

**TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES
Thursday, February 4th, 2016**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Linda Haac, Chair
Rob Dow
Diana McDuffee
Kurt Štolka
Colleen Barclay
John Nicopoulos
Bethany Chaney

STAFF PRESENT

Bergen Watterson
Marty Roupe

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

GUESTS

Laura Van Sant

I. Call to order

Linda called the TAB meeting to order at 8:05pm.

II. Approval of Minutes (January 19th)

Kurt moved to approve the minutes, Rob seconded. All in favor.

III. Text Amendment to Establish regulations for Facilities that Provide Social Services Including Dining

Kurt asked why the parking requirement should be assigned for the land use rather than for the specific location. He said that he thought that each location would be different and the amount of parking required should depend on the characteristics of the location (i.e. transit availability, how walkable/bikeable, downtown vs. residential). Linda asked where in Town are the B1G, RR and R-20 zones that are being discussed for the text amendment. Marty showed them on the map— B1G is downtown and the other two are more residential neighborhoods that spread out towards the edges of town. Linda asked why the amendment proposes the land use for only those specific zones. Marty answered that the general idea is to provide some separation between these types of uses. He noted that this is other jurisdictions have done, but that Carrboro does not need to follow suit. Bergen mentioned that the Chapel Hill facilities are located on Homestead Road and that the Carrboro zoning nearest to there is R-20. Colleen asked if the amendment includes a buffer requirement between these services. For example, could there be more than one service provider within each zone listed in the amendment? Marty answered that the Board of Aldermen removed the separation/buffer requirements from the amendment. This way the service providers can cluster as long as they are in the appropriate zones. Bringing the conversation back to the parking requirements, Marty noted that the standards are presumptive and that service providers

can ask for reductions or additions, as long as they provide justification. Linda asked how far the site needs to be from a transit stop. The answer is ½ block. Rob said that he does not understand the need for allowing the use only in particular zones. He did not think that the specific zone should matter and suggested taking out the zone requirement from the amendment to allow the service provision anywhere. The group was concerned that this was out of their ‘transportation’ purview, but Bethany urged the group to put this in their comments, particularly in terms of proximity to transit. She also mentioned that there are churches located in every zone, and if the provision of dining facilities is prohibited in certain zones, then churches would not be able to provide this service.

Linda asked what other municipalities of Carrboro’s size have adopted text amendments like this and what their successes have been. Diana said that she thought that the circumstances of this type of service are unique to each location and that it will be difficult to find useful comparisons. Marty mentioned that Bozeman, Montana had a similar text amendment and is similar in size to Carrboro but likely very different in context. Kurt said he thinks that it should be looked at as a Carrboro/Chapel Hill project and treat the community size as ~80,00 instead of ~20,000 people. The service will not be just for Carrboro residents.

Colleen said that she thought that if the ½ block from transit requirement remains in place then it will be difficult to find locations in the R-20 and RR zones for the services. There are few bus stops and the busses that run out there only operate at certain times of day, which would limit people’s ability to access the site. Bethany asked how the parking requirements would work for dining space that may be used also as meeting space. Marty answered that the applicant would need to explain the joint use of space in their parking justification statement in the application. Bergen asked if staff had looked into who would be using the facility, particularly about families that may drive to the location. Marty said that he and other staff had visited the dining facility in downtown Chapel Hill and there were very few cars parked in the lot when they went. He said that they could ask IFC who their anticipated clientele would be. Bethany mentioned that the Board of Aldermen had asked IFC who their predicted clientele would be and they thought that it would be lots of workers and laborers that would come for lunch. She said that the shelter on Homestead Road serves breakfast and dinner so the people who stay at that location would likely eat those meals there.

Comments:

- 1) The use should be allowed in any zone in Town, as long as it meets the transit proximity requirement. The transit requirement should consider the particular route’s schedule and frequency so the site and mealtimes are accessible.
- 2) The TAB would like to hear other examples of other jurisdictions under 100,000 people.

