



# TOWN OF CARRBORO

## PLANNING BOARD

*301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510*

---

**THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 2009**

MEMBERS		STAFF
James Carnahan	Susan Poulton	Patricia McGuire
Sharon Cook	David Shoup	Thelma Paylor
Debra Fritz	Damon Seils	
Heidi Paulsen	Rose Warner	

**Absent:** (3) Matthew Barton, Rich Bell, and David Clinton

**I. INTRODUCTIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA** – The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Heidi Paulsen. The new PB member, David Shoup, was introduced, followed by introductions by all others present. Discussion of a LUO amendment proposal and the status of report on Top Ten Planning Projects were added under “Other Business.”

### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**A) March 19, 2009** –Seils moved to approve the minutes, subject to edits noted, and Carnahan seconded. Ayes: (6) Carnahan, Cook, Fritz, Paulsen, Seils, and Warner; Abstentions: (2) Poulton and Shoup.

### III. Old Business

#### A) Action on Sustainable Neighborhood Proposals

Paulsen opened the discussion. Questions and replies were as follows: Will item #8 (size limit on houses to 1,400 square feet) preclude large families from living in sustainable neighborhoods? (Other mechanisms could be used to achieve such neighborhoods, such as conditional use rezoning, with the specific design elements offered by the applicant/developer. Another strategy could be to use a scoring system like the one in the Austin Smart Growth Matrix. Projects with smaller houses could get a better score on this item, but projects would be able to include a mix of homes of varying sizes. David Clinton and staff are to provide information on resources and speakers who can help the Planning Board have a better understanding of this topic. Solid waste management/waste reduction/recycling were added as a 13<sup>th</sup> element in the proposal. The item will be scheduled for further discussion at a future meeting.

#### B) Discussion of Training Needs

McGuire noted that this item was on the agenda for two reasons. First, the Board of Aldermen had asked staff to develop training materials for all advisory boards in follow-up to a worksession in the fall. Staff will be meeting to discuss this matter soon; McGuire is seeking information on Planning Board members’ interest/need for training in general topics (procedural, structure of town government, open meetings, public records). In addition, McGuire is seeking to understand planning-specific training that might be of use to PB members. Possible training topics that were noted include: learning more about relationships between the advisory boards and the Board of Aldermen, how advisory board recommendations are transmitted to the Board of Aldermen, how formal or informal the process is and

should be, and how recommendations are considered by the Board of Aldermen; “starter” course on what PB members need to know; roles and responsibilities of PB members.

#### **IV. Other Business**

**A) Recommendation on Scheduling Connector Roads** – Carnahan voiced his concern about the town considering the connector roads issue during the political campaign. He noted that he would rather it not be conducted with that kind of intensity in the background. Q&A: Is that not artificially holding back the discussion to postpone until after the election? (A decision like that is for the Board of Aldermen to make. It doesn’t appear to be appropriate for the Planning Board to even make the recommendation. However, in a politically charged situation, the topic may not get the best possible hearing.) Is this going to be a single worksession with the Board of Aldermen or is it going to be a much more drawn out process? (Not known at present.) What is the process when the Board of Aldermen has decided that they want to review the connector road policy? (Expect it to be a lengthy process, with any changes following advisory board review and a public hearing, but details are not known at present. Changes to connecting roads requirements will involve changes to policy and the Land Use Ordinance). If substantive changes were proposed, would advisory board input be involved? (It is anticipated that advisory board input would be involved. Changes to the Land Use Ordinance are required to be referred to the Planning Board for review). Does staff have an idea of when this would be scheduled? (Staff has not yet discussed; expect to do so in course of updating the Quarterly Calendar. Due to workload, feel it is unlikely that worksession would be scheduled before the break, but do not know at present). Rather than making a recommendation on timing of work session, perhaps PB should recommend a process that would ensure advisory board review, opportunity for public input? (Yes, might also influence timing). Carnahan and Seils will exchange emails on developing a possible recommendation for the PB to consider at a future meeting.

