



Action Minutes

Central West Focus Area: Steering Committee Meeting

Meeting Date/Time: November 7, 2013, 6:00-9:30 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Mia Burroughs, Bruce Murray, and Abby Parcell

Councilmembers Present: Sally Greene and Ed Harrison

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

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 and upcoming meetings.</p>		
<p>2. Public Participation/ Comments</p>	<p>María de Bruyn: <i>Maria provided the statement she read at the meeting to Megan; please see the following:</i> The Steering Committee members have all devoted a lot of effort to the Central West process, likely much more than any of you anticipated when joining the Committee and I'd like to thank you all for the time you devoted to this.</p> <p>Among the recommendations for revisions to the plan that you will discuss this evening is one that would address a request for a minimum percentage of green space. It says: "The percentage of open space in the area north of Estes Drive will be at least 15%. The entire focus area is anticipated to</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
	<p>have 40% of open space which includes open space and undevelopable land.” This is an extremely disappointing proposal and I would hope that you would consider changing it. First, the proposal refers to open space rather than green space. Green space is not defined in the glossary; open space is and includes agricultural uses, pastures, meadows, parks, recreational areas, lawns, gardens, cemeteries, ponds, streams, etc.</p> <p>Green space should be defined in the glossary as protected areas of land that preserve the existing natural features as they are, including ground cover, shrubs, saplings, trees, decaying wood and other natural elements that help absorb and retain rain water and provide a habitat to wildlife, including mammals, insects and birds.</p> <p>The request has been made for a minimum percentage of 15% of green space, not open space. This percentage should also not include the RCD, which already is being preserved.</p> <p>Further, the percentage should not apply only to the area north of Estes Drive but to the entire area of land under discussion. I would further request that the definition of green space be added to the Glossary, as well as the terms workforce housing and traffic mitigation measures.</p> <p>Dave Sidor: The Committee adopted consensus as a goal. You should work towards this tonight. There is consensus between the Citizens Plan and the Steering Committee plan in that both talk about the land swap as an option.</p>		
<p>3. Review and Discuss Possible Revisions to</p>	<p>Lucy Carol Davis read a statement to the Steering Committee.</p>	<p>Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Julie McClintock to approve the edits for all items</p>	<p>The Steering Committee members</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
<p>the draft Central West Small Area Plan</p>	<p>The Steering Committee reviewed the document titled “Comments Received about the draft Central West Small Area Plan.” The Steering Committee discussed the items listed under the “Discussion Items” and reviewed and discussed some items listed under “Consent Items.”</p>	<p>listed under “Consent Items” except for items #17, 21, 22, 23, 29, and 36 which require additional discussion. <i>Vote: 14 out of 14 – Passed</i></p> <p>Motion by Jared Simmons and seconded by Michael Parker to send item #3 under discussion items to the Parks and Recreation Commission for their consideration. <i>Vote: 12 out of 14 (Opposed: Sarah McIntee and Firoz Mistry) – Passed</i></p> <p>For a list of the motions made regarding the items under “Discussion Items” and items #17, 21, 22, 23, 29, and 36 under “Consent Items,” please see the chart that is attached to these action minutes.</p> <p>Motion by Firoz Mistry and seconded by Jeff Kidd for the Steering Committee to endorse the draft Central West Small Area Plan with the recommendations and to forward these documents to the Council for their approval. <i>Vote: 10 out of 14 (Opposed: Julie McClintock, Firoz Mistry, David Tuttle, and Mickey Jo Sorrell) – Passed</i></p>	<p>are to send a statement about their thoughts regarding the draft Central West Small Area Plan and process to develop the plan. These thoughts would be included as an attachment to the staff memorandum to Council for the November 26th Council Business meeting. They are to send Megan their statements by tomorrow, Tuesday, November 12th.</p>
<p>4. Public Participation/ Comments</p>	<p>Elaine Marcus: I am greatly disturbed that a member of the Steering Committee was able to read a letter that concerned another Steering Committee member. It was inappropriate and disrespectful. Thank you to the Steering Committee for their work.</p> <p>Dave Sidor: Thank you to the Steering Committee for your hard work and effort.</p> <p>Fred Lampe: The Town indicated that you are going to do an economic analysis. Based on the back of the envelope work I’ve done, the Steering Committee’s plan will be</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Motions/Votes	Action
	a burden on the Town. Will also have great traffic impacts. Disappointed in the Steering Committee.		
5. Closing			The meeting adjourned at 9:30p.m.

The Steering Committee has met their charge and is forwarding the draft Central West Small Area Plan with revisions and amendments to the Council. No additional Steering Committee meetings are scheduled.

