



Action Minutes

Central West Focus Area: Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Date/Time: July 1, 2013, 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Members Present: Mia Burroughs, Anthony Carey, Lucy Carol Davis, Eric Hyman, Jeff Kidd, Julie McClintock, Sarah McIntee, Firoz Mistry, Bruce Murray, Abby Parcell, Michael Parker (co-chair), Whit Rummel, Amy Ryan (co-chair), Jared Simmons, Mickey Jo Sorrell, David Tuttle, Councilmember Jim Ward, and Buffie Webber

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: David Bonk, Loryn Clark, Mary Jane Nirdlinger, and Megan Wooley

Council Members Present: Mayor Mark Kleinschmidt, Matt Czajkowski, and Ed Harrison

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
1. Introductions and Opening Remarks	Megan Wooley, Chapel Hill Planning Department, opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. She provided an overview of the newly developed Community Input webpage which can be found at the following link: http://www.townofchapelhill.org/index.aspx?page=2251		
2. Comments from Mayor Mark Kleinschmidt	Mayor Mark Kleinschmidt thanked the Steering Committee for their work and encouraged the Committee to keep up their strong work. Stated that it is important to have a deliverable at the end. Also stated that the Committee can ask for more time, but the Committee would need to be specific about <i>why</i> they want more time.		
3. Public Participation/ Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapel Hill is not a bedroom community; there are two major industries which are UNC and UNC Hospitals. The Committee should discuss building upon these two industries. Interest in keeping Estes Drive to two driving lanes and would like bike/ped lanes. Westchester, New York has good examples of two-lane, charming roads. 		

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in including a special needs playground. • Estes Drive is not safe, need to reduce the speed limit, include traffic circles and bike lanes. He liked Concept Plan C. 		
<p>4. Committee Discussion: What was heard from the Council</p>	<p>Amy Ryan, SC co-chair, introduced this agenda item noting that the Co-Chairs presentation to Council included a summary of the Committee's work and an overview of the concept plans. The principles and objectives received support from the community, and there was an interest in gathering Town fiscal data, not making traffic worse, having improved bike and ped facilities, involving the schools, recognizing the rights of property owners and that development can help get improvements in the neighborhood. Also, some community and Council members raised an interest in having a neutral facilitator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Committee member noted that there was an interest in holding a walking tour. • The Committee discussed the need for a facilitator. 	<p>Motion by Mia Burroughs to have the Town put financial resources towards hiring a professional facilitator that would be with the Committee at meetings where decisions would be made. Julie McClintock seconded. Eight members voted yes, eight voted no, and one abstained. The motion did not carry.</p>	
<p>5. Committee Discussion: Work Plan for Milestone 3</p>	<p>Amy Ryan, SC co-chair, introduced this agenda item noting that a work plan was drafted with the goal of finishing the process in November.</p>	<p>The Steering Committee all voted yes to approve the dates with the amendment of finding a new date for the July 18th meeting and changing the August 13th meeting to August 7th.</p> <p>The Steering Committee all voted yes to approving the proposed work plan.</p>	<p>Megan will send the Steering Committee a Doodle poll to determine a new date for the July 18th meeting.</p>
<p>6. Committee Work Session</p>	<p>Megan Wooley provided an overview of the homework activity responses.</p> <p>Loryn Clark facilitated the Committee's conversation about Areas A, B, and C. <i>Please see attached notes for an overview of the Committee's discussion.</i></p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
	<p>The Steering Committee discussed whether this process for conversation worked well, and they agreed it did. They also agreed that they would like to have Loryn facilitate the discussion on July 9th.</p>		
<p>7. Public Participation/ Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the office uses in Concepts B and C. Stated that the proximity to the schools makes this area special. • There is a lot of stormwater runoff in the area after the flooding. • Concern about the word [small area plan] “outline”; is August 19th too late for this? • Walking with kids/biking on Estes Drive is bad; there is a need to repair Estes. Stated that she and her family are not afraid of density. We crave diversity, vitality. Chapel Hill not what it used to be; it’s not the place “to be” anymore. • Need to get someone who can draw while the Committee is talking. Still need to integrate concerns about Estes. 		
<p>8. Closing</p>			<p>The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.</p>

Notes from the July 1st Committee Discussion
Central West Steering Committee
July 1, 2013

Area A

Areas of general agreement:

- Area be mixed-use (Residential, office, retail, civic – not manufacturing)
- Retail use should be on the bottom floor with office and residential above

Areas for continued discussion:

- Does Estes necessarily need the same character along its length?
- Should trees be along the road in this area or sidewalks and retail wrapping around the corner?
- Phased approach to development – surface then structured parking
- Area should respond to Carolina North
- For NCDOT: How close to a major intersection can a new roadway be?
- Further discussion needed: Some in favor of a hotel, others not

Area B

Areas of general agreement:

- This area needs to have buildings with more than one story
- Have lower heights near the existing single-family houses.

Areas for continued discussion:

- Revisit the “blank” spot on the plans for this area
- Maybe have smaller offices in this area mixed with residential; have a live/work space
- Have transitions
- Possibly bury the powerlines
- Have similar characteristics along Somerset (Areas B and C)
- Civic or municipal uses
- Traffic concerns (safety) near schools – Some Committee members feel that density may help this, others don't

Area C

Areas of general agreement:

- *None added to the list on July 1st*

Areas of continued discussion:

- Support for using performance-based measures
 - Something can go in the area as long as it doesn't have certain characteristics
- Keep in mind safety of schools