

Clayton Growth Plan Update

Steering Committee Meeting #5

Meeting Information

Date: → February 24, 2021

Time: → 6:00-7:30 PM

Location: → Virtual Meeting

→ Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83449916386?pwd=OGVEaTdQdk92ZVdWcG9mMU5ZVGxaZz09>

Join by Phone

+1 646 558 8656 (Dial-in Number)

Meeting ID: 834 4991 6386

Passcode: 272535

Agenda Items

• **Welcome / Introductions**

- Samantha Wullenwaber, the Town of Clayton Planning Director welcomed everyone.

• **Attendees**

- Jim Perricone
- Dana Wooten
- Michael Grannis
- Patrick Pierce
- Sara Perricone
- Dean Penny
- Al Merritt
- Marty Bizzell
- Bob Anderson
- Michael Sims
- Samantha Wullenwaber
- Cathy Marraccini
- Jake Petrosky
- Jaquasha Colón
- Allison Evans

• **Meeting Materials**

- The following materials were provided to the steering committee in advance of the meeting:
 - SC #4 Summary
 - Draft Vision and Goals
 - Draft Future Land Use Map
 - Draft Future Land Use Character Area Descriptions



- **Schedule Update**
 - The working schedule was presented. The meeting's focus will be draft vision and goals for the plan.

- **Draft Vision and Goals**
 - Discussed vision statement options. SC liked Jim Perricone's version because it felt more personal. Maybe add "growing" or "thriving and growing diverse community."

- **Draft Recommendations**
 - Many of the ideas from the old Future Land Use Map are relevant.
 - Preserves employment areas
 - Treats downtown differently.
 - Old FLUM was influenced by availability of infrastructure. Infrastructure availability has changed and the FLU Map has been updated based on new water and sewer data. Additional coordination with staff will be needed over the coming weeks to verify feasibility of service in some areas.
 - Reviewed how future land use map will influence rezonings and development design. Affects utility and transportation investments. Want to avoid concentrating homes in areas that don't have good access to roads and utilities.
 - Discussed density and the Future Land Use Map. Need to be clear in the plan how density is calculated. Also need to include flexibility and means to incorporate good design.
 - Discussed how to calculate density in mixed-use developments. Could have a density measure with a policy that allows for flexibility when measuring MXU if it meets certain criteria.

- **Character Areas**
 - How has the FLU been working? Approved developments that have remaining lots have been summarized by FLU category in the existing future land use map. Findings include:
 - *Ag/Rural Residential (ARR): The adopted Growth Plan called for development to be under less than 2 dwelling units/acre (DUA). Average density of new development has been 1.1 dwelling units/acre (DUA)*
 - *Low Density Residential (LDR): The adopted Growth Plan called for development to be under less than 3 dwelling units/acre (DUA). Average density has been 1.8 DUA. Two subdivisions have been at 4 dwelling units per acre, but one was partly located in a Community Center mixed use area.*



- *Medium Density Residential (MDR): The adopted Growth Plan called for development to be under less than 5-7 dwelling units/acre (DUA). This area has had a variety of densities but all subdivisions have been under 6 DUA. Average density of new development in this area has been 3.4 DUA.*
- *High Density Residential (HDR): The adopted Growth Plan called for development to be under less than 10-12 dwelling units/acre (DUA). Average density of new development in this area has been 8 DUA.*
- *Neighborhood Center / Community Center (NC/CC): There was not a defined density maximum or target for these areas in the adopted Growth Plan. Average density of new development here has been 12.5 DUA, but there have only been two large developments (apartments).*
- *Downtown Residential: In the Downtown Residential area the previous Growth Plan had a generous density maximum stated as less than 12-20 DUA. Other standards in the Unified Development Code (zoning) has kept development at lower densities with an average of 8.4 DUA.*
- Suitability analysis maps were shown for residential and commercial development. These maps need to be refined based on coordination with the public works department to factor in near-term sewer expansion plans. The Residential Suitability Map shows the majority of areas that are very suitable for residential development are between the Neuse River and the Clayton Bypass, as well as north of the Neuse River around Riverwood. The commercial suitability map shows areas highly suitable for commercial development along US 70, NC 42, at the intersection of Covered Bridge Road and O'Neil Street and Pritchard Rd.
- Industrial suitability analysis is in draft form.
- A draft Future Land Use Map was shown and compared to the FLU Map in the 2040 Growth Plan. Differences in old and new FLU include:
 - Changes to the extent of the planned community center by Johnston health. Also changes to the density of residential around the interchange (some High Density Residential changed to Medium Density).
 - Small expansion of new neighborhood center on covered bridge road to include the east side of the road near the planned Northern Connector road.
 - New, planned neighborhood center shown on Ranch Rd near the Clayton Bypass.
 - Expansion of employment center to the south of US 70
 - Changes to residential densities based on an analysis of utilities
 - Changes to downtown. In the previous FLU map and Growth Plan downtown was separated into the Downtown Core and a Downtown Residential category. In the draft FLU Map the downtown area is now divided into three areas: the Downtown Core centered around Main Street, a Downtown Support area and a Downtown Neighborhood



category that is meant to reflect some of the areas near downtown that are primarily single family residential.

- The project team is creating and understanding the Clayton transect, to reduce conflicts in development
- Still having discussions with staff about street connections and types.
- Also still working with staff to verify the feasibility of utility service in the short and medium-term in some areas.
- SC Member Question: What about new models of employment centers? Trend is for more integrated model with live/work/play. RTP is an example of an older-style office industrial complex that now needs to adapt to changing demands. Clayton could really market their employment land because it is not isolated like RTP is. Different sites will affect different models, manufacturing or tech.
- Steering Committee would like to incorporate knowledge industry into ED Recs
- Downtown Parking Discussion
 - The Town will need to address parking as downtown grows.
 - Money in capital improvements plan to formalize parking on N end of main street.
 - Parking will also be explored as transit is explored.
 - Overlay walmart parking lot on downtown map.
 - Michael Grannis said a parking observation was done a few years ago. Can we go out at lunchtime and see how many spaces are being used? Consider doing this again, at lunchtime in particular.
 - Discussions with NCRR will dictate what can be done for improvements around the tracks. First Street happens to be in the RR ROW. Talks about parking along first, pedestrian tunnels. RR did preliminary designs. Utility work and stormwater issues are at play.
 - Any successful Downtown will have a parking “problem”. Sometimes perceived problem is greater than actual issue.
 - Should consider a parking deck as one option. Perhaps seek out a public-private partnership.
- Discussion of potential sites for design concepts
 - Steering Committee liked conservation subdivision idea, area across from distribution center.
- FLU changes
 - May be a need for an Employment Center designation across from the distribution center on Shotwell Road. Team will look at the West side in more detail.
- Housing Variety
 - Policy ideas were presented for encouraging a mix of lot sizes in new development and a tiered approach to attached housing (a suggested



change from the current approach that allows up to 50% with an Open Space Subdivisions (OSS)).

- Open Space
 - Enhancing open space and tree preservation requirements is recommended. Currently the Open Space Subdivision (OSS) option requires a minimum open space of 12.5%.
 - Policy ideas include:
 - Consider minimum open space requirements for base zoning districts (R-10, R-8, R-6). A minimum of 10% is suggested.
 - Enhance Open Space Subdivision standards to encourage the protection of additional open space and tree canopy. Tiered approach to open space requirements
 - Prioritize open space types
 - Consider a tree preservation requirement in certain zoning districts
- Parks and Natural Resources
 - Natural resources in the planning area were discussed
 - A concept plan for planned greenways and park search areas was discussed.