The following document provides an overview of the motions made regarding the revisions and amendments to the draft Central West Small Area Plan during the November 7th Steering Committee meeting.

Comments Received about the draft Central West Small Area Plan
Divided into: Discussion Items, Consent Items, and Advisory Board/Other Comments
For discussion by the Central West Steering Committee during their November 7, 2013 meeting

This document provides a list of the comments received about the draft Central West Small Area Plan.

The comments have been organized into the following three sections:

Section	Description	Begins on Page... (of this document)
Discussion Items	These are items that need further discussion by the Steering Committee during the meeting on November 7 th .	Page 2
Consent Items	These are technical corrections and edits that reflect clarifications in the draft plan.	Page 7
Advisory Board/Other Comments	These are additional comments that have been received and are already addressed in the plan.	Page 12

In the charts below, staff comments have been provided, and for the “Discussion Items” and “Consent Items,” suggestions for possible revisions to the plan have been made.

Discussion Items					
<i>Discussion Items are items that need further discussion by the Steering Committee.</i>					
Number (for reference)	Comment	Who and When	Staff Comment	Possible Revision	Motions and revisions made during the November 7 th Steering Committee Meeting
Executive Summary					
1	Need a better discussion of the drivers of the Concept Plan.	Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th	We agree.	<p>Include the following statement in the Executive Summary, as the second paragraph under “Purpose of the Central West Small Area Plan”:</p> <p>The Central West Small Area Plan makes a conscious attempt to balance many considerations: respecting existing neighborhoods; preserving and enhancing the natural environment; developing a new neighborhood that integrates with existing ones and complements the evolving Carolina North campus; creating new, neighborhood-oriented destinations; assuring the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists; mitigating the impacts of new vehicular traffic; and taking into account financial impacts and viability for both the Town and developers. Doing so required that the Committee consider and make many trade-offs and compromises.</p>	<p>Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Jared Simmons to approve the following:</p> <p><i>(Note: This language is the same as in the “Possible Revisions” column.)</i></p> <p>Include the following statement in the Executive Summary, as the second paragraph under “Purpose of the Central West Small Area Plan”:</p> <p>The Central West Small Area Plan makes a conscious attempt to balance many considerations: respecting existing neighborhoods; preserving and enhancing the natural environment; developing a new neighborhood that integrates with existing ones and complements the evolving Carolina North</p>

					<p>campus; creating new, neighborhood-oriented destinations; assuring the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists; mitigating the impacts of new vehicular traffic; and taking into account financial impacts and viability for both the Town and developers. Doing so required that the Committee consider and make many trade-offs and compromises.</p> <p><i>Vote: 14 out of 14 – Passed.</i></p>
Chapter 3: Planning Principles and Objectives					
2	<p>Remove road that connects from Homestead Road into Carolina North - in Principle #4, Objective F and on Figures 2.24, 2.25, 2.26, 2.27.</p>	<p>Ed Harrison October 28th; Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)</p>	<p>The Carolina North development agreement does not recommend this road.</p>	<p>Remove Objective F in Principle #4.</p>	<p>Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Eric Hyman to amend the objective to state: “The Steering Committee realizes this objective is in conflict with the Carolina North Development Agreement, and we recommend that the Council revisit this decision.” <i>Vote: 8 out of 14 – Failed</i></p> <p>Motion by David Tuttle and seconded by Whit Rummel to remove the objective. – <i>Failed</i></p>

					<p><i>The Steering Committee decided to table the discussion about this item and return to it later in the evening.</i></p> <p><i>When the Steering Committee returned to this item later in the evening, the following motion was made:</i></p> <p>Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Lucy Carol Davis to keep the objective. – <i>Failed</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, the objective will be removed.</i></p>
Chapter 4: Concept Plan					
3	Minimum percentage of green space needs to be included in the plan	Julie McClintock (10/18); Mickey Jo Sorrell (10/21); Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	We agree.	<p>Include a statement in Chapter 4: Concept Plan under the section “Buffers and Open Space” that states: “The percentage of open space in the area north of Estes Drive will be at least 15%. The entire focus area is anticipated to have 40% of open space which includes open space and undevelopable land.”</p>	<p>Motion by Jeff Kidd and seconded by Whit Rummel to amend the statement as follows: “The planning area is anticipated to have 40% of green space which includes open space and undevelopable land.” – <i>Did not pass.</i></p> <p>Motion by Julie McClintock and seconded by Eric Hyman to amend the statement as follows: “The percentage of public green space for each project north of Estes Drive</p>

