TO: Roger L. Stancil, Town Manager

FROM: Sabrina Oliver, Director, Communications and Public Affairs
            J.B. Culpepper, Planning Director
            Mary Jane Nirdlinger, Assistant Planning Director
            Jennifer Phillips, Community Participation Coordinator, Communications and
            Public Affairs

SUBJECT: Report on One Developer Presentation Pilot

DATE: May 25, 2012

PURPOSE

The purpose of this memorandum is to respond to a request from Council to pilot a process for a one developer presentation to all advisory boards at the same time.

DISCUSSION

In June 2010, Council asked staff to pilot a process for a one developer presentation to all advisory boards at the same time. This process has now been piloted twice; Chapel of the Cross (June 29, 2011) and Shortbread (Nov. 29, 2011).

Lessons Learned:
- Dates for one developer presentations must be set at least a month in advance, if not more, in order to promote maximum attendance by advisory board members.
- Strong support from the Chair and Staff Liaison is crucial to encouraging advisory board members to attend.
- Reducing the number of advisory bodies involved in development review would streamline the process.
- There is still work to be done to create a meeting format which satisfies the needs of Council, the developer, advisory bodies, and the public.

Chapel of the Cross (June 29, 2011)
Model: The meeting was held in the Council Chamber. All advisory board members sat in the audience. However, individuals did not necessarily sit with their board. The meeting was facilitated by the Planning Director and presentations were made to the full group by staff and the developer. Following the presentations there was an opportunity for public comment and then advisory body members asked questions. When that section ended, the advisory bodies broke into separate meeting rooms to have their separate group discussion.

Expectation: That all four advisory bodies would make their recommendations on the project that evening.

Participating Advisory Bodies: Planning Board (quorum present)**,** Historic District Commission (quorum present)**,** Transportation Board (did not make quorum)**,** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board (did not make quorum)

Feedback on the pilot:
- Developer
  - Liked the idea of being able to address all advisory boards at once, but because all the advisory boards were not able to make quorum this benefit wasn't fully realized.
- Advisory Board Members
  - 69% of those who completed the feedback survey stated that the developer's presentation gave enough information for their board to make a recommendation.
  - 63% of those who completed the feedback survey stated that the question and answer section of the meeting gave their board enough information to make a recommendation.
  - 63% of those who completed the feedback survey stated that the public comment section gave their board enough information to make a decision.
  - Those members who did not attend, but completed the feedback survey, stated that they did not attend because the time of the meeting was not convenient for them or they were out of town.
- Public
  - One member of the public felt that this format did not allow adequate opportunity for citizen input.
  - Some concern has been expressed regarding the ability of an individual member of the public to follow all of the discussion when advisory boards broke into separate rooms for discussion in the Chapel of the Cross model. To address this staff tried the model used for Shortbread Lofts.

- Staff
  - There was no difference in the level of staff support from the current development review model because the staff liaison supporting each advisory body was present.
  - Staff project lead liked having one presentation as it eliminated the need to coordinate individually with each board.
  - Developing an effective format for a one developer presentation to all advisory boards would be more achievable if there were fewer advisory bodies.

Shortbread Lofts (Nov. 29, 2011)

Model: The meeting was held in the Council Chamber. The Chairs of the five participating advisory bodies sat at the dais. The Planning Board Chair acted as chair of the meeting and the Community Design Commission Chair acted as time keeper for public comment. Advisory body members sat in the audience with the other members of their group. Presentations were made by staff and the developer. This was followed by an opportunity for advisory body members to ask questions. Then there was an opportunity for public comment. The next section was for each advisory body to have discussion and make their recommendations in the chamber with the discussion chaired by the appropriate advisory body chair.

Expectation: That all five advisory bodies would make their recommendations on the project that evening.

Participating Advisory Bodies: Planning Board (quorum present)**,** Community Design Commission (quorum present)**,** Parks & Recreation Commission (quorum present)**,** Transportation Board (did not make quorum)**,** Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board (did not make quorum)

Feedback on the pilot:
- Developer
  - Liked the idea of being able to address all advisory boards at once, but because all the advisory boards were not able to make quorum this benefit wasn't fully realized
  - Expressed a disappointment that many of the questions were actually comments rather than factual questions about the development plan being presented.
- Advisory Board Members
  - 83% of those who completed the feedback survey stated that they received enough information from the developer's presentation for their board to make a decision.
  - 78% of those who completed the feedback survey stated that the question and answer session within the meeting provided their board with enough information to make a recommendation.
  - Those members who did not attend, but completed the feedback survey, stated that they did not attend because they did not have enough notice about the meeting, they felt one meeting a month was all they could manage due to other commitments, or they had a prior commitment.
  - Concerns were raised about the length of time meetings like this would take if the project had great public interest.
- Public
  - Only one member of the public spoke at this meeting and she was in favor of the project.
- Staff
  - There was no difference in the level of staff support from the current development review model because the staff liaison supporting each advisory body was present.
  - Staff project lead liked having one presentation as it eliminated the need to coordinate individually with each board.
  - Room logistics created challenges for the meeting format.
  - Developing an effective format for a one developer presentation to all advisory boards would be more achievable if there were fewer advisory bodies.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the Council accept the report.

TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL
NORTH CAROLINA

Meeting Date: 6/21/2010
AGENDA #7f

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title of Agenda Item: Development Review Asssessment Update. (R-26)

Council Goal 3: Continued Focus on Land Use, Transit and Development.

Background: Since 2008, staff has reviewed and improved the planning and development process consistent with the Council goals and community input. In January, the Council initiated the next phase of improvements: A review of the Council's development-related policies and procedures and the role of the advisory boards, and a review of the Land Use Management Ordinance. This memorandum describes the next steps in this process, based on feedback received during several recent focus group meetings with advisory board members, developers and town staff.

Fiscal Note: Based on the ongoing Council Goal, sufficient funds were included in the 2010-11 Budget to accomplish review of the Land Use Management Ordinance with some technical assistance. This can be done without affecting other Council planning priorities.

Recommendations: That the Council adopt the attached resolution to authorize the next steps to improve the development review process.

ATTACHMENTS:
Viewing attachments may require [Adobe Acrobat](#).

Manager's Memorandum
Resolution
Advisory Board Outreach Summary
Pending Text Amendment Schedule
Developers Outreach Summary
Staff Outreach Summary

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Town Council

FROM: Roger L. Stancil, Town Manager

SUBJECT: Development Review Assessment Update

DATE: June 21, 2010

PURPOSE

This memorandum provides an update to the January report ([January 25, 2010](http://townhall.townofchapelhill.org/agendas/2010/01/25/7c/)[1]) on the 2008 Council Goal to improve the development review process. We are also proposing next steps based on the priority items identified in our recent focus groups of stakeholders in the development review process related to roles, policies and procedures of the Town Council and advisory boards.

