

## **Carrboro Connects Public Hearing Draft – Public Comments**

### **March 2022**

THE FOLLOWING REPRESENTS ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS SUBMITTED SINCE NOVEMBER 16, 2021 IN RELATION TO CARRBORO CONNECTS AS OF MARCH 4, 2022. COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED THROUGH THE PROJECT WEBSITE AS WELL AS EMAIL.

**Respondent No:** 1**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Nov 23, 2021 11:19:43 am**Last Seen:** Nov 23, 2021 11:19:43 am**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Please share any feedback you have on the Public Hearing Draft Plan! If relevant, please specify the chapter/goal/strategy/project with your comment.**

Here are a few comments on the draft of the comprehensive plan. First, thanks for the efforts. Implemented as written, it is a huge improvement on the current LUO. But that was not a hard feat, given the huge inadequacies of the old planning regime. I, however, think that the plan is too little and too late. The goals are great, but will the plan achieve those goals? Housing is one area where the plan is too little and too late. Not very bold. It would be helpful to have the reasoning of the plan fully laid out for Carrboro residents to examine. We have a huge affordability crisis in town. When Durham went forward with their Expanding Housing Opportunities initiative, they devoted time and resources to explain the "why" of the proposal. They included presentations and a solid review of the literature through links that would help citizens evaluate why the proposal would address the problems it was trying to solve. The public hearing phase of the plan needs some degree of outward facing education. It should also include likely scenarios as to what will happen in the town in a "business as unusual" scenario. What will happen with housing affordability, traffic, climate related impacts, taxes, etc., if we continue down the path we have been on. What is the outlook with the new plan? Is there a third alternative or others that will meet the goals of the new plan better? I would find it very helpful for someone to explain, for example, how the plan gets people in the NoGro neighborhoods (north of Greensboro) out of their cars or helps them reduce the number of trips in some future 15 minute town scenario given that they are not near any of the planned corridors and that the town is very disconnected from north to south. As I see the new plan, those neighborhoods still will produce heavy flows of traffic and offer few alternatives for reduced car dependency. Also, how does the plan add to affordability in those neighborhoods? I would also find it helpful if someone would explain how the plan actually gets the housing we need built in the numbers of units needed at a pace that would actually make a difference given that so little of the future LUO maps allow for multiple-unit housing. Who will build it? Who will own it? Will it all be next to the highway and further the economic segregation of the town? Again, I'll point out that commercial lots have sat empty for years because no one wants to go through the hassle and risk of going through the current process in Carrboro. According to my reading of the plan and the maps, missing middle housing still seems to be missing in the great majority of the land area of our town. It would be nice to know how many total acres are dedicated to single family zoning in our current LUO and compare that to the number of total acres in the new comprehensive plan. How many new acres are switched from single to multi-family zoning. If, as many historians have pointed out in depth, single family zoning walks hand in hand with social exclusion and segregation, how does this plan centered on equity leave so much of the town's single family zoning untouched? Multi-unit housing is how working class people can outbid the rich for expensive land. The plan restricts that collective power to a very small slice of our land area. Sadly, the plan asks that we "consider" or "investigate" far too many critical items. Carrboro government is really good at considering and investigating things-- they can do it for years and years. I may be wrong, but from my quick read, it seems to punt on all the really hard issues that some progressive communities are successfully addressing in their comprehensive plans. And finally, while the plan uses all the right buzz words of the moment, it needs to set forth some common understanding of what they really mean in the context of the plan and in the context of the town. For example, walkability. Does it mean an exclusive suburb with sidewalks where it is nice to walk a dog? Or is it something else? Where does walkability currently exist (or does it?) and what can we expect to see as we enhance it throughout the town? Another great example is "character." What does that mean? And to whom? I have lived here for almost 30 years and have no idea what you mean by the word as used in the plan. Most of Carrboro is automobile dependant suburbs with very low walkability scores. Is that the "character" we are trying to promote? A lot of Carrboro is segregated by income. The term needs a precise definition if it remains in the plan. Things that should be in the plan: Simple, broadly applicable fixes that are being rolled out in other progressive cities and towns: end single family zoning, add ADU regulations that ensure that they actually get built, end parking minimums, and end free parking. Deal with the design mistakes of the past in the street network-- long stretches of road with no signals and no intersections are not safe and don't promote walkability. Greensboro, Hillsborough, and Main streets need some sort of treatment in this plan. It's also hard to argue that a street with traffic that regularly is over 40 mph is a "family" neighborhood and should be zoned as such. Upzone the area around the Farmer's Market. The market is a significant investment but sits empty most days of the week. Adding mixed use density to the area will bring more people and activate it on other days of

the week. Downtown should not be restricted to two streets that run from Jones Ferry to Eastgate in Chapel Hill. We need a thicker downtown. Main Street? Carrboro is one of the few towns I have been to where Main Street isn't really Main Street. Extend zoning changes so that Main Street can actually be a Main Street. Where is the transit for transit oriented density? Where will the future high frequency routes be that will actually get people out of their cars in significant numbers? We do have transit oriented density, but the transit we are oriented around is cars. Much of the density on the west and south sides of town doesn't add to the liveliness or vitality of the streets in Carrboro because it is car oriented and adds density but not urbanity. Don't make the same mistakes now. The plan leaves the most wealthy neighborhoods untouched. The plan should figure out how to add affordable housing to the most wealth segregated neighborhoods and should have a plan for using affordable housing fees and HOA's as a force for change rather than the force for exclusion and the status quo that they have been in the past. Figure out how to expedite your decisions-- 9 years or more for a park? How is that responsive to citizens? Re-designing Main Street was mentioned at least 5 years ago and nothing has happened. The delay in the various processes that Carrboro has created does not serve its citizens on the whole. The various choke-points you have created have empowered and served wealthy NIMBY's at the expense of the town's other residents, but they have not given us the high quality places that we all deserve.