IV. Hilton Garden Inn

The group wanted to discuss the feasibility of installing a mini-roundabout outside the entrance to the hotel instead of the medians that are currently in the plans. A group member mentioned that the roundabout could likely be accommodated if the drop-off area for the hotel was moved to the west. Laura said that the drop-off area needs to be in front of the door and visible from West Main Street. She mentioned that when the new buildings are built where the Arts Center is then there will be more room to work with and they can consider the design then. Rob noted that the reason why he was interested in the roundabout was to serve as a way to slow cars down and provide a sense of uncertainty, which has been shown to make drivers proceed more cautiously. He was particularly concerned about the entrance/exit to the parking deck and the lack of visibility. Laura said that, in her observations, people tend to drive cautiously in that area currently. She commented that the Amante Pizza delivery drivers and the Back Alley Bike employees testing bikes are the only ones speeding through there. Bethany said that she has seen a lot of speeding inside the parking deck and that people tend to be more cautious when they near the exit. Rob said he is concerned about the ‘shortest path’ issue of the crosswalks. He thought that people will cross across the entrance of the parking deck and that is why the TAB had requested a crosswalk there. Laura answered that they do not want to make an unsafe crosswalk official and that they may just need to agree to disagree. Linda suggested adding some markings on the pavement throughout the whole intersection to indicate to cars that they need to pay attention, and make the area more attractive. She brought up Southpoint Mall as an example. Kurt then asked about the lane width in the alley behind the Cat’s Cradle. Laura said that they had narrowed the land width but, due to delivery trucks and fire trucks, cannot narrow the width of the street. The group finished the conversation by reviewing their previous comments and the responses from the applicant.

Comments:

- 1) The TAB would like to see a better solution for pedestrians in the intersection outside the parking deck/hotel entrance:
 - a. Explore creating a visually interesting, distinct pavement surface for the intersection that would serve as a warning to all users that they are entering a mixed-use area, or
 - b. Improve the crossing across the parking deck entrance/exit
- 2) The TAB recommends that the Board of Aldermen strongly encourage the developers to align the parking deck expansion with the hotel construction to ensure that there is adequate public parking in the downtown area in the near future.

V. TAB Elections

Linda nominated Colleen to be the new chair of the TAB. Diana made the motion to nominate and Linda seconded. All in favor.

Rob moved to nominate Diana for vice-chair of the TAB, Kurt seconded. All in favor.

VI. Other Business

Linda told the group that it will have the opportunity to comment again on the Vision2020 document. She reported that two advisory boards did not have a chance to comment on the document, and one of the advisory boards commented on the whole document. She said she thought that the TAB should have the opportunity to comment on the whole document, not just the transportation section as it had done. The group briefly discussed their previous comments on the Climate Action Task Force Report, particularly in relation to the Bolin Creek Greenway. Bethany let the group know that there will be a public hearing on the Climate report and they should attend if they are interested. Linda said she thought that there should be an official process whereby the advisory boards are kept up to date on Town action and discussion related to the topics they are charged with handling. She gave the example that the TAB did not know about the 2/11/16 parking study kick-off meeting until this 2/4 meeting. Bergen noted that the time/date/location for the meeting was not set until a couple of days before.

VII. Staff Report

Bergen let the group know that there is a public meeting in Chapel Hill on 2/9 to discuss bicycle and pedestrian improvements to Estes Drive between MLK Blvd. and Caswell (near the schools). She also repeated the details of the 2/11 parking study kickoff meeting and said that she would email them the flyer and the link to the survey. She asked that they take the survey soon and provide her with any feedback.

The group asked about the Town's process for snow clearing. Bergen and Bethany told them that it was a work in progress, but that Chapel Hill Transit had commended Carrboro's Public Works Department on clearing the snow from bus stops.

Linda let the group know that she will be gone for the next two meetings.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00pm.