



TOWN OF CARRBORO

PLANNING BOARD

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 2008

MEMBERS	GUESTS		STAFF
James Carnahan	Jason Hamilton	Lydia Lavelle	Trish McGuire
David Clinton	Mike Neal	Robert Kirschner	Marty Roupe
Sharon Cook		EAB	Adena Messinger
Debra Fritz		TAB	Randy Dodd
Heidi Paulsen		AC	Jeff Kleaveland
Damon Seils		ESC	James Thomas
Susan Poulton		Richard Gaylord	James Harris
Matthew Barton		Bill Jackson	
Rich Bell		Doug Grenaid	
Rose Warner		Eric Wolfe	

Absent: Seth Chadbourne

I. JOINT REVIEW ITEMS – (PB, TAB, EAB, ESC, AC)

A) 120 Brewer Lane Conditional Use Rezoning/Conditional Use Permit Application – Trish McGuire introduced the item and summarized the rezoning request and findings. Jeff Kleaveland described the proposed site plan, including the size of the building, access through and connection with the 110 Brewer Lane project (i.e. modification of that project's conditional use permit to allow access to Brewer Lane through parking area), parking, appearance/elevation, storm water management, screening, downtown livability/urban amenities requirements. Mr. Kleaveland distributed a revised list of staff-recommended conditions. Two questions from the audience were entertained. First, whether/how construction impacts on the Libba Cotton bikeway would be mitigated (to be addressed in construction mitigation letter that will be submitted for public hearing). Second, whether the location of a new railroad car siding for the University had been selected (staff will check; there has been some communication between Jannice Ashley of the UNC property office on this topic. It is known that this site is not the selected location). Richard Gaylord, of Downtown Urban Ventures, LLC, owner of the property, introduced the other owner (Bill Jackson) and design team. Mr. Gaylord described the project's history and goals of owners/designers. Mr. Gaylord noted that the property was the long-term site of Ray Butler's auto repair business and that many green building, sustainable design features were being incorporated into the building and site. Some of these features include bike lockers and bike racks, green roof/landscaping over the parking garage, passive solar, photovoltaic panels for parking deck and hall lighting, reclaimed water for exterior watering, and locally produced brick.

Advisory board members had questions about several aspects of the proposal, as follows (responses, where provided, are noted in parentheses): location of bicycle and pedestrian access (via west end of building around and alongside service road proposed on 300 E. Main Street project; clarification of the number of stories (5 stories from E. Main Street, 5 stories from Libba Cotton, 4 stories from Brewer Lane); exterior materials (brick, stucco, aluminum (for windows); emergency vehicle access (breakable

1 or operable bollards to Libba Cotton bikeway, per Fire Department); security plan for underground
2 garage (not sure yet of how use of parking will be controlled, particularly spaces "shared" by residents
3 and businesses); clarification of size-limited units (yes they have them and they must remain so for one
4 year after occupancy); is there covered parking for bikes (yes, in garage, otherwise racks in courtyard.
5 Also exploring outlets for plug-ins and Zip car.); is there a LEED accredited professional in the project
6 (yes, though no plans for certification, 3rd party verification due to costs at present); if no 3rd party
7 certification, how will they prove green features (applicant is willing to agree to conditions for specific
8 items , if provided); are the balconies big enough to use (yes, approximately 5 feet deep and 12 feet
9 wide); expected commercial uses (office, though neighbors at neighborhood meeting also asked about
10 child and senior day care uses); will there be a centralized alarm system (yes); where is the green roof
11 (on the terrace above the parking deck, have also been considering use of planters on balconies and on
12 roof top. Roof will be accessible by building residents); plans call for existing trees to be used as
13 firewood, could they be milled instead? (applicant will explore); there appears to be no direct access to
14 courtyard from Libba Cotten bikeway (that is due to limited size of site and space limitations); assigned
15 spaces for residents and extra for service vehicles (incorporated into calculations, with spaces for
16 residential units and service vehicles). There was some discussion of access to bike parking through the
17 parking garage and further exploration of this point by Planning Board members.
18