Adoption of the attached resolution would authorize these proposed next steps.

BACKGROUND

In Phase 1 of the effort to improve the development review process, consistent with the Council Goal and community input, staff focused on streamlining the internal review process and providing better information to the public.

A key element of Phase 1 was the application of technology to our process for increased transparency, accountability and enhanced work flow. The staff has reviewed proposals for that technology and is conducting a due-diligence review of the potential vendors. An update will be brought to the Council in the fall.

In January, the Council initiated Phase 2, a review of the Council's development-related policies and procedures and the role of the advisory boards.

DISCUSSION

Town Council has heard the community interest in improving the development review process without negatively affecting the outcomes. To understand those interests, I held three facilitated focus group sessions to explore common concerns and opportunities for improvement. Those focus groups comprised advisory board members, developers and business owners, and Town staff. They were all asked the same question:

---

[1] http://townhall.townofchapelhill.org/agendas/2010/01/25/7c/

What could be done to improve the Town's development review process in terms of the roles, policies, procedures of the Town Council and advisory boards?

Participants identified a number of ideas and then listed their top seven priority items, in order. Attachment 2 contains the detailed input from the sessions. The input from the sessions involves both actions that can be controlled by the Manager and those controlled by the Council.

The top seven priority items from each group were:

Advisory Boards
1. Increase collaboration among boards; present to multiple advisory boards at the same time; perhaps use social networking media
2. When reviewing applications/projects, it would be helpful to have better sense of context i.e. other projects being considered in the area
3. Process does not have to be linear; more hub and spoke; all info goes out at the same time and there is a central dissemination point
4. Consolidate generic or recurring recommendations faster into the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO)/ordinances
5. Reverse the "dumbing down" of the concept plan preview process enacted by Town Council
6. Educate the members of the advisory boards and commissions on the total process and their roles
7. Explore electronic means of gaining input from citizens, e.g. PowerPoint and comment online

Developers
1. Scrap the existing review process and start over; develop a reasonable timeframe that is less than existing
2. Develop an actual flowchart of the process
3. Need a concise summary of processes with deadlines, timelines, flowcharts, etc.
4. Council: adopt and write an operational goal regarding date certain schedules and measure against this
5. Beef up advisory board members with more expertise; designate specific seats on boards as requiring professional experience requirements
6. Simplify the requirements of submittal; far too much into is required; rife with uncertainty; info that is not needed is required up-front
7. Limit the review by boards and commissions to their areas of responsibility

Staff
1. Allow staff to make more administrative decisions rather than boards/council
2. Reduce number of boards and commissions where possible, e.g. Transportation board and Bike/Ped. Board; Greenways and Parks/Rec. Commission
3. Reduce number of approvals requiring Council action

6

4. Joint advisory board meetings to reduce number of presentations
5. Create streamlined minor SUP process
6. Let each advisory board appoint a member to development review consortium so applicants can present to one group
7. Eliminate advisory boards

From the focus sessions, we have identified improvements we can make now, such as improving our communications about process and timeframes, making more information available on the website, and improving the format for presentations to the boards and Council. In order to make broader improvements based on the priority items above, I recommend that the Council authorize the Town Manager to take the following steps:

1. Update handouts and web materials to reflect process improvements and share with applicants and advisory boards.
2. Develop an advisory board and advisory board staff liaison training program.
3. Initiate a review of the Land Use Management Ordinance, described below.
4. Pilot a process for one developer presentation to all advisory boards at the same time.
5. Develop a strategy for the Council's consideration that could merge advisory boards that have similar functions such as the Transportation Board with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board and the Parks and Recreation Commission with Greenways Commission.

I believe these improvements, coupled with the technology enhancements underway, could have a significant positive effect on the development review process.

Review of the Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO)

This recommendation emanates from the Council 2009 goal to continue improvement of the development review process, as well as the feedback from the three focus groups. The LUMO, its interpretation and framework, are the basis for the review process and at least some of the frustrations expressed in stakeholder groups. A review would identify which parts of the Land Use Management Ordinance are working well, where there are conflicts between the LUMO and other goals, where changes in other regulations or conditions impact the LUMO, and where changes in community values may affect the ordinance. A review would also look at the current types of applications and review processes, including the Concept Plan Review process.

As part of the Ordinance update process, the staff will consider the Council's pending text amendments (Attachment 1). Staff will provide recommendations for implementing those changes, after considering the relationship between those actions and the LUMO review.

<div align="center">

NEXT STEPS

</div>

Staff can implement some of the early improvements now and begin taking action on the priority items. In the fall, we will provide an update to the Council with a refined schedule and process for implementing the recommended actions.

Based on the ongoing Council Goal, sufficient funds were included in the 2010-11 Budget to accomplish the review of the Land Use Management Ordinance with some technical assistance. This can be done without affecting other Council planning priorities.

SUMMARY

The staff will continue to implement the internal review process improvements from Phase 1. With Council authorization of the next steps, we can continue our thoughtful effort to improve the development review process without negatively affecting the outcomes.

RECOMMENDATION

To continue this development review improvement effort, I recommend that we take the next steps described here and in the attached Resolution:

1. Update handouts and web materials to reflect process improvements and share with applicants and advisory boards.
2. Develop an advisory board and advisory board staff liaison training program.
3. Initiate a review of the Land Use Management Ordinance, described above.
4. Pilot a process for one developer presentation to all advisory boards at the same time.
5. Develop a strategy for merging advisory boards that have similar functions such as the Transportation Board with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board and the Parks and Recreation Commission with Greenways Commission.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Advisory Board Outreach Summary (p. 6).
   - http://chapelhillpublic.novusagenda.com/AttachmentViewer.aspx?AttachmentID=4583&ItemID=785
2. Pending Text Amendment Schedule (p. 12).
   - http://chapelhillpublic.novusagenda.com/AttachmentViewer.aspx?AttachmentID=4585&ItemID=785
3. Developers Outreach Summary (p. 15).
   - http://chapelhillpublic.novusagenda.com/AttachmentViewer.aspx?AttachmentID=4586&ItemID=785
4. Staff Outreach Summary (p. 21).
   - http://chapelhillpublic.novusagenda.com/AttachmentViewer.aspx?AttachmentID=4587&ItemID=785

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE TOWN MANAGER TO TAKE NEXT STEPS ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT REVIEW ASSESSMENT PROJECT (2010-06-21/R-26)

WHEREAS, the Town Council has heard the community interest in improving the development review process; and

WHEREAS, the Council reviewed themes for development review improvements related to roles, policies and procedures of the Town Council and advisory boards;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council hereby authorizes the Town Manager to take the following steps based on feedback from key stakeholders in the review process:

1. Update handouts and web materials to reflect process improvements and share with applicants and advisory boards.

2. Develop an advisory board and advisory board staff liaison training program.

3. Initiate a review of the Land Use Management Ordinance.

4. Pilot a process for one developer presentation to all advisory boards at the same time.

5. Develop strategy for merging advisory boards that have similar functions such as the Transportation Board with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board and the Parks and Recreation Commission with Greenways Commission.

