



Action Minutes

Central West Focus Area: Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Date/Time: September 24, 2013, 4:30 p.m. to 6:50 p.m.

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

Members Absent:, Jeff Kidd and Bruce Murray

Staff Present: David Bonk, Mary Jane Nirdlinger, Matt Sullivan, and Megan Wooley

Council Members Present: Jim Ward and Lee Storrow

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
<p>1. Introductions and Opening Remarks</p>	<p>Megan Wooley, Chapel Hill Planning Department, opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. She provided an overview of the agenda, upcoming meetings including the LUMO kick-off events this week, and the schedule for the review of the draft language.</p>		<p>Draft language for the Small Area Plan: The subcommittee has reviewed the language for Chapters 1-3, and the language is currently being revised based on these edits. Once these edits are complete, Megan will send the language to the Steering Committee.</p> <p>The language for Chapters 4-5 is currently being drafted, and Megan will send this to the Committee once it has been drafted. She will also</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
			send a Doodle poll to the subcommittee members to schedule a meeting time to review Chapters 4-5.
<p>2. Public Participation/ Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan Tom: Please see attached comments. • Dave Sidor: Consensus was listed as a goal by the Steering Committee. Asking the Committee to work towards consensus. The devil is in the details. Density is not addressed. • Maria de Bruyn: The Small Area Plan should include a section on how the plan addresses the comments from the community session and survey. 		
<p>3. Facilitated Discussion of the “General Trend of Ideas” Map (Approved by the Steering Committee during the September 19th meeting as the first draft and starting point for discussion)</p>	<p>Matt Sullivan facilitated the Committee’s discussion and asked the Committee to focus on the issues of use, height, and bicycle and pedestrian amenities.</p>	<p>Motions Pertaining to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Amenities Discussion:</p> <p>Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Eric Hyman for the Committee to discuss use, height, and bicycle and pedestrian amenities in order to have a deliverable for the Planning Board. <i>Vote: 12 out of 14 with 2 opposed (Julie McClintock and Firoz Mistry) – Passed.</i></p> <p>Edits to the “Figure 1: Evaluation for Form and Use Area: Circulation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change “Investigate” to “Recommend” on “Investigate parallel route to Franklin along Elliot Rd.” • Change the spelling of “Bowlin” to “Bolin” (in two places in the brown blocks) • Add a proposed greenway that connects Carolina North to the dotted line of “Evaluation for Form & Use Area” then behind the schools to connect to Elliot Road • To the note “Connect to Bolin Creek Trail 	

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
		<p>where possible (Burlage Cir. & Meadowbrook Dr.)” add to the end of this sentence: “in an environmentally conscious and safe manner”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green lines on the map should be a suggestion, not a must • The first priority is an off-road bike path on Estes Drive. The Committee would like to gather feedback from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board about this suggestion. <p>Motion by Jared Simmons and seconded by Julie McClintock that the Committee recommend this bicycle and pedestrian plan, with the additional comments made during the meeting [and noted above] to the Planning Board, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board, Transportation Board, and Greenways Commission. <i>Vote: 14 out of 14 – Passed.</i></p> <p>Motions Pertaining to the Use and Height Discussion:</p> <p>Motion by Amy Ryan and seconded by Michael Parker to approve the heights listed as “3 stories” on the “General Trend of Ideas” map. <i>Vote: 10 out of 15 with 5 opposed (David Tuttle, Julie McClintock, Firoz Mistry, Mickey Jo Sorrell, and Abby Parcell) – Passed.</i></p> <p>Motion by Michael Parker and seconded by Michael Parker to have staff look into the possibility of turning the power easement into a road. <i>Vote: 11 out of 15 with 4 opposed (David Tuttle, Julie McClintock, Firoz Mistry, and Mickey Jo Sorrell) – Passed.</i></p> <p>Amendment: Have staff look into the possibility of turning the power easement into a greenway if the road is not feasible. <i>Vote: 14 out of 15 with 1</i></p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
		<p><i>opposed (David Tuttle) – Passed.</i></p> <p>Motion by Sarah McIntee and seconded by White Rummel to have staff investigate the appropriate location of a traffic circle or light. <i>Vote: 15 out of 15 with 0 opposed – Passed.</i></p> <p>Motion by Amy Ryan and seconded by Jared Simmons to approve the residential uses on the “General Trend of Ideas” map, except for: Area J, the spine road in A, B, and C, and the purple dot on C. <i>Vote: 11 out of 15 with 4 opposed (David Tuttle, Julie McClintock, Firoz Mistry, and Mickey Jo Sorrell) – Passed.</i></p> <p>Motion by Michael Parker and seconded by Jared Simmons to approve the uses for the areas on the map that are designated for uses other than residential, except for the spine road in A, B, and C and the purple dot in C. <i>Vote: 11 out of 15 with 3 opposed (David Tuttle, Julie McClintock, and Firoz Mistry) and 1 out of the room (Mia Burroughs) – Passed.</i></p> <p>Motion by Buffie Webber and seconded by Eric Hyman to have mixed-use along the spine road in Areas A and B, up to Somerset Drive with the mixed-use designation being one lot deep and the lots next to Somerset Drive being residential. <i>Vote: 9 out of 15 with 6 opposed (David Tuttle, Julie McClintock, Firoz Mistry, Mickey Jo Sorrell, Abby Parcell, and Jared Simmons) – Fails.</i></p> <p>Motion by Mia Burroughs and seconded by Jared Simmons to allow Institutional use on Area C with residential use on the north side of the Area. <i>Vote: 11 out of 15 with 4 opposed (David Tuttle, Julie McClintock, Firoz Mistry, and Mickey Jo Sorrell) – Passes.</i></p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
		<p>Motion by Sarah McIntee and seconded by Whit Rummel to designate the uses on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., south of Estes Drive, as 3 stories along Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., then stepping back to 4 stories, then stepping back to 5 stories with the caveat that the Committee would receive feedback from the Planning Board and have time for additional discussion. <i>Vote: 14 out of 15 with 1 opposed (David Tuttle) – Passed.</i></p>	
<p>4. Public Participation/ Comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Morris: Consider the history of the Committee's work- the consultant produced maps that had building footprints. Then moved to A1, A2, B1, and B2 which had a lot less detail, no building footprints. This plan has less detail. Impossible to tell the detail. The Committee is handing a plan to the Planning Board that has no definition. • Maria de Bruyn: The plan should have a minimum amount of space designated to green space, and this should not say "public space" since this would include plazas, farmers' markets, etc. 		
<p>5. Closing</p>			<p>The meeting adjourned at 6:50p.m.</p>