					<p>will be at least 15%. The planning area is anticipated to have 40% of public green space which includes open space and undevelopable land.”</p> <p><i>Vote: 11 out of 14 (Opposed: Jeff Kidd, Sarah McIntee, and David Tuttle) - Passed</i></p>
Chapter 5: Transportation					
4	<p>“Have the Town staff investigate the possibility of a bicycle/pedestrian bridge across Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.” – Could add in the “Additional Transportation Recommendations” on page 50 or into the Bike/Ped section</p>	<p>Mickey Jo Sorrell (10/21); Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)</p>		<p>Add a statement in Chapter 5: Transportation under the section titled “Additional Transportation Recommendations” under the bullet point “Have Town staff investigate the following:” that states: “The possibility of a pedestrian and bicycle bridge over Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. In the event that a bridge is not possible, provide other options for the safe crossing of the road.”</p>	<p>Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Michael Parker to approve the following:</p> <p><i>(Note: This language is the same as in the “Possible Revisions” column.)</i></p> <p>Add a statement in Chapter 5: Transportation under the section titled “Additional Transportation Recommendations” under the bullet point “Have Town staff investigate the following:” that states: “The possibility of a pedestrian and bicycle bridge over Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. In the event that a bridge is not possible, provide other options for the safe crossing of the road.”</p>
5	<p>Consider the possibility of a pedestrian and bicycle bridge over MLK. In the event that a bridge is not possible, provide other options for the safe crossing of the road.</p>	<p>Greenways Commission October 23rd</p>	<p>Language could be added to Chapter 5: Transportation</p>		

					<i>Vote 14 out of 14 – Passed.</i>
6	Add a principle that says no widening of Estes Drive.	Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th			Motion by Amy Ryan and seconded by Julie McClintock to add the following statement to the list of bullet points in Chapter 5: Transportation under “Additional Transportation Recommendations”: “The Central West Small Area Plan recommends adding additional lanes at the intersection of Estes Drive and Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The Steering Committee recommends that the lanes on Estes Drive be consolidated into two travel lanes near the intersection of Somerset Drive and Estes Drive. The Steering Committee prefers not to add additional travel lanes on Estes Drive beyond the two existing travel lanes.”
7	Add additional principle and text to emphasize that the Steering Committee recommends keeping Estes at 2 lanes between Franklin and Somerset, with bike-pedestrian improvements. Document that there is no funding in Durham- Chapel Hill MPO plans; and that the 2009 Long Range Transit Plan did not select Estes as a “high investment service” for transit.	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	We have received conflicting viewpoints about this from the community. Information about traffic mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 5: Transportation, section “Traffic Mitigation Measures.” Additional information about the traffic analysis and recommended mitigations may be provided in the Appendix of the plan (see item #20 in this chart).		
8	I believe that one day Estes Drive will be widened.	John Ager (Planning Board) October 29 th			<i>Vote 14 out of 14 – Passed.</i>
Chapter 6: Environmental Considerations					
9	Propose conservation of granite ridge and old hickory forest as a first priority goal. If developed, pull- back	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock)	A statement has been included in Chapter 6 under the section “Recommendations for Resource Conservation	Add a sentence to this statement that says: “If possible, prioritize the conservation of the granite ridge and	Motion by Jared Simmons and seconded by Julie McClintock to include the language and amend it as follows: “If feasible,

	structures such as garden apartments for seniors or graduate student families from ridge and steep slopes, utilizing flatter land; allow greater heights ONLY if smaller footprint; keep buildings closer to MLK and transit.	(11/4)	District Overlay Areas” that discusses this area: “In the area nestled between the Resource Conservation District overlay, greater heights have been allowed in this area in order to preserve the natural space; therefore, building footprints should be minimized in this area.”	mature forest and pull development away from the ridge and steep slopes.”	prioritize the conservation of mature forest and pull development away from the ridge and steep slopes.” <i>Vote passed.</i>
Chapter 8: Implementation					
10	Vision statement cites a goal of “providing affordable/workforce housing.” No further plan is provided.	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	Principle 9: A Diverse Population states that “The area shall serve a broad socio-demographic range of Chapel Hill residents, students, workers, and visitors.”	In Chapter 8, under “Other Implementation Considerations” include the following statement: “The Central West Focus Area should include a high number of housing that is affordable to households that make less than 80% of the area median income. If for-sale housing is constructed, the Town’s Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance states that 15% of these units must be affordable (if the project has over five dwelling units). If rental housing is constructed, recommendations from	Motion by Amy Ryan and seconded by Michael Parker to include the language and amend it as follows: In Chapter 8, under “Other Implementation Considerations” include the following statement: “The Central West Focus Area should include a significant amount of housing that is affordable to households that make less than 80% of the area median income. If for-sale housing is constructed, the Town’s Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance states that 15% of these units must be affordable (if the project has over five dwelling
11	What a missed opportunity if had senior housing here and not workforce housing.	Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th			
12	Need to have a strong statement regarding developing a partnership with UNC for workforce housing.	Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th			