Q2. <b>Age</b>	45-54
Q3. <b>About Me</b>	I reside in Carrboro
Q4. <b>How long have you lived in the Carrboro area?</b>	20+ years
Q5. <b>What is your primary language spoken at home?</b>	English
Q6. <b>Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?</b>	White
Q7. <b>Preferred Pronouns</b>	He, him, his
Q8. <b>Gender</b>	not answered

**Respondent No:** 2**Login:** James Yankaskas**Email:** pwsjry@med.unc.edu**Responded At:** Nov 30, 2021 06:49:23 am**Last Seen:** Nov 30, 2021 14:47:24 pm**IP Address:** 173.95.183.59

**Q1. Please share any feedback you have on the Public Hearing Draft Plan! If relevant, please specify the chapter/goal/strategy/project with your comment.**

I strongly support the further development of affordable housing in our area. As a 40+ year resident and a long-term UNC employee I observed the contributions of many local individuals to our community. Rising housing costs limit residential options for many essential workers. This can lead to longer commutes, more traffic, parking problems, and community disruption. Habitat for Humanity helps many working families through their housing work, volunteers, and thoughtful planning. Carrboro's leaders and community are in an ideal position to continue and increase such affordable housing efforts.

<b>Q2. Age</b>	65-74
<b>Q3. About Me</b>	I reside in the Northern Transition Area, Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction Area, or Other
<b>Q4. How long have you lived in the Carrboro area?</b>	20+ years
<b>Q5. What is your primary language spoken at home?</b>	English
<b>Q6. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?</b>	White
<b>Q7. Preferred Pronouns</b>	not answered
<b>Q8. Gender</b>	Male



**Respondent No:** 3**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 02, 2021 16:57:49 pm**Last Seen:** Dec 02, 2021 16:57:49 pm**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Please share any feedback you have on the Public Hearing Draft Plan! If relevant, please specify the chapter/goal/strategy/project with your comment.**

Just a factual correction: on page 13 of the introduction, the section On Language, it states that Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term "intersectionality" 20 years ago. She used the word in a published work for the first time in 1989, 32 years ago. She also has said repeatedly that she didn't come up with the concept and pointed to a much longer history of intersectional advocacy by Black women.

**Q2. Age** 35-44

**Q3. About Me** I reside in Carrboro

**Q4. How long have you lived in the Carrboro area?** 11 - 20 years

**Q5. What is your primary language spoken at home?** English

**Q6. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?** White

**Q7. Preferred Pronouns** They, them, theirs

**Q8. Gender** **Other (please specify)**  
Nonbinary

**Respondent No:** 4**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Dec 02, 2021 18:22:15 pm**Last Seen:** Dec 02, 2021 18:22:15 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Please share any feedback you have on the Public Hearing Draft Plan! If relevant, please specify the chapter/goal/strategy/project with your comment.**

Still too many "consider"s. We could make this a much shorter and more focused document if we either found an action to take or struck the project from the plan. "Consider" to me, means either that we can't agree on what to do, or that we don't really care about the topic. The former needs more attention to find a resolution, the latter doesn't belong in a comprehensive plan.

Q2. **Age** 35-44

Q3. **About Me** I reside in Carrboro

Q4. **How long have you lived in the Carrboro area?** 11 - 20 years

Q5. **What is your primary language spoken at home?** English

Q6. **Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?** White

Q7. **Preferred Pronouns** They, them, theirs

Q8. **Gender** **Other (please specify)**  
Nonbinary

**Respondent No:** 5**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 26, 2022 09:03:44 am**Last Seen:** Jan 26, 2022 09:03:44 am**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Please share any feedback you have on the Public Hearing Draft Plan! If relevant, please specify the chapter/goal/strategy/project with your comment.**

I object to the basic premise of allocating resources derived from ALL TAXPAYERS to the priority benefit of one group , BIPOC. BIPOC groups may not be disadvantaged simply because of their skin color or background. Plenty of not otherwise delineated white people live in Carrboro TOO I support equalizing resources but not the emphasis on BIPOC. EQUALITY not ill defined preferences to a certain politically favored group is what I think will move us forward without fueling resentment between tax paying citizens,

**Q2. Age** 65-74

**Q3. About Me** I reside in Carrboro

**Q4. How long have you lived in the Carrboro area?** not answered

**Q5. What is your primary language spoken at home?** English

**Q6. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?** White

**Q7. Preferred Pronouns** She, her, hers

**Q8. Gender** Female

**Respondent No:** 6**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Jan 26, 2022 09:13:35 am**Last Seen:** Jan 26, 2022 09:13:35 am**IP Address:** n/a