This the 21st day of June, 2010.

Home   My Surveys   Resources   Plans & Pricing

Joint Advisory Board Meeting - Member Survey Edit

Design Survey   Collect Responses   Analyze Results

View Summary

Browse Responses

Filter Responses

Crosstab Responses

Download Responses

Share Responses

Default Report ▼   + Add Report

Response Summary

Total Started Survey: 20
Total Completed Survey: 20 (100%)

PAGE: 1

1. Please provide the following information   Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Name: Show Responses	100.0%	20
Email Address: Show Responses	100.0%	20
Phone Number: Show Responses	95.0%	19
answered question		20
skipped question		0

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?   Create Chart   Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board	20.0%	4
Historic District Commission	25.0%	5
Planning Board	**35.0%**	7
Transportation Board	20.0%	4
answered question		20
skipped question		0

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?   Create Chart   Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	80.0%	16
answered question		20
skipped question		0

10

I Report on Single Developer Review Presentation May 2012

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011? Create Chart Download

No	20.0%	4
	answered question	20
	skipped question	0

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence? Create Chart Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Personal	0.0%	0
Wednesdays are inconvenient for me.	0.0%	0
The time of the meeting was inconvienent for me.	**100.0%**	**1**
The time of year was inconvenient for me.	0.0%	0
I did not receive enough notice to attend.	0.0%	0
	Other (please specify) Show Responses	3
	answered question	1
	skipped question	19

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation? Create Chart Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	68.8%	11
No	31.3%	5
	Additional Comments? Show Responses	10
	answered question	16
	skipped question	4

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation? Create Chart Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	62.5%	10
	answered question	16
	skipped question	4

11

I Report on Single Developer Review Presentation May 2012

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

	Create Chart	Download
No	37.5%	6
Additional Comments? Show Responses		11
answered question		16
skipped question		4

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	62.5%	10
No	37.5%	6
Additional Comments? Show Responses		10
answered question		16
skipped question		4

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	73.3%	11
No	26.7%	4
If you answered "no," please provide additional information. Show Responses		6
answered question		15
skipped question		5

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	81.3%	13
No	18.8%	3
Additional Comments? Show Responses		12
answered question		16
skipped question		4

12

I Report on Single Developer Review Presentation May 2012

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

	Response Percent	Response Count
Having board chairs sit at the front of the room	14.3%	1
Asking boards to sit together	100.0%	7
Having boards vote during the joint meeting	28.6%	2
Other Show Responses		11
answered question		7
skipped question		13

Response Type:	Collector:
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	IP Address:
empty	174.99.111.198
Response Started:	Response Modified:
Thursday, July 7, 2011 5:59:29 AM	Thursday, July 7, 2011 6:04:06 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Ana Lopez

Email Address: - ana@epinvestments.com

Phone Number: - 619 261-8598

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Historic District Commission

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

It was clear the developer's had done a great deal work and was willing to do additional work to assist the board with its recommendation.

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

It is very helpful to the perspective of other groups as you ask your own questions to the developers.

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

Unfortunately, our board had to conduct our usual meeting during this time so it made it quite lengthy.

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

We used some of our own board meeting to discuss the recommendation.

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	152.54.6.109
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Thursday, July 7, 2011 6:11:51 AM	Thursday, July 7, 2011 6:15:46 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Dylan Sandler

Email Address: - dylansandler@gmail.com

Phone Number: - 828-713-6779

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

The presentation and Q&A lasted too long, so that our Board rushed through the discussion in the break-out session. I would be nice to try to keep the presentation to 20 or 30 minutes and the Q&A to roughly 30 minutes, particularly as members of the development team circulated around

the Board meetings in the break-out sessions.

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

No Response

Response Type:	Collector:
Normal Response	New Link (Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	152.2.185.19
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Thursday, July 7, 2011 6:10:34 AM	Thursday, July 7, 2011 6:18:56 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Ray Magyar

Email Address: - Ray_magyar@unc.edu

Phone Number: - 919. 962.5028

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

Historical facts were nice to hear but more specific facts were needed (traffic generation and direction, use of new floorspace, number of parking spaces, etc.

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

Developers and presenters should have more specific information available to anwer pertinent questions.

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

There should be time limits iposed for responses.

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

No Response

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

Presentations and Responses should have a time limit imposed.

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Asking boards to sit together

Response Type:	Collector:
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	68.209.206.11
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Thursday, July 7, 2011 6:27:38 AM	Thursday, July 7, 2011 6:31:01 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Deborah Fulghieri

Email Address: - polnodeb@bellsouth.net

Phone Number: - (919)968-0278

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Planning Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

No

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

I was out of town.

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No Response

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No Response

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No Response

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

No Response

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

No Response

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

My general impression is that the new format was devised to limit public and advisory board input, in order to signal that "Chapel Hill is open for business."

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	69.134.26.37
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Thursday, July 7, 2011 6:52:30 AM	Thursday, July 7, 2011 7:11:00 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - martin rody

Email Address: - theglen@nc.rr.com

Phone Number: - 919-967-8311

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Historic District Commission

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

For some reason there were very few questions. I'm that the planning board would have spent at least 30 minutes on this project at a regular meeting.

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No

Same as above.

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Having board chairs sit at the front of the room

Asking boards to sit together

Response Type:	Collector:
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	69.134.160.254
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Thursday, July 7, 2011 7:29:11 AM	Thursday, July 7, 2011 7:35:05 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Whit Rummel

Email Address: - whitr@aol.com

Phone Number: - 967-6200

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Transportation Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

Too many comments from non-board attendees threw the presentation into disarray.

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No

Isn't this question the same as the previous one?

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

Though it went too long because of off-topic input from anti-development participants.

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Noone of the above, though I would recommend that questions be reserved for advisory board members. If other citizens would like to voice opinions they should attend the appropriate board breakout meeting and speak then.