				<p>the Mayor’s Committee on Affordable Rental Housing should be applied.”</p> <p>Also include in this section:</p> <p>“The implementation phase of this plan will require a variety of partners, and the plan encourages developing partnerships with the non-profits, business owners, community members, and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to implement the vision set forth in this plan.”</p>	<p>units). If rental housing is constructed, recommendations from the Mayor’s Committee on Affordable Rental Housing should be applied.”</p> <p>Also include in this section:</p> <p>“The implementation phase of this plan will require a variety of partners, and the plan encourages developing partnerships with the non-profits, business owners, community members, and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to implement the vision set forth in this plan.”</p> <p><i>Vote: 11 out of 14 (Opposed: Jeff Kidd, Anthony Carey, and Firoz Mistry) – Passed.</i></p> <p>Motion by Julie McClintock and seconded by Firoz Mistry to include the following language in the draft plan: “The Committee recommends a post-Small Area Plan joint initiative with UNC to investigate the possibility of providing workforce housing.” <i>Vote: 4</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<i>out of 14 (Opposed: Sarah McIntee, Jeff Kidd, Anthony Carey, Amy Ryan, Eric Hyman, Whit Rummel, Lucy Carol Davis, Jared Simmons, and Buffer Webber) – Failed</i>
13	A recommendation for Council to explore removing the airport hazard district is included in the plan – Does the Committee want to include this?	Julie McClintock (10/18); Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	Recommendation is located in Chapter 8: Implementation	Keep or remove language.	Motion by Sarah McIntee and seconded by Whit Rummel to not make a change to the language. <i>Vote: 10 out of 14 (Opposed: David Tuttle, Mickey Jo Sorrell, Julie McClintock, and Firoz Mistry) – Passed</i>
14	Council asked Committee to examine transit impacts along major corridors in impact area. No study has occurred.	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	The Steering Committee’s principles discuss connectivity throughout the Planning Area; these include: Principle 4: Improve Physical Connections, Principle 5: Minimize Vehicular Traffic Impacts, Principle 6: Enhance the Pedestrian/Bicycle Experience, and Principle 7: Improve the Transit System. These principles are located in Chapter 3 of the Small Area Plan.	Add a statement in Chapter 5: Transportation under the section titled “Additional Transportation Recommendations” that says: “Integrate the findings from the Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard – South Columbia – US 15-501 South Corridor Alternative Analysis Study into recommendations for this area.”	Motion by Julie McClintock and seconded by Michael Parker to include the following language in the draft plan: <i>(Note: This language is the same as in the “Possible Revisions” column.)</i> Add a statement in Chapter 5: Transportation under the section titled “Additional Transportation Recommendations” that says: “Integrate the findings from the Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard – South Columbia – US 15-501 South Corridor Alternative Analysis Study

					into recommendations for this area.” <i>Vote: Passes</i>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Note: The Steering Committee also requested that a statement be added in the Executive Summary that says that there are areas that need more discussion in the future such as around transportation, stormwater, open space, etc.

Consent Items: Technical Corrections/Edits

Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Julie McClintock to approve the following edits for all items listed under “Consent Items” except for items #17, 21, 22, 23, 29, and 36 which require additional discussion. *Vote: 14 out of 14 – Passes*

(Motions regarding the items #17, 21, 22, 23, 29, and 36 are listed next to these items in the chart below.)

Consent Items are technical corrections and edits that reflect clarifications of the language in the draft plan.

Number (for reference)	Comment	Who and When	Staff Comment	Possible Revision	Motions made during the November 7th Steering Committee Meeting
Chapter 1: Introduction and Planning Process					
15	Need to say why we are doing all of this. Need a proactive statement at the beginning of the plan.	Jason Baker (Planning Board) October 29 th	We agree.	Add a sentence to the last paragraph on page 1 which states: “The Council recognized that possible development would best serve the needs of the Town and the immediate surrounding neighborhoods if it were carried out with the guidance of a small area plan with community involvement.” (See	

