

Meeting Date/Time: May 21, 2020; 5:00 pm

Members present: Chad Pickens; Mary Stowe; Pamela Schultz; Phil Post; Sally Hoyt; Stefan Klakovich; Stephan Hearn; Steve Bevington; Shugong Wang

Members absent: None

Staff: Sue Burke; Alisha Goldstein; Allison Weakley; Becky McDonnell (Planning Dept.); Amy Harvey; Alisa Duffy-Rogers

Guests: George Retschle; Jennifer Player; Scott Murray; Bruce Ballentine; Julie McClintock; Michael Murphy

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
Meeting called to order	Ms. Schultz called the virtual meeting to order and called the roll.	N/A	The virtual meeting began at 5:00 on Zoom. All members were in attendance; a quorum was present.
Introductions	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Mr. Hearn asked to be excused from the meeting for a brief time around 6:00 pm.	Mr. Pickens made a motion to excuse Mr. Hearn from the meeting for a brief time around 6:00 pm; the motion was seconded by Mr. Bevington. Ms. Schultz called the roll for the vote. The motion passed unanimously (Pickens, Stowe, Schultz, Post, Hoyt, Wang, Klakovich, Hearn, Bevington).	N/A
BOARD BUSINESS			
Weavers Grove Conditional Zoning Application	Ms. McDonnell made a Powerpoint presentation to the Board. The Town Council has requested that the Board provide a recommendation for the Weavers Grove Conditional Zoning application. They are currently presenting this project to Town boards and commissions. The public hearing is scheduled for June 10 with possible action by the Town Council on June 24. The project site is 32.6 acres and is bounded by I-40 to the north; Sunrise Rd to the west; and the Chandlers Green neighborhood to the south. The applicant is proposing a residential community, with emphasis on affordable housing.		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
Weavers Grove (cont.)	<p>The applicant is also requesting the property be rezoned from R-2 to R-6-CZ and NC-CZ. There are Jordan buffers and RCD on the site. The total impervious area proposed is 572,000 sq. ft. (~40%).</p> <p>Mr. Retschle introduced Ms. Player, President and CEO of Habitat for Humanity. Ms. Player provided a brief overview of the vision for this project, which is to provide affordable home ownership to Habitat for Humanity families in Orange County and market-rate home buyers.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle stated that there are 100 affordable and 143 moderately priced housing units being proposed. The project meets the Town's stormwater management requirements.</p> <p>There is a perennial stream in the northern half of the project site along with several small mapped wetland areas. An intermittent stream is present in the southeast corner of the site with an ephemeral stream at its upstream end.</p> <p>There are documented instances of flooding in Chandlers Green. This project proposes to provide 100-year peak flow reduction in the southeast corner of the site that flows toward Chandlers Green.</p> <p>The stormwater management plan includes four stormwater constructed wetlands and four permeable pavement parking areas. They will be designed in accordance with the State's Design Manual. The HOA will be responsible for maintenance.</p> <p>A berm is also proposed along I-40 for sound. The addition of the berm pushes the project over the maximum allowed disturbance in the RCD, requiring a modification to the regulations. The berm is being treated as its own site.</p> <p>The site will be cleared and graded and will have erosion and sediment controls, including perimeter controls. It will be monitored to ensure compliance.</p> <p>The project has received its permits from the Army Corps of Engineers and NCDEQ for the wetlands disturbance.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz asked Board members if Ms. McClintock could provide her comments before the Board began</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
Weavers Grove (cont.)	<p>with its questions as Ms. McClintock needs to leave early.</p> <p>Ms. McClintock said the Environmental Stewardship Advisory Board was very interested in having the Stormwater Advisory Board review this application. She is hoping the Stormwater Advisory Board will come up with substantial recommendations that will improve things.</p> <p>Ms. McClintock has toured the project site a couple of times. The best land for development is the lower half. The area proposed for the Habitat houses has a high water table.</p> <p>The berm construction will remove a substantial amount of tree cover and, consequently, the infiltration of stormwater.</p> <p>Ms. McClintock asked the Board to look at the permeable pavement areas – where it is being placed and if it can be effective in low-lying areas.</p> <p>The ephemeral stream will be impacted, which was gushing today according to Michael Murphy.</p> <p>Look closely at the exceptions being asked. Ms. McClintock believes it is dangerous to allow exceptions to our ordinances particularly with a site that has the stormwater challenges this site has.</p> <p>Piping – a lot of the stormwater is being piped. It is not being daylighted and no water features are being created for people to enjoy.</p> <p>Ms. McClintock noted that the 751 project is very dense but it includes natural channels instead of piping and she would like Habitat to emulate the 751 project in that respect.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz asked if Board members had any clarifying questions.</p> <p>Mr. Bevington asked about the maintenance of the permeable pavement. What is required to maintain it? Is there a plan? Who is responsible for the plan? Who owns it?</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said the pavement area was designed to minimize the amount of landscaping areas draining to it. A vac truck would need to be used several times</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
Weavers Grove (cont.)	<p>a year. A recorded O&M plan and annual inspections by a P.E. are required. The owner (the HOA in this case) is responsible for hiring an inspector and maintaining the permeable pavement.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak.</p> <p>Ms. Duffy-Rogers said that Michael Murphy had signed up to speak.</p> <p>[Several attempts were made to contact Mr. Murphy but were unsuccessful.]</p> <p>Ms. Schultz opened the discussion to the Board.</p> <p>Mr. Klakovich asked if there would be less water coming to the area in the southeast corner.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said the volume of water would increase but the flow rate would be reduced.</p> <p>Mr. Klakovich noted that the site was losing wetlands but creating bioretention and constructed wetlands. Are there concerns? Comparisons?</p> <p>Mr. Retschle noted that area of constructed wetlands will exceed the area of natural wetlands disturbed.</p> <p>Ms. Hoyt said they don't have the same value but agreed there will be more wetlands habitat.</p> <p>Mr. Pickens asked if they were using paving blocks.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle answered they would propose paving blocks (PICP) or porous concrete.</p> <p>Mr. Post hoped that they would choose pavers as that would make future maintenance much easier.</p> <p>Mr. Post asked if soil testing to check for depth to groundwater had been done. What is the void ratio of the stone?</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said soil testing had been completed; there are some areas with perched water near the surface. These permeable pavement systems are not infiltrating systems. The stone will have 40% voids.</p> <p>Mr. Post asked if the offsite runoff in the southeast corner was just carried through or picked up and treated. Were there areas that were not treated?</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said the offsite runoff in the southeast corner was being treated. Offsite areas not being treated have no impervious area.</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