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	129.33.49.251
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Thursday, July 7, 2011 7:42:50 AM	Thursday, July 7, 2011 8:05:49 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Rainer Dammers

Email Address: - rainer_dammers@yahoo.com

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

it was good to get a more generic presentation versus one that is tailored towards the focus of the

particular board as we usually get

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

this part was a little long due to the broad scope of the meeting and audience. Again it was helpful to understand question and hear answers to concerns of other boards

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

No

I couldn't say - we didn't have a quorum to get a breakout session

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

it could and should be shortened a little by keeping tighter control over the time allowed for questions in the public session

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Asking boards to sit together

Having boards vote during the joint meeting

Response Type:	Collector:
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	69.134.15.224
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Friday, July 8, 2011 11:42:17 AM	Friday, July 8, 2011 11:47:07 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Carol Hazard

Email Address: - hazardc@meredith.edu

Phone Number: - 9199293123

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Transportation Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

There was repetition in the presentation that was unnecessary. On the whole, good presentation.

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

Should have been town input on parking limits for town center that would have answered our questions.

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

Please! no outside comments which gave only an opinion of one.

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

Should have happened faster.

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

yes

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Having only boards present (and allowed to speak) but to vote in their own meetings

Response Type:	Collector:
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	152.16.225.144
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Friday, July 8, 2011 12:38:34 PM	Friday, July 8, 2011 12:48:36 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Mirta Mihovilovic

Email Address: - mihov001@bellsouth.net

Phone Number: - 919 968 1237

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Transportation Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

Presentation by devepoler and associates was too long

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

Too many of the questions did not pertain and did not influence transit issues

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

A weak yes , because most opf the public comments came from those interested in the approval of the project.

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

No

Due to lack of public transport (I do not drive) I did not meet with my board. I did left comments with our T board chairman....

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

MORE THAN ENOUFGH. Presentation and discusion can be shortened to 45 min each. Transit issues were a minor portion of joined session

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

I suggest 45 min presentation 45 min discussion 45 min individual Board sessiion

Response Type:	Collector:
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	24.225.64.136
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**

Monday, July 11, 2011 3:11:47 PM	Monday, July 11, 2011 4:07:30 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Del Snow

Email Address: - djdsnow@msn.com

Phone Number: - 919-942-5274

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Planning Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

Fortunately, the apllicants were present during the Planning Board's break-out meeting

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

Too many different subjects were covered-it was not a focused discussion

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No

see above

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

No

somewhat

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

No

If this had been a more controversial application, the meeting could have easily gone beyond midnight.

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

I can see the value of combining similar Boards-T Board and Ped/Bike or CDC and Historic Commission. However, I feel that this process weakens review. Going through the review boards separately is an iterative process. What is learned during one phase is generally serves as a basis for continued questions and/or exploration.

Most importantly, citizens become aware of the subtleties as they attend each review and they are being given short shrift with much less opportunity to both learn, provide feedback, and voice opinions.

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	205.188.116.10
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Sunday, July 17, 2011 6:37:52 PM	Sunday, July 17, 2011 6:40:20 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Elizabeth Preddy

Email Address: - mepreddy@aol.com

Phone Number: - 960-9448

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Historic District Commission

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

Public comments should be strictly limited to no more than 3 minutes per person

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

When combined with our commission meeting, it was too long at over 4 hours

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

No Response

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	75.177.137.174
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Tuesday, July 19, 2011 11:57:09 AM	Tuesday, July 19, 2011 12:02:00 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - John Ager

Email Address: - jager@nc.rr.com

Phone Number: - 919-451-2379

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Planning Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

The applicant under review was well prepared and the project was relatively uncontroversial. Even

so it was a long meeting. I would support continuing the experiment with joint boards meeting, but I'm skeptical that a more complex or controversial project could be handled this way. But - I still think it's worth trying. Putting applicants through multiple presentations seems like torture.

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	151.151.109.6
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Tuesday, July 19, 2011 12:43:04 PM	Tuesday, July 19, 2011 12:44:46 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Jon DeHart

Email Address: - jondehartchnc@gmail.com

Phone Number: - 9194084749

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Transportation Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

No

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

I was out of town .

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No Response

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No Response

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No Response

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

No Response

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

No Response

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Asking boards to sit together

Having boards vote during the joint meeting

Response Type:	Collector:
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	152.3.254.73
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Tuesday, July 19, 2011 12:45:10 PM	Tuesday, July 19, 2011 12:46:47 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Katherine Kopp

Email Address: - kkopp3@gmail.com

Phone Number: - 919-933-8383

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Historic District Commission

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

No Response

Response Type:	Collector:

Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	24.9.204.31
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Wednesday, July 20, 2011 1:24:50 PM	Wednesday, July 20, 2011 1:26:33 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Douglas MacLean

Email Address: - maclean@unc.edu

Phone Number: - 919-942-2759

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

No

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

I was out of town.

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No Response

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No Response

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No Response

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

No Response

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

No Response

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

I wasn't there, so I can't make specific recommendations. But I think joint meetings are a good idea.

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link

	(Web Link)
Custom Value: *empty*	**IP Address:** 152.16.51.172
Response Started: Wednesday, July 20, 2011 8:57:00 PM	**Response Modified:** Wednesday, July 20, 2011 9:08:57 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Andrea Rohrbacher

Email Address: - arohrbacher@earthlink.net

Phone Number: - 919-967-4213

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Planning Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

Planning Board wanted more information about communication and collaboration with UNC. Developer had nothing in writing from UNC indicating support or concerns to be addressed.

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No

felt there was inadequate input from public; boards had additional time with applicant, public had only one chance which was used primarily for questions from Boards

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

In the spectrum of projects we hear, this was an easy one that did not have some of the more complex issues due to land locked location, no affordable housing, no recreation space, very

little transportation issues related to ingress or egress plus other factors often addressed by planning board

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Asking boards to sit together

Disagree with having boards vote during joint meeting, would consume too much time while each board listened to the discussion of other boards.

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	98.69.217.177
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Thursday, July 21, 2011 1:08:15 PM	Thursday, July 21, 2011 1:21:58 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Susan Smith

Email Address: - susansmith_mla@bellsouth.net

Phone Number: - 919-968-1128

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Historic District Commission

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

To a certain extent. Looking forward to hearing more details though. Unfortunately, the town had just decided to go paperless, and we received last minute notice so I didn't have everything printed out as it would have been over 100 pages.

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

Yes

Basically. I didn't understand some of the terminology and that didn't become clear until they came back for our decision.

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

Yes

It would have helped greatly to hear what were the areas in the proposal that caused controversy and to hear pros and cons on those. Only one women spoke against this proposal, but hearing both sides of a proposal or at least some of the difficult decisions that were made as part of the presentation would have been helpful in generating input from us.

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

Yes

But we had our regularly scheduled meeting after this and that made for a very long night. I don't recommend this.

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

Asking boards to sit together

It was helpful to hear responses from the other boards before we voted, but it is important to have time to talk as a board first. Boards sitting together happened naturally for us and perhaps it would help us see who is on each board.

