



# TOWN OF CARRBORO PLANNING BOARD

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 2008

MEMBERS		GUESTS	STAFF
Matthew Barton	Rose Warner	Lydia Lavelle	Trish McGuire
Rich Bell	Heidi Paulsen	Scott Kovens	Thelma Paylor
James Carnahan	Damon Seils	Eric Chupp	
Seth Chadbourne	Sharon Cook	Alena Callimanis	
David Clinton		Steve Berge	

**ABSENT:** DEBRA FRITZ AND SUSAN POULTON

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA – request to put NC Power/resolution regarding PEAK OIL on the May 1st agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – moved by Clinton and seconded by Warner Thursday, April 3, 2008 subject to noted corrections (“Weaver” should be “Warner;” remove “lively discussion” in Item AI, insert additional text pertaining to: Callimanis’ description of photos near Winmore, insert McGuire’s explanation of sedimentation and erosion control v. storm water management, insert Clinton’s comment regarding elementary school and other development upstream of Winmore in relation to comments regarding storm water impacts, reference Carnahan as provider of info on percentage of Carrboro residents working in town, and add Cook’s explanation of no-walk zones for developments around Winmore.

VOTE: AYES (8) Paulsen, Seils, Chadbourne, Clinton, Bell, Carnahan, Cook, Warner; NOES (0); ABSENT/EXCUSED (2) Fritz, Poulton; ABSTENTIONS (1) Barton.

Carnahan suggested that members prepare edits in advance of the meeting. Lavelle suggested numbering the lines in the draft minutes to simplify discussion and editing.

### III. ACTION ITEM

A) Recommendation: Land Use Ordinance Text Amendment to Modify Impervious Surface Limitations for Day Care Uses in Village Mixed Use Developments – McGuire noted that a final draft of the ordinance had been included in the agenda packet. McGuire noted that additional provision (section 2) had been revised since the PBoard saw the draft ordinance on April 3. The provision had been revised to more broadly provide for encouragement (rather than requirement) of the inclusion in day care developments benefiting from the exception to impervious surface limitations of building and/or site features that would mitigate environmental benefits from storm water, greenhouse gas emissions, water use, et cetera. McGuire reviewed the staff memo, noting that research into origin of the village mixed use provisions had revealed that “impervious surface limitation” derived from “lot coverage” requirements in Loudon County, Virginia and that there was no indication that this requirement was related to water quality. McGuire also described an illustration from the Center for Watershed Protection that revealed the impacts on stream quality in association with impervious surface area, absent storm water

40 management/treatment, and estimated that impervious surface in the single-family residential use area  
41 would increase from 50 percent to 57 percent with the addition of a daycare center on Lot 1. McGuire  
42 reported that she had not determined the overall impervious areas expected at Winmore from the site plan,  
43 but that she expected to locate this information soon. Planning Board members had questions about  
44 location of the swimming pool and impervious contribution (not within flood plain or stream buffer; staff  
45 is checking on impervious); plans for traffic light at Winmore Drive/Homestead Road (presently there are  
46 none).

47  
48 Clinton moved that the amendment be adopted as written and Chadbourne seconded. Cook said we were  
49 not at that point yet and Carnahan asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak.

50  
51 Alena Callimanis offered comments regarding clear cutting of the property, location of pool within  
52 floodplain, impact of bridge construction and erosion on walkways under the bridge, lack of  
53 accountability for sedimentation and erosion (with retention pond performance noted), opposition to  
54 changing the regulations to fit project rather than making developers meet regulations. Carnahan noted  
55 the Planning Board's role is to discuss the LUO amendment and that erosion control/Winmore  
56 development is a different subject. Eric Chupp described the proper functioning of the ponds at Winmore,  
57 including the overflow from the lowest pond. Chupp offered comments on the LUO text amendment,  
58 noting that it had been requested and prepared to address a particular issue. Chupp referenced the Town's  
59 Childcare Committee report findings from 2005 regarding need for daycare spaces in town due to existing  
60 supply and growing demand and indicated that the text amendment was narrowly focused per those  
61 findings and the subsequent discussion of the Board of Aldermen. A daycare would still be required to  
62 meet all other requirements of the LUO, including storm water management. Chupp noted that in all of  
63 Carrboro, LUO limits development of village mixed use projects to 3; one has been decided on and the  
64 other two are floating.

65  
66 Steve Berge stated that if the impervious surface is going to be waived it should not be to solve a  
67 perceived social problem in the town. McGuire noted that the LUO regulations relating to storm water  
68 management had been made stricter since the approval of Winmore; a new daycare use there would be  
69 required to meet the new standards.

