



# TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

## Community Design Commission

### Meeting Minutes

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

John Weis, Chair  
Susan Lyons, Vice Chair  
Susana Dancy

Edward Hoskins  
Scott Levitan  
Megan Patnaik

**Tuesday, April 26, 2022**

**6:30 PM**

**Virtual Meeting**

#### Language Access Statement

For interpretation or translation services, call 919-969-5105.

ဘာသာပြန်ဆိုခြင်းနှင့် စကားပြန်ခြင်းအတွက်၊ (၉၁၉) ၉၆၉-၅၁၀၅ ကိုဖုန်းခေါ်ပါ။

Para servicios de interpretación o traducción, llame al 919-969-5105.

လၢတၢ်ကတိၤကျိးထံ မ့တမၢ် လၢတၢ်ကွဲးကျိးထံအတၢ်မၤစၢၤအဂီၢ် ၁ ကိးဘၣ် (၉၁၉)-၉၆၉-၅၁၀၅

如需口头或  
书面翻译服  
务，请拨打  
919-969-5105.

#### Virtual Meeting Notification

Board members will attend and participate in this meeting remotely, through internet access, and will not physically attend. The Town will not provide a physical location for viewing the meeting.

The public is invited to attend the Zoom webinar directly online or by phone.

Register for this webinar:

[https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_Utp\\_owgFRw2DjjldO90kWQ](https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Utp_owgFRw2DjjldO90kWQ) After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar in listen-only mode. Phone: 301-715-8592, Meeting ID: 873 4523 9680

#### Opening

#### Roll Call

**Present** 6 - Chair John Weis, Vice-Chair Susan Lyons, Susana Dancy, Edward Hoskins, Scott Levitan, and Megan Patnaik

#### Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Lyons, seconded by Patnaik, that Union Grove and Peach Apartments be moved to the Consent Agenda, and that Virtual Meeting Recommendation be moved to the end of the agenda. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Lyons, seconded by Dancy, that the agenda be approved as amended. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

### **Announcements**

Chair Weis announced that the CDC retreat is tentatively scheduled for May 20. He will share more details, including time, as follow up to this meeting.

Corey Liles, staff liaison, noted that the Harris Teeter project is also being heard by the Transportation and Connectivity Advisory Board, and there may need to be flexibility on agenda order to accommodate that.

### **Petitions**

No petitions were presented or discussed.

### **Approval of Minutes**

#### **1. March Minutes**

[\[22-0325\]](#)

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Lyons, seconded by Hoskins, that the March 22 Minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote (Levitan abstaining due to not being present at the March 22 meeting):

**Aye:** 5 - Chair John Weis, Vice-Chair Susan Lyons, Susana Dancy, Edward Hoskins, and Megan Patnaik

**Abstain:** 1 - Scott Levitan

### **Consent Agenda**

A motion was made by Hoskins, seconded by Vice-Chair Lyons, that the Consent Agenda (1751 Dobbins, Pinnacle Self-Storage, Union Grove, and Peach Apartments) be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

#### **2. 1751 Dobbins Drive Final Plan-Elevations**

[\[22-0326\]](#)

Commission is asked to review and consider action on this final plans review. Minor elevations modifications are proposed to previously approved plans. Actions include approval, approval w/ conditions or deferral to respond to comments/meet voluntary compliance.

#### **3. Pinnacle Self-Storage Final Plans-Lighting**

[\[22-0327\]](#)

Commission is asked to review and consider action on this final plans review lighting. Elevation were approved at the March meeting and the Commission shared lighting could be added to the consent agenda as noted. Actions include approval, approval w/ conditions or deferral to respond to comments/meet voluntary compliance.

6. Union Grove [\[22-0330\]](#)  
Final Plans-Lighting

Commission is asked to review and consider action on this final plans lighting. At the March meeting the commission requested applicant provide fixtures and a cost analysis for switching to 3K light temperatures. Actions include approval, approval w/ conditions or deferral to respond to comments/meet voluntary compliance.

This item was moved to the Consent Agenda and approved.

7. Peach Apartments [\[22-0331\]](#)  
Conditional Zoning Recommendation

Commission is asked to review and consider a recommendation on this Conditional Zoning application. Actions include approval, approval w/ conditions or denial.

This item was moved to the Consent Agenda and recommended to the Council for approval.

