



Town of Carrboro

Town Hall
301 W. Main St.
Carrboro, NC 27510

Meeting Minutes Board of Aldermen

Tuesday, April 11, 2017

7:30 PM

Board Chambers - Room 110

Present: Mayor Lydia Lavelle, Alderman Damon Seils, Alderman Bethany Chaney, Alderman Jacquelyn Gist, Alderman Randee Haven-O'Donnell

Absent: Alderman Michelle Johnson, Alderman Sammy Slade

Also Present: David Andrews, Town Manager, Catherine Dorando, Town Clerk, Bob Hornik, Town Attorney

POETRY READING, RESOLUTIONS, PROCLAMATIONS, AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Celisa Steele read a poem by Rebecca Baggett entitled, "Testimony."

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

Mayor Lavelle proclaimed April 2017 as "Child Abuse Prevention Month" in the Town of Carrboro.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING MEETINGS

Catherine Dorando, the Town Clerk, announced the upcoming public meetings.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 28, 2017

MOTION WAS MADE BY ALDERMAN GIST, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HAVEN-O'DONNELL TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 28, 2017, AS AMENDED. VOTE: AFFIRMATIVE FIVE, ABSENT TWO (JOHNSON, SLADE)

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING HB 436 LOCAL GOVERNMENT/REGULATORY FEES

A motion was made by Alderman Chaney, seconded by Alderman Haven-O'Donnell, that this resolution be approved.

**A RESOLUTION OPPOSING HOUSE BILL 436, WHICH WOULD ELIMINATE CERTAIN FEES
ON NEW CONSTRUCTION THAT FUND CRITICAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT
INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS**

Whereas on March 22, 2017, House Bill 436, entitled “An Act Providing that Counties and Cities Shall not Impose Regulatory Fees on New Construction” was filed for consideration by the North Carolina General Assembly;

Whereas the Bill, as written, would eliminate approximately \$2.8 million in revenues for schools in Orange County during a time when capital improvements for safety and growth are particularly critical;

Whereas the Bill, as written, would eliminate a total of \$28.9million in local government revenues for critical infrastructure across the Triangle J Region, an interdependent economic development region of which Carrboro and Orange County are a part;

Whereas the Triangle Region grew by 40,264 residents in 2015-16 and is estimated to grow by another 1 million residents in the next 30-40 years;

Whereas the growth in the region serves as a critical economic development driver not only for the Triangle, but the State of North Carolina as a whole, bringing new jobs and revenue to the state;

Whereas to accommodate the economic development opportunities the growth brings, local governments must have revenues to provide required services like schools, water, sewer and street networks;

Whereas House Bill 436, would eliminate important sources of revenue being used to build this critical infrastructure and services; and

Whereas Orange County would have to consider property tax rate increases estimated to be a minimum of 2 cents, affecting housing costs for more than 21,000 people across more tha 8,700 households, whether they own or rent;

Whereas other individual local governments across the Triangle J Region would have to consider property tax increases ranging from 1.45 to 14 cents to deal with the revenue loss.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we, the members of the Carrboro Board of Aldermen express our opposition to House Bill 436 as it will affect household economies in the Town of Carrboro as well as the infrastructure of our local schools.

The resolution is effective upon adoption.

This 11th day of April, 2017.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Alderman Gist, Alderman Haven-O'Donnell, Alderman Chaney, Alderman Seils and Mayor Lavelle

Absent: Alderman Johnson, Alderman Slade

A PRESENTATION TO INFORM THE BOARD OF ALDERMAN OF PROPOSED FIRE CODE CHANGES

The purpose of this item was to seek Board of Alderman support of the Fire-Rescue Department writing a letter on behalf of the Town of Carrboro in opposition to two proposed Fire Code changes.

Chief Williams provided the staff report. In response to a question from Mayor Lavelle, Chief Williams explained that the Building Code Council reviews the code every six years and that all members of the Building Code Council are appointed by the Governor of North Carolina.

Mayor Lavelle stated that she would also write a letter to Governor Cooper.

A motion was made by Alderman Gist, seconded by Alderman Haven-O'Donnell, that this resolution be approved.

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE FIRE-RESCUE DEPARTMENT TO OPPOSE CHANGES TO THE FIRE CODE

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CARRBORO BOARD OF ALDERMEN THAT:

Section 1: The Fire-Rescue Department is hereby authorized to write a letter on behalf of the Town of Carrboro in opposition to two proposed Fire Code changes.