				recommendation in draft dated 11/6)	
16	<p>Improve connections between Chapter 2 and the rest of the plan: Having the existing conditions as the second chapter made the vision statement feel disconnected from the principles and concept plan; should be clearer about how these are connected.</p>	<p>Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29th</p>	<p>We agree.</p>	<p>Move the Vision Statement to the beginning of Chapter 3, and rename this chapter "Chapter 3: Vision Statement, Planning Principles, and Objectives." Also move some of the maps in Chapter 2: Existing Conditions to an Appendix and adding some more description to the maps. (See recommendation in draft dated 11/6)</p>	
17	<p>Online Survey: should include results from the survey or at least reference the survey and where people can find the results</p>	<p>Mickey Jo Sorrell October 21st</p>	<p>Information about "E-Communications" can be found in Chapter 1.</p>	<p>Add the following statement to the "E-Communications" section of Chapter 1: "Two informal, online questionnaires/surveys were conducted, the first in March of 2013, and the second in September of 2013. More information, including the results, can be found here: www.townofchapelhill.org/index.aspx?page=2185."</p>	<p>Motion by Firoz Mistry and seconded by Jared Simmons to include the following language with the addition of a brief summary of the results of the surveys:</p> <p>Two informal, online questionnaires/surveys were conducted, the first in March of 2013, and the second in September of 2013. <i>Insert language about the results of the surveys here.</i></p> <p><i>Vote: 13 out of 14 (Opposed: Buffie Webber) -</i></p>

					Passes
Chapter 2: Existing Conditions					
18	Include a topographic map	Suzanne Haff (Planning Board) October 29 th ; Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	We agree.	Include the topographic map developed by Rhodeside and Harwell and add a description of the map. (See attachment)	
19	Add Elliott Woods housing to the map of Housing Affordability Index (Figure 2.22) or Public Housing (Figure 2.23)	Erin Langston October 21 st	Elliott Woods is not public housing that is owned by the Town (<i>public housing</i> defines housing owned by the Town). Elliot Woods is an affordable housing community that is owned by the Interchurch Council.	Change title to: “Affordable Housing” (from “Public Housing”) for Figure 2.23 and add an informational block about the Elliot Woods community.	
Chapter 4: Concept Plan					
20	Insert the traffic analysis information and the density numbers into the Small Area Plan	Steering Committee October 18 th	It is useful to have record of the assumptions that were made during the planning process.	Insert the traffic analysis information and the density numbers in the Appendix.	
21	Place square footage numbers for each quadrant in the Concept Plan chapter in each quadrant section	Michael Parker and Amy Ryan November 4 th	We agree.	Insert a chart with square footage information in Chapter 4: Concept Plan, section “The Concept Plan: Land Use,” next to Figures 4.3, 4.5, 4.6, and 4.8.	Motion by Lucy Carol Davis and seconded by Julie McClintock to include the square footage information in Chapter 4: Concept Plan, section “The Concept Plan: Land Use,” next to Figures 4.3, 4.5, 4.6, and 4.8. <i>Vote: 11 out of 13 (Opposed –</i>

					<p><i>David Tuttle and Mickey Jo Sorrell) Sarah McIntee was out of the room – Passes</i></p> <p>The Committee expressed an interest in stating next to the square footage charts that these numbers were used for the traffic analysis; that the assumptions provide a workable level of development and traffic; and to see the Appendix for more information.</p>
Chapter 5: Transportation					
22	Remove the blue line on Caswell Road from Figures 5.5. and 5.6	Sarah McIntee (10/11); Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	Installing a sidewalk on Caswell Road is listed in the Town’s Sidewalk Improvement Plan; therefore, we recommend that the notation remains in the Central West Small Area Plan.	Keep current language.	Motion by David Tuttle and seconded by Michael Parker to keep the sidewalk designation for Caswell Road on the map. <i>Vote: 11 out of 12 (Opposed: Sarah McIntee; Jeff Kidd and Lucy Carol Davis out of the room) – Passed</i>
23	Remove “(Burlage Cir. & Meadowbrook Dr.)” from the lower right-hand grey box in Figure 5.6	Sarah McIntee October 11 th	There are concerns that the Bolin Creek Trail cannot be connected via Burlage Cir. or Meadowbrook Dr.	Remove “(Burlage Cir. & Meadowbrook Dr.)” from the lower right-hand grey box in Figure 5.6.	Motion by Sarah McIntee and seconded by Jared Simmons to remove “(Burlage Cir. & Meadowbrook Dr.)” from the lower right-hand grey box in Figure 5.6. and to remove the language in the grey box that states “Connect to Bolin Creek Trail where possible off