70  
71 Planning Board members had questions about need for daycares (2005 report indicates there is a  
72 significant need); traffic impacts (the use would generate trips; the permit review process would seek  
73 information on the amount and type of trips and impact on existing roads and traffic); why a rezoning  
74 was not proposed (use is permitted, it is the impervious surface limitation that prevents use of Lot 1; LUO  
75 amendment allowed focus on particular barrier to daycare use); number of other village mixed use  
76 developments under review at present (none); original purpose of impervious surface limitation (from lot  
77 coverage concept, to shape the form of development rather than for water quality).

78  
79 Motion to approve the draft ordinance as presented was made by Clinton and seconded by Chadbourne.  
80 Support for encouragement rather than requirement of additional environmental features was offered.

81  
82 Some additional questions and comments were offered. Hesitation at deciding when total impervious of  
83 Winmore was not known (estimated that it could be 45 to 50 percent impervious at build-out. McGuire is  
84 seeking the info from plans and engineers who designed storm water management system); why civic lot

85 was inadequate and whether homeowners would be responsible for storm water management after  
86 development was completed (the civic lot was too small to accommodate the school that was under  
87 consideration and that the homeowners would inherit this responsibility); clarification of the storm water  
88 system related to development on one side of the bridge as well as an interest in more details of the site  
89 plan (the current storm water management system will treat water on the west side of the creek. New and  
90 separate storm water management would be designed for the development of Lot 1 which is on the east  
91 side of the creek. Chupp also offered that the applicant would be willing to bring the project back to  
92 advisory boards for review, even if not required by the Board of Aldermen). Clinton offered that he  
93 would be willing to entertain a friendly amendment on this point. Chadbourne agreed. Further comments  
94 and questions included; agreement with need for daycares, but not at this site; concern that 50 percent  
95 limit on single family residential use lots was designed to keep the village under this threshold, since as  
96 Center for Watershed Protection data illustrates, water quality impacts are significant when impervious  
97 area exceeds 25 percent; imperviousness of the proposed fire station site (not known but staff will check)  
98 and likelihood that the environmental benefits of locating such a use in proximity to homes and jobs  
99 would outweigh any negative impacts of the daycare use and additional impervious surface.

100  
101 The amended motion, made by David Clinton and seconded by Seth Chadbourne was stated as follows:

102  
103 that the Planning Board recommends that the Board of Aldermen adopt the draft ordinance amending  
104 Section 15-176.2(f)(5)(d) to exempt daycare uses from the impervious surface limitations that apply  
105 within single family residential use areas of village mixed use developments, with the additional  
106 recommendation that subsequent permit applicants making use of this provision, undergo advisory board  
107 review of their applications.

108  
109 Associated Findings

110  
111 Furthermore, the Planning Board of the Town of Carrboro finds that the amendment is reasonable and in  
112 the public interest because it is consistent with Carrboro Vision 2020, particularly policies (see Human  
113 Services policies 1.31 through 1.35).

114  
115 VOTE: AYES (6) Paulsen, Barton, Seils, Chadbourne, Clinton, Bell; NOES (3) Carnahan, Cook,  
116 Warner; ABSENT/EXCUSED (2) Fritz, Poulton; ABSTENTIONS (0).

117  
118 IV. OTHER BUSINESS

119 A) Updates on Town Initiatives

- 120 1. Advisory Board Recognition Dinner – Thursday, April 24, 2008 confirmed it was at 5:30 PM;  
121 McGuire asked everyone to please come.
- 122 2. Bicycle Plan Steering Committee – Public Workshop – over 60 citizens came out– many  
123 people completed the survey and McGuire will send PB members the link if they are interested  
124 in taking the survey. Barton thought it was a nice survey and he enjoyed filling it out.  
125
- 126 3. Greenway Commission (Cook wasn't there last week and she is not getting anything; i.e.  
127 emails, agendas, etc. McGuire said she follow-up on that). The Commission met earlier this  
128 month; meeting first Wednesday of every month - one topic was the project description for  
129 Bolin Creek and it was recommended that the Board of Aldermen go forward with NCDOT

130 for conceptually planning of the greenway between Estes Drive and Homestead Road and also  
131 from the Lake Hogan Farms trail up Jones Creek to the Jones property subdivision (now  
132 known as Legacy at Lake Hogan Farms). The Board of Aldermen accepted the  
133 recommendation and authorized moving forward with municipal agreement that will make  
134 funds available for town to hire a consultant to help with this planning process. .  
135

136 B) Other Matters – Clinton asked about the Board of Aldermen’s schedule for the summer and  
137 whether Planning Board members were able to discuss their schedules (Warner, Clinton, and Bell  
138 will be gone July and August mostly). McGuire will put summer break on the agenda for next  
139 meeting.  
140

141  
142 V. ADJOURNMENT – Carnahan will be away next meeting and will return on May 17<sup>th</sup>; Clinton  
143 will return in June. Cook moved for adjournment and Clinton seconded at 9:08 PM.  
144  
145  
146  
147

DRAFT