



TOWN OF CARRBORO

**PLANNING BOARD**

*301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510*

---

**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2010**

MEMBERS		GUESTS	STAFF
Matthew Barton	Robert Williams	James Carnahan	Patricia McGuire
Debra Fritz	David Clinton	Joal Hall Broun *	
Susan Poulton			

\*= Liaison, Board of Aldermen

**Absent/Excused:** (5) Damon Seils, David Shoup, Amber Wagner, Tamara Oxley, Rose Warner

- I. JOINT REVIEW ITEMS - LUO Text Amendment related to the Alternative Design Review of Downtown Developments.** McGuire described the draft ordinance, noting the recent circumstances (i.e. 300 E. Main Street, Phase B and need to hold off on some of the architectural detail due to subsequent phasing of the development) and proposed two-tier process for review of alternative design of developments in downtown consistent with the structure of permitting otherwise in use. Questions/answers were as follows: Hasn't the PB looked at these standards before? (Yes, at the time the section was established and once since then, c. 2005, when the section was revised). Would the proposed change solve the problem of the 605 W. Main Project not having gone back through advisory board review? (The architectural standards themselves necessitate review and compliance of noted architectural features). Who reviews the architectural standards? (Staff does initially; if different, the permit issuing authority also reviews). Who ensures that a project complies with the approved plans? (Prior to adoption of the architectural standards for downtown, review for compliance would depend on whether the architectural design was made a condition of a permit).

Motion was made by Barton and seconded by Fritz that the Planning Board recommends that the Board of Aldermen adopt the draft ordinance.

**VOTE: AYES:** (5) Barton, Clinton, Fritz, Poulton, Williams

**ABSENT/EXCUSED:** (5) Oxley, Seils, Shoup, Wagner, Warner

**NOES:** (0)

**ABSTENTIONS:** (0)

Associated Findings

By a unanimous show of hands, the Planning Board membership also indicated that no members have any financial interests that would pose a conflict of interest to the adoption of this amendment.

Furthermore, the Planning Board of the Town of Carrboro finds that the proposed text amendment is consistent with Carrboro Vision 2020 policies specified in 2.0 related to preservation of the Town's character and recognition of the interests of all members of the community, including property owners, neighbors, and other interested citizens when making development decisions.

VOTE: **AYES:** (5) Barton, Clinton, Fritz, Poulton, Williams

**ABSENT/EXCUSED:** (5) Oxley, Seils, Shoup, Wagner, Warner

**NOES:** (0)

**ABSTENTIONS:** (0)

**II. INTRODUCTION AND AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS**

Robert Williams, new PB member, was introduced and welcome. Discussion of outdoor lighting was moved to first item under Other Business.

**III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

February 4, 2010 - moved by Clinton and seconded by Barton to approve the minutes with the edits noted by Seils and Clinton.

VOTE: **AYES:** (4) Barton, Clinton, Fritz, Poulton

**ABSENT/EXCUSED:** (5) Oxley, Seils, Shoup, Wagner, Warner

**NOES:** (0)

**ABSTENTIONS:** (1) Williams

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

**A) Continued discussion of LUO Text Amendment related to outdoor lighting**

**Standards** – Former member, James Carnahan noted that the PB had made a recommendation but had been holding further discussion. Carnahan noted that he was hoping the PB would make an additional recommendation. Carnahan asked whether the ordinance compelled the replacement of freestanding yard (i.e. barn lights). McGuire said only when the lights needed to be fully replaced (fixture, et cetera). Carnahan suggested two actions. First, that the PB recommend that the Board of Aldermen revisit the Town's street lighting policy because 1) lighting is responsible for 16 percent of GHG emissions (from inventory); 2) lights spillover and prevent enjoyment of the nighttime and morning skies; 3) effect on the night sky. Lack of uniformity, bright lights contrasted with deep darkness. Second, that 15 feet in height be the only presumptive standard, rather than 15 feet and 25 feet. Clinton shared brochures from the company CREE showing new LED light fixtures that are on the market and street installation (15 foot poles; use about 1/20<sup>th</sup> the energy needed for traditional lighting;