					MLK Jr. Blvd” and to replace this language with the following statement: “Make southern connections from Central West to the Bolin Creek Greenway where feasible.” <i>Vote: 14 out of 14 – Passed</i>
24	Each of the illustrations (Figures 5.1, 5.3, 5.4) would be helped by labeling "looking east" or some other explanation. It probably would have helped to have Figure 5.6 before these three, since it somewhat explains what we're looking at.	Mickey Jo Sorrell (11/2); Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	We agree.	Move Figure 5.6 to before Figure 5.1 and label the directions on Figures 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4.	
25	In Figure 5.1 (p.52), I think the lanes are mislabeled. Unless I misunderstand, the "travel lanes" are "turning lanes" and visa versa.	Mickey Jo Sorrell (11/2); Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	We agree.	Re-label the turning and travel lanes.	
26	In the paragraph at the bottom of page 52, second sentence, it should probably say "cross-sections in Figures 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4" rather than just 5.4	Mickey Jo Sorrell (11/2); Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	We agree.	Edit this sentence to read: "The cross-sections in Figures 5.1, 5.3, and 5.4..."	
27	Also on p.52, the text states that the bike	Mickey Jo Sorrell (11/2); Proposed	We agree.	Edit this sentence to read: "The path could then	

	path will connect to Clayton, then Audubon, then Elliot. This is not what is shown on the map in Figure 5.5 and 5.6.	Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)		connect to on-road bike lanes on Clayton Road that would connect with to Elliot Road via Curtis Road or a path through school property (shown in Figure 5.4). The on-road bike lanes on Elliot Road would connect to Franklin Street (Figure 5.5 and Figure 5.6)."	
28	On page 56, second paragraph, Figures 5.2, 5.4, 5.8, and 5.9 are mentioned. 5.2 doesn't actually show a bike way. It should probably read "Figures 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9."	Mickey Jo Sorrell November 2 nd	We agree.	Edit the sentence to read: "The bicycle and pedestrian facilities shown in Figures 5.2, 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9 show examples..."	
29	Provide information on existing conditions. "Estes/MLK, Estes/Franklin intersections often back up for more than a mile at peak hours."	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	Chapter 5 in the Concept Plan discusses the existing transportation conditions.	No change recommended.	Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Jeff Kidd to not add the proposed language and to make no change to the plan. <i>Vote: 10 out of 14 (Opposed: Julie McClintock, Firoz Mistry, Mickey Jo Sorrell, and David Tuttle) – Passed</i>
Chapter 6: Environmental Considerations					
30	Stormwater Section – Is this the language the Steering Committee would like to see in the plan?	Julie McClintock October 18 th	Stormwater recommendations are provided in Chapter 6. The Steering Committee reviewed this language during their October 8 th	Include a statement in Chapter 6: Environmental Considerations, section "Stormwater Recommendations" that says: "Consider implementing a stormwater district if	
31	Add language to Stormwater Section: Use state-of-the-art,	Proposed Improvements Document	meeting. This section		

	best- management practices consistent with federal, state, and local regulations for any development in this area. Consider a stormwater special assessment stormwater district.	(Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	emphasizes the development of a Small Area Stormwater Management Master Plan.	recommended by the Small Area Stormwater Management Master Plan.”	
32	A stormwater district should be considered for this area. (A district would entail that the properties that have water running through them should pay into a fund).	Suzanne Haff (Planning Board) October 29 th			
Chapter 7: Streetscapes					
33	Buildings should be articulated and have a variety of appearances.	Suzanne Haff (Planning Board) October 29 th	The Small Area Plan includes recommendations for streetscape elements. Principle 1, Objective C states, “Establish a local architectural vernacular appropriate to Chapel Hill that relates to the architecture proposed at Carolina North. Encourage the use of materials and plants native to North Carolina.”	Include a statement in Chapter 7, section “Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and Estes Drive Streetscape Elements” which says: All streetscapes should be visually interesting through the use of varied materials, building heights, and setbacks.”	
34	Need to vary the heights so that it doesn’t look like a	Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th	The recommended heights can be found in Chapter 4 and on page		

	uniform mass.		40.		
Chapter 8: Implementation					
35	Add this language: “The Council also may rezone when the special use permit is submitted within the current review process. Details such as traffic, stormwater, affordable housing, limited parking, as well as noise, air, and water pollution mitigation (that are left out of the small plan) are handled in the permit process.”	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	We agree.	Include a statement in Chapter 8 under “Other Implementation Considerations” that says: “The Council also may rezone when the special use permit is submitted within the current review process. Details such as traffic, stormwater, affordable housing, limited parking, as well as noise, air, and water pollution mitigation are handled in the permit process.”	
Glossary					
36	Insert Glossary Terms	Steering Committee	The Committee requested that a Glossary be included in the Small Area Plan.	Add the Glossary Terms to the “Glossary” Section.	Motion by Whit Rummel and seconded by Jeff Kidd to add the glossary language to the plan. <i>Vote: 14 out of 14 – Passed</i> Town staff is to review the additional terms and definitions provided by Sarah McIntee and consider these for inclusion in the glossary. The Committee also recommended including the following terms in the glossary: - Riparian buffers

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wildlife corridor - Ecologically sensitive areas - Traffic mitigation - Workforce housing - Airport Hazard Zone/District - Stormwater District - Public green space
--	--	--	--	--	---

The following items are already addressed in the draft Central West Small Area Plan or during the Steering Committee’s discussions; therefore, the Steering Committee did not discuss these items, and no motions were made regarding these items.