**Q1. Please share any feedback you have on the Public Hearing Draft Plan! If relevant, please specify the chapter/goal/strategy/project with your comment.**

I resent the feedback form asking REQUIRED questions about age sex etc. These questions make it too easy for you to ignore my replies as some old white woman- seems every aspect of this proposal is geared to prioritize some groups while ignoring others who don't fit the pre-desired outcome. This entire exercise is unfair in that it pits citizens allocated tax funded resources against each other based on segmented grouping. Why not allocate resources equally among all citizens? We all have different needs and they are NOT always based on race sex age group affiliation. The entire premise of this document is offensive to me as it aims to allocate resources strictly to some groups over others- just another method of discrimination- discrimination is wrong no matter the supposed reason, - it is inherently unfair.

**Q2. Age** Under 18

**Q3. About Me** I reside in Carrboro

**Q4. How long have you lived in the Carrboro area?** Not applicable

**Q5. What is your primary language spoken at home?** Other

**Q6. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?** **Other (please specify)**  
None of your business

**Q7. Preferred Pronouns** **Other (please specify)**  
None of your business

**Q8. Gender** **Other (please specify)**  
None of your business

To: Carrboro Connects

January 2022

Hello. All

I moved to Carrboro several years ago when it was time for me to downsize. I found a small condo on Fidelity St. where I'd be within walking distance of most things I'd need – stores, gym, farmers' market, etc.

Carrboro also has nice parks, and I'd driven to, and enjoyed them for years. Alas, my dog and I quickly realized they were not within convenient walking distance on this side of town.

BUT: We DO have the meadow beside Westwood Cemetery, and there are five or six condo and apartment complexes within a ten minute walk of this lovely green space. These buildings are filled with students, young families, working folks, and older people – like me, for example.

We all need this outdoor space: to breathe, to picnic, to see the sky, to exercise, to play with kids and, dogs, and simply to enjoy. It makes no sense to take away such a place.

Very sincerely,  
Jean G. Call

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jean G. Call".

119 Fidelity St. Unit E4  
Carrboro



**Please restore the ParkServe parks priority map and  
please remove (or revamp) the Walkshed map**

Comments on November draft of Carrboro Connects Comprehensive Plan

Bob Proctor February 10, 2022

The September draft of the CC comprehensive plan (CCCP) included a map on p.134 that indicated the highest priority areas of Carrboro for receiving new parks. This ParkServe map was obtained from the Trust for Public Lands. They arrived at their recommended areas by giving weight to the data for the following six important parameters: population density, density of low income households, density of people of color, community health, urban heat islands, and pollution burden. But this insightful map was deleted from the November draft of the CCCP. From 2017 through 2020 our progressive friends urged federal agencies to listen to the data-driven advice formulated by subject area experts. On this matter I would similarly urge you to respect the conclusions of these outside experts by restoring the ParkServe map to the comprehensive plan.

Since providing equitable treatment by the Town to all Carrboro residents over the next 20 years is the primary overarching theme of this comprehensive plan, it is not surprising that the words 'equity' and 'equitable' occur 180 times in the 256 page November draft. Anyone familiar with Carrboro and its parks can readily see that the distribution of parkland and park facilities is highly inequitable when the parks south of Main Street are compared to the parks north of Main Street: To measure equity one must take into account the size of a park, how many facilities it contains, and how many nearby residents must share its space. Although thousands of residents live in multi-family homes south of Main Street, the only Town parks on that side of town are small or tiny, are located on or near Main Street itself, and have scant facilities. In contrast, all four of Carrboro's sizable multi-facility parks are north of Main Street, on the largely privileged side of town where most homes already are surrounded by their own greenery. The deleted ParkServe map reflected this obvious "common sense" analysis: all of its dark purple "Very High Priority" area was south of Main Street.

The deletion of this map is especially concerning because not only has it been replaced by a 10-minute Walkshed map, a sentence that refers to the new Walkshed map has also been added: On p.145 the November draft lists several "Criteria for parkland acquisition and capital improvements" in a new sidebar. The last of these criteria, "Land/project would provide greater access to households that are currently more than a 10-minute walk from a park", is saying to anyone who happens to live within a ten minute walk of *any* patch of land currently designated as a "park" that their needs for natural space and park

facilities have been satisfied. This is unfair to people who live close to several of the designated "parks"; to illustrate this we begin with the two most extreme examples:

The Simpson and Brewer "mini-parks" should really be called "micro-parks". The Simpson park, whose usable area is only 0.16 acre, consists of nothing but a fenced-in playground for children under 7. The hundreds of people living in the apartment homes on both sides of NC-54 near Carrboro Plaza are within a 10-minute walk of this tiny patch of land. No unaccompanied adult male can hang out in this park without scaring away young families and possibly even being called into the police. Apart from the playground there is just one uncovered picnic table (without a brazier). There is no good place to park (not even on the street, given the steep shoulders and another nearby intersection). The Brewer park, whose usable area is only 0.25 acre, consists of nothing but an old badly slanted basketball court surrounded by two small grassy areas: Most of that "park" property is leased to a community pre-school, which has fenced in their playground as a private entity. On weekdays none of the parking spaces are available to the public before 6:00pm. Perhaps two hundred low income folks live in the adjacent neighborhood. This "park" is worthless to any of them who do not play basketball. To tell any of these people, or any of the people living near Carrboro Plaza, that their needs for natural space and recreational facilities have been met is an affront.

