



TOWN OF CARRBORO

PLANNING BOARD

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

JUNE 25, 2020 -- REMOTE MEETING

MEMBERS	GUESTS	STAFF
Catherine Fray, Chair	Dan Jewell with Coulter, Jewell, Thames	Tina Moon
David Clinton	Deans Hackney	Marty Roupe
Braxton Foushee, Vice Chair		Zach Hallock
Rachel Gaylord-Miles, Vice Chair		James Thomas
Elmira Magnum		Laura Janway
Eliazar Posada		Randy Dodd
Susan Poulton		Heather Holley
Bruce Sinclair		Marsha Pate
Rasam Tooloee		

Excused/Absent: Kirsten Leloudis

Town Council Liaisons: Susan Romaine, Barbara Foushee, Randee Haven O'Donnell, Sammy Slade

I. WELCOME & AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

Catherine Fray, Planning Board chair, opened the meeting at 7:40 PM, and welcomed members of the Appearance Commission, Transportation Advisory Board, Environmental Advisory Board, Stormwater Advisory Commission, and one member of the Economic Sustainability Commission. Fray gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda and the joint advisory board meeting process, provided some recommendations for handling the remote meeting format. Zachary Hallock, the Town's Transportation Planner, gave a quick announcement on a free, bicycle basics training event being held remotely on July 9th. Staff liaisons will be providing information on the training event to their respective boards and commissions.

There were no adjustments to the agenda.

II. JOINT REVIEW

(A) Concept Plan review for the ArtsCenter, Conditional Use Permit, 315 Jones Ferry Rd

Roupe provided a few introductory remarks about the project and the requirement for a concept review as part of the process for a conditional use permit (CUP) application. Comments from advisory boards will be directed to the applicant and the applicant will be required to prepare written responses to those comments as part of the formal submittal for the CUP application. Advisory boards will have a second opportunity to review and provide formal recommendations on the project as part of the CUP review process. Roupe also noted that the applicant had applied for and received approval for a variance relating to the intrusion of the entrance and parking into the stream buffer, the previous evening. Advisory board members who would like for the applicant to join their separate

1 break-out meeting after joint review, were asked to indicate their interest using the chat box function
2 for the remote meeting.
3

4 Dan Jewell, with Coulter, Jewell & Thames, provided the applicant presentation starting with a brief
5 history of the ArtsCenter and its relationship with the Town of Carrboro, going back to 1974. Jewell
6 described the site, its natural and topographical features and the benefits to the community for a
7 location within the downtown area. Jewell noted that as currently designed would include a two-
8 story, 19,000 square foot building.
9

10 Regarding the variance, Jewell noted that OWASA has been very cooperative in addressing changes
11 needed for a major sewer line crossing the property that required replacement prior to the site
12 development. The proposal include making improvements to the sewer line and establishing a
13 manmade wetlands, with the intension that the wetland can be incorporated into an educational
14 program, particularly to introduce the topic of climate change to children. Related points of interest
15 included the possible use of permeable pavement for the parking area and areas of possible
16 stormwater detection to address both water quality and water quantity.
17

18 Advisory board members asked a number questions and offered comments. Discussion topics
19 included the following:

- 20 • Why not extend/expand the wetland to cover a larger area? *(Applicant response: A certain*
21 *amount of area is needed to accomplish the programmatic aspects of the proposal—the*
22 *building and associated parking. The ArtsCenter recognizes the need for a certain amount of*
23 *parking to meet the needs of all community members.)*
- 24 • Will pervious pavement be installed? *(Applicant response: this is being considered in*
25 *addition to the stormwater impacts from Jones Ferry Road, bases on the existing topography*
26 *of the site. They are also considering underground storage systems.)*
- 27 • Where will a loading dock be located? *(Applicant response: The loading dock is positioned*
28 *in back of the site accessing the rear of the building. The trash/recycling containers are also*
29 *located in this area.)*
- 30 • What is/is there a proposal to handle overflow parking during events/concerts? *(Applicant*
31 *response: They are reaching out to surrounding property owners with existing parking lots,*
32 *such as OWASA. Setting up arrangements to shuttle from public lots is another possibility.)*
- 33 • Will there be improvements to the existing sidewalk system in the area around the project?
34 The site is zoned M-1, the 10-foot wide sidewalk provision does not apply this district. There
35 is interest, however, in providing the best access for all modes including bike/ped and those
36 with ADA needs. .
- 37 • Clarification to green space? *(Applicant response: Trees removed to install sewer will be*
38 *replaced with trees/vegetation from the Land Use Ordinance approved NC native*
39 *trees/shrubs and should exceeds required shading. The old Oak may have root damage*
40 *which may result in removal. Alternatives for a green roof and solar may be limited due to*
41 *resources.)*
- 42 • What is the timeline for the project moving forward? *(Applicant response: The ArtsCenter*
43 *would like to see seek CUP approval in the late fall/winter.)*
44

45 **(B) Courtesy Review of Concept Plan for Morgan Creek Commons, Conditional Rezoning,**
46 **420 Smith Level Road**
47

48 Moon introduced the project. The applicant, Deans Hackney, has submitted a petition for a
49 conditional rezoning to change the zoning for three parcels along Smith Level Road from R-10

1 (Residential, 10,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit) to Office/Assembly, Conditional. An application for an
2 associated text amendment has also been submitted. The process for a conditional rezoning is to
3 request that the Town Council set a public hearing, and refer the item to the advisory boards for
4 formal comment. The advisory boards' comments would then be included in the materials considered
5 at the public hearing. This is an opportunity for the advisory boards to receive a concept-level review
6 for the Morgan Creek Commons proposal, to ask questions of the applicant and provide feedback. As
7 a conditional rezoning, any conditions attached to the proposal during its approval, would be binding.
8 This includes the various elements of the project shown on the conceptual site plan. Advisory board
9 members may wish to begin thinking about potential conditions as they review the proposal. If the
10 rezoning is approved, the subsequent permit would be a conditional use permit.

