley Farm subdivision.

The following issues were discussed: Barton asked if there was any practical way to gain the emergency vehicle, bike and pedestrian access from NC Highway 54 connecting to the extension of Winsome Lane. McGuire noted that staff has not evaluated the plans on this topic or other LUO ordinance consistency and asked Scott Radway to respond to that question. Radway noted that it is physically possible to connect; but

there are not a lot of locations where that can happen. When asked about affordable housing component to this development or payment in lieu, Radway said nine lots is over five lots and the expectation is that the town would want some affordable housing component. The owner will propose a payment in lieu of including affordable units on site. Chadbourne asked about the density, is it maxed out in terms of its density. Radway responded that it is one unit per five acres and the max is nine units; plus the provision of the ordinance allows you to do a cluster. The density in the watershed requires each lot to be self sustaining, no shared septic systems, and no shared wells limits any increases in density. Radway added that the lots will be subject to stringent impervious surface limitations. Only four percent of the entire acreage in the site can be used for impervious surface; which is roughly two acres of impervious surface out of 50 acres of land and 20% of that pervious surface would be needed for the public street.

Bell requested clarification as to why the concept plan did not include a connection to Highway 54. Radway stated they made the assumption that they would not have a roadway connecting to NC 54 due to limited sight distance (visibility), existing easement that provides access to the private cemetery, and additional impervious surface needed for a longer street. Bell noted that it seemed desirable for a street connection to also provide for bike and pedestrian access to Hank Anderson Park. Radway noted that he and the applicant felt that a road connecting Hwy 54 to Winsome Lane and through to Old Fayetteville Road will generate too much traffic and they don't think it is the right thing to do. Alderman Lavelle requested a discussion about a greenway connection. McGuire commented that there had been some discussion following the walkabout of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan's proposed Morgan Creek Greenway.

There was a question about the standard for emergency access roads. Staff noted that this was addressed in the Fire Code (part of State Building Code) and there was a requirement for a certain type of surface and width. It was noted that gravel was permitted as an "all-weather" surface, but that this would count toward the project's impervious surface limit. Radway noted that the vehicle radius requirements for fire trucks might be the most problematic part of the standards. Radway has discussed with Fire Chief Travis Crabtree, who has suggested that if the homes have sprinkler systems, a separate emergency access may not be needed.

Other questions regarding: homeowner's association (yes, there will be one); potential for meadow or pasture serving horses (not sure); solar access (applicant is looking for the best environmental design that he can put out there; design of subdivision will seek to balance a number of factors including cost/length of street, aesthetics/choice of wooded vs. open lots, and others). Radway added that his client would use pervious pavers for the driveways, reuse of water since it is predominantly single family homes that can be collected and reused. There were also questions about creating larger green space contiguous to the park and whether the designer had considered making a loop road and connecting to Stroud Lane (no, much smaller and not designed to handle that level of traffic).

Paulsen asked if anyone had any recommendations and McGuire reminded Planning Board members that their role, if they choose to exercise it is to provide written comments to the applicant so that, should this design proceed through the rest of the process, a written comment on how and why the project did or did not respond to their comments would be provided when it returns for advisory board recommendations prior to the public hearing. Clinton asked if they could postpone for two weeks when Carnahan is available and Paulsen said she thought it would be good because all board members need to be present for their input. Alderman Lavelle suggested making comments for the attendees present. Clinton and Bell spoke on connectivity, bike and pedestrian access.

Connectivity issue to NC 54 – Clinton doesn't see a full purpose to make full connectivity; bike and pedestrian would be good in any case and Bell also agreed. Conceptual plan from the University Lake to

Smith Level Road is what is being considered now. Bell agrees on bike plan and it seems to him that it would be good to have access to the parkway and the school. He does not have enough information about the emergency vehicle issue and he would like to hear more. Fritz asked about bike pedestrian way, do we have any pervious surface or anything that can be used for that. Clinton mentioned access to the graveyard there and the turnaround at the end of the cul-de-sac and Fritz said right now that is dirt. What kind of pavement would be required for a bikeway? Clinton stated it need to connect from the end of the cul-de-sac and then to NC 54. Barton said going along NC 54 on a bike is a scary experience. Further, he stated that he didn't remember seeing a sign saying Stroud Lane is private property. A bike or pedestrian can easily travel along Stroud Lane. Chadbourne suggested bike connectivity between the two green spaces and Barton agreed that it could hook into Morgan Creek; which could eventually have some official trail.

