



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, November 27, 2018

6:30 PM

RM 110 | Council Chamber

Opening

Roll Call

Corey Liles-Principal Planner
Adam Nicholson-Urban Designer

Present 7 - Chair Volker Mueller, Susana Dancy, Christine Berndt,
Edward Hoskins, Susan Lyons, Megan Patnaik, and Polly
Van de Velde

Absent 1 - Lucy Davis

Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Berndt, seconded by Dancy, that the agenda be approved.
The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Announcements

Announcement made by Berndt looking for volunteers to attend poster presentation
of UNC Chapel Hill students. Berndt, Dancy and Van de Velde volunteered.

Petitions

Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Dancy moved to approve the meeting minutes for October 15th &
23rd, 2018, with the addition of encouraging Habitat/Carol Woods developer to
design the streets with pedestrians as primary emphasis and vehicular as
secondary emphasis.

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Van de Velde, that this be approved.
The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

1. CDC Minutes - October 15, 2018 and October 23, 2018

[\[18-0955\]](#)

Consent Agenda**2. Performance Bicycle Façade Improvements-COA** [\[18-0956\]](#)

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that this Certificate of Appropriateness be approved. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Old Business**3. COA: Tarheel Lodging** [\[18-0958\]](#)

Agenda modification-Eastowne Redevelopment team was not present at beginning of meeting. Tarheel Lodging project was moved up as a result.

Chair Mueller determined that Design Alternatives should be voted on individually before action on the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Design Alternative 1-Increase block length for Street 1 to 550'

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Hoskins to accept DA 1.

Aye (6) - Chair Mueller, Dancy, Hoskins, Lyons, Patnaik and Van de Velde

Nay (1) - Berndt-Justification envisioning an alternate design that would increase pedestrian access throughout the site by moving the pass-through from the north end to the south end of building 4, between it and the parking deck.

Design Alternative 2-Increase pass through spacing for Street 1 to 517'

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Hoskins to accept DA 2 and encourage applicant to include artistic and lighting elements.

Aye (3) - Dancy, Hoskins, Patnaik

Nay (4) - Chair Mueller, Berndt, Lyons and Van de Velde,
Motion Failed

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Hoskins to accept DA 2 with condition requiring an artistic enhancement in line with Rosemary crosswalks.

Aye (6) - Chair Mueller, Dancy, Hoskins, Lyons, Patnaik and Van de Velde

Nay (1) - Berndt-Justification: supports artistic enhancement, but believes a pass-through could have been designed to comply with Ordinance, and believes the proposed north pass-through does not fulfill a public purpose.

Design Alternative 3a-Increase Build-To Zone from 10'-17' on Fordham/A-1 Wrap

A motion was made by Hoskins, seconded by Van de Velde to approve DA 3a.

Passed Unanimously

Design Alternative 3c-Exempt +/- 260sf of 4th & 5th floors from step back requirement

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Van de Velde to accept DA 3c.

Passed Unanimously

Design Alternative 4a-Reduce facade required in Build-to-Zone on Street 2 from 60% to 40%.

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Hoskins to accept DA 4a.

Passed Unanimously

Design Alternative 4c-Exempt 8" depth of 4th & 5th floors from step back requirement.

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Van de Velde to accept DA 4c.

Passed Unanimously

Design Alternative 5-Reduce parking deck setback from 30' to 10' along Street 2.

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Hoskins to accept DA 5.

Passed Unanimously

Design Alternatives 9 and 10-Reduce ground story transparency along west elevation to 7%.

Reduce upper story transparency along west elevation to 4%.

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Lyons to accept DA 9 and 10 with a condition that the sign be placed to provide relief on the facade.

Passed Unanimously

Design Alternative 11-Alternate to principal entrance location requirement.

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Hoskins to accept DA 11.

Passed Unanimously

Design Alternative 12-Allow OAS 6 at corner of building 3 to be covered.

A motion was made by Hoskins, seconded by Van de Velde to approve DA 12.

Passed Unanimously

Design Alternative 13-EIFS as a primary material.

The applicant stated that EIFS could be considered equivalent or better to other primary materials, due to its affordability, durability, opportunity to provide texture with different thicknesses of material and its similarity to cementitious siding which is allowed. Dancy noted that she felt it was equivalent or better than cementitious siding.

A motion was made by Hoskins, seconded by Dancy with amendment to include material use of 63% EIFS max on building facade, to approve EIFS as a primary material for this reason and because there is brick on the bottom level of the hotel's proposed design, and to approve EIFS for the TRU hotel only.

Aye (5) - Chair Mueller, Dancy, Hoskins, Lyons and Patnaik

Nay (2) - Van de Velde and Berndt do not think the material is allowed by code as a primary material and does not think it is an equivalent or better

material.

Design Alternative 14-Increase max Ground Floor Elevation above 4' for Buildings 2 & 3.

A motion was made by Patnaik, seconded by Dancy to approve DA 14.
Passed Unanimously

Facade Review

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons to approve the TRU Hotel building elevations with modified West facade as shown on slide 14 of applicant presentation.

Aye (6) - Chair Mueller, Dancy, Hoskins, Lyons, Patnaik and Van de Velde
Nay (1) - Berndt against use of EIFS as a primary material and fin design.

The applicant's presentation included elevations of Parking Deck A (on Block 1) which had not previously been shared with the Commission. Commission members stated that more could be done to make the visible portions of the deck architecturally compatible with the buildings and appropriate settings, and that relief was needed on the ramp retaining walls.

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that the Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the Design Alternatives and associated conditions approved above, and with the further condition that Parking Deck A and ramp are subject to additional review of revised elevations.

Berndt notes her Nay vote for 3 of the Design Alternatives and feels she cannot vote for the project as a whole as a result.

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

Nay: 1 - Berndt

New Business

4. UNC HealthCare Eastowne Development

[\[18-0957\]](#)

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons to extend meeting by 15min.
Passed Unanimously

Staff requested Commission to provide review and approval for the elevations of the Medical Office Building, the Parking Structure and Lighting Plan.

Staff requested Commission to provide a courtesy review for Recommendations of Urban Design Review, Entry Sign Review and the Modified Landscape Buffers.

Commission members expressed concerns about the visual impact of the parking structure materials along Eastowne Drive, and the potential for light spillover from the top level. The applicant proposed some modifications that would reduce off-site light spillover.

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Lyons to approve the lighting plan with modifications to top deck including shorter light mounting heights and poles and removal of light fixtures proposed along the perimeter of the deck.

Passed Unanimously

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Berndt that discussion of courtesy review items be deferred to a future meeting.

Passed Unanimously

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Van de Velde, that the medical building elevations be approved. Action on parking structure would be subject to additional review of revised elevations.

Hoskins notes material choice and lack of Chapel Hill character for Nay vote.

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

Nay: 1 - Hoskins

Adjournment

Next Meeting - DATE

Next Meeting-December 10, 2018

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that 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 for more information on the above referenced applications.

See the Advisory Boards page <http://www.townofchapelhill.org/boards> for background information on this Board.