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	66.57.69.166
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Thursday, July 21, 2011 7:36:24 PM	Thursday, July 21, 2011 7:37:28 PM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - James Stroud

Email Address: - jrstroud2@yahoo.com

Phone Number: - (919)971-7063

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Planning Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

No

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

The time of the meeting was invonvient for me.

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No Response

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No Response

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No Response

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

No Response

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

No Response

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

No Response

Response Type:	**Collector:**
Normal Response	New Link
	(Web Link)
Custom Value:	**IP Address:**
empty	207.59.131.33
Response Started:	**Response Modified:**
Friday, July 29, 2011 7:39:11 AM	Friday, July 29, 2011 7:49:40 AM

1. Please provide the following information

Name: - Jason Baker

Email Address: - jason@jasonbaker.us

Phone Number: - 919-442-8278

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

Planning Board

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on June 29, 2011?

Yes

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

No Response

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

The Planning Board does not typically make decisions about SUPs or rezoning requests the same night of the original developer presentation unless the project is incredibly straightforward

6. Did the Question and Answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

No

We typically ask developers to come back with additional details about at least a few items for which the original presentation did not provide adequate detail, or otherwise need to consider additional information about a particular concern.

7. Did you feel that the public Question and Answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

No

8. Did you feel that the break-out system was effective for advisory boards?

Yes

9. Was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recommendation?

No

I could not imagine this process working with more difficult projects. The meeting would easily last until the wee hours of the morning if all of the necessary questions were asked.

10. If Council decides to continue with joint advisory board meetings for development review, do you feel that the format of joint advisory board meetings would be improved by...(please check all that apply)

I think it's worth continuing to pursue this meeting format, but that it needs to be changed some for it to be more effective. Typically, citizen comment is a separate part of planning board meetings and limited to a specific amount of time for each speaker. I would suggest putting all non-advisory board comment at either the beginning or the end of the meeting. It would be useful to look at how Carrboro handles joint review meetings - I think their process works better than our experiment did. I also have concerns about how time constraints are a factor when boards have multiple other items on their agendas. It did not seem like every board had quorum; if quorum can't be met and the presentation needs to be made again, the time-savings is essentially lost. So finding a night that works well for everyone involved is important. Many people signed up for boards and commissions knowing their availability on certain nights of the week. Making additional meetings convenient and predictable will be another key to making this new process successful.

Nov 29 Joint Advisory Mtg. Member Feedback

SurveyMonkey

1. Please provide the following information:

		Response Percent	Response Count
Name:		**100.0%**	**24**
Email Address:		95.8%	23
	answered question		24
	skipped question		0

2. Of which board or commission are you a member?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Planning Board		29.2%	7
Community Design Commission		**33.3%**	**8**
Parks and Recreation Commission		16.7%	4
Transportaion Board		12.5%	3
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board		8.3%	2
	answered question		24
	skipped question		0

3. Did you attend the Joint Advisory Board meeting on Tuesday, November 29, 2011?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		**79.2%**	**19**
No		20.8%	5
		answered question	24
		skipped question	0

4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Personal		0.0%	0
Tuesdays are inconvenient for me.		0.0%	0
The time of the meeting was inconvient for me.		0.0%	0
The time of year was inconvenient for me.		0.0%	0
I did not receive enough notice to attend.		33.3%	2
Other (please specify)		**83.3%**	**5**
		answered question	6
		skipped question	18

5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		83.3%	15
No		22.2%	4
	Additional Comments?		8

answered question		18
skipped question		6

6. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the question and answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		77.8%	14
No		22.2%	4
	Additional Comments?		9

answered question		18
skipped question		6

7. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did you feel that the public question and answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		68.8%	11
No		31.3%	5
	Additional Comments?		10
	answered question		16
	skipped question		8

8. If you answered "yes" to question 3, was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recomendation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		78.9%	15
No		21.1%	4
	Other (please specify)		9
	answered question		19
	skipped question		5

9. How could the joint advisory board development review process be improved?

	Response Count
	21
answered question	21
skipped question	3

Q1. Please provide the following information:

1		
Name:	patric lebeau	Dec 20, 2011 12:52 PM

2		
Name:	Beth Mueller	Dec 19, 2011 3:34 AM
Email Address:	beth.mueller@sbcglobal.net	Dec 19, 2011 3:34 AM

3		
Name:	Susan Pedersen	Dec 16, 2011 10:50 PM
Email Address:	spederse298@gmail.com	Dec 16, 2011 10:50 PM

4		
Name:	Erin Daniel	Dec 16, 2011 4:26 PM
Email Address:	alliancelifecoaching@gmail.com	Dec 16, 2011 4:26 PM

5		
Name:	George Selkirk	Dec 16, 2011 2:15 PM
Email Address:	gselkirk@freelon.com	Dec 16, 2011 2:15 PM

6		
Name:	Suzanne Haff	Dec 16, 2011 2:06 AM
Email Address:	suzhaff@gmail.com	Dec 16, 2011 2:06 AM

7		
Name:	Kimberly Brewer	Dec 15, 2011 9:49 AM
Email Address:	kimberly.brewer@tetratech.com	Dec 15, 2011 9:49 AM

8		
Name:	Del Snow	Dec 14, 2011 6:48 PM
Email Address:	djdsnow@msn.com	Dec 14, 2011 6:48 PM

9		
Name:	Andrea Rohrbacher	Dec 14, 2011 6:16 PM
Email Address:	andrea.rohrbacher@duke.edu	Dec 14, 2011 6:16 PM

10		
Name:	Erin Crouse	Dec 13, 2011 10:56 AM

Q1. Please provide the following information:

Email Address:	erin@erincrouse.com	Dec 13, 2011 10:56 AM
	11	
Name:	michael parker	Dec 12, 2011 11:37 PM
Email Address:	miparker1@aol.com	Dec 12, 2011 11:37 PM
	12	
Name:	Rainer Dammers	Dec 12, 2011 12:19 PM
Email Address:	rainer.dammers@yahoo.com	Dec 12, 2011 12:19 PM
	13	
Name:	Haig Khachatoorian	Dec 12, 2011 12:12 PM
Email Address:	hkhacha@ncsu.edu	Dec 12, 2011 12:12 PM
	14	
Name:	Michael Collins	Dec 12, 2011 10:06 AM
Email Address:	mmcc.collins@mindspring.com	Dec 12, 2011 10:06 AM
	15	
Name:	Polly van de Velde	Dec 10, 2011 12:05 PM
Email Address:	pahc@earthlink.net	Dec 10, 2011 12:05 PM
	16	
Name:	Mary U. Musacchia	Dec 10, 2011 8:23 AM
Email Address:	marymusacchia@mindspring.com	Dec 10, 2011 8:23 AM
	17	
Name:	Deborah Fulghieri	Dec 9, 2011 9:38 PM
Email Address:	polnodeb@bellsouth.net	Dec 9, 2011 9:38 PM
	18	
Name:	John Ager	Dec 9, 2011 8:19 PM
Email Address:	agerjohn@gmail.com	Dec 9, 2011 8:19 PM
	19	
Name:	Joan	Dec 9, 2011 7:49 PM
Email Address:	Guilkey	Dec 9, 2011 7:49 PM

