



TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

Community Design Commission

Meeting Minutes

Town Hall
405 Martin Luther King Jr.
Boulevard
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Susana Dancy, Chair
Christine Berndt, Vice-Chair
Edward Hoskins
Kim Levell

Susan Lyons
Megan Patnaik
Polly Van de Velde
John Weis

Tuesday, January 28, 2020

6:30 PM

RM 110 | Council Chamber

Opening

Roll Call

Staff

- Corey Liles
- Adam Nicholson

Town Consultant

- Tony Sease

- Present** 6 - Chair Susana Dancy, Vice-Chair Christine Berndt, Kim Levell,
Susan Lyons, Megan Patnaik, and Polly Van de Velde
- Absent** 2 - Edward Hoskins, and John Weis

Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that the agenda be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Announcements

1. Mayor has asked commission to consider their top (3) priorities over the next 5 years. Discussion is welcome w/ final priorities emailed to Adam Nicholson by Monday, February 3rd.
2. Due to a scheduling conflict the Town's new urban designer Brian Petterson will be unable to attend the January meeting. He's planning to be at the February meeting for introductions/questions.

In addition to the announcements included on the agenda, others were captured from the Commission and Staff.

1. Staff to update Dollar General discussion item to read as Dollar Tree.
2. Staff reminded commission to clearly speak into provided microphones.
3. Commissioner Van de Velde provided a short update on the Eastowne project discussions.
4. Staff reported the transformer shown on the December University Place plans was not under CD purview b/c the modified SUP from 2000 did not include a

stipulation that the CDC review transformers. If there was a future rezoning application, then staff would determine if a review would be considered.

5. Vice-Chair Berndt noted that she would like to discuss two items under the CDC authority agenda item; CDC review of mechanical equipment and the rules governing 4-3 votes.

Petitions

Approval of Minutes

1. December Minutes

[\[20-0078\]](#)

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Patnaik, that the December minutes be approved as amended for University Place below. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Staff noted that Levell's reason for nay vote for University Place was not against the approval itself, but against the amendment that greater emphasis be placed on the mall entrance. This reason will be added to the minutes.

Vice-Chair Berndt requested that a sentence be added noting the she asked staff to investigate whether the CDC would review the transformer enclosure at a future meeting. This enclosure was noted on the plans for University Place, but was not part of the December review.

Consent Agenda

Commissioner Lyons requested the Dollar Tree item be removed from the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that the consent agenda be approved w/ the following modification. That the Dollar Tree consent item #4 be pulled and discussed as the first new business agenda item later in the meeting.

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

2. Carraway Village-Multi Tenant Building

[\[20-0079\]](#)

Commission is asked to approve minor building modifications.

3. Chapel Hill High School-Elevations Mods

[\[20-0080\]](#)

Commission is asked to approve minor building modifications.

5. 311 W. Franklin Street

[\[20-0082\]](#)

Commission is asked to approve awning additions.

Old Business

6. Blue Hill Massing Update[\[20-0085\]](#)

Commission heard updates from Staff and Consultant on Blue Hill Massing efforts. Staff clarified that Council would like CDC recommendations.

The following commission and individual comments were noted:

Commission Consensus

1. While the commission was supportive of the massing reductions, they thought the proposed standards were not going far enough in addressing Council's concerns that buildings are simply too big.
2. Commission agreed that including townhomes and stacked townhomes as a building typology in Blue Hill (w/out requiring a commercial component) was a positive.
3. Commission was supportive that building separations be held at a minimum of 30'.
4. The Commission agreed that reducing parking structure setbacks and allowing stand-alone parking deck are options that could be included, but there were varying opinions on the desirability of those options. The Commission reiterated that the CDC review all four sides of decks is important as well as structures.

Individual Comments

1. Clear pedestrian connections from every project to surrounding sites and destinations need to be addressed.
2. There were mixed opinions on allowing a full top floor plate for 4-story buildings; it could encourage 4-story buildings but remove an opportunity for mass variation.
3. Building separation areas should be beneficial to the public w/ usable spaces and engaging site features, and perhaps be up to 40' wide.
4. Encourage the use of greenery on the facades of parking decks including structured supports as interesting architectural features.
5. Standalone parking decks could lead to shared parking opportunities, ground floor active use is important.
6. Parking garages should be connected internally to retail uses.
7. Examine parking requirements in general.
8. Consider increasing the requirement for Outdoor Amenity Space to above 6% as a way to reduce massing of buildings.
9. Limiting the square footage of townhomes may be unnecessary.
10. Considering revising the Design Guidelines if the new regulations are adopted.
11. Keep the existing pedestrian pass-through rules as an option, but wider.
12. There is still a need to an overall plan of connected green spaces and pedestrian ways throughout the district.

7. Park Apartments-Transformer Enclosure[\[20-0083\]](#)

Commission was asked to consider action on transformer enclosure for modification to Blue Hill Certificate of Appropriateness. At December meeting the commission approved material changes to the building and a modified street tree design, and asked the applicant to revise the transformer design.