Were all 11 of the parks and facilities listed in the R & P brochure automatically included for the formation of the Walkshed map?

I have heard from one source that the Town's image with the County has already been damaged by the Town ignoring Carolina North when computing parkland available. If a Carrboro resident within ten minutes of UNC's Carolina North (or Chapel Hill's Hargraves pool) wants to walk in nature (or go swimming) they are not going to care about which government entity is managing the space. That UNC space and that Chapel Hill park should simply be included in the Walkshed map without using a special color. Moreover, if someone wants to go jogging on the grounds of a public school on the weekend, they are not going to be concerned with whether the Town holds some obscure contract with the school district for that space. Public schools tend to be evenly distributed geographically, their grounds can confidently used only on the weekends (by lone adult males who don't want to be feel skittish about being near a school), and they are usually good only for jogging. So all schools should be ignored when forming a map. Carrboro Elementary School (details below) and Smith Soccer Fields should be ignored. If you don't play soccer, then how are those soccer fields being less than a ten minute walk away from your home relevant to the question at hand?

The Century Center is a valuable resource, and it is true that dancing groups use it and some exercise classes are held there. But since it is entirely indoors it does not provide any contact with nature. Relatively few people live within a ten minute walk of it; what our downtown is currently lacking is a natural space (other than the privately owned WSM front (plastic) "lawn"). It would be best to simply delete the Century Center from this analysis. This analysis should include only the four real parks (Anderson, MLK, Wilson/Adams, Baldwin), and (once their small areas and their high population service areas are taken into account) the Town Commons mini-park and the Simpson and Brewer micro-parks.

In 1954 in their Brown decision the Supreme Court ruled that "separate but equal" is inherently impossible since separate always implies unequal. Please contrast the mono-facilities offered by the tiny Simpson and Brewer Parks with the multiple gold-plated facilities in the large MLK Park, which is in the heart of the most privileged part of Carrboro. The contrast becomes more glaring when one computes the numbers of residents who live within ten minute walks of those three parks. To obtain true equity the Town should aspire to offer an equal amount of natural space per person and an equal number of facilities per person. After all, the General Parks Facilities Comparisons table on p.157 compares the numbers of acres of parkland per 1000 residents for Carrboro overall to the nationwide average for this statistic for comparably sized towns. A good example of this is provided by Town Commons: It could reasonably be called a "mini-park" since it offers a little bit of open green space and four facilities. However (as the description below indicates) not only does it pale in comparison even to Baldwin Park (much less than to Wilson, MLK, and Anderson Parks), it is surrounded by hundreds of residents within a ten minute walk (in contrast to those parks). So the residents living near it are not now being equitably served by it.

Using the Walkshed map in its current form will help to lock in the existing inequitable distribution of natural spaces, parklands, and park facilities. In my humble opinion I feel that the November draft gives too much emphasis to the 10-minute walk concept. Although proximity is extremely important, having a sharp cut-off at 10 minutes is likely to lead to some strange conclusions. Nonetheless, if it is retained, my companion document, 'If the Walkshed map is ...', proposes incorporating the acres per 1000 residents metric into the 10-minute Walkshed map. This proposed map, which could be easily prepared, would not address the number of facilities available but it would still paint a much fairer picture for the siting of our next park than the current Walkshed map would. Even if the Walkshed map is improved in this manner the ParkServe map should still be restored to the comprehensive plan.

## **\*\* Park Details \*\***

**Town Commons Mini-Park:** You can't use it during a prime recreation time, before 1:00pm on Saturdays (which is 25% of weekend daylight hours). Even if all three of its parking lots are ignored, the center grass is only 21% of its roughly square area. Since it has no large trees it is difficult to describe it as providing a "natural space": Its paved areas add up to 55% of its squarish area, with its border grass and trees comprising the remaining 24%. It is surrounded by two large parking lots, a busy street, and a noisy car wash. Its two large parking lots, along with Town Hall and the gym and their parking lots, form one of the most intense urban heat islands in Carrboro. This means that exercising in it during the summer months is more unpleasant (and riskier) than exercising in the large green parks on the northside of town. (It does contain four facilities: covered spaces, a pair of picnic tables, a tiny playground, and restrooms.)

**Carrboro Elementary School "Park":** There is no signage at the school that indicates that some of its grounds are somehow regarded as forming a Town park. The Recreation and Parks' brochure states that this "park" is open on weekdays from 3:00pm to dark. However, the only sign on the school property states "These Grounds Are Reserved for School Use Only Mon-Fri 7:00am-6:00pm"! I recently decided to brave the danger of the cops being called when I entered at 5:30pm on a Friday, since there were still a dozen children playing on the equipment (overseen by some sort of official adult). On the hidden baseball field in the back I did see an adult male dog walker and an adult male jogger; they must have entered via the signless back entrance. The R & P brochure lists the following facilities: youth baseball field, basketball court, play equipment, open space. How is this different than any other schoolyard? What is the point of including this particular school in the analysis at hand?

