



# TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

## Community Design Commission

### Meeting Minutes

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

Volker Mueller  
Susana Dancy  
Christine Berndt  
Lucy Davis

Edward Hoskins  
Susan Lyons  
Megan Patnaik  
Polly Van de Velde

---

**Tuesday, March 26, 2019**

**6:30 PM**

**RM 110 | Council Chamber**

---

#### **Opening**

#### **Roll Call**

Staff present included  
Liles, Nicholson and Pearstein.

Council members present included  
Buansi and Oates.

**Present**      8 - Chair Volker Mueller, Susana Dancy, Christine Berndt, Lucy Davis, Edward Hoskins, Susan Lyons, Megan Patnaik, and Polly Van de Velde

#### **Approval of Agenda**

A motion was made by Hoskins, seconded by Van de Velde, that the agenda be approved w/ the following items being moved to the Special Meeting on Monday, April 1st at 6:30pm.

1. Park Apartments
2. Chapel Hill Preschool Update
3. Charting Our Future Update
4. Roger's Road Discussion
5. Application for Community Design Commission

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

#### **Announcements**

1. Development Review Board Chair Update meetings will now be held every other month. Next meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 10th at 9am. Meetings will still be held in the second floor conference room of Town Hall.
2. Eastowne Kick-Off Meeting currently scheduled for April 4th.
3. Sub-Committee for Project Improvements to provide updates on two (2) meetings held on March 11th and March 21st, 2019.

## **Petitions**

Commissioner Berndt petitioned staff to review the approved elevations and constructed condition of residential buildings at Carraway Village. Staff to report back at April, 23rd meeting.

## **Approval of Minutes**

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

1. February Minutes [\[19-0262\]](#)

## **Consent Agenda**

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Patnaik, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye:6-Chair Muller, Dancy, Hoskins, Lyons, Patnaik and Van de Velde.

Nay:2-Berndt and Davis.

Nay votes noted their desire to see arches repaired at Notting Hill.

**Aye:** 6 - Chair Mueller, Dancy, Hoskins, Lyons, Patnaik, and Van de Velde

**Nay:** 2 - Berndt, and Davis

2. Notting Hill Apartments [\[19-0263\]](#)  
Building Elevation Modifications

Commission is asked to review and approve elevation modifications based on new paint proposed for exterior elevations of the existing structures. Applicant citing 'life safety' also request approval for the removal of the stone archways which are currently used at breezeways.

## **Concept Plans**

3. 1751 Dobbins Drive Office Building [\[19-0264\]](#)

### Concept Plan-Comments for Applicant and Council

Commission is asked to review this application and provide comments which will be forwarded to the Applicant and Council for consideration as project continues through the entitlement process.

#### Commission Comments

1. Expressed appreciation for the development proposal and its thoughtfulness on such a difficult site, given that the owners of the adjoining private drive did not grant access to this property.
2. Expressed concern over the amount of proposed impervious surface and requested the use of stormwater mitigating measures such as pervious paving and green infrastructure.
3. Members were split on the architectural context of the proposed building, some liking the modern expression. Others expressed concerns over the lack of fitting in w/ the existing context of surrounding buildings. The building could share some common elements w/ its neighbors, while still expressing modern design.
4. A suggestion was made to consider cantilevering the building over the parking as a way to reduce impervious surface.

#### Public Comment

1. Citizen spoke and expressed concern over traffic impacts to surrounding neighborhood, citizen also requested that the growth of the applicant's site be permanently capped.

### 4. 1000 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard

[\[19-0265\]](#)

### Concept Plan-Comments for Applicant and Council

Commission is asked to review this application and provide comments which will be forwarded to the Applicant and Council for consideration as project continues through the entitlement process.

#### Commission Comments

1. The site should serve as a significant BRT node along Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. The site could be a template for what a BRT node could look like.
2. High-quality architecture for this site is a must. The intersection of N. Estes Dr. and Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. is one of the most prominent in Town, and the architecture on this corner could make a gesture to the intersection. The corner building design should make an impact. Some members suggested placing a plaza there.
3. Members emphasized the important of making this location attractive for people to stay and use public transportation.
4. Suggest drawing the public into the site with pedestrian gathering spaces along internal axis (reducing the impact of traffic noise and exhaust while dining outside). There should be more community gathering spaces provided.
5. There is an over-abundance of parking spaces provided and the ratio of parking to related uses is too high. Providing 1,300 parking spaces cannot

work at this intersection.

