

RESPONSE TO COMMISSION COMMENTS

Community Design Commission - 03/27/2018

In reviewing the the draft Text Amendments to the Form District Regulations, associated with implementation of the Blue Hill Design Guidelines and the Chapel Hill Mobility Plan, members of the Community Design Commission provided comments which are compiled in the table below.

Comment Source	Topic	Comment	Response
CDC Emails Chris Berndt	<i>Review Schedule</i>	Will the proposed amendments track on the same schedule for adoption as the Guidelines? If so, it seems that the community and advisory boards may benefit from input opportunities, and sufficient time to look at the actual amendments. It is not clear if the schedule on the agenda is for both the Guidelines and the Text Amendments?	Proposed amendments are currently tracking with the adoption of the Design Guidelines. Information was shared at the Joint Work Session in preparation for the opportunity for Commissions to recommend at their subsequent meetings. If there are components of the proposed text amendments that need further consideration, these could be split into a package separate from the Design Guidelines.
CDC Emails Chris Berndt	<i>3.11.4.7 Administration of Form Districts</i>	What about the case of renovations? In our recent review of a renovation to the Village Plaza, a statement was made that we can't require upgrading of the back of the building because it was a renovation. I would like clarification of this point. If there is a renovation, can the CDC require improvements to the back side of a building where the applicant was only proposing renovating 3 sides? Some of that building faces the greenway, and the area needs significant attention to improve the existing site conditions.	Changes to a building that do not involve enlargement, extension, or structural alteration are not required to bring a building into greater conformity with Form District Regulations, so long as the degree of nonconformity does not increase. This is in accord with Article 7 of the LUMO. Based on this guidance, a cosmetic facade renovation does not compel other changes to the building or site.
CDC Emails Chris Berndt	<i>3.11.1.2.G Application of Design Guidelines</i>	Please make sure the Code reference to the Design Guidelines document has sufficient teeth in it for the CDC to rely upon the guidelines in requiring applicants to do x or y.	Revised language for the reference to the Design Guidelines supports the use of the document in informing the CDC's review for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
3/5/18 Joint Work Session	<i>3.11.4.1.G Service Entrances and Vehicular Access</i>	If we're changing the code, we need to include no service entrances on Type A Frontages. The CDC has asked for this multiple times. Please include it in these revisions.	The proposed amendment has been updated to not allow service entrances on a building's primary frontage (typically a Type A frontage) when it fronts multiple streets.
3/5/18 Joint Work Session	<i>3.11.2.4.3 Subdistrict Standards, Building Mass</i>	Need to clarify the concept of breaking the building into modules with offsets - what is the required width of offsets?	Standards for modules and offsets have been updated to clarify dimensional requirements. A diagram has been drafted to illustrate the concept.

Comment Source	Topic	Comment	Response
3/5/18 Joint Work Session	3.11.2.4.3 <i>Building Mass</i>	Proportionality to building referenced for pass-throughs - could you do the same thing for building modules and offsets? (width as necessary to maintain proportion)	Language to this effect has been added - module and offset dimensions should be in proportion to the building as a whole.
3/5/18 Joint Work Session	3.11.2.4.1 <i>Outdoor Amenity Space ratio</i>	Don't allow people to do less amenity space (reduce the 6% requirement). Already that's barely anything	No change is proposed to the current 6% Outdoor Amenity Space ratio. The proposed amendments would allow the dimensions of individual amenity spaces to be reduced with a Design Alternative, but not for the total required area to be reduced.
3/5/18 Joint Work Session	3.11.4.1.F <i>Drive Thrus</i>	Drive-thrus should not be allowed "by right". Blue Hill is the only place in Chapel Hill where you can have a drive-thru by right, even though it is designed specifically to be more pedestrian friendly.	The proposed amendment has been updated to list drive-thrus as a Special Use in the Permitted Use Table, thus only permitted with Council approval.
CDC Emails Chris Berndt	3.11.4.7 <i>Administration of Form Districts</i>	p. 101 --The 4 sided building design is a good addition. I want to make sure all four sides of a building can be reviewed per the guidelines and the Code. Where a back side faces the greenway, it should receive equal attention to the front side. Other sections of the report now encourage buildings to face the greenway.	New Frontage types are included with the proposed amendments including one (Type E) applicable to greenways. By assigning this Frontage where a building faces a greenway, it is subject to review per the Design Guidelines and the Code.
3/5/18 Joint Work Session	<i>Zoning Map</i>	It is a problem that zoning always ends at one side of the street. Public realm encompasses both sides of the street.	Changes to the boundary of Form Districts is outside the scope of the current text amendment package. A Zoning Map Amendment could be considered at a future time.
CDC Emails Chris Berndt	<i>Daylighting Booker Creek</i>	I was struck by the number of people who brought up daylighting Booker Creek. The revised report seems to have more in it to encourage development to face the creek so that the E-F area is developed around that focus. With that concept in mind, I feel that adding a reference to daylighting as a long-term strategy would be useful. Certainly the picture seems to suggest it.	The Design Guidelines, as revised, encourage a walkable and active public environment along Booker Creek, further reinforced by new Frontage types in the text amendments. Town policy does not currently refer to daylighting of Booker Creek as a long-term strategy, however staff will look into introducing this as a strategy via the Booker Creek Flood Storage project (rather than via the Design Guidelines).