**If the Walkshed map is retained,  
please incorporate sizes-of-parks and populations-served**

Proposal to improve November draft of Carrboro Connects Comprehensive Plan

Bob Proctor February 9, 2022

For the consideration of the creation of new parks the November draft of the CC comprehensive plan (CCCP) replaced the ParkServe map with a new Walkshed map. As the accompanying document 'Please restore ...' indicated, the ParkServe map accurately reflected the current inequitable distribution of parks within Carrboro while the Walkshed map has several inequitable shortcomings. In my humble opinion I feel that the November draft gives too much emphasis to the 10-minute walk concept. Although proximity is extremely important, having a sharp cut-off at 10 minutes is likely to lead to some strange conclusions. Nonetheless, in case it is retained, here it is indicated how the Walkshed map could be improved to give a much more accurate view of how the Town can more accurately provide equitable access to nearby natural spaces and parks for its residents.

Most importantly, please consider first revising the new sidebar on p.145 as follows. This will better align this sidebar with the overarching theme of the comprehensive plan, in which the words 'equity' and 'equitable' appear 180 times over 256 pages. The title for this sidebar is "Criteria for parkland acquisition and capital improvements". First delete the last sentence, which pertains to 10-minute walksheds. Please consider replacing it with a new first bullet point. This emphasizes equity with respect to both quantity and quality, without limiting its scope by referring to the somewhat-arbitrary 10-minute walkable metric:

"• Land/project would enhance access to natural spaces and parks which are equitable both with respect to nearby acres per 1000 population served and with respect to population per nearby facility available."

### **Principals for Refinement of Walkshed Map**

- As the recent inclusion of the General Parks Facilities Comparisons table on p.157 of the November draft indicated, it is important not only to have some parkland within a 10-minute walk of as many residents as possible, the *amount* of parkland provided per resident is also a crucial metric to achieve equity.
- When determining the population served by a park it should be kept in mind that people are not going to hesitate to cross town lines and they will not care which government entity is managing a tract or a facility.
- Schools are more or less evenly distributed geographically and they tend to have similarly limited facilities. Their grounds can be accessed only during limited times. For the sake of simplicity it seems best to ignore all school grounds, whether or not our R & P department happens to have some kind of contractual arrangement in place with the school district.



## 9 Parks to Include (and 3 to Ignore)

Please see 'Please restore ...' for the rationales.

Parks & Natural Areas: Anderson, MLK, Wilson/Adams, Baldwin, Hargraves, Carolina North.

Mini-Park: Town Commons

Micro-Parks: Simpson, Brewer

Please Ignore: indoors-only Century Center, Carrboro Elementary schoolyard, Smith Soccer Fields.

## Map Colors

After deleting the three facilities listed above, begin with the Walkshed map.

Pale Yellow: Do not shade any land outside of Carrboro's boundaries, with the following exception ... do shade all areas pale yellow that are outside of Carrboro but within the 10-minute walkshed of any of the 9 listed parks. (This is being done to indicate which nearby non-Carrboro areas are contributing people to a park's service burden.)

Shades of Pink & Red for Non-Walkable Areas: Within Carrboro's boundaries, shade all areas that are not within a 10-minute walk of one of the 9 listed parks with some shade of pink or red. The lightest pink would be used for the most sparsely populated non-walkable areas and the darkest red would be used for the most densely populated non-walkable areas. (All of these areas have 0 acres of parkland within a 10-minute walk.) Dark red would indicate the most "unparked per person" parts of Town.

Shades of Blue & Purple for Walkable Areas: For the areas within a 10-minute walk of some park we want to indicate (as in the table on p.157) just how many people (within Carrboro and outside of Carrboro) are using each acre in that park. For example, suppose a 1 acre park has 1000 people living within a 10-minute walk of it. (For now also suppose that its walkshed does not overlap with the walkshed of any other park.) Then its walkshed would be shaded with a shade of blue/purple that would indicate that it is providing 1.0 acre per 1000 residents within its 10-minute service area. If a large park was situated in a thinly populated part of town (e.g. MLK) then its statistic might be something like 10.0 acres per 1000 residents. Shade it pale blue to indicate that those folks are being "amply-parked". If a small park was situated in a densely populated part of town (e.g. Town Commons) then its statistic might be something like 0.1 acres per 1000 residents. Shade it dark purple, to indicate that it has the highest need for more parkland within the "under-parked" parts of Town.

Overlapping Walksheds: Here and there there may be small areas that are within a 10-minute walk of two parks, e.g. the homes midway between Wilson and Town Commons. Those areas would given the shade of blue that indicates the sum of the two density stats for the two walksheds that it is in.

