



TOWN OF CARRBORO

PLANNING BOARD

301 West Main Street, Carrboro, North Carolina 27510

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2009

MEMBERS		GUESTS	STAFF
Matthew Barton	Rose Warner	TAB	Patricia McGuire
Debra Fritz	Susan Poulton	David Bonk	Thelma Paylor
James Carnahan	Damon Seils	Steve Spade	Jeff Brubaker
		Brian Litchfield	
		Unnamed guests (2)	

Absent/Excused (5): Rich Bell, David Clinton, Sharon Cook, Heidi Paulsen and David Shoup

I. JOINT REVIEW ITEM Long-range Transit Plan (PB, TAB) – Patricia McGuire noted that Chapel Hill staff were in attendance. Spade noted that the process underway at this point is to share the plan and seek community feedback as to whether other things need to be considered. There were a few questions/responses, as follows: Was the 1997 resolution contradicted by 2004 resolution? Bonk noted that in the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan, train service had connected between downtown Chapel Hill to Carrboro and on to Horace Williams. The updated 2035 plan reflects work on the Long Range Transit Plan under review at present in that the train connection between CH and Carrboro was eliminated; the train stopped at the hospital. Who were representatives from Carrboro? Mayor Chilton and Alderman Coleman. Did the TAB take a position on use of rail corridor? (Previously has supported rail to/through downtown; was not asked to comment recently). Aren't we going to look at a certain rail line from UNC to Durham, won't that be in first? (Earliest that TTA estimates the rail corridor can be in place is 2023). Think should keep option open, if rail not okay at the present time, want to have the rail through downtown as an option. Is rail the only option? No, bus rapid transit (BRT) is also proposed. Does plan envision conversion of lanes for BRT or addition of new lanes along Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd? (transition to presentation in which Bonk and Spade described background of the plan, use of the regional model for projections, options/evaluation, participants, management of process by policy committee (elected officials from Chapel Hill and Carrboro, senior management from UNC), structure of the plan, status and next steps, including timeline for possible implementation. Bonk also described the plan's vision, the specific gateway locations, role of TOD and components of transit-supportive development, plan assumptions, and recommendations, and integration with long-and short-range transit plan. Additional questions/answers were as follows: Does the Estes Drive service from Gateway 3 continue to west? (No, but met from service from Gateways 7 and 8. Other routes could be developed that could be continuous. Park and ride development also anticipated). Where is Site 18 in Carrboro? (Homestead Road, just south of Lake Hogan Farms.) Were case studies done for any other sites in the report? (Town of Chapel Hill, while working on small area plan for northwest Chapel Hill, hired same consultant to do detailed

TOD designs for several sites. Does the plan assume buses will remain fair-free? (Yes. Local system, at least, though remains to be determined for other service.) Is there a cost-comparison between the “branding” approach for BRT and proposed increased service on existing system, in conjunction with improvements that are already in place (alternatives analysis). Have you considered eliminating car lanes from Franklin and/or MLK? (As part of alternatives analysis, expect some of those actions and their effects would be evaluated. UNC has changed driving behavior through its parking policy/parking limitations.) What about the existing rail line? Was there an alternatives analysis? No. Policy decision was that the rail line would not be available for this use. Could staff elaborate on this? University’s emphasis on use of line for coal, Carolina North development plan shifted to MLK and away from the rail line; additionally Carrboro representative expressed concern about high frequency train service through the downtown. Was there a Chapel Hill policy decision? Did Chapel Hill hold a public hearing? (No. This is the public comment period.) Any proposal for land uses to mitigate sprawl that might come about due to sprawl from abundant parking near the nodes/gateways? (Conceptual design work for Chapel Hill Northern urban area with intense mixed-use developments. Expect parking use for park/ride during the day; for the on-site mixed uses at night.) Will the improvements in this system cannibalize ridership from regional transit? (As service improves and achieve a better mode split, expect that will revisit the abundance of parking and also improve the cost-effectiveness. Part of the purpose was to identify the number of trips coming in. To assume a significant impact might not be accurate, with the assumption being that they transfer from cars, et cetera, to transit. Right now, we assume parking. That should change in time.) How does this plan mesh with the Long Range Transportation Plan? (It has been coordinated). Is there a plan to not run a fleet of yellow school buses? (Not part of this plan, though anticipate some coordination, particularly of afterschool activities/support). (Seils question re DCH Transit plan and answer = no.

Public forums are scheduled in Chapel Hill on December 8th and January 12th. Following that, final presentation and report will be prepared and brought back to elected officials. Suggest PB and TAB provide input by early January. **Joint review ended at 8:57 PM.**

II. INTRODUCTIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA - There were none.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - November 5, 2009 - Deferred until December 3, 2009.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

A) LUO Text Amendment - Adjustments in income levels and other requirements associated with affordable housing units – Dowling clarified proportional reduction in units provided to the proposed reduction in price levels. McGuire noted that in preparing for the public hearing and further communication with Dowling, as well as builders and developers lead staff to recommend that the Board of Aldermen continue the public hearing on this item to allow time to refine the affordable housing provisions.

Some questions and responses are as follows: How urgent is this? Dowling replied that the current stock of approved units will yield a need for considerable subsidy. Hence this proposed ordinance. However, since the market has slowed down considerably, the units are not coming on line at

present, providing time to come up with good solutions. Dowling is seeking to develop the best program in the country, for homeowners, their neighbors, and the community. Is Dowling gaining experience from homes that are completed to influence the new homes that are being built? Carrboro ordinance doesn't provide that kind of authority. Could he provide a list of the must-haves to ensure the long-term cost-effectiveness of the homes? Yes.

Motion was made by Barton and seconded by Seils that the Planning Board recommends that

- 1) the Board of Aldermen accept the staff recommendation and continue the public hearing on this matter to February at the soonest, and;
- 2) Staff and the Board of Aldermen take into consideration the Carrboro Vision2020 goal to include 15 percent affordable housing units in all new residential development, and determine the desired housing stock and affordability.

VOTE: **AYES:** (6) Barton, Carnahan, Fritz, Poulton, Seils, Warner

ABSENT/EXCUSED: (5) Bell, Clinton, Cook, Paulsen, Shoup; **NOES:** (0);

ABSTENTIONS: (0)

A) Discussion of Noise and Tethering Ordinance - Deferred until December 3, 2009.

B) Meeting schedule for December – Walkabout and concept plan review taking place on December 3rd. In lieu of a meeting, a holiday party will be held on 12/17/09 at the Poulton home.

V. ADJOURNMENT– moved by Damon and seconded by Carnahan; unanimously approved. At 9:36 PM.