Weavers Grove (cont.)	<p>Mr. Klakovich asked about Ms. McClintock's comment concerning the berm. How high is it?</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said it was 6-10 feet. The berm area would be heavily replanted.</p> <p>Mr. Post asked if the berm would be higher than the units themselves.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said it would be higher than the first floor.</p> <p>Mr. Pickens asked if the permeable pavement can work in areas that are saturated.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said the site will be graded (it is not a low spot) and there is plenty of fall. The pavement will be dry and should work very well.</p> <p>Ms. Hoyt noted that according to the report there is at least 4.8 feet to groundwater.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz asked what the expected life of permeable pavement is. How will the HOA handle if it fails?</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said all of the stormwater facilities will require maintenance. The permeable pavement will need to be kept clean and the HOA will be provided instructions for maintenance. The HOA will have to implement a plan for repairs, as needed. Because it is non-infiltrating, you can pull up the pavers and clean out the stone.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz asked what is guarantee for permeable pavement life.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said it will depend on how well it is maintained. If it is maintained, it should function for many years.</p> <p>Mr. Post suggested including that pavers be used as part of the Board's recommendation.</p> <p>Ms. Hoyt agreed that pavers make repairs easier.</p> <p>There appears to be dumpsters located in the middle of one of the permeable pavement areas.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said they would extend the concrete apron so that trucks would sit on concrete instead of pavers when emptying the dumpsters.</p> <p>Ms. Hoyt suggested switching out that permeable</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
Weavers Grove (cont.)	<p>pavement area near dumpsters with another area using traditional pavement.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz said the plans showed trees near the permeable pavement areas.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said the project must meet parking lot shading requirements. They have designed it so that the tree islands do not drain to permeable pavement.</p> <p>Ms. Hoyt asked if the HOA would be responsible for landscape maintenance (e.g., blowing leaves off the pavement).</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said yes.</p> <p>Mr. Bevington said that Ms. McClintock mentioned favoring other density options. This project is using the RCD for stormwater and green space instead of letting the RCD perform its natural stormwater functions. The ideal solution would be to remove some units and increase the density so that stormwater control measures are kept out of the RCD. There is a general concern about approving modifications and the cumulative impacts on the RCD and on flooding.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz agreed that it feels like a large portion of the RCD is being used for stormwater, which seems to defeat the purpose of having an RCD. While she understands the affordable housing concerns, not all the units are for affordable housing.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz asked about the modifications to the regulations that the applicant was requesting.</p> <p>The ones of primary concern to the Board are the additional land disturbance in the RCD and the increase in density.</p> <p>For Board members, the idea of higher density in return for more green space and undisturbed RCDs is not an issue, especially in urban areas. The larger issue is allowing higher density and still having the RCD used for siting stormwater controls. Is the Town comfortable with this?</p> <p>Mr. Retschle replied that the Land Use Management Ordinance allows construction of stormwater measures in the RCD if you can show a practical</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
Weavers Grove (cont.)	<p>necessity. Some of the disturbance in the RCD is in order to provide the additional detention storage. Some of the density is needed to make the project financially viable.</p> <p>For this particular site, the Board members seem to agree that the affordable housing component justifies the exception to the regulation.</p> <p>Mr. Klakovich suggested that the discussion be tabled and that it be a future agenda item.</p> <p>Ms. Hoyt asked how the project fits in the range with respect to parking.</p> <p>Mr. Retschle said it was in the middle. The minimum is 378 spaces and the maximum is 495. This project is proposing 432.</p> <p>Ms. Schultz noted that there is a lot of parking; is that of concern to other Board members?</p> <p>Mr. Post thinks the Board should be providing conceptual comments much earlier in the process, not at the 11th hour.</p> <p>Mr. Klakovich said the discussion of when the Board gets involved could be a future agenda item.</p> <p>The Board identified several items – paver blocks vs. porous concrete; ephemeral stream disturbance; RCD disturbance; maintenance by the HOA – and discussed if these should be included as part of the Board’s recommendation for this application.</p> <p>The Board drafted its recommendation and decided to suggest, rather than require, the consideration of pavers over porous concrete to help with future maintenance.</p>	<p>A motion to approve the following recommendation was made by Mr. Post; Mr. Klakovich seconded the motion.</p> <p><i>The Stormwater Management Utility Advisory Board (Board) recommends approval to the Town Council with a suggestion that the selected permeable paving system reflect efficiency and lower maintenance costs over the long term.</i></p> <p>In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously (9-0).</p>	
Future Agenda Items	<p>RCD Encroachment – how often is the RCD disturbed and the extent</p> <p>When is the best point in the process for Board to provide its recommendations.</p>		
ADJOURNMENT	The next Board meeting is June 23, 2020.	A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Klakovich and seconded by Ms. Hoyt. It passed unanimously by a show of hands.	Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.