## **Other Possible Maps**

- If there is only one map: If the Walkshed map is converted into just one map as suggested above then the acres in Adams should be added to the acres in Wilson to obtain one Wilson/Adams tract.
- A Natural Spaces map: It would be nice to prepare a second map that would indicate access to natural spaces using the same acres-per-1000-residents metric. Then Adams could be removed from Wilson/Adams in the first map. The Simpson park would be removed from the Natural Spaces map. The sizes of Brewer and of Town Commons would be cut in half for Natural Spaces; the latter mini-park is 55% pavement.
- A Facilities map: It would be nice to prepare a third map that would indicate access to recreational facilities. Then the Century Center would be listed. If a Natural Space map had been prepared then the Adams tract could be ignored for the facilities map, apart from its trails being counted as a facility for Wilson. A scoring system could be developed to indicate how many facilities are available at each site. Both Simpson and Brewer would receive scores of '1' (for playground-only and for basketball-only). Town Commons would receive a score of '4' (pavilion, play area, two picnic tables, restrooms). MLK Park would receive a score over '20'. It has two covered picnic areas (each with multiple tables and braziers), a jogging track, a pair of exercise stations on that track, a mini-amphitheater, a large and luxurious play area, a pump track, a community garden, and plush (heated!) restrooms. Not to mention 9 benches and 18 garbage cans!

**Ben Berolzheimer**

---

**From:** Mary Bryant  
**Sent:** Friday, February 18, 2022 2:38 PM  
**To:** Ben Berolzheimer  
**Cc:** Trish McGuire  
**Subject:** FW: flawed infill policy

---

**From:** Richard Ellington <outlook\_41CF9C58A0763675@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 18, 2022 11:10 AM  
**To:** PublicComment <publiccomment@carrboronc.gov>  
**Subject:** flawed infill policy

The town of Carrboro seems hell-bent on covering every piece of urban grass with driveways and buildings. A once generous-sized lot on the corner of High and Old Hillsborough streets that originally had only one small house, a nice lawn and greenery and an accessory structure now has five dwellings on it. This is shameful.

The town that once was p[populated by a couple of thousand citizens is now about TEN TIMES that with only a small increase in area. Living cheek by jowl with your neighbors may be a thing, good or bad, but I see no reason to find out.

For years we have had flooding issues in various location in our town. Tom's Creek is the classic example. The trailer park on South Greensboro Street is another. It has been determined by a number of experts in various reports to the town government that something needs to be done about controlling the flow and rate of runoff after storm events BUT the town government has done very little to actually address this issue. One of the reasons for the increase in rate and rate of runoff is housing density and impervious surface from the increased infill.

The town government needs to either get serious about reducing the rapid infill rate OR deal seriously with runoff. This is part of the town council's job.

Respectfully submitted, Richard Ellington

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

**Ben Berolzheimer**

---

**From:** Rob LaVelle <rlavelle@cfsnc.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 22, 2022 6:16 PM  
**To:** council  
**Subject:** comprehensive plan thoughts

Dear Town Council,

I'll offer a brief note about the comprehensive plan because I cannot attend tonight's meeting. I do hope to retire in a progressive southern town, and the plan still offers me, a teacher, healthy prospects in that regard. But unfortunately, it looks like the progressive southern town will be one in Uruguay or Chile instead of Carrboro. My big fear is that the plan is not a significant enough departure from business as usual, and by not doing enough, we will continue to see housing prices spiral upward even after full implementation. Luckily, I'll be able to sell my small house for an insane pile of money to finance the transition! If only others had that same option.

There is a lot to consider in the plan and in the feedback on the plan, but I think one comment from the Transportation Advisory Board cuts to the quick: "The land uses proposed in the Future Land Use Map are insufficient to meet the Town's CCAP GHG emissions reduction goal of 80% which is included as a goal in Carrboro Connects. The future land use map should be revised to include increased density and additional mixed-use development within the downtown and the immediate surroundings to help meet this goal. This is needed to significantly reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled, which is both a metric of the transportation section, and has a significant impact on reducing transportation emissions to reach the 80% GHG reduction goal." Truly said.

The plan needs to get serious about some serious numbers, primarily, what is the magic number of people per square mile that gets people out of their cars and into alternative modes of transportation, including public transportation. This number is not a mystery. Urban geographers know it. The consultants writing this plan probably know it, I hope. And the land use maps as presented in the plan are a long way from getting us to that point.

I have written to you earlier on the plan's missing housing, so I won't linger there, but I will offer three more pieces of advice

First, the plan needs to be clear about the relationship between building housing in general and affordable housing in particular. The plan talks a lot about affordable housing, but it really skirts lightly around the question of why housing is so expensive in Carrboro in the first place: supply restrictions. I may be wrong, but it doesn't seem to mention market-rate housing very much. I really do wish we could create a broad right to shelter in the US independent of market conditions, but to ignore the role of the wider market in capitalist America is negligent in any comprehensive plan. The best way to preserve and protect NOAF is to build enough housing in the first place. The plan needs to address the supply issues we have and the rectify the fact that it is really hard to build anything other than single family homes on most town lots.

Second, the plan needs to be clear about how fine-grained or coarse-grained future development will be. The plan seems to be pushing the broad development of large parcels of land on Jones Ferry and 54, and also in Calvander and Rodgers/Estes. The plan does not seem to push the easy redevelopment of fine grained infill projects closer to the town core. This is a mistake. The crappiest places on Earth are all master-planned, coarse-grained developments built to a finished state by one contractor. The coolest places on Earth are all fine-grained products of many, many hands.

