

**PLANNING COMMISSION WRITTEN COMMENTS****Item heard on March 11, 2025****Comments received as of March 18, 2025****TC2400003****Statutory Development Agreement Amendment**

CHAIR CAMERON	Vote: Yes
	Comments: No written comments provided.
VICE CHAIR CHAGARIS	Vote: No
	<p>Comments: My concern with this Amendment is that it will set a precedent for future affordable housing projects in that the potential developers will use this or other amendments to avoid the comprehensive plan ... with the end result being affordable housing areas in Durham will “look different” from other developments in the same area (place types).</p> <p>Quotes from residents: “They could be kids in the woods. One of the healthiest things that can developmentally happen for children”</p> <p>Comprehensive plan verbiage: “Due to past racist practices in the allocation of land, communities of color and low-wealth communities are more likely to live in low-lying areas with fewer green spaces and more paved surfaces.”</p> <p>More Comp plan verbiage: Establish an urban heat island monitoring program to collect localized temperature data and identify existing urban heat islands, particularly in historically black neighborhoods.</p> <p>We should not disregard the voices of the citizens that helped craft the Comprehensive plan.</p>
CAPERS	Vote: Yes
	Comments: No written comments provided.
CUTRIGHT	Vote: Yes
	Comments: This sets the stage for a low income housing project that puts a number of affordable housing units in our community. Specific to this amendment, the ability to put tree save on the table when a joint development agreement is put before the City allows for special cases, like affordable housing projects, to be successful at the expense of some tree preservation. Because this still requires and changes to the UDO to come before the governing bodies, this is a low-risk amendment.
CZAJKOWSKI	Vote: No
	Comments: The cost of this UDO change is greater than the potential benefits.
KOPAC	Vote: Yes
	Comments: While I was reluctant to open the door for potential future reductions in trees and OS, given the rarity of development agreements, the fact any future accommodations will have to be agreed to by the city council, and the enabling of more desperately needed affordable housing, I supported this amendment.
MACIVER	Vote: Yes
	Comments: No written comments provided.

PIONTAK	Vote: Yes
	Comments: The flexibility this change allows is justified in modifying; it is not a blanked change and will still require governing body approval in the future.
WOUK	Vote: No
	Comments: Allowing this text amendment will open the door to more requests to not meet the minimum tree coverage required by the UDO. I believe it is a poor precedent to set as that minimum tree coverage is an important policy to ensure we are creating healthy, livable and equitable developments.