A motion was made by Levell, seconded by Lyons, that the Park Apartments transformer enclosure be approved w/ the modification that only arborvitae be used to screen the enclosure. This along w/ approvals from the December CDC meeting, completes the modification to this Blue Hill CoA. The motion carried by the following vote:

Vice-Chair Berndt stated the proposed enclosure does not meet the Design Guidelines to incorporate transformers into the building and site; or to minimize impacts on sidewalks.

Aye: 5 - Chair Dancy, Levell, Lyons, Patnaik, and Van de Velde

Nay: 1 - Vice-Chair Berndt

New Business

4. Dollar Tree @ Eastgate-Awnings [\[20-0081\]](#)

Commission was asked to approve awning additions for new tenant.

After clarification for the awnings was provided, a motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that Dollar Tree be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

8. Valvoline Elevations/Lighting [\[20-0084\]](#)

Commission was asked to review and consider action on proposed building elevations and proposed building lighting.

The Commission members expressed concerns about how the building would relate in scale and material to the adjoining building, and about the garage doors facing Franklin Street. Clarification was requested from staff as to whether this plan constituted a drive-through?

A motion was made by Lyons, seconded by Van de Velde, that the Valvoline discussion item not be approved as presented. As a result the item is deferred to a later meeting for discussion. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

10. University Inn-Courtesy Review [\[20-0087\]](#)

Commission is asked to provide comments to applicant on proposed plans. No official action required.

The applicant provided background information on the traffic and roads plan, and stated that they would like to return w/ a revised plan to focus retail on the corner of 15/501.

Motion was made to move University Inn up in the agenda to be heard after Valvoline discussion item.

The following Commission member comments were noted:

1. Agreed retail should address the corner, the overall design should emphasize the corner w/ perhaps a different height and hierarchy.
2. Respect the 100yr floodplain.
3. Encouraged following the proposed form-district code guidelines and break up the massing by providing two buildings w/ an internal gathering space for residents.
4. Provide more green public spaces that attract people and focus on pedestrian entrances and connections to adjoining properties.
5. Commission was mixed on the parking deck being wrapped.
6. Expressed support if this were another use beside purely residential.
7. Be sensitive to stormwater requirements.
8. Make the design unique and special, being different will set it apart and draw people across 15/501.
9. The circle entrance off Ephesus is problematic for traffic flow.
10. Consider green roof and solar panels are parking deck.

Courtesy Review

11. Chapel Hill Nine Marker

[\[20-0088\]](#)

Commission was asked to review the design for the Chapel Hill Nine historic marker to be placed at 450 W. Franklin Street. The marker has been a collaborative effort of community partners, a local design team and town staff. The marker is currently under fabrication and CDC comments will be addressed as needed if time allows. Comments should be emailed to Adam Nicholson no later than Friday, January 31st. Those comments will be forwarded to the design team and project leads for consideration.

The following commission and individual comments were noted:

Commission Consensus

1. The project is valued, but concerned about the configuration and location for walkability around the feature.
2. Concerned about the scale of the structure and height of the pedestal.
3. Wanted verification that all parties had been contacted about their picture being shown.
4. Commission requested that comments be forwarded to council.

Individual Comments

1. Think it looks like a tombstone.
2. Concerned it's the only structure in town that looks like it does.
3. Worried about exposure to adjacent buildings.
4. Wondered if the marker could include a planter portion or seatwall.

5. Would like to see a phone scan icon added in order to get more information on the events and the project.
6. Thinks the photo's overpower the text, if the photos were smaller the overall size of the monument could be reduced.

9. CDC Review Authority

[\[20-0086\]](#)

Staff to review CDC authority and answer questions as needed. Staff will review LUMO language and standard stipulation language concentrating on application types and review authority. Town attorney has provided additional information for review regarding questions on CDC authority as related to landscape review. Due to a scheduling conflict, he will not be available to attend this meeting, but will try to be at the February meeting. In the meantime questions can be sent to Adam Nicholson. No action is required for this item.

This item was deferred to be discussed at a special meeting date to be determined. Commission will also discuss their board priorities at a special meeting date.

Adjournment

Next Meeting - February 25th, 2020

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Patnaik, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Order of Consideration of Agenda Items:

- 1. Staff Presentation*
- 2. Applicant's Presentation*
- 3. Public Comment*
- 4. Board Discussion*
- 5. Motion*
- 6. Restatement of Motion by Chair*
- 7. Vote*
- 8. Announcement of Vote by Chair*

Public Charge: The Advisory Body pledges its respect to the public. The Body asks the public to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner, both with the Body and with fellow members of the public. Should any member of the Body or any member of the public fail to observe this charge at any time, the Chair will ask the offending person to leave the meeting until that individual regains personal control. Should decorum fail to be restored, the Chair will recess the meeting until a genuine commitment to this public charge is observed.

Unless otherwise noted, please contact the Planning and Development Services Department at 919-969-5066; planning@townofchapelhill.org for more information on the above referenced applications.

See the Advisory Boards page <http://www.townofchapelhill.org/boards> for background information on this Board.