Third, the plan needs to deal with the impact of broad rezonings as opposed to narrowly targeted rezonings. The plan seems to be deliberately written to not poke the nimbys from the usual neighborhoods, but falls short because it does so. What does the academic literature say about the impacts of spot zoning on speculation? The plan allows for very little change for most places in town and for very significant changes on some targeted lots. This is a set up for some intense land speculation. Affordable housing will be very hard to get if narrow rezonings boost the speculation on the only land available to build multi-family units, shooting ourselves in the foot. Broad rezonings have less of an impact on land values and would reduce some of the heavy speculation that the plan will unleash.

Thanks for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Rob LaVelle

P.S. Sorry, I couldn't resist. The part of the plan that gives me nausea is to see the undefined redevelopment opportunities in the Calvander area. Are these going to be the same dumb greenfields developments that we have seen in Carrboro in the last decade or so? More suburbs with walk scores under 10? Please, no.

--

Rob LaVelle  
Carolina Friends School  
Upper School, Spanish and Geography

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are the property of Carolina Friends School. The contents of this communication are confidential and may contain information that is privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. It is intended solely for use of the individual or entity to whom this email is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and immediately delete this message and any attachments. Any unauthorized use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited.



**Ben Berolzheimer**

---

**From:** heidi perov <heidiperov@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 23, 2022 11:41 AM  
**To:** council  
**Cc:** Richard White; Trish McGuire  
**Subject:** Comprehensive plan

Dear Mayor and Town council,

I have been struggling with what comments to make on the Comprehensive plan, an undertaking that began two years ago. The Town went to extraordinary measures to make sure there was great diversity on the task force, and yet last night, there were still comments that the Town had not adequately engaged with all of its residents. At this point, I would have to think that many residents either don't want to engage, or they are overwhelmed with the scope of the plan, and don't know how to approach it. I know that a comprehensive plan is a herculean undertaking, and I admire all who have worked so hard to come to consensus on the plan.

However, the plan is still far from finished. Many of the "X% by X date" goals are still to be filled in, and, as was mentioned in the public hearing last night, there are far too many "consider this" and "investigate that" phrases for the plan to have any meaningful impact on the Town's future.

Meanwhile, for the past two years, **several really important decisions have been put on hold** for the sake of the completion of the Comprehensive Plan.

One of the highest priorities of these, in my mind, is the changes to the LUO that would allow more multifamily housing and that would prevent further proliferation of near-million-dollar single family homes to be built on lots.

I fully expect this process could take another year, which will be another year lost in terms of making progress on the LUO and other town priorities.

So, what are my comments? I would like to see the LUO discussion and other worthwhile discussions not be put off, (let the Comprehensive Plan incorporate the revised LUO), that the same be done for other Town priorities, that the plan be bold and put real definitive goals in place of "considerations." ("That which is not measured cannot be improved.")

As always, thank you for all you do to make Carrboro a better place.

Sincerely,  
Heidi

Heidi Perov Perry  
[heidiperov@gmail.com](mailto:heidiperov@gmail.com)  
919-618-8199  
Certified Bicycling Instructor (LCI) #4338  
@heidiperov

**Ben Berolzheimer**

---

**From:** Diana Newton <diananewton@fallingapples.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 23, 2022 8:06 PM  
**To:** council; Trish McGuire  
**Subject:** Feedback on Carrboro Connects Comprehensive Plan

Dear Mayor Seils, Town Council members, and Ms. McGuire,

I wanted to offer my feedback on the Carrboro Connects Comprehensive Plan in writing, which I offered briefly in the public hearing at last night's Council meeting, for your consideration.

Carrboro Connects is certainly “comprehensive,” which is on the one hand, laudable for breadth of consideration across many of the Town's areas of need, concern, and growth. The current Carrboro Connects draft commits and counting to describe 7 key areas, all of which are to be viewed through the twin lenses of climate action and race and equity. Great!

Leaders need to have visions that inspire people to engage and follow. Those visions may even be grand. But they get in trouble when the vision become so comprehensive as to become grandiose!

**The dark side of “comprehensive”** rears its head when the planning body takes on too much, for too long a time horizon, with too few or unknown resources, and too little realism. We leave in a remarkably VUCA (volatile-uncertain-complex-ambiguous) time in which long-term planning is fraught with unknowns as never before.

Upon careful review, the Comprehensive Plan lacks:

- detailed implementation specifics
- acknowledgement of need for expanded human resources
- realistic, achievable goals
- budget projections
- a transparent, publicly available progress tracking mechanism for accountability

The Plan is unquestionably thorough at its current 258 pages,. But with over 40 goals and over 100 strategies, and a fatiguing number of additional bullet points for initiatives/projects, **it begs credibility as to HOW the Town of Carrboro Council and staff could possibly achieve this vision.** Only 40 pages—15% of the Plan—is dedicated to Implementation. Metrics are missing and often meaningless. Budget projections are a chimera.

And importantly, the “HOW” is inextricably related to the “WHO.” Every one of the strategies will require more time and energy and communication from Council and staff. My fundamental question is then: You and what army are taking this on? While the HR section includes the usual boilerplate mission and language of “recruit, hire, develop, and retain,” there is **no acknowledgement in the Plan that current staffing would need to be significantly increased, or by how much.** Even today, the staff is not able to achieve many of its current goals in a timely way. Where is the commitment for expanding human resources?

