



TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

Community Design Commission

Meeting Minutes

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

Susana Dancy, Chair
Christine Berndt, Vice-Chair
Edward Hoskins
Kim Levell

Susan Lyons
Megan Patnaik
Polly Van de Velde
John Weis

Monday, May 18, 2020

4:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

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_xzTRUMQ_RXigGeSCOUaLmQ

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar in listen-only mode. Phone: 301-715-8592, Meeting ID: 826 4942 0142

Opening

Roll Call

Present 8 - Chair Susana Dancy, Vice-Chair Christine Berndt, Edward Hoskins, Kim Levell, Susan Lyons, Megan Patnaik, Polly Van de Velde, and John Weis

Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Van de Velde, seconded by Lyons, that the agenda be approved with the modifications noted below. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Chair Dancy requested to discuss the commissions downtown review petition as Item #7.

Hoskins requested to discuss the commissions design award initiative as Item #8.

Announcements

Staff announcements included follow up discussion on whether the commission would have a July meeting.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Berndt, seconded by Van de Velde, that both meeting minutes be deferred to the Community Design Commission, due back by 6/23/2020. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

1. April 3rd-Meeting Minutes [\[20-0318\]](#)
2. April 27th-Meeting Minutes [\[20-0319\]](#)

Concept Plan Reviews

3. Carraway Village [\[20-0320\]](#)
SUP Modification Request

Commission is asked to review and provide comments on a concept plan for a potential SUP mod for Carraway Village. Proposed modifications to the SUP include potential changes to use categories, public street A and signs.

Commission Consensus

1. Multiple commissioners expressed support of the proposed modifications.
2. Multiple commissioners were supportive of a gas station being placed in Block A due to visibility and highway accessibility, but they noted that its relation to the RCD needed further investigation and caution.
2. Two commissioners preferred a gas station be placed in Block's B or C, noting the gateway location of Block A and not wanting a gas station in the entranceway to Chapel Hill.
3. Multiple commissioners were supportive of the modifications to the gateway signage to allow additional tenant panels. However, they also thought that the way the signage is designed makes it difficult to read and looks cluttered, and they encouraged the applicant to think about potential design modifications.
4. After reviewing the RCD on the adjoining properties commissioners agreed it made sense to not extend Public Street A to the property line of Block G. The applicant also stated that a driveway could be extended to a future self-storage building.

Individual Comments

1. One commissioner noted that a gas station located in Block A did not fit with the vision for the block that was previously approved through the master planning efforts for the project.
2. One commissioner noted support of the self-storage in Block G, provided in respected the RCD.
3. One commissioner did not feel that additional sign panels would be desirable or help, but was supportive of additional ground signage for wayfinding.
4. One commissioner preferred retaining gas stations as an accessory use only.

New Business**4. 125 E. Rosemary-Parking Structure
Conditional Zoning Recommendation**[\[20-0321\]](#)

Commission is asked to provide a recommendation to council for this conditional zoning project. There are (3) motions the CDC is authorized to make. Those are approval, approval w/ conditions or denial. Please note that these motions are recommendations to Council, not final actions.

Commissioners motioned the following recommendations. Approved recommendations to be forwarded to Council for review. Each motion is noted below with their recorded votes.

Levell motioned, seconded by Van de Velde to require (2) green walls on the north and east walls. Motion carried 7:1.

Aye-Vice-Chair Berndt, Hoskins, Levell, Lyons, Patnaik, Van de Velde and Weis

Nay-Chair Dancy, opposed the motion because she felt the Commission was micro-managing this detail.

Vice Chair Berndt motioned, seconded by Lyons to eliminate the 2nd entrance on West Rosemary Street at Northwest corner. Motion failed 4:4.

Aye-Lyons, Vice-Chair Berndt & Hoskins

Nay-Chair Dancy, Weis, Levell, Van de Velde and Patnaik

Reasons for nay vote centered around the lack of information provided at this point.

Lyons motioned, seconded by Weis to eliminate the pedestrian bridge from recommendation A. Motion carried 6:2.

Aye-Chair Dancy, Lyons, Patnaik, Weis, Levell and Hoskins

Nay-Vice Chair Berndt and Van de Velde opposed eliminating the pedestrian bridge.

Vice Chair Berndt motioned, seconded by Hoskins that the commission would like an iterative design review process during final plan review. Motion failed 4:4.

Aye-Vice-Chair Berndt, Hoskins, Lyons & Van de Velde

Nay-Chair Dancy, Weis, Patnaik & Levell

A motion was made by Weis, seconded by Van de Velde, that 125 E. Rosemary conditional zoning application be recommended for approval to Council. The motion carried by the following vote:

Vice-Chair Berndt noted nay because the design is too big and too tall, and does not mitigate the impacts of the project upon the surrounding neighborhoods and historic districts, and the Town as a whole (per item D in Resolution B).

Aye: 7 - Chair Susana Dancy, Edward Hoskins, Kim Levell, Susan Lyons, Megan Patnaik, Polly Van de Velde, and John Weis

Nay: 1 - Vice-Chair Christine Berndt

Old Business

5. Valvoline-Final Plan Elevations

[\[20-0322\]](#)

Commission is asked to review and consider action on proposed building elevations and lighting w/ modifications made by applicant after feedback from the January CDC meeting. There are (3) motions the CDC is authorized to make. Those are approval, approval w/ conditions or deferral.

Previous review comments by the CDC included concern about how the building related in scale and massing to the adjoining building and concern w/ the garage doors facing Franklin Street. At that meeting clarification was requested from staff as to whether or not this project would constitute a drive-thru. Staff's determination concluded that for a drive-thru a 'window' has to be provided, so this project does not qualify.

The applicant presented plans w/ changes to the elevations to relate it to the adjoining buildings. Chair Dancy noted the garage doors still faced the street and were too close to it.

Van de Velde motioned the project be approved as presented. No second was initially made. Weis then seconded the motion w/ a friendly amendment to add more landscaping in front of the building. Van de Velde did not accept it as a friendly amendment and she withdrew her motion.

Levell motioned to approve with additional landscape screening. No second or vote was recorded. Chair Dancy suggested tabling this item to the next meeting w/ additional landscaping being provided. Staff noted that the Commission cannot require landscaping.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Berndt, seconded by Weis, that Valvoline

be deferred until the next meeting, with the applicant considering the comments and concerns. The motion carried 7:1.

Levell gave no reason for nay vote.

Aye: 7 - Chair Susana Dancy, Vice-Chair Christine Berndt, Edward Hoskins, Susan Lyons, Megan Patnaik, Polly Van de Velde, and John Weis

Nay: 1 - Kim Levell

Petitions

Downtown Design District Petition

Commissioner Weis provided an edited draft petition reflecting the Commission's discussion at the April 27 meeting to request the downtown be made a special appearance district. Vice-Chair Berndt moved, seconded by Van de Velde, that the petition letter to Council be approved with one modifications to the last sentence in paragraph 5, and submitted to Council. Vote was approved unanimously.

Hoskins gave an update on the design awards initiative including updates on relevant staff who were working to coordinate the awards efforts. He made a motion, seconded by Van de Velde to postpone further work this year and ask Council to make the design awards a priority in 2021. Vote was approved unanimously.

6. Elevation Modifications Petition

[\[20-0333\]](#)

Vice Chair Berndt submitted a draft petition to address possible improvements of changing approved elevation modifications. The Commission voted unanimously to submit it to staff. Staff will report back verbally at the June meeting.

Adjournment

Next Meeting - Tentative, June 23

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 for more information on the above referenced applications.

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