

**DRAFT SUMMARY MINUTES OF A PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE CHAPEL HILL TOWN COUNCIL
MONDAY, MAY 15, 2017, AT 7:00 PM**

Council Members Present: Mayor Pam Hemminger, Mayor pro tem Donna Bell, Council Member Jessica Anderson, Council Member George Cianciolo, Council Member Sally Greene, Council Member Ed Harrison, Council Member Nancy E Oates, Council Member Maria T Palmer, and Council Member Michael Parker.

Staff members present: Town Manager Roger L. Stancil, Deputy Town Manager Florentine Miller, Town Attorney Ralph Karpinos, Business Management Director Kenneth C. Pennoyer, Budget Manager Matt Brinkley, Assistant Business Management Director Amy Oland, Planning Director Ben Hitchings, Senior Planner Kay Pearlstein, Housing and Community Executive Director Loryn Clark, Police Officer Rick Fahrer, Fire Marshal Tommy Gregory, and Deputy Town Clerk Amy Harvey.

[AGENDA ITEMS](#)

1. [Open the Public Hearing: Recommended Budget for FY 2017-2018. \(no attachment\)](#)

Mayor Hemminger opened the public hearing at 7:00 p.m. She announced that the North American Travel Journalists Association was visiting the area, and would publish information about fun things to do in Orange County. Mayor Hemminger also mentioned the "Free the Mimosas" bill 155, pending state legislation that would allow restaurants to serve alcohol earlier on Sundays.

Council Member Greene announced an upcoming public meeting of the Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition at the Public Library.

Town Manager Roger Stancil gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Town's FY18 recommended budget. He said that it included no reductions or additions to current services. It addressed the Council's strategic priorities, and would keep employee compensation competitive with neighboring jurisdictions, he said. Mr. Stancil said that the neutral tax rate was 50.8 cents, a 1.6 cent reduction from the current rate. He explained that a revenue neutral tax rate meant that some people would pay more while others would pay less, or stay the same.

Mr. Stancil reviewed how the budget would address the Council's strategic priorities, which included maintaining the current level of investment in affordable housing (AH), planning for and managing the future, leveraging Town assets, addressing downtown improvements, replacing police headquarters, and funding stormwater and other infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Stancil said that the budget continued the Town's existing commitment of \$5.3 million for AH, DHIC funding, and support for the Northside Neighborhood Initiative. The Council would discuss other AH options at its Wednesday meeting, he said, adding that those would include a bond referendum, utilizing Town-owned properties, forming partnerships, and addressing

development regulations and fees. Staff was in the process of establishing performance measures and was beginning an employee survey of housing preferences, he said.

Mr. Stancil provided details on a proposed 2.5 percent raise for employees, as well as value added pay programs, and a proposed policy for six weeks of parental leave. He said that the recommended budget would continue existing health care benefits.

Director of Business Management Ken Pennoyer continued the PowerPoint presentation. He said that the total proposed FY18 budget was \$106.7 million, which was an increase of 1.5 percent. The General Fund would increase by 0.8 percent, Transit Fund would go up 12.3 percent, Parking Fund would go down 0.9 percent, Public Housing Fund would decrease 5.6 percent, and the Stormwater Fund would go up 15 percent, he said. Mr. Pennoyer explained that major revenues came from property taxes (up 0.3 percent) and sales taxes (up 6.9 percent). He pointed out that the Town could lose up to \$1.4 million in sales tax revenue from the state, but said that other state revenues were expected to stay about the same. The Town's Fund Balance use was down by about 0.3 percent, he said.

Mr. Pennoyer noted the staff recommendation to increase the stormwater fee by \$6.00 per 1,000 square feet of impervious surface. He said that on-street metered parking would increase by 25 cents per hour. He discussed Orange County's tax revaluation, and said that 45 percent of the homes in Town would decrease and 52 percent would increase. Mr. Pennoyer reviewed next steps in the budget process, which included three budget work sessions prior to adoption of a budget on June 12, 2017.

Mr. Stancil returned to say that staff was preparing responses to questions the Council had asked at its previous meeting. He hoped to deliver those replies the following day so the Council would have a chance to review them prior to its next work session, he said.

Council Member Cianciolo asked if a 29 percent decrease in fees assume that nothing would be built next year at Carraway Village, Obey Creek, and Glen Lennox.

Mr. Pennoyer replied that those projects had been factored in, and some fees had already been received.