Section 2. This resolution is effective upon adoption.

This 11th day of April, 2017

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Alderman Gist, Alderman Haven-O'Donnell, Alderman Chaney, Alderman Seils and Mayor Lavelle

Absent: Alderman Johnson, Alderman Slade

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING SB 434 “AN ACT TO AMEND CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES LAWS”

A motion was made by Alderman Gist, seconded by Alderman Haven-O'Donnell, that this resolution be approved.

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING SB 434: AN ACT TO AMEND CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES LAWS

WHEREAS, the North Carolina General Assembly, Environmental Management Commission and Department of Environment Quality have adopted and are implementing many beneficial regulations over many years that respect local government authority, and

WHEREAS, the Town of Carrboro and its citizens have been leaders over the years in protecting the environment in water quality, land use regulation, stream buffer protection, open space preservation, and stormwater management, and

WHEREAS, The Town has administered Land Use Ordinance provisions for regulating riparian buffers since 1983; and

WHEREAS, in 2015, the NC General Assembly passed Session Law 2015-246 limiting local authority to implement buffer provisions that are more restrictive than State provisions, and in 2016 Carrboro engaged in an extensive review process including preparing a report documenting the scientific evidence supporting the buffer provisions in the Land Use Ordinance. In doing so, the Town obtained State approval to continue to enforce local buffer provisions, and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina General Assembly is actively reviewing a bill, SB 434, that is based on the premise that "...[a] local government should apply riparian buffer standards that do not exceed established State or federal standards in order to assure uniformity of regulation throughout the State", and

WHEREAS, this premise is contrary to many decades of environmental policy in North Carolina, and

WHEREAS, the bill applies to a broad spectrum of "local government actions, including, but not limited to, zoning, subdivision control, flood control, or water supply watershed protection ordinances, comprehensive plan, policy, resolution, condition of approval imposed on an applicant for approval of a development plan, or special or conditional permit, or other measure", and

WHEREAS, according to NC League of Municipalities staff, SB 434 could potentially cause stormwater permit holders, including Carrboro, to violate regulatory requirements, and

WHEREAS, additionally, the bill adds flood control to the list of reasons a local government can't have a larger buffer, harming a community's ability to protect property from flooding; and,

WHEREAS, there may be other unknown and undesirable consequences of the provisions in SB 434.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Carrboro Board of Aldermen oppose SB 434 for the aforementioned reasons.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution is provided to the legislative delegation.

The resolution is effective upon adoption.

This 11th day of April, 2017.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: Alderman Gist, Alderman Haven-O'Donnell, Alderman Chaney, Alderman Seils and Mayor Lavelle

Absent: Alderman Johnson, Alderman Slade

WORK SESSION

DRAFT COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

The purpose of this item was to present the draft Communications Plan to the Board of Alderman and receive feedback on the draft plan.

Julie Eckenrode, Assistant to the Town Manager, made the staff presentation and presented the Draft Communications Plan.

The following notes were taken as comments from the Board:

Question 1: What additional information should the Town communicate to stakeholders?

- The type of meeting (regular, work session, public hearing) should be indicated on the agenda.
- Investigate if the town can sign-up to use Next Door.
- Provide ways for people to know about various volunteer opportunities (not just advisory boards).
- Important to identify a staff point person for communications and so the Board of Aldermen knows who to contact.
- Establish a chain of command for the communication in the policy.
- Had communications issues during water crisis – what can we do to prevent that from re-occurring?
- Consistency and accuracy of messaging.
- Notifications of any changes that are happening that are of community interest/concern (ie CVS corner update).
- Single webpage for these interests/concerns.
- Development projects each having their own webpage.
- This about how we get our message out without spinning.
- Making sure we reach more than the most politically invested people.
- Holding board meetings in different locations occasionally.
- Look into technology solutions to concerns over recording/streaming.

Question 2 In addition to current methods, how should the Town communicate? Are these methods represented in the draft communications plan?

- Have more documents available in Spanish.
- Look into sites that translate language.
- Examine partners to reach specific audiences and include community representatives on

emergency communication.