## Old Business

4. UPlace Redevelopment [\[22-0328\]](#)  
Final Plans Review

Commission is asked to review and consider action on this final plans review. Actions include approval, approval w/ conditions or deferral to respond to comments/meet voluntary compliance.

Commissioners noted that building design and public space activation had improved since the initial proposal. However, there were still concerns around the blank walls on Building 5. Commissioners agreed that Building 5 elevations should be deferred for further review.

Commissioners also requested that when the office buildings are submitted for review, the package show connections with the Chick-Fil-A site and interface between the Fordham Blvd streetscape and adjacent buildings.

A motion was made by Hoskins, seconded by Dancy, that the lighting plan be

approved and that the building elevations for Buildings, 2, 3, 4, and the existing mall be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**5. Carraway Village Phase 3**

[\[22-0329\]](#)

**Final Plans Review-Elevations and Building Lighting**

Commission is asked to review and consider action on this final plans review for elevations and building lighting. A courtesy landscape plan has been provided by the applicant per the commission's request. Actions include approval, approval w/ conditions or deferral to respond to comments/meet voluntary compliance.

Commissioners noted that at-grade parking and building placement detracted from what was otherwise a high-quality building design.

A motion was made by Patnaik, seconded by Levitan, that the building elevations and lighting plan be approved.

Vice-Chair Lyons stated concerns about the building overlooking the Putt Putt and self-storage, and a need to be more family-focused, as reasoning for her Nay vote.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 5 - Chair John Weis, Susana Dancy, Edward Hoskins, Scott Levitan, and Megan Patnaik

**Nay:** 1 - Vice-Chair Susan Lyons

**New Business**

**8. 1800 Fordham Blvd.**

[\[22-0332\]](#)

**5/3 Bank-Special Use Permit Comments**

Commission is asked to provide comments to the applicant for this Special Use Permit Request.

Commissioners reviewed the application and provided comments to the applicant.

No public comment was received.

Note: The CDC's review of this application functions as a preliminary forum. No comments or recommendations may be made part of the evidentiary record, in accordance with North Carolina General Statutes for quasi-judicial procedures (§ 160D-301(b), § 160D-406).

9. Harris Teeter [\[22-0333\]](#)  
Comments-SUP

Commission is asked to provide comments to the applicant for this Special Use Permit Request.

Commissioners reviewed the application and provided comments to the applicant.

No public comment was received.

Note: The CDC's review of this application functions as a preliminary forum. No comments or recommendations may be made part of the evidentiary record, in accordance with North Carolina General Statutes for quasi-judicial procedures (§ 160D-301(b), § 160D-406).

### **Concept Plan Reviews**

11. 121/130 Grand Alexander [\[22-0335\]](#)  
Subdivision

Comments is asked to provide comments for this concept plan application. This is a subdivision proposal and could be moved to the consent agenda if the commission does not have comments.

Members of the public shared concerns about increased flooding issues, missing information on plans, loss of significant trees and habitat, and lot size inconsistent with surrounding lots.

Commission members provided comments for consideration by the applicant and Town Council. No action was taken.

- Need more information and clarity about lot sizes, surrounding densities, existing easements, streams, and drainage patterns before it would be possible to support proposal.
- Need for careful stormwater review.
- Need for applicant to work with neighbors so that plans reflect their comments.
- Concern that ephemeral stream could be classified as more significant, warranting protection.

12. 828 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. [\[22-0336\]](#)  
Municipal Service Center

Comments is asked to provide comments for this concept plan application

Members of the public shared concerns about the development creating safety issues along Bolinwood Dr, risks to future residents from capped coal ash, inadequate buffers along Bolinwood Dr and facing existing neighborhood, retaining wall design, and missed opportunity to make the site more of a destination.

Commission members provided comments for consideration by the applicant and Town Council. No action was taken.