Mr. Stancil explained how changes in state regulations had affected fees for building permits.

Council Member Palmer noted a 5.6 percent reduction in federal funds for housing, and asked how that might affect the Town.

Mr. Pennoyer replied that it would affect the Town's public housing support funds. The Town would use Fund Balance to make up part of the difference, he said.

Council Member Palmer clarified that the Town would not reduce what it spends on housing by that amount.

Council Member Oates confirmed with Mr. Stancil that the Town was working on obtaining

grant funds for the purchase of electric buses. Staff was preparing more detailed information to present to the Council the next day, he said.

Council Member Oates mentioned recent information about how the Town was attracting fewer families with children, and asked where those families were going.

Mr. Stancil replied that a fee had recently been enacted by Orange County to discourage larger apartments, which, in turn, had deterred high-density, multifamily projects. He posed one idea of perhaps partnering with others to rebuild a Town-operated property that would include more high-density units.

Mr. Stancil said that another way to address affordability would be to have an agreement among all entities in the County to waive fees for Affordable Housing (AH). He pointed out that the Town does waive those fees, and that it would make a great deal of money available for AH if all entities did so.

Council Member Anderson confirmed with Mr. Stancil that the Town's OPEB payment was included in the operating budget, and that he would provide detailed information in writing. Mayor Hemminger added that staff had moved it into a separate trust, so that it would be counted differently and the Town would receive more credit.

Mayor Hemminger clarified that HUD support would be going down by 12.4 percent. The Town's housing budget would be down only 5.6 percent because the decrease had been offset by a reduction in capital expenditures due to fewer major maintenance projects in the next year's budget, she said.

Dmitriy Nikitin, a graduate student at the Gillings School of Public Health, spoke in support of the Nickel for Housing proposal. He summarized his current financial situation, and said that AH was hard to find in Chapel Hill. Mr. Nikitin said that having students housed farther away from their schools led to poorer performance and social isolation. He urged the Council to go forward with the Nickel for Housing proposal.

Maggie West, speaking on behalf of the Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition, said that, as co-director of the Community Empowerment Fund (CEF), she worked every day with people whose lack of housing impacted many aspects of their lives. She wanted to remind the Council that AH had been identified as a major Town priority, and that a sense of urgency needed to be reflected in the Town's budget. Ms. West presented an argument for why increasing funding beyond A Penny for Housing was essential.

Yvonne Cleveland, a Chapel Hill resident, told about how she had obtained a home through Habitat for Humanity, and emphasized the importance of having AH in Town. She spoke in support of the Penny for Housing Fund, and said she was praying that the Council would find a way to increase it to a nickel. Ms. Cleveland mentioned people who had benefited from the AH Reserve Fund, but pointed out that there were many more who needed help. She submitted a petition from 66 people who were in favor of A Nickel for Housing.

Becca Zerkin , a Chapel Hill resident, offered her support for the Nickel for Housing initiative. She thanked Council members for their service, and for the kindness and thoughtfulness with which they led the Town.

Robert Dowling , executive director pf Community Home Trust, discussed the Trust's current inventory and thanked the Council for its ongoing support. He requested an \$11,270 increase in funding to meet the needs within the community for housing for very low income people. Mr. Dowling said that there was a growing scarcity of apartments that rent for \$500 a month or less, and that these were not being created through inclusionary zoning. He said that communities were relying more on local funding as federal subsidies decline or perhaps disappear. Mr. Dowling asked the Council to not view his request as ingratitude. The Community Home Trust was very grateful for all the support the Council had provided over many years, but was asking for more, he said.

Kathy Atwater, a Chapel Hill resident, said that the Northside Land Bank had acquired 18 properties through partnerships with Habitat for Humanity, Community Home Trust, and EmPOWERment, Inc., and had 16 units of AH in process. As a life-long Northside resident, she had seen many changes, and was now seeing positive ones, she said. Ms. Atwater pointed out that many who once lived in Northside, but had moved away, were coming back because of the AH that was being provided there.

Jared Brown Rabinowitz, a Housing Advisory Board (HAB) member, urged the Council to adopt the Nickel for Housing initiative, and added that the HAB thought the Opportunity Fund portion of that was key. He pointed out that the Council had an opportunity to prevent the kind of "gentrification" that he had seen take place in other communities.