Q1. Please provide the following information:

20		
Name:	martin rody	Dec 9, 2011 7:41 PM
Email Address:	thegllen@nc.rr.com	Dec 9, 2011 7:41 PM
21		
Name:	Mirta Mihovilovic	Dec 9, 2011 7:01 PM
Email Address:	mihov001!@bellsouth.net	Dec 9, 2011 7:01 PM
22		
Name:	penny rich	Dec 9, 2011 6:24 PM
Email Address:	pennyrich.ch@gmail	Dec 9, 2011 6:24 PM
23		
Name:	Whitcomb Rummel	Dec 9, 2011 6:20 PM
Email Address:	whitr@aol.com	Dec 9, 2011 6:20 PM
24		
Name:	Paul Neebe	Dec 9, 2011 5:51 PM
Email Address:	Neebe@virginia.edu	Dec 9, 2011 5:51 PM

Q4. If you answered "no" to the previous question, what was the reason for your absence?

1	With such a busy family life, one meeting a month is about as much as I can do	Dec 16, 2011 4:26 PM
2	Out of town on business	Dec 16, 2011 2:15 PM
3	Had out of town wedding of daughter already scheduled.	Dec 16, 2011 2:06 AM
4	out of town business commitment	Dec 12, 2011 11:37 PM
5	I left earlier due to lack of public transporaton from downtown Chapel Hill to Colony Lake after 9:30pm (D route to Legion Rd serving Colony Lake)	Dec 9, 2011 7:01 PM

Q5. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the developer's presentation provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

1	Too much was lost in the distraction of other board questions	Dec 14, 2011 6:48 PM
2	we made a recommendation, however I thought it was based on minimal information compared to other developments we have considered	Dec 14, 2011 6:16 PM
3	I really liked limiting the presentation to 15 minutes.	Dec 13, 2011 10:56 AM
4	Not in the joint meeting. It was only when the CDC met individually with the architects that we got enough information.	Dec 10, 2011 12:05 PM
5	The material needed to be sent more than two or three days in advance. Not having been a part of any previous conversations it was being put into the deep end of a pool and not knowing how to swim. You may survive but it isn't pretty.	Dec 10, 2011 8:23 AM
6	Although I had read the package beforehand, and I had read the Town's Comprehensive Plans general intentions for downtown, there was not a strong framework in which to judge the proposal. Although I think the proposal presents an ugly building with a poorly considered recreation space, it seems to fit the 2000 Comprehensive Plan goals of building "a variety of densities downtown."	Dec 9, 2011 9:38 PM
7	I liked hearing the Q's and A's from other boards and commissions.	Dec 9, 2011 7:49 PM
8	Q and A session of the meeting was too long because members of each specific board came up with questions pertaining to their specific area of advise. .I have to recognize that the Q and A format was informative. Consider starting these Join Meetings at 6 or 6:30pm I, however, found the calculations used to determine number of units that should fall under the "affordable housing label "DID NOT make sense. I would appreciate if the administration of the Town of Chapel Hill sends a memo, for all board members to read, explaining how affordable housing is computed.	Dec 9, 2011 7:01 PM

Q6. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did the question and answer session within the meeting provide your board with enough information to make a recommendation?

1	Unfortunately, there were far more questions asked by the various board members, particulalry related to parks and recreation area, than needed for me to make a recommendation.	Dec 15, 2011 9:49 AM
2	see above	Dec 14, 2011 6:48 PM
3	there was not adequate time to ask in depth, detailed questions we have done in past developments	Dec 14, 2011 6:16 PM
4	The question and answer period was helpful to the board, but most of it was not relevant to our discussion, and was an inefficient use of our time.	Dec 13, 2011 10:56 AM
5	Information coming from discussion on the sidewalk standards in particular from the planning board and others where very helpful and would otherwise not have surfaced.	Dec 12, 2011 12:19 PM
6	Not until we met individually.	Dec 10, 2011 12:05 PM
7	suffered from the point made to prior question.	Dec 10, 2011 8:23 AM
8	Planning Board didn't get to do Q&A until 9:45PM. The goal of these joint meetings seems to be to make sure questions are not asked, by tiring out the volunteers on the boards.	Dec 9, 2011 9:38 PM
9	I felt the initial Q&A (all Boards involved) was only somewhat helpful. There were a lot of questions I regarded as not relevant to the application. But this was not due to the meeting format. The Q&A at the Planning Board session later in the evening was helpful and did provide me with sufficient information to make a recommendation.	Dec 9, 2011 8:19 PM

Q7. If you answered "yes" to question 3, did you feel that the public question and answer session provided your board with enough information to make a recomendation?

1	The applicant had not presented the proposal to neighboring property owners, so there was really only one person from the public speaking. This person represented a non-profit who was slated to receive money from the developer.	Dec 15, 2011 9:49 AM
2	see above	Dec 14, 2011 6:48 PM
3	very few questions from the public	Dec 14, 2011 6:16 PM
4	It was fine this time, but I worry at the length of the meeting if there is more public input, because it was already very long.	Dec 13, 2011 10:56 AM
5	N/A as there was only one public comment which was very high level and generally in favor	Dec 12, 2011 12:19 PM
6	There was no public there to ask questions. There was only one speaker from the public.	Dec 10, 2011 12:05 PM
7	I simply do not have enough experience yet to provide a response.	Dec 10, 2011 8:23 AM
8	There was very little public input, which on one hand was surprising since so many nearby businesses are affected, but on the other not so much so, since the affected business owners would have started their day some 15 hours earlier.	Dec 9, 2011 9:38 PM
9	I had to leave for lack of public transportation at the time in which the public Q and A session have just started.	Dec 9, 2011 7:01 PM
10	A little TOO much almost. Questioning by some board members actually turned into opinion-giving in some cases. I think comments should be limited to direct issues.	Dec 9, 2011 6:20 PM

Q8. If you answered "yes" to question 3, was the length of the meeting sufficient for your board to gather the information necessary to make a recomendation?