19 Following conclusion of Joint Review portion of meeting, the Planning Board continued its inquiry of
20 the Butler, as follows: Requested clarification of pedestrian access on west end of property. Is it
21 through the landscaping? Though lots of time spent on design, sentiment that bike/ped access was not
22 as strong as it could be. What could Planning Board and owners/designers do to improve this so the
23 project is more porous, provides greater connectivity to the bike path and adjoining developments.
24 Challenges of matching the elevations and openings of both projects was noted as both projects
25 changed to meet the height and other provisions of LUO. Owners and designers discussed and agreed
26 that they were willing to work this out if could match up with the 300 E. Main project and are willing
27 to include a sidewalk along northern edge of building/south edge of service/access road to 300 E. Main
28 Street project. There was a request for clarification of some of the green building features, particularly
29 whether the owners were looking to use all the electricity from photovoltaics or use net metering.
30 Owners indicated that they are just exploring these options and learning about tax credit and other
31 opportunities. Request for clarification of staff comment on bike racks (staff indicated that there
32 appear to be some potential bike/auto conflicts in parking garage, as well as a possible deficiency in
33 bike parking spaces in view of number of residential units and commercial spaces and wanted to
34 highlight in case advisory board members wished to explore). Owners indicated they were willing to
35 return or to respond to questions otherwise.
36

- 37 B) Arbors at Winmore Required Concept Plan Review - Brandon Finch of John R. McAdams and Dean
38 Edwards, Vice President for Affordable Housing in Crosland LLC's Raleigh office presented the item.
39 Finch noted that the original conditional use permit for Winmore had set aside one lot for a co housing
40 project. Since no detail was provided, the permit required that a stand-alone permit be obtained in the
41 future. Finch summarized that 48 affordable units had been approved initially, showing the location of
42 the lots, and configuration of access drives, parking, et cetera. Crosland had determined that North
43 Carolina and federal tax credits could be used for affordable rental housing units. Per the permit, xx
44 of the lots were to be offered to Orange Community Housing and Land Trust. This has been done and
45 OCHLT has indicated that it is not able to take the units. This change requires a modification to the
46 conditional use permit in order to allow an increase in affordable units from 48 to 58 and an overall
47 increase in the number of units on the associated lots at Winmore from 56 to 58. The upper lot,
48 originally designated for co housing, will still need to go through a conditional use permit process.
49 Concept plan review, per Section 15-50 of the LUO, will not be needed as this was done for the
50 entirety of the site during the review of the Winmore project. Questions from advisory board members

1 were as follows: # of 3-bedroom units (16); #2-bedroom units (32); what is impact to schools and
2 transportation (increase in 2 units over originally approved project; residential density still available for
3 project; expect these impacts were considered when Winmore approved); access to the daycare
4 proposed by Goddard School (not aware of this); why a separate clubhouse (meeting space required by
5 state for tenants); access to community gardens (for residents of affordable units, process used to date
6 involves site preparation and organization by management association initially and turned over to
7 residents); access to Winmore amenities (these residential components will be part of HOA for
8 Winmore and residents will have equal access to all amenities available to HOA members).
9

10 11. INTRODUCTIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS – there were none.
11

12 III. Minutes Approval – May 15, 2008 – Matthew Barton moved approval of the minutes, seconded by
13 David Clinton. James Carnahan noted one edit – need to correct spelling of John Alderson's last name.
14 The motion was unanimously approved.
15

16 IV. Other Business – To be discussed at June 19 meeting.
17

18 V. Scheduling courtesy review for June 19 – Carnahan, Cook, and Warner indicated they would not be
19 available. Seven other members present indicated they would be available. Planning Board will meet
20 at 6:30 p.m., with light supper provided, to complete review of items scheduled for public hearing on
21 June 19th, and will convene with other Joint Review boards at 7:30 for a courtesy review of 300 E.
22 Main Street. The Planning Board will continue review of the June 24 public hearing items at the
23 conclusion of the courtesy review.
24

25
26 VI. ADJOURNMENT – The meeting adjourned at 9:50 PM.
27