Advisory Board/Other Comments			
<i>Advisory Board/Other Comments are additional comments that have been received about the draft plan and are addressed in the plan.</i>			
Number (for reference)	Comment	Who and When	Staff Comment
Chapter 1: Introduction and Planning Process			
37	Need to state in the plan how the input received at the community sessions was considered and incorporated into the plan	Julie McClintock October 18 th	Language about community outreach is included in the “Community Engagement” section of Chapter 1. Language has been reviewed by the writing subcommittee and by the Steering Committee.
38	Present wording insufficient: “These sessions have provided valuable information that was considered by Steering Committee members in moving forward in development of the Central West Small Area Plan. “	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	
Chapter 2: Existing Conditions			
39	The specifics about the Resource Conservation District (i.e., 150 feet, etc.) and steep slopes should be included in the plan so that people in the future will understand why certain decisions were made.	Suzanne Haff (Planning Board) October 29 th	This information is included in Chapter 2 on the page titled “Environmentally Protected Sensitive Areas,” page 14.
Chapter 4: Concept Plan			
40	Consider land swap idea	Suzanne Haff, Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th	The Concept Plan, page 40, states “Encourage exploration of a possible land swap that would put the ridge forest land into conservation, if land owners were amenable.”
41	Remove open-ended category “Institutional Use” near residential neighborhood. Neighbors in Somerset-Huntington Drive petitioned Steering Committee for a compatible	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	The Steering Committee passed a motion during their September 24 th meeting to include institutional uses in this area with residential use on the north side of the area.

	residential use. Starter homes in Citizens' Plan are a compatible use.		
42	I want to ask the committee for clarity on what we are recommending for Butler property. What are preferred types of uses within mixed use? Are luxury student apartments allowed?	Julie McClintock October 25 th ; Kimberley Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th ; Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	The uses for Area A are defined in the Concept Plan as residential, commercial, retail, and/or institutional.
43	Maximum height on Area H (currently 5-8 stories)	Mickey Jo Sorrell October 21 st	See Chapter 4, page 40, for the Concept Plan. These heights (5-8 stories) reflect the density numbers that were approved by the Steering Committee during their October 18 th meeting.
44	Add Citizen concept map that provides clear assumptions and density caps giving equal opportunity to developers.	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	The Steering Committee reviewed the Alternative Map and developed the draft Concept Plan in the Small Area Plan.
45	Committee did not discuss a hotel use on Area A	Julie McClintock October 18 th	A motion was passed during the September 24, 2013, Steering Committee meeting to approve the uses for the areas on the map that were designated for uses other than residential, except for the spine road in A, B, and C and the purple dot in C. The Concept Plan includes a notation with an arrow pointing to Area A that states, "Anchor use (could be mixed use or hotel), with adjacent retail/dining and public plaza or green space."
Chapter 5: Transportation			
46	For Figure 3, Estes Drive Cross Section, we recommend that the bike lanes be grade-separated and swapped with the planting strip on each side to be a protected bicycle lane (cycle track).	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board - October 22 nd Greenways Commission – October 23 rd	The next step in constructing bicycle and pedestrian facilities along Estes Drive will be the preparation of detailed design and engineering plans. During this process the Town will evaluate the feasibility of alternative designs for the bicycle facilities based on operational efficiency, impact on adjoining properties, right of way availability, overall cost and consistency with the Town's Bicycle Plan.
47	The proposed bicycle lanes should be provided behind the planting strip rather than adjacent to the automobile travel lanes.	Transportation Board (10/24)	

