



# TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

## Community Design Commission

### Meeting Minutes

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

Susana Dancy, Chair  
Edward Hoskins  
Scott Levitan

Susan Lyons  
Megan Patnaik  
John Weis

**Tuesday, September 28, 2021**

**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 ၂ 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: URL After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar in listen-only mode. Phone: 301-715-8592, Meeting ID: 824.0488.5201

#### Opening

#### Roll Call

Scott Levitan arrived after the Opening of the meeting, during the Announcements agenda item.

#### Present

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

#### Approval of Agenda

Chair Dancy stated that she would be recusing herself from the Aura Blue Hill discussion and requested that item be moved to the end of the agenda.

A motion was made by Weis, seconded by Patnaik, to discuss Aura Blue Hill after

Concept Plan Reviews. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Chair Dancy then requested that Lowes be pulled from the consent agenda for questions from Commissioners.

A motion was made by Weis, seconded by Hoskins, that the agenda be approved as amended. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

### **Announcements**

No announcements at time of agenda release

Announcements shared during the meeting:

- Special meetings for review of University Place Design Standards scheduled for October 4 at 3pm and October 11 at 3pm. The Town Manager has requested to receive all CDC input by October 15.
- Staff will be reaching out to reschedule the November and December Commission meetings - due to holidays.
- The CDC Petition on membership will be back for Council consideration and possible action on October 13.
- Based on Town policy for conflicts of interest, staff noted that Chair Dancy would not participate in the discussion or vote on Aura Blue Hill, and would be moved to 'Attendee' status during that portion of the meeting.

### **Petitions**

Members asked about status of the Downtown Design petition. Staff shared that they had made a report to the Town Manager in early 2021. A good next step would be for the Chair to inquire with the Mayor on plans for the petition.

### **Approval of Minutes**

A motion was made by Weis, seconded by Lyons, that the August Minutes be deferred for action to the following meeting, allowing time to incorporate edits submitted by Weis and Lyons. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

1. August Action Minutes

[\[21-0716\]](#)

### **New Business**

2. Lowes  
Final Plans-Lighting Plan Upfit

[\[21-0717\]](#)

Commission is asked to approve lighting upfit for Lowes at Fordham Blvd.

No applicant representative was present to answer Commission questions.

A motion was made by Weis, seconded by Levitan, that this item be deferred

for review at the next meeting. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Commission members inquired about incorporating a lighting specification for 3000K or less. Staff advised that this could be considered as an amendment to Town development regulations, possibly in the Engineering Design Manual.

A motion was made by Dancy, seconded by Hoskins, that the request to incorporate this specification be shared with appropriate Town staff. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**3. Fifth Third Bank [\[21-0718\]](#)**  
Final Plan-Elevation Review

Commission is asked to consider action on final plans elevations. Allowable actions are approval, approval w/ conditions or deferral.

This item was deferred for review at a later date, at the request of the applicant.

**4. Self-Storage at Carraway Village [\[21-0719\]](#)**  
Final Plans-Elevation and Lighting Review

Commission is asked to consider action on final plans elevations. Allowable actions are approval, approval w/ conditions or deferral.

Commission members identified additional information needed for review, including a more developed landscape plan and understanding of how the building would appear from the property to the east.

A motion was made by Weis, seconded by Hoskins, that this item be deferred for further consideration at the next meeting, allowing time for the applicant time to respond to Commission questions and concerns. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

### **Concept Plan Reviews**

Applicant representatives for 150 E. Rosemary were presenting to the Transportation and Connectivity Advisory Board at this time. That item was therefore deferred to later in the meeting, and review of the first Concept Plan proceeded.

**5. 5500 Old Chapel Hill Road [\[21-0722\]](#)**  
Concept Plan

Commission is asked to provide recommendations to Council/Applicant for proposed concept p

No public comment was received.

Commission members provided the following comments to the applicant:

- Multifamily use is appropriate to help with housing need; height and scale are appropriate for this location.
- Consider changes to the parking layout that would remove parking from in front of the building and not separate the building from the street. Consider a building footprint that would accommodate underground parking.
- Landscaping considerations: soften parking bays so they are less rigid. Adequate buffers to east and west are important. Landscape the storm pond as a visual asset.
- Support for conceptual articulation on front facade - consider applying a similar treatment to all 4 sides.
- Consider changes to building orientation to maximize resident views of woods to the north (less view of courtyard). One possibility is to skew legs of the building on a diagonal.
- Consider providing owner-occupied units.
- One member suggested considering more units on the site (without increasing height) since the project could serve a mid-range price point. Another member stated that more units would cause traffic problems, given conditions of the surrounding road network.

No action was taken.

## **New Business**

### **6. 150 E. Rosemary Conditional Zoning Recommendation**

[\[21-0720\]](#)

Commission is asked to provide a recommendation to Council for CZ application.

No public comment was received.

A motion was made by Weis, seconded by Lyons, that the project be recommended for approval with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant rethink the approach to waste disposal.
2. That architectural treatment of the exhaust fans and other upper-level mechanical equipment be subject to CDC review and approval at the Final Plans stage.

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

## Concept Plan Reviews

### 7. Stanat's Place Concept Plan

[\[21-0723\]](#)

Commission is asked to provide recommendations to Council/Applicant for proposed concep

Members of the public provided comment. Multiple speakers expressed concern about the extension of Cabernet Drive - street design not supporting additional traffic, safety risks given the number of children in Vineyard Square, loss of a community gathering place, and risk of cut-through traffic to access Homestead Park. Other concerns noted included tree removal - impacts on stormwater, privacy, and necessary buffer width.

Commission members provided the following comments to the applicant:

- Concern about the extension of Cabernet Drive - with the existing road being narrow, and the possibility of traffic cutting through the neighborhood particularly at times of peak activity. Though it was also noted that the street layout could discourage cut-through traffic.
- Concern about not having sidewalks on both sides of the street, in front of all homes.
- Criticism of front-oriented garages with driveways and garaged doors dominating the street and sidewalk. Consider having rear garage access, with on-street parking for traffic calming.
- Need wider buffers and more green space for privacy where the property adjoins Vineyard Square (homes along Vintage Dr) and Homestead Park.

No action was taken.

## New Business

A motion was made by Levitan, seconded by Hoskins, to recuse Chair Dancy from the Commission's discussion of Aura Blue Hill, based on her identification of a conflict of interest. The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Vice-Chair John Weis assumed the Chair role at this time through the remainder of the meeting.

### 8. AURA Blue Hill Certificate of Appropriateness

[\[21-0721\]](#)

Commission is asked to hear initial information on Certificate of Appropriateness request.

No public comment was received.

Commission members provided initial feedback, at the applicant's request, on some options for design features - 3 vs 4-story form along Legion Rd Ext; Separated buildings vs pass-through approach; and Provision of affordable housing in-lieu of required nonresidential space.

Commission members identified additional information needed for review, including elevations of all side and rear facades (particularly parking deck screening), street-level perspectives of proposed buildings in relation to adjacent development, and details of window types.

The Commission requested that Urban Designer Brian Peterson be present at the next meeting to review the Urban Design Assessment.

The item was deferred for continued discussion at the next meeting.

#### *Adjournment*

Next Regular Meeting - October 26

A motion was made by Lyons, seconded by Hoskins, to adjourn the meeting at 11:10PM. 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.*