6. Suggest consulting the Central West Small Area Plan for proposed street layout and building heights.

7. The projects access points are too close to the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and N. Estes Dr. The distances for NCDOT approval seem problematic.

8. Members were split over the gridded nature of the layout.

9. The two large buildings along Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. need reconsideration. Some members deemed the corner one too high and monolithic. Other members felt the building at the corner might be undersized. The corner may be the more appropriate location for the proposed office building which may provide more opportunity to create a landmark.

10. Members appreciated how the gridded plan feathered out to connect the neighborhood sites and greenways or offered opportunities for future connections. Members expressed concern over the mixture of uses, specifically related to the percentages present and potential lack of critical mass for attracting retail.

11. Members expressed concern regarding the residential over parking fronting N. Estes Dr. and the lack of activation (attractiveness to pedestrians) this set up creates. One suggestion was for live/work town homes. There should be ground level units w/ entrances facing the street.

12. There is insufficient open/green space and amenity space. Consider providing more open spaces clustered between housing, and consider underground parking to provide more open space, as suggested by a citizen.

13. Make the project inviting to the senior apartment dwellers to be living nearby on N. Estes Dr.

14. The parking decks should be wrapped on all sides. The decks are lower than the structures surround the decks; would like examples of how this would look to residents in the upper units.

15. Applaud the provision of affordable housing for 80-100% of median income, but suggest considering affordability below 80% AMI as well.

16. Consider green building approaches to emphasize the cutting-edge nature of the development.

17. What is the status of the Town's road improvements and bicycle path, and how will it be coordinated w/ this project?

18. The Council should consider NC law provisions which allow the Town to deny a building permit, or refuse to approve a formal application for 3 years after timber harvest.

19. The reduction in the tree canopy is troublesome, and the applicant should make every effort to provide the community w/ a well designed project that also replace some of the trees.

#### Citizen Comments

1. Three citizens spoke and expressed concern over the traffic impacts along Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and N. Estes Dr. The proposed density at a very difficult intersection, stormwater controls and the lack of diversity in the plan; suggestions were made concerning the desirability of

green rooftops, the design of amenity spaces between housing units and using underground parking to create more green space.

2. A citizen group spoke out in support of the project including its connection to adjacent communities and its consistency w/ the small area plan.

## **Old Business**

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that Commissioner Berndt be allowed to leave the meeting early (quorum still exists). The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

7. Carraway Village [\[19-0268\]](#)  
Chick-fil-A  
Final Plan Application-Elevations, Site Lighting and Mechanical  
Screening

Commission is asked to review and consider approval for this Final Plan application based on the standards established in the Design Guidelines. Scope of review will include Building Elevations, Site Lighting Plan and mechanical screening based on directive of SUP.

Applicant has also submitted ZCP application for Staff review.

A motion was made by Davis, seconded by Dancy, that this item be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye:6-Chair Mueller, Davis, Lyons, Hoskins, Dancy, Patnaik.

Nay:1-Van de Velde.

Van de Velde noted building does not reflect positive architecture as reason for nay vote.

**Aye:** 6 - Chair Mueller, Dancy, Davis, Hoskins, Lyons, and Patnaik

**Nay:** 1 - Van de Velde

**Excused:** 1 - Berndt

8. Carraway Village [\[19-0269\]](#)  
Multi-Tenant Building  
Final Plan Application-Elevations, Site Lighting and Mechanical  
Screening

Commission is asked to review and consider approval for this Final Plan application based on the standards established in the Design Guidelines. Scope of review will include Building Elevations, Site Lighting Plan and mechanical screening based on directive of SUP.

Applicant has also submitted ZCP application for Staff review.

A motion was made by Davis, seconded by Van de Velde, that this item be approved w/ no architectural elements on main projection, lowering the awning 1' and removing awnings over the plantings. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye:6- Chair Mueller, Davis, Lyons, Van de Velde, Hoskins, Dancy.

Nay:1-Patnaik.

Patnaik noted she could not approve building as currently designed as reason for nay vote.

**Aye:** 6 - Chair Mueller, Dancy, Davis, Hoskins, Lyons, and Van de Velde

**Nay:** 1 - Patnaik

**Excused:** 1 - Berndt

#### *Adjournment*

Next Meeting - Tuesday, April 23

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that this 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](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.*