Mayor Hemminger noted that the Council had also receiving input from many via email and phone. Citizens would have many more opportunities to comment as the Council dove deeper into some aspects, such as AH, at works sessions, she said. Mayor Hemminger stressed that the Council took all comments into consideration when trying to figure out how to make Town resources match Town values.

[CONCEPT PLAN REVIEWS](#)

2. [Concept Plan: Amity Station, Mixed-Use Development, 322 West Rosemary Street \(Project # 16-095\). \(R-1\)](#)

Director of Planning and Development Services Ben Hitchings reviewed changes to the concept plan review process. He then gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding Amity Station, a three-parcel site on West Rosemary Street. He noted that the site was in Focus Area 1, and the Town/Village Center Medium Residential and the Residential 3 zoning categories. Mr. Hitchings pointed out that the concept plan was the third that the applicant had submitted since 2015. He displayed a table comparing the three plans, noting that the greatest change had been a reduction in height. He said that the applicant had submitted an alternative proposal for the site as well, and that it included five site plans.

Mr. Hitchings reminded the Council that the Town was in the process of finalizing a West Rosemary Street Development Guide, and he pointed out that the Amity Station was in the middle of that guide's study area. He reviewed Housing Advisory Board and Community Design Commission comments and showed a rendering of the front elevation. The applicant was anticipating needing to rezone the R-3 portion of the site to TC-2 as well, and was asking for a height variance based on the density bonus for floor area related to the AH proposal. Mr. Hitchings recommended that the Council adopt R-1, transmitting comments to the applicant.

Jared Martinson, an architect with MHA Works, gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding Amity Station. He reviewed a process timeline, which ran from a community meeting in 2014 to the present, and showed a list of the many meetings and focus groups in which MHA Works had participated. He said that the plan had improved due to that input, and he showed the differences between a previous concept proposal and the current one. Mr. Martinson said that the new plan attempted to apply the ideas of the Northside Conservation District. Amity Station would be a bridge between the neighborhood and the downtown, he said.

Mr. Martinson pointed out that the project contained both market rate and affordable housing (AH) as well as commercial office space. It proposed a streetscape that would engage the public way, flexible interior spaces, and a courtyard that could be defined by residents of the building, he said. He listed several community benefits that the project would bring.

Andy King, of MHA Works, continued the PowerPoint presentation, explaining that the proposal was for approximately 35 AH units, and that a yet-to-be-determined, non-profit partner would participate in the design of an integrated, mixed income, mixed use development that manifests the community's AH goals. He pointed out that the applicant did not plan to build about 100,000 square feet of the density bonus that would be allowed for the amount of AH he was offering.

Mr. King described a welcoming ground floor that would encourage an active streetscape with multiple small retail spaces. He showed design approaches that would break down the scale of the building, described the commercial and office space areas, and showed images of a typical entrance, facade, and internal spaces. Mr. King showed photos of Nunn Alley as it currently was adjacent to renderings of proposed area improvements. He emphasized that nothing in the proposal would change Nunn Alley itself.

Mr. Martinson discussed additional benefits, which included community uses, job creation, interior/exterior public art, and way-finding and culture. He showed examples of other projects that MHA Works had designed.

Dan Jewell, of Coulter Jewell Thames PA, said that Amity Station proposed a diverse, multi-generation, mixed-use building that offered more than 15,000 square feet of commercial and office space, and compelling community benefits. He requested that the Council ask the Town Manager to initiate a development agreement (DA), rather than a special use permit (SUP) process, in order to allow a continued open dialogue throughout the design and approval process. A DA would allow the project to more deeply involve the developing principles of the West Rosemary Street Development Guide, Mr. Jewell said.

Council Member Anderson verified with Mr. Martinson that the proposal included working with a non-profit AH developer throughout the design process. The applicant would pay for all design fees, donate the land, and build the building, and an AH non-profit developer would then purchase it, Mr. Martinson said.

The applicant, Larry Short, explained that he would donate the land and pay the soft costs to get the project through the process. He would also pay for the infrastructure for AH and would finance the construction of that, he said. He would be selling the "sticks and nails," meaning all that was not included in that, to an AH provider, he said.

Council Member Anderson said there had been much community input about things that were not being addressed. Not much had changed, so she did not understand why the project was back again, she said.

Mr. Martinson replied that there had been changes in the square footage, and that the new concept included more office and retail.

Council Member Anderson asked staff how many concept plan changes the Council had to look at.

Mr. Hitchings replied that there was a minimum waiting period with some proposals before the Council would hear an item again. However, that was not the case with concept plans, which could be resubmitted with no minimum or maximum waiting period, he explained.

