

**A RESOLUTION SPECIFYING ANY FURTHER ACTION IN FOLLOW-UP TO A
DISCUSSION OF PINE STREET
Resolution 58/2001-02**

WHEREAS, the Carrboro Board of Aldermen seeks ample opportunity to evaluate existing regulations and policy, and;

WHEREAS, the Board has discussed issues related to Pine Street development.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Carrboro Board of Aldermen that the Aldermen specifies the following further action in follow-up to this review:

This is the 13th day of November in the year 2001.

Patricia J. McGuire

From: Sarah C. Williamson
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2001 8:42 AM
To: Robert Morgan; Roy M. Williford; Patricia J. McGuire
Subject: FW: Ordinance Changes

Sarah C. Williamson
 Town Clerk
 Town of Carrboro
 (919) 918-7309

-----Original Message-----

From: Allen Spalt [mailto:aspalt@mindspring.com]
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2001 10:42 PM
To: Sarah C. Williamson
Cc: Andreas & Jennifer Hay
Subject: Fwd: Ordinance Changes

Sarah,

Andreas reports that neither Alex nor Mark received this email. Could you please print it out and send or leave it for them for Tuesday? Thanks,

Allen.

Date: Fri, 21 Sep 2001 16:07:15 -0400
 From: Andreas Hay <Andreas.Hay@wcom.com>
 Subject: Ordinance Changes
 To: Allen Spalt <aspalt@mindspring.com>, Mike Nelson <Mayrnelson@aol.com>, Joal Hall Broun <brounsj@mindspring.com>, Mark Dorosin <abmd@mindspring.com>, Jacquie Gist <jmgist@email.unc.edu>, Diana McDuffee <mcduffee@email.unc.edu>, Alex Zaffron <azaffron@etrademail.com>
 Cc: "'Jennifer Hay (E-mail)'" <jahay@mindspring.com>, John Bahr <kenpo@mindspring.com>, Constance Newman <cnewman@intrex.com>, pendzich@mindspring.com, "'Jennifer Curtis (E-mail)'" <jencurt@mindspring.com>, "'Jimmy and Mardi McCusker (E-mail)'" <magooz@juno.com>, "'Rich Bell (E-mail 2)'" <ncsmartgrowth@mindspring.com>, "'Susan Victoria Baker (E-mail)'" <svbaker@earthlink.net>, "'Wendy Banning (E-mail)'" <wbcis@mindspring.com>, "'Cnewman@Intrex. Net'" <cnewman@intrex.net>, "'Came@Med. Unc. Edu'" <came@med.unc.edu>, rrangeo@earthlink.com, wallerlc@earthlink.com
 Importance: Normal
 X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

Mayor and the Board,

The following is a list of the ordinance changes we feel are most needed to preserve neighborhoods, protect public safety, provide affordable housing and keep communities aware of development that will impact them. We plan to present this with a few additional details at the meeting next Tuesday. We wanted to give you a chance to read over and think about it prior to the meeting.

1. Eliminate the "two-family conversion" portion of section 15-182(b) which allows the conversion of a single family home to a duplex on lots with 150% of the minimum lot size for the given zoning district. As currently allowed this gives developers an unfair advantage over owner-occupiers on the open market. Per the Planning Department, this is the biggest exposure to Pine Street and other similar neighborhoods from ultra-high density properties.
- 1a. Add the ability to build a 500 square foot detached single family dwelling (granny suite) on lots with 150% of the minimum lot size for the given zoning district. Houses of this small size provide truly affordable housing, have minimal impact to the neighborhood, does not significantly skew the playing field toward developers/landlords, and take advantage of existing infrastructure.
2. Define "group homes" and/or "dormitories" and "other similar housing" (section 15-146) and provide some restrictions on these high density, high impact dwellings in residential neighborhoods.
- 2a. Require 150% of lot square footage (e.g., 15,000 sq ft in an R-10 zone) per group home dwelling.
3. Define "substantial impact" (section 15-52(c)) to ensure that neighbors are notified up front of developments that will impact them.
- 3a. Provide more than 10 days for public comment or hold a public hearing.
4. Provide some limitations on the maximum number of parking spaces and/or the maximum number of regularly parked vehicles at a property including on-street parking. This could be based upon lot size and/or zoning district. It may be appropriate to restrict on-street parking on some streets to ensure this does not create on-street parking issues.
- 4a. Provide restrictions on creating and regulation on existing de facto cul-de-sacs. Shared driveways for properties with multiple high occupant density dwellings creates the traffic equal to or greater than many real cul-de-sacs with the exception that these de facto cul-de-sacs have unregulated (no signage) access to the street.
5. Limit the size of the expansion or replacement of a non-conforming dwelling (section 15-124(e)) to 750 sqft or the size of the original non-conforming dwelling, which ever is larger. This protects affordable housing and eliminates the possibility of expanding a non-conforming dwelling to a huge size in multiple phases. This is the item of which you asked Mr. Brough to revise the language.