The next Steering Committee meeting will be on Thursday, October 3rd from 6:00-9:00pm at the Transit Building, 6900 Millhouse Road.

Comments to the Steering Committee

Alan Tom September 24, 2013

Just last week, the Steering Committee (Action Minutes for September 19) voted to use the map recently developed through individual conversations with Steering Committee members "as a first draft and starting point for the Committee's discussions."

Tonight that same map appears on your agenda for final action because, as noted in the agenda directions, "the Committee needs to send a plan to the Planning Board for their review on October 1st" Even by the twists and turns that have become a defining characteristic of the Central West Steering Committee, the abrupt switch in one week from a map being "a first draft and starting point for ... discussions" to being an action item is a astounding change in direction.

The reality is that the Steering Committee is not near being ready to offer a final report that could be meaningfully reviewed by the Planning Board next week. Let me capture major unresolved problems that are embedded in the map under consideration this afternoon (for reference, here is the map: <http://www.townofchapelhill.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=20575>)

- 1) A key problem with the plan on the table is the failure of this plan to have a set of defensible performance standards for traffic and flooding, presuming that performance outcomes are to be part of the assessment for potential developments.
- 2) The plan does not identify square foot maximums for each developer (you can't have both flexibility of building placement and no sense of maximum square footage and still have meaningful protection for surrounding neighborhoods).
- 3) The whole issue of Estes Drive is unaddressed in the plan under consideration, leaving it unclear, for example, the maximum number of lanes that might be added as part of traffic mitigation procedures or

precisely what features will promote the safety of school-age children and other pedestrians (part of this latter issue may be addressed this evening).

4) Yet to be discussed and resolved is whether senior housing can be appropriately placed on a ridge with nearby steep ravines in one of Chapel Hill's last remaining near old-growth forests.

5) The southward extension of Somerset would entail it crossing a drainage area, both an expensive road to build and an environmentally questionable proposal.

6) While the map states that intensity decreases as one moves eastward on Estes, it is hard to see on that map how that claim is true.

7) Even though we now know that Carolina North is going to be phased in slower than originally expected, no provisions are apparent on the map for accommodating Central West development to the phase-in of Carolina North.

These 7 unresolved areas -- other people no doubt can add to this list -- are significant, and it is not surprising that these areas are unresolved. After all discussion of this new map has just begun, and the Steering Committee has only recently started to talk to one another in a serious way. In the absence of a skilled facilitator and with a committee charge that has morphed periodically, the Steering Committee has seemed to spin in circles for much of the past 6 months.

When the Town Council established the Steering Committee membership last October, the Council made the committee membership broadly representative of the interests of the community, ranging from landowners to institutional representatives to residents of Central West. This was a design to promote, if not compel, consensus, and the Steering Committee early on adopted consensus as a goal.

Now is not the time to shortcircuit that goal. I urge you to persist and to work for consensus so that the interests of everyone around the table are preserved and the final small area plan has the support of all of you.