11
12 Deans Hackney with Hackney & Company, made the applicant presentation. Hackney provided an
13 overview of the proposal, including the types of vendors—self-storage facility, retail, office and
14 possibly restaurants, with the idea that retail and restaurant uses would occur the ground floor and
15 office on the upper stories. Hackney provided information on the stormwater analysis and anticipated
16 stormwater management plans, including the location and size of retaining walls, parking needs, and
17 bike/pedestrian access to the site and within the site.

18
19 Advisory board members asked a number questions and offered comments. Key elements of the
20 discussion are as follows:

- 21
- 22 • How does the proposal take into account the sidewalk network along Smith Level Road and
23 Culbreth Road to accommodate the number of pedestrians that currently walk in the area,
24 both in terms of access to the site and within the site? (*Applicant response: There are*
25 *existing sidewalks and the plan is to make it accessible to neighbors easily. Much grading*
26 *work will be done as part of the development to make the site more level. A retention pond is*
27 *proposed for an area at the bottom of the slope.*)
 - 28 • Is there a residential component? (*Applicant response: No.*)
 - 29 • Consideration for traffic flow planned? (*Applicant response: The current plan includes*
30 *adding a four-leg to the existing three-leg intersection at Smith Level Road and Culbreth,*
31 *and a second access point, from the southern portion of the project that would provide right-*
32 *in/right-out access only. A Traffic Impact Analysis has been prepared.*) Staff added
33 information relating to the Town's project to design and construct a sidewalk along one side
34 of South Greensboro Street from the northern end of Old Pittsboro Road to Public Works
35 Drive. The project includes an operational analysis of the area between the new roundabout
36 at South Green and the Smith Level Road bridge to evaluate the possibility of adding bike
37 lanes along either side of the road. Project design is just getting underway.
 - 38 • Advisory board members asked about opportunities to request few parking spaces and to
39 increase the number of shade trees in the parking area to limit the urban heat island effect.
 - 40 • Advisory board members asked for more information about the storage units, particularly
41 information about the market analysis and the determination that self-storage units are
42 appropriate/needed in this vicinity, the number and size of the units, and the use of large
43 moving trucks within the complex to service the storage component of the project.
44 (*Applicant response: the 20 X 20 units are the largest offered and customers will load in the*
45 *back of the building. The feasibility study shows the market will support it and the office*
46 *offerings provided. The market analysis suggested that this area is underserved with regard*
47 *to storage needs. Hackney's analysis suggested that the project would bring economic*
48 *development benefits to the community. The storage facility would probably carry the*
49 *project.*)

- 1 • Some advisory board members asked about housing, and could the project include residential
2 units, indicating that the addition of housing would make the project more in line with
3 community interests/needs. (*Applicant response: The project provides amenities for the*
4 *surrounding neighborhoods such as a potential place to eat and shop with a chance for*
5 *gathering. Additional benefits include taxable income, no further burden on the schools, and*
6 *it will be attractive.*)
7

8 Three of the adjacent property owners attended the meeting and offered comments.

- 9 ○ Ellen and Jim Cornette at 101 Smith Level Road stated concerns about the need for a
10 retaining wall and the possible negative impact on their existing property. Their property
11 is located within 30 feet from the project. The Cornette expressed concerns with noise,
12 safety relating to the retaining wall and stormwater management, and the appearance of
13 the retaining wall and the overall appearance of the project.
14 ○ Sarah Poulton at 105 BPW Road stated she is disappointed in the plan and added in her
15 opinion does not serve the community according to town goals. She was not contacted.
16 ○ Alex Nesbitt at 101 BPW Road concurred with the Cornette's comments and reiterated
17 her concerns about the impact of the project: noise, lighting and stormwater runoff.
18
- 19 • Other members of the advisory boards asked about additional images to provide a better
20 sense of the visual impact of the project. A section cutting north-south to provide a sense of
21 the height of the project relative to the slope of Smith Level Road and the scale of existing
22 buildings is needed. Other images such as the rear elevation of the storage building as it
23 would be seen driving south from the Smith Level Road bridge are also needed.
24 • Other members summarized the concerns mentioned so far: noise, stormwater management,
25 safety, environmental impact, and appearance.
26

27 *The Joint Review portion of the meeting ended at 10:25 PM. Planning Board members remained in*
28 *the main meeting webinar while the other advisory board members shifted to joint their respective*
29 *individual remote meetings.*
30

31 **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JUNE 4, 2020**

32 Posada moved to approve the minutes; Foushee seconded the motion.

33 **VOTE:** AYES (8) Fray, Clinton, Foushee, Gaylord-Miles, Mangum, Posada, Poulton, Rasam and
34 Sinclair. **NOES** (0); **ABSTENTIONS** (0); **ABSENT/EXCUSED** (1) Kirsten Leloudis.

35 The June 4, 2020 Planning Board minutes were approved.
36

37 **IV. OTHER MATTERS**
38

39 After a brief discussion, the Planning Board members to meet again on July 2nd to finalize their
40 comments on the two projects. Fray asked for volunteers to collect comments from the various
41 board members and begin to draft comments for refinement at the next meeting. Gaylord-Miles
42 volunteered to assemble draft comments on the ArtsCenter, and Sinclair agreed to take on the
43 Morgan Creek Commons project. Sinclair requested that members send him their thoughts by the
44 weekend.
45

46 **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

47 Motion was made by Foushee to adjourn the meeting, and seconded by Gaylord-Miles. The June
48 25, 2020 Planning Board meeting was adjourned at 10:57 PM.