

Meeting Date/Time: October 3, 2013, 6:00 to 9:00p.m.

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

Members Absent: Mia Burroughs, Bruce Murray, and Amy Ryan

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

Council Members Present: Jim Ward

	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 agenda and upcoming meetings.		
2.	Public Participation/ Comments	 Larry Slifkin: Long-time resident of Chapel Hill. This plan has an emphasis on a self-contained community; can't stop people from RTP buying here. Carolina North is pie in the sky. If they need more houses for UNC, they have the land to build it. If this is a self-contained community, why not place it in the county? Not here where it will be an imposition. The trail behind his house has had to be realigned because it fell into Bolin Creek. Put this nice concept where the land is cheap. People that live on Estes are scared. Traffic is bad. Think of the welfare of the community. Maria de Bruyn: Several Planning Board members suggested creating a hybrid of 		

	Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
		 the two plans. John Morris: Clearly traffic and transportation are key issues. Four concepts were analyzed. After that, Michael and Amy developed a new plan. Classifies this as mixed-use. Does not note how much square footage is here. Michael and Amy have brought up a performance standard approach. Committee seems to be relying on this. Put some numbers on the plan so that modeling can be done. Give us details about performance standards. Sandy Turbeville: Somerset and Huntington neighborhood have concerns about the traffic and use on the majority map. Need more specificity. 		
3.	Debrief from Planning Board Meeting	The Steering Committee discussed the comments heard from the Planning Board meeting on October 1 st when the Planning Board reviewed the Committee's draft Concept Plan and recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian amenities.		
4.	Review Stormwater Measures	The Steering Committee discussed the proposed language for stormwater that is to be included in the plan.	Motion by Julie McClintock and seconded by Jeff Kidd to amend the stormwater language to include a new beginning paragraph and aspirational language, and to remove some of the more regulatory language. Vote: 14 out of 14 – Passed.	Staff is to draft revised stormwater language and send it to the subcommittee that is reviewing the language of the plan.
5.	Review Possible Traffic Parameter Language	The Steering Committee discussed the transportation impacts of the draft Concept Plan.	Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Lucy Carol Davis for staff to conduct a transportation analysis of the draft Concept Plan; where there is a range of heights to use the highest number; and to compare this analysis to the analysis of the four plans (A1, A2, B1, and B2) and the existing conditions. Vote: 11 out of 14 with 3 opposed (David Tuttle, Firoz Mistry, and Julie McClintock) – Passed.	Staff will conduct a transportation analysis of the draft Concept Plan.
6.	Density Discussion	The Steering Committee discussed items relating to the density of the draft Concept		

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
7. Public Participation/Comments	Plan such as open space. Kathryn Butler: The original proposal for my property includes two uses that are the least generators of traffic, are offpeak, and are the highest uses of transit. If your concern is traffic, consider these uses. Emily Baucom: The Planning Board	Motions/Votes	Action
8. Review Draft Vision Draft Street Character Visions, and Additional Recommendations	use the official definitions from Wikipedia. The Steering Committee reviewed the draft vision, street character visions, and additional recommendations. Each Committee members provided their thoughts about the language, and their comments are to be provided to the subcommittee that is reviewing the language of the plan.		Committee members' comments about the vision, etc. are to be provided to the subcommittee that is reviewing the language of the plan. The subcommittee will pull together the comments and provide updated language for the plan.
9. Closing			The meeting adjourned at 9:00p.m.

The next Steering Committee meeting will be on Tuesday, October 8th from 6:00-9:00pm at the Transit Building, 6900 Millhouse Road.