**The Comprehensive Plan lacks precise, fleshed-out Implementation specifics to support the vision details.**

**Recommendation #1: Develop and add completed metrics that are reliable and realistic before approval of the Plan.**

While “How to Use This Plan” proclaims that the metrics are “quantitative objectives that can be measured over time,” within each chapter, there is a woeful lack of meaningful, quantitative metrics. While there is acknowledgement by TOC Planning that the metrics need to be “refined,” I assert that many need to start by being defined at all.

**Examples of non-quantitative metrics:**

- “Reduce cost burden for homeowners from 17% to x%” (p. 39)
- “x% of budget requested...” (p. 52)
- “Calculate... native plantings... by x%” (p. 59)
- “Increase number of BIPOC and small businesses...” Increase by how many-1 or 100? (p. 125)
- “Reduce annual retail spending gap”--by how much? (p. 125)
- “Set a target for number...” (page 125)--obviously! What is it? (p. 125)

**Recommendation #2: Develop meaningful financial resource estimates before approval of the Plan.**

In addition to “how” and “who,” the Plan completely omits addressing the critical “how much” question. Within the Implementation chapter (and throughout), there are no budget projections. There is a vague statement about the use of “available resources,” and costs are only described in relative terms (\$-\$\$-\$\$\$) and by likely funding source. Are we being asked to commit millions or billions over this timeframe, and how does the money align with the priorities. There is no way to tell here.

**Recommendation #3: Identify those goals that have previously existed and identify barriers to achieving them.**

The Plan includes some goals and strategies that have been in existence for a while yet not accomplished. Without examining the “why?,” citizens have little reason to trust that they will now be accomplished just because they are included in a big new document.

Example: The RainReady program was developed over two years ago but remains stillborn. Why? There is no valid reason why the Stormwater staff could not have called an informational meeting in my neighborhood during the last two years. When asked by a SWAC member if the RainReady pilot had been done or was something in the future, staff could not answer the question, stating that “what is included and not included in the pilot is blurry.” This is an implementation failure that needs to be unpacked and addressed.

While prioritizing green stormwater infrastructure is the right thing to do, the Plan does not address how the Town intends to deal with its failing grey stormwater infrastructure.

The Carrboro 2021 Stormwater Management Plan includes a need for outreach and support from HOAs. Carrboro does not even have a complete list of HOAs, which is mind boggling.

**Recommendation #4: Commit to development of a digital Plan dashboard that Carrboro citizens can easily access and that is regularly updated.**

Transparency in government depends on readily available, accurate information and is fundamental to accountability for achieving the Plan's goals.

A digital dashboard should be one that any one of us can go to and see progress on Housing Goal 2, Strategy 1.2 at any time. We should be able to see Progress against goal, include current vs. projected timeline and costs. The current TOC website is a morass of pages and links and needs to be overhauled stem to stern.

To close, I implore each of you to see the massive investment that has been made in this Plan to completion in a way that is **not driven by a rush to deadline**. Please **get it right**. Please **make it realistic**. Twenty years of our future is at stake.

Thank you,  
Diana Newton

Diana Newton, Neighbor-Citizen-Advocate  
103 Dove Street

## **Barred Owl Creek Neighborhood Coalition**

Carrboro, North Carolina USA

Coalition Website: <https://barred-owl-creek.gogladly.com>

**From:** dbailey15able <delores.bailey@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 1:12 PM  
**To:** Ben Berolzheimer  
**Subject:** Re: Town of Carrboro - Upcoming Community Workshop

## Attachment C

Good Morning Ben,

Sorry I could not make the meeting with the NAACP housing committee. I did want to be sure you knew of EMPOWERment's affordable rental housing program and all that we do that compliments the Comprehensive Plan specifically Goal 2. I particularly think EMPOWERment's name should be mentioned as well as a picture of at least one of the 14 affordable rental units we own in Hillmont or one of the four affordable rentals we own in Collins Crossing. Both of these communities contain money received from Carrboro's Affordable Housing funds. The EMPOWERment - Carrboro collaboration to produce and preserve affordable rentals is one I am sure will continue and therefore needs to be mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan.

EMPOWERment's Affordable Rental Plan acquires properties in Carrboro with the assistance of Carrboro Affordable Housing Funds. Staff seeks out properties that allow us to increase the Carrboro affordable rental inventory. We work with homeowners to purchase homes as well as apartments that will add to that stock. We have acquired more than 10 of our units as we are currently negotiating a sale. EMPOWERment manages our rental units. These units targeted residents that earn 80% AMI and below. We have the unique distinction of offering our units at below market rate. To achieve this price, EMPOWERment calculates subsidies into the units. We particularly address Strategies 2.2, 2.3. I am happy to supply you with pictures of our units either at Hillmont or Collins Crossings. You also might not be aware that EMPOWERment has funding available from the County to assist with mobile home ownership which can be used in Carrboro (Strategy 3.3). In a program called DMAP- Displacement Mitigation Assistance Program, EMPOWERment works with families that may need to relocate and or purchase a mobile home.

As I understand it, these suggestions are for potential inclusions into the plan. I would appreciate and believe it is appropriate to name EMPOWERment's work with The Town of Carrboro in addressing affordable housing acquisitions, productions and preservation.

Thank you

Delores Bailey