

02-24-2021 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions

ITEM #13: Continue the Public Hearing: Conditional Zoning Application for Columbia Street Annex, 1150 S. Columbia Street

Council Question:

So far, what has come of the staff's response to the Planning Commission's recommendation for having both southern and northern crossing signals to cars, around Purefoy Road and the staff's recommendation that the applicant work with the NCDOT for appropriate signage along S. Columbia Street? – A stipulation has been included for a ped-activated signal with flashing beacons for the crosswalk north of Purefoy Road on S. Columbia Street and for the crosswalk north of the 54 Bypass Intersection with S. Columbia Street?

Staff Response:

The Ordinance includes a condition requiring installation of pedestrian crosswalks both north and south of the development contingent of NCDOT's approval. Based on preliminary conversations with NCDOT, we believe the proposed crosswalks would be acceptable.

Council Question:

What would be the precise location of the ped crosswalk north of Purefoy Road and north of the 54 Bypass intersection with S. Columbia Street?

Staff Response:

The proposed location is shown on the updated site plan set, however, the location and final configuration would require NCDOT approval.

Council Question:

Staff indicated in its report from the fall that the developer has identified that they may reduce the parking further than what is projected currently. How much has the developer reduced the parking and percent reduction is that from the minimum allowed in a Mixed Use-Village District?

Staff Response:

The applicant is requesting proposing 69 parking spaces for up to 60 dwelling units and up to 3,000 sq. ft. office space. The Land Use Management Ordinance (LUMO) would normally require a minimum of 67 spaces (based on one-bedroom units) and a maximum of 87 spaces. The Mixed Use-Village (MU-V) district allows up to a 50 percent reduction in the minimum parking standards. (The ordinance actually states "shall be 50% of the minimum...", so the reduction doesn't need Council approval and they aren't varying the MU-V standards.) The applicant does not yet have the actual breakout of unit sizes yet and has indicated they will provide a maximum

02-24-2021 Town Council Meeting

Responses to Council Questions

of parking for 88 percent of the units. The applicant is requesting to consider fewer parking spaces in the future if the demand for parking does not meet the proposed.

Council Question:

What has been the applicant's response to the staff's recommendation that the loading spaces at the back of the structure be considered for use by transportation network companies?

Applicant Response:

The owner is happy to allocate one or two spaces for cars waiting to pick up passengers for users of Uber or Lyft type spaces. In that case those cars wouldn't be parked there permanently, just able to use those spaces for waiting passengers.

Council Question:

To what extent would the applicant's provision of riparian buffer restoration and/or enhancement improve the current poor stream conditions and mitigate the impacts proposed within the RCD buffer?

Staff Response:

An assessment of the applicant's provision of riparian buffer restoration and/or enhancement is speculative until there is a stream study and a plan is submitted for the riparian buffer restoration. The application has not defined the linear feet of stream stabilization or provided a planting plan for restoration. The Town has also asked the applicant to use the Jordan Accounting tool developed by NCDEQ to estimate nutrient export from the proposed development in reference to existing conditions. The applicant has not provided this information for staff to make any analysis to assess the impact from these mitigation activities.

Council Question:

Can the stormwater staff comment on the impacts of incursions into the RCD that are concentrated on one side of the stream? Will the unbalanced disturbance eventually harm any stream restorations that are planned?

Staff Response:

The proposed incursion in the RCD on the east side of the property stays outside of the 50-foot streamside zone. The overall preserved width of 100 feet inclusive of both streambanks will allow the stream to maintain its natural channel. The project has proposed to use level spreaders at the two stormwater runoff outfalls in order to disperse runoff flow through the streamside buffer before reaching the stream. Dispersed flow is critical to preventing a concentrated flowpath that can wash out the streambed and to mimic as best as possible the existing hydrologic conditions on site.

02-24-2021 Town Council Meeting

Responses to Council Questions

Council Question:

The applicant says they may further reduce the number of parking spots. This might provoke overflow parking in adjacent neighborhoods. Do those residential areas currently have residential parking permit regulations?

Staff Response:

The following roads in this area are part of the Town's Residential Parking Permit program: Chase Ave, Coolidge Street, Dawes Street, Dogwood Drive, Old Pittsboro Road, Pine Bluff Trail, S. Columbia Street, Smith Ave, Valentine Lane, Westwood Drive, Woodland Ave, Howell Street, and Purefoy Road.

Council Question:

The packet frequently cites this project offering "live/work space" – is this just referring to the fact that someone living in the apartments could theoretically rent space in the office section below?

Staff Response:

We believe that is the interpretation of the live/work space statement.

02-24-2021 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions

Council Question:

Placing BRT stops in the middle of a highway interchange seems unwise in terms of creating vehicle/pedestrian/bike conflicts. Is this just a preliminary location, or is it a preferred location?

Staff Response:

The proposed station locations are located curb side – please see the graphic below:



Council Question:

Where is the applicant at on the suggested 50% total parking space reduction and the dedicated TNC parking spaces recommendations from TCAB?

Staff Response:

The owner is happy to allocate one or two spaces for cars waiting to pick up passengers for users of Uber or Lyft type spaces. In that case those cars wouldn't be parked there permanently, just able to use those spaces for waiting passengers.

Council Question:

Where is the applicant at on making 20% of the total parking spaces "EV Ready"?

Applicant Response:

We're going to make sure there's conduit to all the parking spaces. Upon opening, the 2 spaces

02-24-2021 Town Council Meeting

Responses to Council Questions

to be served by an EV station will be under the main building so the dual station can cover both a handicap and a standard space. Otherwise the spaces will all have conduit to them. But as these are for-sale units, it would be up to individual owners to install specific charging stations if they have their own electric car and need a dedicated charger, the same way people who own a house need to install their own charger if they buy an electric car.