



Town of Carrboro
Northern Transition Area Advisory Committee

NTAAC

Monday, January 23, 2017th

MINUTES

7:30, Planning department, Town of Carrboro Town Hall

Committee Members: Amy Jeroloman, Anahid Vrana, Jay Bryan (via teleconference), Jeanette Moore
Staff Present: Jeff Kleaveland

1. **Discuss the Twin Creeks Regional Recreation Plan conceptual plan as suggested by *Unique Places* (a firm specializing in conservation planning).**
 - a. *The group broadly discussed the “Twin Creeks Regional Recreation Plan” as proposed by Jeffrey Fisher of the conservation firm, Unique Places. Note that this proposal is not a formal application at this time; Mr. Fisher is just exploring some planning possibilities for the area based partly on the availability on the real estate market of the second phase of Ballentine project which is undeveloped at this time. This phase of the project has some significant costs (including, possibly, two bridges) that make it difficult to develop at this time.*
 - b. *Regarding the plan itself, it was evident that there were some inaccuracies.*
 - i. *The “Orange County Land” adjacent to the TLC conservation easement to the west is actually owned by OWASA. In light of this, staff reminded the group that OWASA utilizes conservation easements on their lands surrounding University Lake.*
 - ii. *The plan shows two “future educational facilities”; to date staff is only aware of one such facility plan, the middle school site proposed adjacent to the existing Morris Grove Elementary school. Furthermore, the Lake Hogan Farm Road extension alignment follows the existing greenway path. Staff informed the group that this is an unlikely alignment as town policy favors crossing the Bolin Creek with a bridge to open upon connectivity to the properties to the east. Staff said that the Town is currently investigating alignments in these areas.*
 - iii. *The “Developable Land” as represented on the map generated some discussion; the group was not necessarily comfortable with the locations shown.*
 - c. *The committee remarked briefly on the well-considered comments by John Gant regarding the plans. Mr. Gant, though not a member of the committee, has been a participant in the NTA Design Charrette and formerly was a member of the Board of Adjustment. In light of the useful observations therein, Jeroloman made the following motion:*
 - i. *MOTION (Jeroloman, 2nd by Moore): That Mr. Gant’s comments be added to the NTAAC minutes). (AYES: Unanimous);*
 - d. *In light of the above motion, the observations by Mr. Gant are hereby added below:*
 - i. *The “Meadow Flats” public green space occupies some area that is already being pursued by a developer for some intensive commercial development, so is this feature something that Mr. Fisher is working to establish on that land instead? I see the idea of a “Meadow Flats” public green space extending north onto other properties – this is very nice and I wonder if Mr. Fisher has secured an agreement with Duke or the property owner to enable this to happen? I see the*

idea of public walking trails on Bolin Brook Farm - this is also a very nice idea and I ask if Mr. Fisher has something in play here with these land owners as well?

- ii. *It appears that Mr. Fisher wants to convert the \$1 million, 8 foot wide pedestrian bridge and major investment of the paved greenway into a two lane road. This concept does not seem possible. Or perhaps is this created a parallel, adjacent road and path for some unexpressed reason? This drawing seems to emphasize the existence (or not) of stream crossings, rather than describe bridges and their purposes – why? The greenway was created apart from a road for the natural experience, which it provides successfully. The greenway currently has no street crossings which can present a safety hazard to be managed. Why is the greenway not extended further in this plan, to where it could connect with sidewalks in neighborhoods to the south and southwest? This concept seems to sacrifice the value and purpose of the greenway, and for whatever reason emphasize it as a stream crossing feature.*
 - iii. *I see that Tucker’s Pond Road would not be extended, despite the fact that it is engineered for extension and to allow that community to have more than one exit path and perhaps to access land to the north which could become part of the future county park. Is there a reason to reverse that original access plan?*
 - iv. *The suggestion to have only one access road to a major county park is unusual and insufficient, as there is potential for significant user traffic, and a need for emergency vehicles and large county maintenance vehicles to provide safety and service to that park. Mr. Fisher’s route from the farmhouse to a thoroughfare could be made less than 1000’, but he shows a 1 mile route instead which leads all vehicles through the midst of playgrounds and parking lots where small pedestrians will be an elevated risk, all within the park. It then further entwines the park traffic with the traffic of 3 schools and the Lake Hogan community. It would be interesting to see the DOT’s traffic expectations associated with the actual park amenities which the County will eventually install, as well as the traffic expected from the schools.*
 - v. *The proposed elimination of a future road and stream crossings to the east seems to be an undesirable side effect of the new path for an access road ... and seems short sighted, as eventually there should be park access and connectivity of that large land acreage which may be developed into residential areas or other things. Three education facilities may have access solely on that one road, and that will be a grand transportation failure with traffic jams for hours on each and every school day. The morning traffic crunch at Morris Grove already backs up from the school, past the roundabout, along Eubanks Road, and occasionally extends onto Old 86 Hillsborough Road! Much better thoroughfares and connections to and within neighborhoods and parks are needed.*
 - e. *All of these things said, the group moved on to discuss the following, more pressing interest.*
2. *Light-Industrial Land Use Proposal for the Town-owned property (the 23.5 acre parcel located at 7917 Old NC 86).*
 - a. *The group discussed the Town’s proposal to site light-industrial land uses on the above referenced Town-owned property. This idea was presented to the Board of Aldermen by the Town’s Economic and Community Development Director on September 20th, 2016. The particulars of this meeting can be found here: <https://carrboro.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2839205&GUID=DE286B5B-CFDC-4C66-940A-35308E132327&Options=ID|Text|&Search=flex>*
 - b. *It was discussed whether or not the proposed commercial use for the property has been presented to the Orange County Board of Commissioners and what their reaction to the idea was. The*

committee requested that staff provide more specific information. In particular, the committee would like to invite Annette Lafferty (formerly Annette Stone), the Town's Community Economic Development official, to discuss the project in person with the group. In addition, the committee requested additional information pertaining to the Town's plans for engaging the public about the development of the project. Staff will respond to these requests via email.

3. Other Business:

- a. *Amy requested that staff keep the NTAAC apprised of any developments associated with FLX rezoning applications in the NTA.*