
From: Sammy Slade

Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2015 5:24 PM

To: boa; publicemail; David Andrews; Catherine Wilson; Patricia J. McGuire

Subject: Questions re: 'South green' development

All,

Here are some questions that I have for staff/the developer about the rezoning/CUP.

For STAFF:

-- In response to staff prompting (part II, attachment B staff report) and concerns from the neighbors (list shared during meeting) please share with us conditions that already exist for B-1 (g) and EAT zoning districts which regulate hours of operation to mitigate noise that might cause unreasonable disruptions to the peace and quiet of the nearby residential area, for our consideration as a condition.

-- Please update appropriate documents (i.e. Part II, Attachment B, 'staff report', Page 7 says 10 covered bike spaces) to reflect applicants promise during the meeting of providing 24 (?) covered bike parking spaces (also different number in Part II, attachment F. p. 9 -- says 20 covered bike spaces.)

-- The grading that will happen will be changing a primary constraint slope I believe?, how does this jive with our ordinance re: primary constraints?

-- Does the fire department or any other town department have a record/map of flood-affected trailer homes? Are there photos of the flood at the point where the Old Pittsboro rd. creek backs up at the 54 on-ramp?

-- What is the closest north bound bus stop?

FOR DEVELOPER:

-- (Part II, Attachment B, 'staff report', Page 9) Says that "in reviewing the landscape plan

there is ample opportunity to replant additional trees in the areas of the project to the east"
Does the developer have a response to this?

-- In regard to the objection on TAB advisory board recommendation #7, is the developer willing to only raise the crosswalks as opposed to the full intersection?

-- In response to EAB recommendation #1 developer expresses intent to reestablish the native forest, can they provide plans on how to do this?

-- Can the developer provide more information on their efforts to meet performance items # 14 and 16?

-- Related, are they able to provide a dumpster for compostables, especially since they plan on attracting a number of food businesses?

FOR STAFF AND THE DEVELOPER:

-- The trees that will be planted will be larger trees, there is a lot of pervious pavement in the project, will this pervious pavement aligned to serve the needs of these trees re: water? If not will the developer provide the necessary pervious surfaces that the trees need?

--(PartII attachment F, page 12) Are the two LED fixtures that are needed from Duke something that the developer has confirmed being able to do?

-- Part II attachment F, page 2, -- It is acknowledged here that "It ponds deeply, creating an unapproved detention basin that decreases the incidence of flooding downstream (i.e. the trailer park)" The property's flooding improvements will pass water through the property bypassing what use to be a de-facto detention basin; to what degree will the trailer park flood because of this?

-- Part II Attachment H page 4 -- "Post development runoff volume to a 37% reduction over the pre-development run-off volume" does this include the runoff that comes to the property from other places, or just what is generated on the property?

-- Part II, Attachement J p.3 "reduce the frequency of overtopping and thus improve the impacts associated with overtopping" Relates to the question of trailer homes on the east side of the trailer park that are affected by overtopping vs. trailer homes that are affected by the damn effect of the 54 on-ramp. Is the issue of flooding at the trailer park a function of overtopping or watter bottlenecking on the property?

-- The developer is missing out on Solar electricity generation on its roofs, would they be willing to offer their roofspace to a 'solar bank,' --a registry, held by the town, of commercial

buildings that are open for learning more about and potentially being the space to be used by an LLC wanting to install panels on their roof or for when third party solar is made legal in NC?

--Given the concern about opening up the street because it will increase through traffic on a street that is perhaps too narrow to accommodate such extra traffic and given that there is a missed opportunity --if we close the street-- to make shorter the travel distance (and less the ghg emissions) by neighbors to and from the bottom of Greensboro street through the development, would the developer be willing to install retractable bollards that can be activated by neighbors? see examples here:

<http://www.directindustry.com/industrial-manufacturer/retractable-bollard-75863.html>

Thanks.

--Sammy

Sammy Slade
Alderman
Town of Carrboro
919-951-5200
sslade@townofcarrboro.org

From: damon.seils@gmail.com [mailto:damon.seils@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Damon Seils

Sent: Friday, May 01, 2015 11:14 AM

To: Bethany Chaney; Jacquelyn Gist; Lydia Lavelle; Michelle Johnson; Randee Haven-O'Donnell; Sammy Slade; publicemail; David Andrews; Patricia J. McGuire; Catherine Wilson

Subject: Questions About South Green Application

Hi, everyone.

I look forward to the responses to Sammy's many excellent questions. Here are my questions for staff about the South Green application:

1. What is the status of staff condition #2 regarding relocation of the Purple Leaf Place sidewalk extension? Can we change the condition from "that the developer pursue relocating" to "that the developer relocate..."?
2. Does staff condition #20 allow for the alternative lighting proposed by the applicant?
3. Is there a way to accommodate restrictions on the timing of waste collection without relying on a private vendor?
4. Will at least 30% of the south-facing and west-facing building elevations be shaded?
5. Will low-emissivity windows be used along the south-facing and west-facing building elevations?
6. Will attic insulation be installed to exceed the current building code R value rating by 35% or more?
7. I echo Sammy's question about how the applicant would meet performance standards 14 and 16.

8. With regard to the proposed roundabout, my impressions from the agenda materials and presentations are that (1) the traffic impact analysis projects that the roundabout would improve service at that location; (2) roundabouts in general enhance safety and minimize delays compared with traditional intersections; and (3) NCDOT has no concerns about the grade of the southbound approach to the proposed roundabout. Are these impressions correct?
9. What are the functional classifications—as defined in Section 15-210(b) of the Land Use Ordinance—of Purple Leaf Place and the proposed Rand Road?
10. Consistent with TAB recommendation #3, will sharrows be placed in the roundabout?
11. Consistent with TAB recommendation #5, can the bike path be split to serve both ADA ramps on the south side of the roundabout?
12. Consistent with TAB recommendations #6 and #7, will the applicant include raised pedestrian crossings throughout the development?
13. Consistent with TAB recommendation #8, will the applicant install stop signs where driveways enter Rand Road?
14. Consistent with EAB recommendation #1, will the applicant use only native or noninvasive plant species?

Thanks,

Damon

--

Damon Seils - Alderman, Town of Carrboro, NC - damonseils.org - 919-960-5931 - townofcarrboro.org - Tree City USA and a Silver-Level Bicycle Friendly Community - E-mail correspondence to and from this address may be subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.