Mr. King pointed out that the 2015 plan had included a significant number of four-bedroom units, which the applicant had since eliminated because of the Town's request to discourage students. In addition, the applicant had conceded to an age restriction of 21 (college juniors), Mr. King said.

Council Member Cianciolo confirmed with Mr. Short that nothing would be off the table during a DA discussion.

Council Member Parker asked if the office space would be market rate or subsidized, noting that incubator and start-up companies could not afford to pay the going rate per square foot.

Mr. Martinson replied that there was about 6,000 square feet of dedicated commercial office space on the Nunn Alley elevation, roughly 10,000 square feet of flexible office space with a minimum of 1,000 square feet dedicated to affordable commercial use. Beyond that, there were a number of ideas in the development guide regarding opportunities for affordable office and commercial space that the applicant wanted to discuss with the Town, Mr. Martinson said.

Council Member Parker asked what the applicant's justification was for going beyond the four-story limit that was in the Northside Neighborhood Conservation District guidelines.

Mr. King replied that they could bring it down at least two stories if they remove the Affordable

Housing (AH) component and the additional office space that was currently being proposed. Those elements had ebbed and flowed during discussions and were all still on the table, he said.

Mr. Martinson said that the current plan provided the most community benefit. If the height were decreased, then the AH and commercial space would decrease, he said.

Council Member Greene said she agreed that there were trade-offs and a balancing act that must be accommodated. She confirmed with Mr. Martinson that MHA Works would share its numbers during a DA process.

Council Member Oates confirmed with Mr. Short that the AH building would be sold to a non-profit for the cost of constructing the building. She also confirmed with him that he would be transparent with those numbers.

Mr. Short pointed out that the AH would be sustainable with Section 8 vouchers because a non-profit would not have to pay real estate taxes.

Council Member Oates asked about the Nunn Lane access agreement and Town Attorney Ralph Karpinos said that he would check Town files. There was public access through there, but it was not wide enough to be a road, he said.

Mayor Hemminger clarified that Nunn Lane was wide enough for cars, but that Nunn Alley, at the other end was only wide enough for pedestrians.

Council Member Oates asked if there was an agreement with the Town regarding the property in the middle, and Mr. Karpinos agreed to check Town files. He said he thought there was an agreement to keep Nunn Alley open as a public pedestrian walkway from Rosemary Street, but it was not wide enough to be a vehicular access.

Council Member Oates asked about the applicant's five alternative plans, and Mr. Martinson replied that the team had submitted five separate site plan applications to staff for review. They had been exploring other options, but the one being presented was the preferred concept, he said.

Mayor Hemminger confirmed with Mr. Jewell that stormwater would be handled under the buildings, parking lot, and courtyard.

Craig Knight, a Chapel Hill resident, said that his great-grandmother had owned the lot that his uncle PH Craig currently owned. He shared some of his memories of the property before and after his uncle and the Town had improved the area. Mr. Knight requested that the Town widen Nunn Alley to the minimum standard of 27 feet, with a sidewalk and lighting. The concept plan being presented would greatly harm his uncle and his uncle's property, he said.

PH Craig, owner of two properties in the area, said that the applicant had previously proposed widening Nunn Alley enough for a fire truck, but he did not want to allow him to use it. He said

that he would like to see a 27-foot wide road with sidewalk, lights, curb, and gutter there. It was time for the Town to correct the way the alley had been laid out 100 years ago, he said. Mr. Craig added that building six stories next to that little alley would decrease the value of surrounding properties. He was against the "gigantic" project as proposed, he said, stating that it would go back farther into the residential area than any other proposed project.

George Berrett, a Northside resident representing the Marion Cheeks Jackson Center, reviewed the history of the applicant's proposals, and pointed out that the Council had said it would not approve a plan until those who had spoken against it at meetings were speaking in favor of it. He was one of those who had spoken against it and was still not excited about the concept plan, he said.

Mr. Berrett described nearby Shortbread Lofts and said it was hard to trust that a commercial space by the same developer would be an asset to the community. Neighbors had asked for an age restriction of 22 years or higher, he pointed out. He said that six to seven stories went against the vision in the Rosemary Imagined Plan and the West Rosemary Street Development Guide. Mr. Berrett urged the Council to look at whether the applicant had accomplished what the Council had charged him to do.