#### **B) Review of Board of Aldermen Annual Retreat Follow-up**

McGuire noted that this is an informational item. The Board of Aldermen holds a retreat each year; this year a one-half (1/2) day retreat was held in February. A follow-up report on potential action items for the upcoming year was reviewed by the Board in early March. Lavelle described the retreat, noting that the focus of this year was concerns about money. Board received presentations from the State Treasurer’s office, Orange County Division of Social Services, town staff, which provided information on state, county, and local fiscal projections. Questions and answers included: What is the concern associated with the “reassess size of houses” item? (Not known; staff is working on GIS data to report on sizes of existing housing stock. Staff seeks to update the PB each year on initiatives of interest to the Board of Aldermen so that the PB will know what topics are underway and may ask for information on progress or opportunities to comment. Is it possible to post the agenda for the Board of Aldermen on the Town website on Friday prior to the meeting? (Staff and Board liaison will check with staff responsible for posting the agenda to see if this is possible).

#### **C) Review of past actions of the Planning Board/Board of Aldermen.**

1) Claremont CUP – Was this issue concluded at previous meeting? One outstanding question seemed to be regarding the basis for approval of CUP without street connection. Carnahan will be reviewing the meeting broadcast and has asked if it was possible to obtain copies of referenced emails. We learned that emails were not part of the public record. Seils noted that all emails that the Mayor had received were posted to his Google group. McGuire stated that emails could be part of the public record, but that the statements could not be part of evidence as they are hearsay. Members suggested it would be helpful if this requirement was made clear in an announcement at the beginning of any hearing and in other places, particularly since procedures for some hearings (i.e. quasi-judicial) are different from others.

Is there a way to hold public hearings in another location where there is more room? (The Board Room is the only space equipped for video broadcast and recording).

2) LUO Amendment re Water Quality Buffers – The Board of Aldermen adopted the ordinance on March 24th. It has been sent on to the State Division of Water Quality Staff for consistency and approval. The ordinance will be effective upon approval of the Environmental Management Commission. There were some edits/changes from the version the PB reviewed in the fall. A provision was added to specifically exclude applicability of the new provisions to developments that are in the application review process already and for up to 2 years after the effective date.

3) Arbors at Winmore/Griffiths Landing CUP – This project has two components, a new conditional use permit for the “coop” lot in the upper northwest portion of Winmore where townhouse-style apartments and a 12-unit apartment building are proposed. The second project, which involved modifying the Winmore conditional use permit, exchanges eight townhouse lots for an additional 12-unit apartment building in the lower southwest corner of Winmore. Both projects are being developed with tax credits through the NC Housing Finance Agency for rental units and will yield an overall increase in affordable units from 48 to 58 at Winmore. The Board of Aldermen approved the conditional use permit and the modification to the Winmore permit on March 24<sup>th</sup>.

**D) Text Amendment Application** - Cook distributed a proposal for a text amendment related to accessory apartments on farm properties and noted that the application has been submitted to the town. Questions/responses were as follows: Is Cook submitting the amendment application on her own? (Yes). Will Cook be submitting the application form and fee? (Notes that cover letter to staff seeks information on other requirements). Is Cook paying the fee for this application? (Yes). Does PB need to schedule a discussion before it is referred? (It will go through the amendment process). Can a person submit a text amendment for a situation that does not apply to them? (Yes). Can PB wait for this to come to them? (The Board of Aldermen will make the decision as to whether or not the item is referred to the Planning Board/scheduled for public hearing.) If it does not come to the PB/is not scheduled for further review, is there a way to know when the Board of Aldermen will be making that decision? (Staff will include anticipated schedule for review by Board of Aldermen and PB on the PB calendar).

**E) Top 10 Planning Items** – Staff will report on this later in the month. Will this whole list go back to the Board of Aldermen this spring for an update? Are any projects pretty far along? How soon would staff have something ready for the BALD on NSAPIRC? (No date specified at this time; not on the quarterly calendar. Not planning to bring back the Top Ten as a separate item for the Board of Aldermen. Staff is proceeding with work and will report separately on the individual items). When did NSAPIRC committee finish its work? (December 2007). What is happening with Green house Gas emissions inventory? (Presentation is February with elected officials. Staff is working on edits to final document; next step will be to hold community meetings – with the first possibly occurring before the summer break - to present the inventory). Was the meeting taped? (Yes and will be placed on website for review).

What is the status of Rogers Road sidewalk project? (Believe it is on the list to receive Surface Transportation Program – Direct Allocation funding in FY 2010-2011. Staff will check and report back).

Is Town receiving economic stimulus funds? (Town has submitted several sidewalk projects and has also requested funds for new bus shelters. TAC is reviewing next week. Staff will send specific information on town request.)

**V. Adjournment** – There being no further business, Seils moved for adjournment at 9:06 PM and Poulton seconded. Support for adjournment was unanimous.