



**TOWN OF CARRBORO  
STORMWATER ADVISORY COMMISSION  
AGENDA**

March 11th, 2021; 6:30 pm  
Remote Meeting

<b><u>Time</u></b>	<b><u>Item</u></b>	<b><u>Presenter</u></b>
6:30 pm	Administrative Matters: Call to order, approval of February minutes	Chair, all
6:35 pm	Public comment (if any)	Chair, all
6:40 pm	203 Project review*	Chair, all
7:25 pm	Announcements and adjourn	Chair

\* Relevant materials are available from the Planning Board agenda item for 3/4:  
<http://www.townofcarrboro.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/3895?html=true>

Citizens (other than Commission members) should email [stormwater@townofcarrboro.org](mailto:stormwater@townofcarrboro.org) to receive an invitation to view the meeting. The requester should also specify if they wish to make any comments in the email. If you wish to make public comment, at the time of public comment, the speakers will be allowed to address the Commission. Please send any written statement or materials to the same email provided above. All written statement and materials will be forwarded to the Commission members.

---

---

## TOWN OF CARRBORO



### STORMWATER ADVISORY COMMISSION – SUMMARY

Remote Meeting on February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021, 6:30 pm (Zoom)

Commission Members		Candidates	Staff
John Cox (vice-chair)	Jeanette O'Connor (chair)	Margot Lester	Randy Dodd
Robert Dickson	Michael Paul	Satya Kallepalli	Heather Holley
Jacquelyn Gist (Council Liaison)	Lauren Joca	Sarah Bloesch	Emily Cochran

#### **Other Attendees:**

Dan Jewell  
Daniel Mayer  
Etan Gumerman  
Jon Hartman-Brown  
Kenneth Reiter  
Marty Roupe (TOC Planning Division)  
Matt Springer  
Preston Royster

#### **Administrative Matters**

The SWAC approved the January minutes unanimously.

#### **Arts Center Review**

Marty Roupe (TOC Planning Division) provided a brief presentation summarizing an overview of the proposed Arts Center project that is currently in construction plan approval stage. A public hearing date has been set for February 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Dan Jewell (Coulter Jewell Thames) summarized the development constraints on the site and the alterations they've had to make to the plans to fit all provisions, with the exception of the annual stormwater volume reduction requirement. Preston Royster (CJT Engineer) also described the provisions they are currently able to meet (water quality, peak runoff rate) and those they are not able to meet (annual volume).

John Cox suggested a combination of green roof and permeable pavement as an option for volume control; specifically, permeable pavement could be installed within the OWASA easement without it being directly on top of the pipe. Marty Roupe stated that OWASA confirmed they would be open to that option. Preston Royster stated the volume capacity of these options, and stated that the back fill surrounding the OWASA sewer line would require a 98% compaction, so pervious pavement would not be effective there. He also stated that, should maintenance be necessary, OWASA may not re-install the pervious pavement correctly. John suggested that the option be studied of at least part of the easement be considered for permeable pavement, even if a 10 ft-wide strip be left for maintenance and equipment moving purposes.

Randy Dodd (TOC Stormwater Division) shared a brief presentation providing a background on the annual volume reduction provision and its purpose as well as other options that may be available to meet the provision. Satya Kallepalli asked whether or not an off-site mitigation credit could potentially be issued for controlling additional runoff

---

---

within the watershed. Marty said that option would have to be investigated as an option for a text amendment, though he is not sure whether or not that is already an option in the ordinance. He also mentioned that landscaping easements exist for a similar purpose, so theoretically the framework is in the ordinance for another reason.

Robert Dickson questioned the total stormwater runoff volume summary calculations that were included in the Stormwater Impact Assessment. Randy replied that they are an alternative way of calculating the runoff volume, and that Town staff have not agreed with the conclusion that the calculations demonstrate compliance with the LUO.

The SWAC discussed written recommendations to the Town Council regarding potential text amendments to the LUO.

Lauren Joca and Satya questioned the nature of the SWAC's input on this project; Jacquelyn Gist (Council Member) clarified that the SWAC may provide feedback and comments but does not hold veto power over the construction plan approval. Robert suggested removing comments to potential text amendment options, stating that a potential text amendment should not be considered, and that the SWAC should suggest only a variance or other means of providing some special consideration. The SWAC agreed that they will not suggest a LUO text amendment.

John reiterated that the applicants should consider additional options, beyond those that were submitted to the Town, including a potential blue roof. The SWAC added this suggestion to the formal recommendation to Council: "We recommend that as part of a variance, the Town will allow the applicant to consider all alternative means of complying with the volume reduction requirement to the maximum extent practicable, including the use of a blue roof". The SWAC discussed the definition of "maximum extent practicable."

Robert suggested that additional requirements be added as part of the variance that may be granted. The SWAC discussed the effect of the variance, as to whether or not it would only apply to annual volume control. Marty advised that the variance can be tailored as necessary. Randy suggested that anything granted should be limited as much as possible to prevent future impacts; Jacquie suggested that it be worded as simply as possible. The SWAC discussed to what specifically a variance or waiver or other means of relaxation would apply – i.e. just the percentage difference of annual volume. John suggests that the specific provision be recorded: "Prefers that the applicant revise the application to comply with provision 15-263(g)(3) of the current ordinance, and negate the need for a text amendment or other special consideration from the Town".

Jacquie suggested that members of the SWAC attend the Town Council meeting in order to adequately explain the recommendations. Marty indicated that staff will be discussing with the Town attorney the specific wording of "variance" versus "special consideration" etc. and appropriate mechanism as well as what is the maximum extent practicable for these options.

The SWAC discussed and adopted the formal motions regarding their findings for both the text amendment and CUP. The SWAC and staff clarified how the CUP and LUO amendment relate; specifically how denial of the CUP would affect the LUO amendment and vice versa, as well as whether or not the SWAC should provide additional recommended conditions to the CUP if it should be approved. As part of this, Mike discussed whether or not the SWAC should request an additional analysis of the interactions between the stormwater infrastructure and sanitary sewer line. John provided additional technical information about this issue. Mike asked whether or not a 401/404 certification would be required; John stated that it may be the burden of the applicant to show that it would or would not be required. Jeanette suggested that the SWAC include a statement that it does not recommend any development within a stream buffer or floodplain.

Mike discussed that increasing the slope of the land on the Art Center side may negatively impact flooding risks on the other side of the channel; Preston stated that the analysis shows no significant change in flood pattern. John provided clarification regarding the floodplain versus floodway. The SWAC added a comment that the applicant submit to staff the flood impact analysis of the impacts of buffer incursion on upstream and downstream flood elevations and in-stream channel stress.

Lauren asked whether or not the stormwater impact analysis includes equity concerns, and suggested that it may be

---

---

worth considering that the downstream neighborhood is a small residential community. An additional comment was added regarding considering the negative environmental justice and racial/economic equity impacts of the project.

Mike described his overall concerns with the plan for this development, Ken responded with clarification on performance space and other sites that may have been considered. John added that despite concerns for the riparian buffer, it is still an urban stream in a developed area, so he has less of a problem with the incursion into the buffer than with the impact of concentrated runoff from the stormwater treatment system. Ken and Preston explained the difficulties of placing a level spreader on the site. The SWAC, TOC staff and Ken clarified the extent of the buffer incursion that was approved by the Board of Adjustments as well as regulatory provisions.

The SWAC concluded their deliberations and agreed on wording for review comments and submitted recommendations for both the text amendment and CUP.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 pm.