- Agreement with the comments made by the Town's Urban Designer (dated 3-14-22) and encouragement for developer to follow them.
- Site plan and building orientation do not create a compelling street edge along MLK Jr Blvd. Consider a street edge similar to that proposed by the Town's Urban Designer, understanding this interest must be balanced with drainage considerations in that area. Make an urban and transit-supportive experience more of a priority.
- Parking deck and surface parking lot are too visible from MLK Jr Blvd. Need measures to make parking less exposed.
- Existing character along this part of MLK Jr Blvd, including for the police station site, is more wooded and features buildings that relate well to their topography. The site design proposes more of a flat site with significant tree removal. Have the buildings respond to topography.
- Incorporate more trees and tree preservation into the landscape plan.
- The Bolinwood Dr frontage shows evenly spaced street trees. Instead create forested area along the street, consistent with the north side of Bolinwood Dr.
- See if the parking configuration can work with the slope of the site to go under the building(s).
- The multifamily/parking deck building is very massive and out of scale with its surroundings.
- The design should do more to integrate with the fabric of existing neighborhoods.
- Site design and design of the retaining wall should do more to celebrate the connection with Bolin Creek. The retaining wall as proposed is problematic.
- Recognizing the value of having a limited amount of surface public parking for access to the Bolin Creek greenway.
- Concern around cut-through traffic on Bolinwood Dr., creating safety issues for existing residents.

### 13. Porthole Alley Redevelopment

[\[22-0337\]](#)

Comments is asked to provide comments for this concept plan application

No public comment was received.

Commission members provided comments for consideration by the applicant and Town Council. No action was taken.

- Varied massing does a good job creating interest. May make building appear 'squatty' on Franklin St - consider more vertical articulation and possible greater height to address that. Massing could also do more to invite movement through the site.
- Replacement of building is opportunity to make alley less narrow, particularly at the Franklin St entry. Consider ways to 'erode' the building and create more outdoor space.
- Determine whether bridges between buildings are really necessary to project budget. Concern the bridges create a missed opportunity for more street life.
- Consider design elements that invite the public into campus. This should start with a street presentation that welcomes all people who want to connect with the university, perhaps with displays and other glimpses of interior programming. Should continue with 'bits of activity'/unfolding experience continuing along the alley.
- Consider bringing the porch experience onto Franklin St.
- Consider a gateway feature similar to Post Office Alley.
- Narrowness of alley could create a tunnel-like feeling. Measures listed above are needed to counteract that and make the space inviting.

Architecture is part of the solution.

- Determine whether it's possible to move the stairwell on the rear of the Hill building to the interior.
- Architecture of new buildings should respect Franklin St character but not try to recreate history.
- Concern about having a purely modern structure as opposed to more historic rehab with dynamic uses.

#### 14. White Oak Drive Multi-Family

[\[22-0338\]](#)

Comments is asked to provide comments for this concept plan application

Members of the public shared concerns about the scale of this project and overall potential growth with multiple projects in the area, size of building and lack of compatibility with surroundings, lack of consistency with the Future Land Use Map, lack of tree preservation, potential strain on roads and infrastructure, loss of existing 80+ year old buildings, and generic nature of building design.

Commission members provided comments for consideration by the applicant and Town Council. No action was taken.

- Project too dense, overwhelms, the site, and generally not acceptable.
- Town staff, particularly Urban Design and Economic Development, should conduct a coordinated review of the 3 projects proposed in this area before anything moves forward.
- Significant concern around the scale of the buildings taking up most of the site. Consider how to create more open space and perimeter buffers.
- Concern that the project does nothing to create a sense of place.
- Consider splitting up buildings so their size is more compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and with the character of Old Durham-Chapel Hill Rd.
- Consider an appropriate transition to the almost exclusively single-family neighborhoods that includes stepping down in height closer to Old Chapel Hill Rd.
- Consider what this development can do to relate more to the neighborhood south of Old Chapel Hill Rd. and have positive impacts on nearby residents.
- Consider how to retain existing trees.
- Concern about the loss of the existing historical buildings on the site.
- Concern that grade change across the site, coupled with large building footprints, would lead to blank walls or other design issues at ground level.
- Overall, consider how to develop this site in a way that fits in better with the neighborhood, with product adapted to suit the context.

**10. Virtual Meetings Recommendation**  
Advisory Board Policy Update

[\[22-0334\]](#)

Commission is asked to provide a recommendation to Council to continue remote advisory board meetings.

This item was moved to last on the agenda.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Lyons, seconded by Patnaik, that the policy update to continue remote meetings be recommended to Council for approval. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

*Adjournment*

Next Meeting - Tuesday, May 24

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Patnaik, to adjourn the meeting at 10:55 PM. 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 Department at 919-968-2728; [planning@townofchapelhill.org](mailto: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.*