



**Planning Board
Special Meeting Minutes
March 28, 2017 - 5:30 PM**

Town Hall

-
- A. Call to Order/Roll Call**
 - B. Action Agenda**
 - C. Other Business**

- 1. Workshop Session

Absent: Sailers, Smith

Stephen Trott, Town Transportation Engineer (also referred to herein as “staff”), opened the workshop session with a summary of the revisions to the Traffic Impact Analysis (“TIA”) ordinance. A copy of the summary is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and incorporated herein by reference. Each proposed change to Article 14, as outlined in the summary, was reviewed by staff. The Chairman requested a copy of the summary be delivered to the members of the Planning Board.

Three (3) questions by the Planning Board had been submitted to the Engineering Department in preparation of the workshop, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B, and incorporated herein by reference. In summary, Max Buchanan, Director of Public Works and Engineering, felt there was confusion about how a TIA is analyzed. There is nothing in the TIA that is a function of dollar amounts. It is as measured by the ICU capacity. A developer, under the new TIA, could invest less money to adequately mitigate traffic impacts. There are intersections that are “candidates” for surplus capacity, and to be considered for mitigation a developer taking surplus capacity and offsetting other impacts must be an impacted intersection. The determination of what intersections are candidates for that surplus application is an engineering judgement. Staff, in concert with NCDOT, and a developer’s engineer will discuss intersections that will have surplus capacity applied, and is a project that makes sense; not because a developer gets off cheaper, but because it makes sense from an engineering judgement.

The CIP (Capital Improvement Projects) and TIP (Transportation Improvement Projects) projects are always considered along with any TIA. Everything is measured by the ICU capacity percentage. It was noted that the new TIA has the option of funding a project in lieu of mitigation. Mr. Buchanan noted that a contribution can be offered if it is being proposed to accelerate an adopted project.

Engineering will define a project and make a cost estimate, and advise the Boards of the scope of the project. The Town Board can accept, or not, the contribution and accelerate the adopted CIP project. Through example of a recent project with a developer contributing funds for the McCoy/Gilead Road intersection, it was noted that the Planning Board was not given an engineering staff report that would contain engineering's findings.

Multiple intersections being identified in a TIA as impacted by a development was discussed, and staff noted the CIP project list is reviewed to determine the worse intersections. Mr. Buchanan noted that engineering will not propose to the Town Board to invest public dollars for an intersection that is not on the CIP. Development will not dictate need, and where the dollars go. If an intersection is impacted 17%, a developer can mitigate that intersection, or offset somewhere else to provide enough capacity to offset the original 17% impact. Projects have to be a valuable improvement, and there is a cumulative ICU. An example: six intersections being impacted, and three intersections are mitigated to offset the total of all six. The CIP is what identifies the greatest need. A developer should only mitigate what is impacted by its project.

The Planning Board wants more information in the staff reports for any remediation to give the members more knowledge to make the very best decision. Traffic management/remediation is a basis for approval of a request and it is important that the members feel comfortable moving ahead. Max Buchanan noted that members should have confidence in staff to make a decision, and administer the TIA Ordinance, and identify projects that are in the best interest of Huntersville. The Chairman noted that the members do have confidence in staff, and reminded the Director that the members are constituted to review decisions. If a Planning Board was rubber stamp for everything in a staff report there would not be a need for a Planning Board. Questions to staff are not personal or professional attacks.

Jack Simoneau, Planning Department, showed the CIP map that is online, and was provided to the Planning Board. The State of North Carolina changed the funding of how the State proportions money, and there are now protected projects for Huntersville. Mr. Simoneau and Mr. Buchanan noted that staff will get information to the members. The Chairman noted that the new ordinance leaves much more to professional judgement, and there are highly qualified members on the Board who may do their due diligence in making a decision on how to vote on any particular application. Members noted that the Board is in support of the additional flexibility, and does not question staff's ability to execute the ordinance; however, there is now an option for a developer to fund improvements and a decision then becomes subjective. Max Buchanan informed how cost estimates are determined by staff versus what a developer may offer to invest. The example of the Gilead Road at McCoy Road project was again used as an example.

Bill Coxe, Transportation Planner, noted that the origins of the TIA is not to get funding from the private sector to do improvements to the transportation system. The purpose, like the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance, was to sequence the delivery of transportation improvements with the impacts of development. It is a sequencing tool. It does not matter who delivers the improvements; it matters that

the improvements come along roughly concurrent with the impacts.

The Engineering Department welcomed the members to contact them with any upcoming questions or concerns. The Chairman thanked staff. There was no further discussion.

D. Adjourn

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2017.

Chairman or Vice Chairman

Michelle V. Haines, Board Secretary