extended lifespan of approximately 20 years). Illustrations also show a parking lot configuration. Clinton suggests that the Planning Board recommend that the Town promote the use of LED lighting whenever possible. Technology is rapidly developing; the Town should challenge developments to include this new technology. Clinton also recommends review of the street lighting policy. Questions/answers were as follows: Are three or four 15 foot high lights needed to cover the same area as one 25 foot high light? (It depends (McGuire's example is about three to one), but Clinton understands from a lighting engineer that generally the tradeoff is two 15 foot high lights to one 25 foot high light). Is the initial cost outlay offset by operational savings? (Significant savings associated with the use of LED lights are shown in the brochure). Are the LEDs as efficient as others? (Brochure shows some greater efficiency in lumen production from low pressure sodium than from LEDs). When is it better to have a 25-foot pole rather than a 15-foot pole? (Draft ordinance made a distinction between commercial and multi-family uses based on existing situations - estimate 20 developments – and the scale of most of those projects). If 15-foot poles are specified as the standard, do all the existing projects have to get permission to have higher poles, when light fixtures are replaced?

Motion was made by Matthew Barton and seconded by David Clinton that after additional discussion of the draft ordinance related to outdoor lighting, the Planning Board recommends to the Board of Aldermen the following modifications to the draft ordinance:

- 1) The first sentence of Subsection 15-242.5(f) is rewritten to read “The presumptive standard for the maximum height of light fixtures is fifteen (15) feet.”
- 2) In Appendix A, Section A-6(b)(15), subdivision d. is rewritten to read “A demonstration or showing of the lifecycle costs of all proposed lighting, including an evaluation of the lease and/or purchase of LED area lighting as one strategy to reduce energy consumption, the selection of other energy efficient luminaires, timers, or other methods (such as fixtures that automatically change wattage output).”

VOTE: **AYES**: (5) Barton, Clinton, Fritz, Poulton, and Williams

**ABSENT/EXCUSED**: (5) Oxley, Seils, Shoup, Wagner, and Warner

**NOES**: (0); **ABSTENTIONS**: (0)

**B) Completion of election of officers** – Continue to future meeting

**C) Update on status of LUO Text Amendment related to affordable housing** – Staff has started conversations with builders, developers, and affordable housing. Staff is working on alternatives and will be recommending that the Board of Aldermen continue the hearing to allow more time for that work to continue. Barton mentioned Chapel Hill's consideration of an inclusionary zoning ordinance. Is the Town's request/incentive for affordable housing considered an inclusionary zoning ordinance?

(No) What is an inclusionary zoning ordinance? (One in which there is a requirement to provide housing for particular income groups.)

**D) Update on greenway planning** – Board approved Phases 1 and 2 of the Bolin Creek Greenway in the Conceptual Plan. Board authorized staff to proceed with preparing municipal agreements with NCDOT on portions of the greenway for which funds have been identified. Staff is working on MA for Phase 1A – the Wilson Park multi-use path connecting between Wilson Park, Estes Drive and Bolin Creek. Staff hopes to proceed this year as well working on a municipal agreement for Phase 1B for the greenway around the High School. Staff is working to find additional match for Phase 2 where additional matching funds are needed. The Board of Aldermen held off on endorsing Phases 3 and 4 along the middle portions of the creek near Carolina North and the PH Craig property -- will seek additional public input. Morgan Creek conceptual plan was reviewed by the Greenways Commission in February and is scheduled to go to the Board of Aldermen in March. Since Heidi Paulsen is no longer on the Planning Board, a new Planning Board representative to the Greenways Commission is needed. Members agreed to seek a representative at a meeting when a larger number of members are present.

**E) Other matters** - Members (ETJ/Transition Area members) reported receiving emails regarding farmers submitting a petition to seek removal from the Town of Carrboro's ETJ. Staff is to obtain a copy of the petition that farmers submitted to Orange County. How similar are University Lake regulations in Carrboro and Orange County? How similar are the University Lake regulations to Cane Creek regulations? Staff has not prepared a comparison. PB will review petition and request follow-up.

**V. ADJOURNMENT.**

There being no further business, the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:10 p.m.