Bell thanked Radway and asked why P- gravel was considered impervious surface (taking out the soil that is there and putting in different soil materials). Chadbourne mentioned the wells and septic tank requirements and Radway added the installation of water and sewer out in the rural areas would get rid of the environmental issues of well and septic (five year process) and no one wants to undertake it. McGuire added they have not been changed - all surfaces become impervious when they are compacted and summarized the Town's water supply watershed planning efforts.

Clinton said he was thinking more about impervious surface and how we handle run off should be revisited. Chadbourne proposed that we address all of the issues that are resulting in big strong developments in big sprawling areas like this and we should be more proactive in getting rid of these old laws. Bell asked Radway if he was developing a sense from the two different groups of what will help him with his design. Radway responded that he was really pleased with the discussion and they just don't have as much knowledge about the local issues and plan as the Planning Board does. The objective here is to get a great neighborhood. This discussion ended at 8:35PM. The Planning Board will resume discussion at the next meeting.

C) Regional Technology Strategy Report Recommendation – Barton suggested that we request the Board of Aldermen to allow us to proceed to adopt some kind of green building and green development standards and do the research necessary to reach that goal. Paulsen asked if NSAPIRC was finished and Aldermen Lavelle said yes, they turned it over to the Board of Aldermen. Paulsen suggested that the Planning Board get the Green Building Committee going with the EAB and TAB. That request was previously made to the Board. Carnahan had recommended that the Planning Board not approve the sustainability guidelines at this time in his email. Clinton suggested that the Planning Board recommend that these not be accepted. McGuire added that she thinks the Board of Aldermen wanted their recommendation on the three questions that have been referred to them: 1) recommended sustainability guidelines to the development review process, 2) consider ways to evaluate the town engineer's performance in the future contracts, and 3) delay requiring engineering detail until after the project has received a CUP but before the construction plan approval.

Item 1. Barton moved and seconded by Bell to address the sustainability guidelines and recommend that the Board of Aldermen not adopt the sustainability guidelines and focus their efforts on green building and green development through a joint board development approach. AYES: (5) Paulsen, Fritz, Bell, Clinton, and Barton; NOES: (0); ABSTENTIONS (1) Chadbourne; ABSENT/EXCUSED (3) Carnahan, Cook, Poulton.

Item 2. Planning Board members indicated some reticence in commenting on the review of the Town Engineer. Clinton stated that he doesn't believe they should be involved in that issue as it is largely an administrative issue to be handled by staff. Upon further discussion, the following motion was made:

Clinton moved and Barton seconded that the Planning Board strongly supports streamlining the development review process; however, the item that has been referred to us does not immediately convince us that there is value in delaying the inclusion of engineering detail until construction plan approval. The motion was unanimously approved. AYES: (4), Fritz, Bell, Clinton, and Barton; NOES: (0); ABSTENTIONS (2) Chadbourne and Paulsen; ABSENT/EXCUSED (3) Carnahan, Cook, Poulton.

Item 3. Barton noted that he loves detailed plans and Bell noted he doesn't see tremendous value in shortening this process and wonders if there are other things they can explore? Is there a way to speed the development process that doesn't deny information of the process? McGuire added that all processes have to comply with the LUO; special and conditional use permit approvals carry an additional level of scrutiny (public hearings, quasi-judicial proceedings, findings of fact, et cetera.).

IV. OTHER BUSINESS – None noted.

V. ADJOURNMENT Clinton moved to adjourn at 9:34 and Bell seconded. Support for adjournment was unanimous.