1	It was far too long given that only one development project was being reviewed and acted upon.	Dec 15, 2011 9:49 AM
2	too much time spent on questions from other boards for us to have sufficient information	Dec 14, 2011 6:16 PM
3	The length of the meeting was too long, and asked our board to more than double their time commitment. If this had been done in our regular meeting, it would have probably taken a half-hour. If future meeting last this long, I doubt that the commission would be able to make quorum.	Dec 13, 2011 10:56 AM
4	Length was too long for Planning Board - we did not finish until 10:30 p.m. Information was good ands sufficient, and it was helpful to hear some of the comments from the other boards, but it increased the overall length of the meeting.	Dec 12, 2011 10:06 AM
5	The meeting was too long with lots of time devoted to questions that were not relevant to the CDC.	Dec 10, 2011 12:05 PM
6	The presentation was 15 minutes long. Q&A was organized board by board, with planning going last after 2.5 hours.	Dec 9, 2011 9:38 PM
7	It dragged along a few times, but on the whole was a good use of time.	Dec 9, 2011 7:49 PM
8	But I would have liked to hear the comments and questions made by the public	Dec 9, 2011 7:01 PM
9	A little too long. Time could be saved by allowing different boards to meet separately to discuss the issue, then return to the forum to tell how it voted.	Dec 9, 2011 6:20 PM

Q9.	How could the joint advisory board development review process be improved?	
1	It could have been more specific to what exactly we should be looking at. ie if there is a special use permit up or rezoning, then that is what the questions should reflect. Not a full range of questioning between each board when that project will come before the individual boards later.	Dec 20, 2011 12:52 PM
2	I think that there are conflicting agendas amoung the differnet boards. Which is more important to the town on the issue of having a solar hot water system, the recreation space or the solar array? This was the first time I saw a presentation with the attempt of an array, but it was looked as not as important as the rooftop recreation space as the parks and recreation board had more members there and were vocal about the use of the recreation space. Which, in the long run, would cost the town more money?	Dec 19, 2011 3:34 AM
3	The meeting was longer than expected. Q and A session should be organized sequentially by commission or board.	Dec 16, 2011 10:50 PM
4	Clarity of expectations to create consistency in submissions	Dec 16, 2011 2:15 PM
5	I don't know. I understand from some who attended that the process needs some tweaking.	Dec 16, 2011 2:06 AM
6	One option would be to reduce the number of boards that the applicant must present to to two or three boards, e.g. the Planning Board, the Community Design Commission, and the Historic District Commission when applicable. The remaining boards would have more of a long-range planning function rather than current plan review. Staff from the various departments would comment on the development applications during interdepartmental review.	Dec 15, 2011 9:49 AM
7	I would advise grouping "mobility" boards (Transportation, Greenway, Bike & Pedestrian, and even Parks & Rec) into one joint meeting. This would work well because individually, each review is not lengthy. The Planning Board and CDC should still have developer-board dedicated meetings in order to have the opportunity to delve into the vast number of issues that both boards oversee. Just as an example, Shortbread did not involve any environmental issues, any significant stormwater issues, or any neighborhood protection issues.	Dec 14, 2011 6:48 PM
8	it would bepend on the development - this one did not have many transportation issues. To have 3 boards that need detailed information at one presentation results in inadequate time for detailed questions. Some boards did not have quorums, possibly due to fact meeting was not a secheduled meeting night for that board. This was unfortunate because the board could only make a recommendation, not take a vote.	Dec 14, 2011 6:16 PM
9	If joint development review becomes a regular thing, then it needs to be done on a particular night, so board members have it in their schedule. Also, I don't think that this is the most effective use of time for smaller boards, and it is a big time commitment for a board that usually only meets once a month. There has to be a balance between what is easiest for the developers and for the boards, and this joint development review made it simple for the developers, but very onerous for our commission. Finally, the planning board-style format was not very conducive to our group's discussion, and I still think that it would be better to break up the meeting so each board could discuss the development in a more comfortable and efficient way.	Dec 13, 2011 10:56 AM

Q9. How could the joint advisory board development review process be improved?

10	The discussion amongst the boards to develop a recommendation could've been done in parallel and private - e.g. in the sections they were seated in the chamber. This would've worked without having to break out into other rooms and save time.	Dec 12, 2011 12:19 PM
11	N/A	Dec 12, 2011 12:12 PM
12	The CDC and the Planning Board have a far more complex task than any of the other boards. I thought the whole process was chaotic with topics jumping from one thing to another. I think the other boards could meet jointly but I think the task for both the CDC and the Planning Board is too multifaceted to be dealt with in such a large forum. I spoke with the architects and they noted that they found it very difficult to follow the process as it jumped from one topic to another. It is unfair to ask advisory board members to spend that much time on one individual project. The CDC would have gotten through 4-6 projects in that time.	Dec 10, 2011 12:05 PM
13	not certain yet as simply not enough experience. Length is painful but not sure where to cut.	Dec 10, 2011 8:23 AM
14	If the goal is to put up cheap ugly behemoths as permanent additions to the downtown, keep this new review process as is. Otherwise, the Town has to guide development much more actively in terms of aesthetics, density, and amenities.	Dec 9, 2011 9:38 PM
15	More training for advisory board members.	Dec 9, 2011 8:19 PM
16	One meeting works well if only 1-2 requests to be processed. Need more than 1 meeting if have 3 or more to get through. REQUIRE that folks attend as a key part of their role as commissioners/board members. Replace members who habitually miss these meetings. Always give Pks and Rec a chance to make their recommendation early. Same for Bikes and Peds Board.	Dec 9, 2011 7:49 PM
17	make sure that more menbers of the commitees or boards attend =we barely had a quorum.	Dec 9, 2011 7:41 PM
18	Joined Meetings are and will be too long as the number of questions per session increases proportionally to the number of Board Members present, even when, as at the Nov 29th meeting, only TWO of the boards achieved quorum. I do not have a good solution for this problem. Start earlier? But note, that many board members have other activities that usually clash with extended meetings	Dec 9, 2011 7:01 PM
19	I thought it was a good way for boards to interact during the Q&A. A little bouncy moving from one topic to the other, but that can be fine tuned.	Dec 9, 2011 6:24 PM
20	See above	Dec 9, 2011 6:20 PM
21	Need more specific notice for meetings and months in advance!	Dec 9, 2011 5:51 PM

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Town Council

FROM: Erin Crouse, Chair
             Parks and Recreation Commission

SUBJECT: Development Review Process

DATE: January 18, 2012

The Commission recently participated in two experimental group development review meetings; one for the redevelopment of the NC 54/Rams Plaza area and the other for the proposed Shortbread Lofts project on Rosemary Street. The Commission discussed these experiences at our January 18, 2012 meeting and voted unanimously (10-0) to forward the following comments to the Council:

- We understand and applaud the intent of the joint meeting. However, we found that from the perspective of the Parks and Recreation Commission the joint meetings were inefficient. In both cases the meetings went on for several hours. If we had used our normal review process we would likely have completed our reviews in 15-25 minutes.
- We made a strong effort to make sure that we had a quorum at the Shortbread Loft meeting. We were successful, but believe that we may have a difficult time in the future due to both the need for extra meetings and the length of those meetings.
- The format was cumbersome and did not allow the Commission to properly discuss the application. The Chair was physically separated from the rest of the Commission. We lost our normal ability to confer with staff to resolve certain questions. In addition, we had less of an ability to discuss specific recreation related issues among the Commission.
- The physical environment of the Council chambers was not as conducive to easy discussion as our normal smaller meeting space.
- One reason stated for experimenting with the joint meeting was the intent to lower costs for the development community. The Commission notes that in almost every case we have modified our agenda to assure that developers are first on our agenda. They seldom have to wait for more than a few minutes to present. Most development review items take only 15-25 minutes. In addition, developers usually send only one representative to our meetings.

The Commission appreciates the need to reduce costs and procedural hurdles for the development community. However, we think that this experiment revealed that joint review is not the best way to achieve the needed efficiencies.

Present: Erin Crouse (Chair), Laney Eric Dale (Vice Chair), Betsey Anderson, Joseph Battle, Regina Blalock, Joan Guilkey, Neal Newcomb, Susan Pedersen, Steven Price, and Raymond Wong

Absent: Mary Musacchia

Dear Mayor and Town Council:

As chair of the CDC I have been asked to comment on the joint advisory board meeting that reviewed the Shortbread Lofts project.

There were several areas of difficulty:

1: Separating the individual chairs from each of his/her respective board resulted in a loss of cohesion for each board.

2: The questions came from all over the room with no coherent pattern or focus. It was difficult to follow and sort design relevant information from other material. I found it chaotic.

3: It took 3 hours for one presentation. The CDC normally reviews 5-8 projects in that time. It is an unnecessary burden on Planning Board and CDC members to sit through multiple discussions of other boards before being able to meet.

4: There were 2 boards that did not have a quorum. This is not fair to the applicant.

When the CDC met directly with the architects we were able to quickly clarify areas of question, make recommendations to the applicant, and take a vote.

I asked the architects how they found the joint advisory board format. They agreed they found it challenging to follow the discussion with questions and comments shifting from one topic to another.

I hope you find these observations helpful. I would be happy to discuss further.

Sincerely,

Polly van de Velde

From:	Mickey Jo Sorrell
To:	Jennifer Phillips
Subject:	Joint Advisory Board Meeting Public Follow-up
Date:	Tuesday, July 12, 2011 2:35:16 PM

Thanks for sending out the survey, Jennifer.
As you know I was interested in this meeting for the process as well as this particular development, since I work at Morehead Planetarium, next door to Chapel of the Cross. I have agreed to follow this project on behalf of Morehead and I reported back to our director, HR, and facilities manager the day after the meeting. I'll keep them in touch with the process and make them aware of the public hearing when it comes up in the fall. Both parties (CotC and MP) are hopeful of increased partnership opportunities as we both move through renovation processes.

But wearing the hat of citizen, I wanted to say a few things about the process. The survey was all about the boards and commissions, but I am concerned that this joint meeting did not allow adequate opportunity for citizen input. Although the agenda clearly stated that citizen questions were allowed, there was an early caution that the meeting was for the boards and efficiency was required - and that certainly discouraged me and a few others around me from participating as fully as we would have liked. The single citizen, who spoke long and often, seemed to be an unpleasant thorn in the side of the project planners, yet several folks from different boards told me how much they appreciated her voice, her research, her thorough and persistant determination.

My understanding of the process AFTER the joint meeting was that the developers (and interested folks?) could follow the discussion from meeting to meeting. We were given the order that the groups would have the project on their agendas. And yet, when I came out of the first meeting (planning), bike/ped and trans. had already completed their discussions and taken a vote. This means that no one was able to attend each meeting. I suspect this would be highly unsatisfactory to citizens who want to follow or participate in a particular project.

And of course, this was a late night for anyone who wanted to stay for all of the discussion. Not sure that's fair to the boards, and it's certainly hard on citizens as well. Especially if they don't feel it was worth their while because they couldn't follow it all or couldn't participate adequately.

On a related note, I've been thinking more about the boards and commissions lately. I remember you telling me (one afternoon at Foster's) that part of your job would be the training of these town volunteers, so I thought you might be a good person to mention this to. During the recent Aydan Court discussion a member of the Transportation Board spoke - for himself, not the board. He passionately related how the board deliberated over Aydan Court, really considering the charge of the Council. He was more than bothered that when transportation issues came up in council discussions, no council member came back to the board to discuss their process or subsequent approval. I really appreciated his voice in that discussion because it drew my attention to a larger issue: every single board and commission approved the AC project, but the Council did not. That has got to be frustrating to these boards - and I admit it is to me as well. If the boards have a clear charge and diligently follow it, should there not be greater alignment with Council?

Perhaps you'll tell me this will change with the new Comprehensive Plan? When the plan is complete a year from now, will it filter (quickly?) through all the documents and charges and protocols and be a guide that will align the work of town volunteers and the Council - AND the citizens? I would like to think so, but I'm not sure that is clear.

I'm still rather new to town government, but I'm an eager learner, and I realize that, though are many folks far more knowledgeable, there are still more who haven't even begun to find their way through town processes. I hope you'll consider my concerns and inquiries on behalf of those of us who know little but care a lot.

Mickey Jo Sorrell
124 Summerlin Dr.
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
919-616-1132

_____
From: Jennifer Phillips [jphillips@townofchapelhill.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 9:21 AM
To: Jennifer Phillips
Subject: Joint Advisory Board Meeting Public Follow-up

Good morning,
Thank you for attending the joint advisory board meeting on Wednesday, June 29, 2011. As this meeting was our first opportunity to pilot a single-developer presentation to advisory boards, as requested by the Council (2010-06-21/R-26) we are interested in gathering your feedback about how it went.
Therefore, we would appreciate it if you would complete a brief 8 question survey letting us know your thoughts about this process by Friday, July 29, 2011. You can complete the survey at http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6HCWWDG
Thank you for your support piloting the single developer presentation process!
        Regards,

[Description: Description: Description:]

Jennifer Phillips
Community Participation Coordinator
Communications & Public Affairs
Town of Chapel Hill<http://www.townofchapelhill.org/>
405 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd
Chapel Hill, NC 27514-5705
Phone: (919) 969-5014
Fax: (919) 968-8406