



TOWN OF CARRBORO

PLANNING BOARD

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

THURSDAY, JUNE 18TH, 2009

MEMBERS		GUESTS	STAFF
Matthew Barton	Debra Fritz	Bob Kirschner	Jeff Kleaveland
Rich Bell	Susan Poulton		
David Clinton	Damon Seils		
Sharon Cook (arrived late)			

Absent/Excused: Paulsen, Carnahan, Shoup, Warner, Lavelle

I. INTRODUCTIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA – Clinton suggested that, since Trish McGuire was absent from the meeting, that the Sustainable Neighborhood agenda item be postponed until such time that she is present. Barton declined this adjustment but agreed to shorten the discussion.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Seils previously suggested an amendment to the June 4th minutes regarding a guest (possibly a Mr. Lacock) but he now retracts his correction due to his uncertainty of the guest's identity. Motion to approve minutes by Barton and seconded by Seils to approve the minutes subject to change noted by Seils. VOTE: AYES: (6) Barton, Bell, Clinton, Fritz, Seils; NOES: (0); Abstentions (0) Absent/Excused: (5) Paulsen, Carnahan, Shoup, Warner, Cook.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A) Barking Dogs and Tethering. Barton mentioned that Carnahan asked that the group continue to discuss this subject despite his absence. Seils mentioned that Carnahan made valuable contributions to the barking section and suggest to Carnahan that improvement be made to improve the tethering section. Seils distributed a draft of the ordinance that included both existing and proposed provisions. He walked the committee through the document and mentioned the proposed includes sections adopted by both Orange County and Chapel Hill. Bell felt the ordinance was in accordance with standards set by the Humane Society and favored replacing the word “dog” with “animal” throughout. The proposed ordinance limits tethering time to 3 hours. Clinton felt the proposed ordinance was especially useful for its instructional value. Fritz had a few questions about the grammar of the first few lines of 10-25 (g)-1. The proposed ordinance would replace Sections 10-1(19) & 10-25(g). Seils provided his handout but was not compelled to move on the ordinance at this time. Bell wants the committee to discuss the enforcement effects of this ordinance (i.e. shelters impact, animal control, etc.). Barton discussed the violation provisions of the barking ordinance which he feels are too aggressive (too frequent, too short a time to impoundment). Fritz discussed the general nature of dogs and their behavior and felt that the ordinance should reflect some of the subtleties of this nature. Seils stated that the town code deals with animal issues in different sections and that this ordinance was an attempt to unify some of this information. Fritz would like to have some discussion of community responsibility as it pertains to this ordinance. Poulton suggested the value of revisiting animal related issues in the Town Code. No motions were made but it was agreed to pass the information onto Carnahan. Barton acknowledged Ms. Cook's late entry into the meeting.

B) Carolina North Traffic Impact Analysis. Barton attended the Tuesday Joint meeting with the Chapel Hill Council and the Carolina North Trustees and Executives and presented “Draft 3” version to the Council. Barton presented a draft-5 (enclosed) to the committee at the meeting. Clinton mentioned the importance of connectivity and the failings of some of the Town’s policies and previous land use decisions. Clinton stated that Carolina North will significantly impact downtown. He stated the need for alternative ways in Carrboro to go east and west and north and south.

Motion by Fritz and seconded by Bell to approve the Draft-5 version of the Planning Board’s recommendation/analysis of the Carolina North TIA for presentation to the Aldermen and the TAB with the of line 13 to include the words “on-site” in reference to the “provision of housing to all income brackets”.

VOTE (7) Barton, Bell, Clinton, Fritz, Seils, Cook; NOES: (0); Abstentions (0) Absent/Excused: (4) Paulsen, Carnahan, Shoup, Warner.

C) Working session on sustainable neighborhoods and LEED ND. General discussion ensued regarding the subject. Block size, connectivity, energy use, infill situations were all discussed. Clinton stated that LEED for neighborhood is oriented more toward new development. The attention of the committee was directed toward the overhead internet display. The LEED ND draft was not available on line. Instead the group referred to *LEED 2009 for New Construction and Major Renovations Rating System* publication for general discussion. The general structure of the document was discussed (checklists and what not) and it was noted, that for LEED points, project attributes are weighted differently. (LEED ND does not currently exist, except in BETA form, and will be LEED v.3 when it is released. LEED v.3 organizes the credits such that there is only one LEED rating list and any regions or specialties are represented by appending special requirements). Efficient transportation arrangements are highly weighted. Clinton noted that in his analysis of these LEED measures he favored those things with benefits that can be realized more by the greater community and less by individuals. Development Density and Infill was discussed. Clinton described the way “Options” work in the LEED rating system; Options are mutually exclusive. Some discussion over density and proximity to services was discussed and it was evident that the Town’s development pattern especially in the Northern Transition Area (NTA) did not meet many of the LEED principles. The Town’s slow review process was discussed briefly. The lack of services/businesses in the NTA was discussed. Bell stated that the LEED document allows us to more clearly see how existing town policies have been unsuccessful in creating the combination of densities and proximities necessary to create sustainable neighborhoods. Bell mentioned that development moratoria in the area warrants discussion as a way to encourage commercial development as long as there is some substantial progress made in securing businesses and services. Cook raised the subject of the Litchfield project as an example of a site that might be better served as a commercial area. Clinton mentioned that busy intersections are best suited for commercial development. Cook mentioned commercial incentives. Grocery store anchors were discussed. Clinton mentioned the lack of sufficient “rooftops”. Bell opined about the failure of the NTA to realize stated plans and suggested that no new residential development in the NTA should be approved without a commercial element. Cook initiated some discussion about the existing bus service and the need to fill in the service up to Eubanks Rd. Further discussion about transit services followed. Barton stated that this should be discussed in reference to the LUO. Clinton stated that this should not involve the ordinance but rather the transit agencies.

Clinton mentioned the possibility of using open space for commercial development for new projects. Cook mentioned the importance of open space and mentioned expedited project review for commercial projects. The group generally discussed the merits and pitfalls of expedited review. How to encourage commercial development in the NTA was broadly discussed (rezoning, development moratoria, incentives, the Hogan properties, etc.). Seils opined that the planning board recommendations should be more forceful in these matters such that further recommendations will not support simply residential development. Poulton recalled the existence of the NTAAC and recommended inviting chair Jay Bryan into the discussion.

V. ADJOURNMENT- There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.