- The communications plan needs to be both proactive and reactive.
- Summarize Board of Aldermen meetings and decisions that were made.
- PIO needs to eventually be a fulltime position. Should be discussed in FY18/19 Budget.
- Should there be different Twitter accounts for departments or should the Town have just one Twitter account?
- Text messaging is powerful.
- There's a difference between communicating well and communicating often.
- Work on ability to communicate/present in a clear and understandable manner for the public – in a way that you don't have to have an advanced degree to understand it.
- Accessibility issues for the public
- Have a consistent look and structure for presentations and agenda items.
- Ask ourselves, what does this mean to the community and what's the impact of it?
- Experts are out there that can help us (including in the UNC communications department)
- County has a meeting summary that is sent out the day after a meeting – basic summary of key points.
 - After the meeting – the chair does a video summary of what happened at the meeting
 - Could do a meeting preview as well
- What capacity do we have as a town to provide those in other languages?
- Much of what is in the plan is tech heavy – want to make sure we leave room for more traditional communicating – think about where people gather and other methods for reaching people.
- Foster relationship with DTH.
- Intro to Carrboro – Carrboro Gov 101.
- Booths at festivals to communicate with the public.
- Do you have questions about Carrboro – ask us!
- Like the idea of the electronic signage but default more to the less tech solution – feels more Carrboro and believe people would respond better to it.
- Poster app.

Question 3: How should the Town inform stakeholder about upcoming public hearing?

- Investigate a weekly calendar that goes to Listserve on Mondays to highlight the events of the week.
- Clean up agenda item title language; make it plain speak so people understand.
- Maybe canvass events to ask people to sign-up for listserves.
- Consider a one-time mailing to let people know about how to get information.
- Could have an Instagram section dedicated to just images of the town. Somehow mimic mailed notices but via email – listservs that cover the area, etc.
- Could do newsletter (town week) and have a section in it for public hearings
- Identify the top 5 reasons why people visit the website and have them as quick links – projects as one of the quick links.

DISCUSSION OF TINY HOMES

The purpose of this work session was for the Board to discuss Tiny Homes and to consider whether and how this type of dwelling may offer new housing options for Carrboro.

The following notes were taken as comments from the Board:

- Opportunities for infill - affordable housing, fund subsidies
- 500 sq. ft. tiny homes – more bang for the buck - appealing to aging seniors
- Club Nova - Getting out
- Orange County Dept. On Aging – interest in diversification housing stock – particularly for women
- Penny Lane – example of one story
- Mobile Home Park – opportunity to capture value – convert with tiny home with approval for similar population
- Could tear down house and put 2 tiny homes
- Get density – doesn't disrupt neighborhoods – could potentially be less disruptive than bigger houses
- We could probably approach Rocky Brook Collaborative ...opportunity with Orange County
- Could purchase property and work toward partnership with home trust
- Cost per house – Penny Lane
- No land costs
- We could proactively approach Rocky Brook Collaborative – seek other partnerships with Orange County
- Communities infill or new communities
- Church of the Advocate – Homestead Road – Greene Tract possible candidate?
Collaborative opportunity
- 3 different categories of opportunities
 - Tiny homes on wheels (considered RV's) zoned for private/public RV Park – flip after 6 months in Carrboro or Orange County
 - 1b. secondary unit – accessory home – so homeowner can earn \$ without cost other than infrastructure hookup (water/sewer)
 - Small homes for special populations like Penny Lane – alternative to apartments
 - Cottage – on permanent foundation 125-440 sq. ft. as secondary units or bungalow court on small lots in a back yard

What do you find appealing about tiny homes?

- Can provide additional income as accessory dwelling units, ability to age in place
- How do we zone for these development
- Exercise similar to chicken coups to understand
- Want people to build tiny homes on tiny lots, ability to scale
- What changes could be made to the ordinance to create a zoning district that would allow that
- Provides additional housing options and relative affordability because of the size of the home

Concerns:

- How do we prevent it from becoming just additional student housing?
- Might need to be built by a nonprofit or public-private partnership
- Safety concerns – sometimes only have one entrance, concern against weather – fire
- If we are looking to make a change, start with homes on foundations
- Prioritize accessory dwellings over tiny lots
- Topic we want to make sure we fully address over the next year
- If we do create a zoning district for a tiny home village, how big do we want to allow it to be? 3 units, 50, 100 units?

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION WAS MADE BY ALDERMAN GIST, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN CHANEY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. VOTE: AFFIRMATIVE FIVE, ABSENT TWO (JOHNSON, SLADE)