Andreas

PINE STREET: FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION

The Board of Aldermen held a discussion of issues associated with new development on Pine Street in August 2001 and directed follow-up action. In late September, the Board of Aldermen requested additional information regarding accessory/in-law cottages and information on how Chapel Hill handles on-street parking and parking limits. Information pertaining to these requests has been compiled. A resolution that provides an opportunity for the Board of Aldermen to specify additional follow-up action was provided for the Board's use.

Trish McGuire, the Town's Planning Administrator, made the presentation.

The Board discussed the ordinance amendments requested by the Pine Street residents (requested amendments in bold).

Limit the size of the expansion or replacement of a nonconforming dwelling (section 15-124(e)) to 750 sq ft or the size of the original non-conforming dwelling, whichever is larger. This protects affordable housing and eliminates the possibility of expanding a non-conforming dwelling to a huge size in multiple phases.

The Board requested that the Town Attorney draft an ordinance to limit the expansion of nonconforming units.

Andreas Hay suggested that the Board limit the number of times a nonconforming use may be expanded.

Provide some limitations on the maximum number of parking spaces and/or the maximum number of regularly parked vehicles at a property including on-street parking. This could be based upon lot size and/or zoning district. It may be appropriate to restrict on-street parking on some streets to ensure this does not create on-street parking issues.

Provide restrictions on creating and regulation on existing de facto cul-de-sacs. Shared driveways for properties with multiple high occupant density dwellings creates the traffic equal to or greater than many real cul-de-sacs with the exception that these de facto cul-de-sacs have unregulated (no signage) access to the street.

It was the consensus of the Board to request that the Town staff obtain models from other university communities on the maximum number of parking spaces allowed per unit. In addition, the Board requested a staff analysis of on and off-street parking on Pine Street, Cheek Street, and Oak Street. This analysis should address whether parking should be allowed on both sides of the streets versus on one side only; the maximum number of cars that could park in both cases; how many parking spaces exist for each house; and the number of multi-family units on Pine Street.

Mr. Hay asked that restricted on-site parking not force additional on-street parking.

Jennifer Hay asked if it is possible to limit the number of parking spaces per dwelling unit. Is there a way to prohibit unofficial fraternity houses in residential neighborhoods?

MOTION WAS MADE BY ALLEN SPALT AND SECONDED BY ALEX ZAFFRON TO EXCUSE MAYOR NELSON FROM THE MEETING DUE TO ILLNESS. VOTE: AFFIRMATIVE FIVE, ABSENT TWO (NELSON, GIST)

Define "substantial impact" (section 15-52(c)) to ensure that neighbors are notified up front of developments that will impact them.

The Town Attorney will prepare a draft ordinance for the Board's consideration.

Provide more than 10 days for public comment or hold a public hearing.

The Board requested that the town staff provide the Board with a copy of the current notification requirements, suggestions for how zoning permits and building permits could be posted on the Town's website and other venues. The Board also requested that the town staff suggest some additional notification requirement for permits associated with the expansion of nonconforming uses.

Andreas Hay pointed out differences in Chapel Hill's land use ordinance and Carrboro's ordinance dealing with limitations on impervious surface on lots, limitations on the size of dwellings, etc.

It was the consensus of the Board to continue discussion of the following requests on November 13th:

Define "group homes" and/or "dormitories" and "other similar housing" (section 15-146) and provide some restrictions on these high density, high impact dwellings in residential neighborhoods

Require 150% of lot square footage (e.g., 15,000 sq ft in an R-10 zone) per group home dwelling.

Eliminate the "two-family conversion" portion of section 15-182(b), which allows the conversion of a single-family home to a duplex on lots with 150% of the minimum lot size for the given zoning district. As currently allowed this gives developers an unfair advantage over owner-occupiers on the open market. Per the Planning Department, this is the biggest exposure to Pine Street and other similar neighborhoods from ultra-high density properties.

Add the ability to build a 500 square foot detached single family dwelling (granny suite) on lots with 150% of the minimum lot size for the given zoning district. Houses of this small size provide truly affordable housing, have minimal impact to the neighborhood, does not significantly skew the playing field toward developers/landlords, and take advantage of existing infrastructure.