Hudson Vaughan, representing the Marion Cheeks Jackson Center, read a letter from the Northside neighborhood and Friends of Northside, which included 77 signatures from those who were concerned about the Amity Station concept. Mr. Vaughan said that the concept plan was largely unchanged after a year of feedback from the neighborhood, and despite the Council's instructions to not return until it had the neighborhood's support. Mr. Vaughan gave several examples of areas where the applicant had not responded to feedback, and to requests for information.

Kathy Atwater continued reading the letter from Northside, which stated that developers had come back to the Council with a third concept plan despite neighbors having told them that it was not what they wanted to see in the area. Therefore, the Northside community felt duly apprehensive about the developer's commitment to promises going forward, she said. Ms. Atwater read that it was unreasonable to ask Northside to continue participating in a process where community perspectives were not directly incorporated into planning. She said that the concept being proposed was not consistent with the Council's vision of a vibrant, diverse, family-friendly Northside and Rosemary Street.

Ray Falk, a Chapel Hill resident who lives at the northeast corner of the Amity Station site, said that the proposed height seemed comparable to what was already there and that he did not object to it. Mr. Falk said that he understood that Nunn Alley would be left as it was.

Council Member Cianciolo said that he had the sense that the neighbors did not think Amity Station was "ready for prime time." He had been to a number of community meetings and had sensed the frustration, he said, adding that some on the Council also felt that they kept seeing the plan without enough changes. Council Member Cianciolo said he was strongly in favor of trying a DA, through which all could quickly find out if there was potential for common ground.

Council Member Harrison said that he had walked the area and tried to imagine what the Amity Station building would look like. Because there was a 30-foot, or so, difference in ground elevation between the site and the bottom of Shortbread Lofts, it would seem much taller than the proposed six to seven stories, he said. Council Member Harrison pointed out that reducing height was one possibility in a DA. He was in favor of a DA because that would keep the dialogue open, he said.

Council Member Anderson expressed frustration over seeing such a little amount of change after so many meetings. She expressed concern that the community would grow tired, and said that she was puzzled by why the concept plan was before the Council again without neighborhood input being incorporated. Seeing the same thing over and over was taking time away from other things the Council could be doing, she said.

Council Member Anderson said she was a little wary of entering into a DA process and agreeing to a plan because all were worn down and the neighbors had stopped showing up. She also commented on problems with data in the Council's packet and said it caused her to doubt other information presented.

Council Member Greene expressed concern about the lack of agreement between the applicant and the neighbors. She was in favor of offering a DA, but wanted to be clear that a DA does not necessarily end with a contract, she said. If the applicant was realistic about trade-offs and about what the real values were, then there was some potential for some agreement, she said.

Council Member Parker said that the design was substantially the same as in the previous concept plan presentation, so his comments from then were still valid. If the applicant was ready to proceed, and would otherwise file for a rezoning and SUP, then a DA would be preferable, he said. Council Member Parker said that DA conversations would address trade-offs, and that the Town would need transparency on the numbers.

Council Member Palmer expressed support for a DA, adding that the goals did not seem that far apart. Raising the age restriction from 21 to 22, and from junior to graduate, would not be a great difference, she said, and noted that there had been no age limit in the previous concept plan. The applicant was moving in the right direction, and she did not have a problem with more height if an entire building of AH was the return, she said. Council Member Palmer said that she did not think that the neighbors and the Jackson Center would get tired of fighting because they were committed to seeing something good come out of negotiations.

Mayor pro tem Bell said she supported the idea of a DA and that the Council had to make decisions about how to balance its interests. It was difficult to come up with a shared project if you do not have shared interests, she pointed out. Mayor pro tem Bell said that it was the Council's job to decide if wider Town priorities could be addressed by this one piece of land. She expressed gratitude to the Jackson Center and EmPOWERment and said that the development team had been very kind and had tried to be as open and thoughtful as possible. Mayor pro tem Bell said that she liked DAs because participants negotiate only what needed to be negotiated, and she proposed that the Manager return with a plan for one for Amity Station.

Council Member Greene stressed that a DA must absolutely include an AH provider as an essential component. She pointed out that such negotiations address what retail space entails, and noted that Northside residents had expressed disappointment with the types of businesses that occupy the first level at Shortbread Lofts.

Council Member Oates said she liked the building's exterior, and that the interface with Northside had been much improved. She noted that the flex space was vague, and said it needed to be something that engaged and improved the neighborhood. She wondered how parking would be prevented from becoming commuter parking, and if provisions would be made for AH parking. The applicant needed to make sure it was not restricting access to PH Craig's property, she said.

