



**ATTACHMENT D:**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS**  
**FEBRUARY 13, 2018**

**TC1700007**

**AL-TURK** - I voted for approval. I think the Planning Department did a nice job amending the original request from the applicant.

**GIBBS** – Attention needed (UDO ?) on use of LED lighting and glare from their use.

Need more/better lighting – Main St, side streets; along routes to “activity areas”

**HYMAN** – Voted yes, moving forward to both the City & County.

**KENCHEN** – I vote to approve. The Durham Innovation District is good for our community. The proposed amendment allows them a mechanism for the branding necessary to set it apart.

**VANN** – Motion passed 14-0. I voted in favor of the matter.

**WILLIAMS** - I approve this text request as it seeks to improve the designation of easily identifying districts. I believe that it will add value to the ease of travel and use of property identification. It must be in very specific terms that The City of Durham must have effective say so and plan in place making sure that we are still able to be the “Big Brother” if you will and this district is not on an island but still responsible to the City of Durham with its newly obtained design leeway.

EXPLANATION of RECOMMENDATION to the GOVERNING BODY

CASE#/NAME: TC1700007: DESIGN DISTRICT STREET SCAPE ALTERNATIVES

MEETING DATE: 02/13/2018

COMMISSIONER: CARMEN WILIAMS

THE REZONING IS/ OR IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE DURHAM COMPREHENSIVE MAP: N/A

My vote on the motion to recommend approval of the rezoning case referenced above is: YES