48	In the case of limited right of way, maintaining the five-foot-wide bicycle lanes should be prioritized over maintaining of the full 10-12' width of the multiuse path.	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board - October 22 nd Greenways Commission – October 23 rd	This can be further discussed with NCDOT when a development application is submitted. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board will be a part of this discussion.
49	As design specifications for the bicycle and pedestrian improvement on Estes Drive from MLK to the traffic light at Caswell Road are developed, that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board be consulted throughout the process.	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board - October 22 nd Greenways Commission – October 23 rd	Yes, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board will be a part of this discussion.
50	New development in the Central West Focus Area should have good networked connectivity without cul-de-sacs and other discontinuities, particularly for pedestrians and bicyclists and other non-motorized modes. These new roads would emphasize safety and accessibility for non-motorized uses.	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board - October 22 nd Greenways Commission – October 23 rd	The Concept Plan provides a vision for internal circulation in the new development and does not include cul-de-sacs or discontinuities. The Committee's Principle 6: Enhance the Pedestrian/Bicycle Experience emphasizes the important of safe facilities that are accessible to those of all abilities.
51	Have connectivity between the new greenways developed in Central West and existing greenways, such as the Bolin Creek Greenway.	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board - October 22 nd Greenways Commission – October 23 rd	The Concept Plan and Bicycle and Pedestrian Map emphasize the importance of connectivity. Principle 4, Objective H also highlights this by stating: Tie new paths and greenways into the Carolina North and town greenway systems and the Campus to Campus Connector.
52	The final plan should include pedestrian and bicycle connections to Franklin Street by way of schools, Pritchard Park and the Library.	Greenways Commission October 23 rd	These connections are demonstrated in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Map (Figure 5.6).
53	The final plan should include pedestrian and bicycle connections to Estes Drive Extension and Carolina North.	Greenways Commission October 23 rd	These connections are demonstrated in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Map (Figure 5.6). Principle 4, Objective G highlights this by stating: Make bicycle and pedestrian movement between Carolina North across MLK and Estes to its eastern and southern neighbors easier and safer.
54	Explore all options to use the power utility easement that runs north to south in the center of the area or	Greenways Commission October 23 rd	The Concept Plan, page 40, includes the following statement: "Look into the possibility of the power easement being used as a road, or a greenway if a road is not

	other routes proximate to it.		feasible.”
55	Explore options to connect the Estes Drive area to the Bolin Creek trail.	Greenways Commission October 23 rd	The Bicycle and Pedestrian Map (Figure 5.6) states: “Connect to Bolin Creek Trail where possible in an environmentally conscious and safe manner.”
56	Include existing dedicated woodland paths – these are well-used paths to the schools.	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	Recommendations for greenways, sidewalks, and bicycle paths are described in Chapter 5: Transportation.
	Safe pedestrian crosswalks need to be reviewed by parents and made more prominent.	Proposed Improvements Document (Submitted by Julie McClintock) (11/4)	See item #10-12 in this chart regarding the importance of partnerships during the implementation phase of the plan.
57	The Central West Plan should be coordinated with ongoing public transportation planning and infrastructure investments.	Transportation Board (10/24)	Chapter 8: Implementation, section “Incorporation into Other Town Plans” discusses the importance of integrating the Central West Small Area Plan with other Town plans.
58	Consideration should be given to the future need to improve Estes Drive and all potential options should be evaluated.	Transportation Board (10/24)	Chapter 5: Transportation discusses improvements to Estes Drive.
Chapter 6: Environmental Considerations			
59	Examine concerns about rare habitat forest.	Melissa McCullough (Planning Board) October 29 th	The Town’s existing Tree Ordinance, Canopy Coverage Ordinance, and Steep Slopes Ordinance will be applied to new development in the area.
60	Support no tall buildings on the ridge line.	Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th	See item #9 in this chart.
Chapter 7: Streetscapes			
61	Architectural elements: Our principles clearly say MLK and Estes streetscape and appearance are to have different treatment - they are the same in most recent draft.	Julie McClintock October 18 th	Streetscape elements are discussed in Chapter 7. See page 59 for “Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Streetscape Elements.” See page 60 for “Estes Drive Streetscape Elements.” See page 60 for “Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and Estes Drive Streetscape Elements.”
Additional Comments			
Parking			

62	Parking Limitations	Julie McClintock October 18 th	<p>Parking considerations are typically discussed during the Special Use Permit process when a development application has been submitted. The Committee provides guidance about parking in the following objectives:</p> <p>Principle 1, Objective J: Minimize the visual impact of parked motor vehicles with, for example, structured parking, screening, and location.</p> <p>Principle 7, Objective E: Promote types of development that encourage and provide incentives for the use of public transportation and limited parking.</p>
63	Consider shared parking, lease parking, payment-in-lieu for parking and other ideas.	Kimberly Brewer (Planning Board) October 29 th	<p>Principle 11, Objective D: Plan for maintaining a tree canopy cover in the CWFA area. Plant new trees where necessary, especially to shade parking lots and paved areas, conserve soil, and provide other environmental services.</p>