Council Member Oates suggested that the applicant think about how the plan fit in with the Rosemary Street Development Guidelines. She pointed out that low-wealth graduate students need housing, and said that raising the age limit to 22 would not limit the market. The fact that Mr. Short already owned the land meant that he could be more flexible with what the community wanted, she said. Council Member Oates said that she did not see much difference from the last concept plan.

Council Member Anderson said that she would want to nail down details of the AH component in a DA. She would also want the Council to think carefully about the idea of office/retail space that was not popular being turned into market-rate housing. In addition, the applicant's idea of reserving the right to switch to condos in the future needed scrutiny, she said. Council Member Anderson said she wanted to know what the inclusionary zoning ordinance would mean if the AH portion were sold to somebody else.

Council Member Harrison compared neighborhood participation and sentiment during the Obey Creek and Glen Lennox DAs and said it seemed as though Northside residents were assuming something much more intense. That lays the grounds for a DA, he said.

Mayor Hemminger said that the project seemed massive to her. She pointed out that the commercial space needed to be activated. A DA would be okay, she said, adding that the plan still needed to address height, age restriction, commercial space, and parking for the AH units.

Mayor Hemminger asked staff about the applicant's five-lot concept plan, and Mr. Karpinos replied that the plan was not clear, but was something that the applicant could build by right.

Council Member Parker asked what the plan contained, and Mr. Martinson described a mixed-use project of four-story buildings that would each stand alone, and have their own parking.

Council Member Oates commented that the five-lot plan looked like it would bring a lower return on investment. She asked why the applicant would not, therefore, make enough modifications in the current plan to satisfy the neighborhood.

Mr. Martinson replied that they were not certain it would bring a lower return. Mr. Short could

build the five buildings by right, and would not have to provide any community benefits, he said.

Council Member Anderson verified that the applicant had not shared the alternate plan with the Northside neighborhood.

They had spoken about a by-right option early in the process but had not, at that time, looked at what it might be, Mr. Martinson said.

Council Member Cianciolo asked why the applicant would ask the manager and staff to spend time and energy working on a DA if they knew they might go forward with an alternate plan. "You can't have it both ways," he said, and advised the applicant to either move forward with the alternate plans, or put them on hold until they see where the DA is going.

Mr. Jewell replied that the alternate five plans were what they could fall back on if the DA fell apart. Mr. Short would not enter into a six-figure application fee for a DA, and spend so much design time on it, if he did not intend to end up with a better product in the end, he said. The five site plans were simply a fallback position if nothing else could be built on the property, said Mr. Jewell.

Council Member Palmer said that it would be a big loss for the Town if the Council was so intransigent that developers started building all that they could by right. She did not want more student rentals, she said, stating that the applicant could make a lot more money building those than he could with family housing and affordable commercial. She hoped to do the DA and avoid that, Council Member Palmer said.

Mayor pro tem Bell asked if staff was reviewing the five site plans.

Mr. Hitchings replied that staff was in the process of determining whether the application was complete and whether it was a common development or five distinct projects. The answer to that would determine next steps, such as whether or not the applicant needed to apply for a SUP, he said.

Mayor pro tem Bell ascertained from Mr. Hitchings that staff work would take approximately six to 10 hours and would involve several staff members. She asked if that would be a good use of staff time if the Council decided to proceed with a DA.

Mr. Hitchings replied that the Town had an obligation to review applications that come in.

Council Member Cianciolo said he would feel better if the applicant halted the review of other applications during the DA process. Doing so would show that they were committed to the DA, he said.

Mayor pro tem Bell said she wondered why Council members were hearing about another concept plan when they and the applicant had just agreed to the shared benefits of having a DA.

Mayor Hemminger explained that she had wanted to make sure that Council saw the alternate plan, since she could not speak on the Council's behalf about what its interest was. The applicant had the right to file an alternate plan, and staff was working on it, she said.

COUNCIL MEMBER MICHAEL PARKER MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER JESSICA ANDERSON, TO ADOPT R-1. THE MOTION WAS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY (9-0) .

[A RESOLUTION TRANSMITTING COUNCIL COMMENTS ON A CONCEPT PLAN FOR AMITY STATION, MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, 322 W. ROSEMARY STREET \(2017-05-15/R-1\)](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.