



## Planning and Zoning Board March 8, 2018 at 6:30 pm

### MINUTES

#### **Attendance**

Board members present for the meeting were:

Chairman Peter Prichard  
Vice Chairwoman Harlean Botha  
Member Lee Langston  
Member Rob Taylor  
Alternate Member Catherine Willis  
Alternate Member Sanjay Acharya

Board members absent for the meeting were:

None

Staff members present for the meeting were:

Martha Paige, Town Manager  
Courtney Tanner, Planning Director  
Benjamin Howell, Long Range Planning Manager  
Michele Stegall, Current Planning Manager  
Brad West, Planner II  
Dylan Bruchhaus, Planner I  
Marty Saunders, Secretary to the Board

#### **1. Call to Order**

*Chairman Peter Prichard* called the meeting to order at 6:31 pm.

#### **2. Invocation**

*Chairman Prichard* opened the meeting with the invocation.

*Chairman Prichard* stated that *Alternate Member Acharya* would be a voting member due to the ETJ vacancy.

#### **3. Adoption of Agenda**

MOTION: *Vice Chairwoman Botha* made a motion to adopt the March 8, 2018 agenda as submitted. *Member Acharya* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **4. Adoption of Minutes**

MOTION: *Member Langston* made a motion to approve the Planning and Zoning Board February 8, 2018 meeting minutes. *Vice Chairwoman Botha* seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **5. Presentations**

None

## 6. New Business – Public Comment

None

## 7. New Business

### 7. a. Land Use Plan Update Presentation and Workshop Activity

*Brad West, Planner II*, informed the Board that this was the first official Land Use Plan update meeting. The current Morrisville Land Use Plan, which won a NCAPA Marvin Collins award, was adopted in 2009. It is now in need of a comprehensive update.

In compliance with the UDO, the Planning and Zoning Board is tasked with delivering a draft Plan update to Town Council. The Town's consultant, Chicago based Houseal Lavigne, and Town staff will assist with this process. He then introduced the consultants to the Board.

Nik Davis, Firm Principal, introduced Michio Murakishi, Senior Associate, and began by describing Houseal Lavigne as specializing in community planning, urban design, and economic development. John Houseal, one the firm's partners, will specifically work on the outreach and public engagement component. In 2014, the firm was recognized by APA as an Emerging Planning and Design Firm. They have a nationwide presence in the US.

Mr. Davis identified an example of their work, the Imagine Flint (Michigan) project, which was a Comprehensive Plan that would lead to a zoning update. This was expected to be a big lift to the community image; specifically, the stabilization of the population and making the community whole again. Input from the community was the driving force of this process.

Michio Murakishi then reviewed the scope of work for the Town's Land Use Plan Update. There is a seven step process that will take place over the next 18-24 months. The steps are as follows:

1. Project initiation – Planning and Zoning Board March Meeting
2. Community outreach
3. Existing conditions evaluation
4. Community vision and goals
5. Subarea plans
6. Community wide plans and policies
7. Plan documents and adoptions

*Vice Chairwoman Botha* wanted to know who comprises the technical review committee. Mr. Murakishi replied that the composition of the committee has not been determined yet.

*Member Acharya* had questions about the project plan that was described. From an IT background, he is accustomed to starting with a vision strategy goal before looking at the "as is" scenario. This situation appears to start with "as is" and then get to the "to be" or vision analysis.

Mr. Davis explained that the goal is to establish where "we" are in terms of the issues, what do we want to move toward (visioning process), and lastly, how do we get there? This process will begin with obtaining information from the public, past plans and studies, and learning as much as possible.

*Member Acharya* stated that his understanding is that incremental changes would be made instead of transformational changes.

Mr. Davis responded that this process would not make incremental changes to the Land Use Plan. Instead, changes would be made to how the community is approaching the Land Use Plan. As the consultant, he does not want to limit the citizen's vision or impose any directions to the plan.

*Member Taylor* wanted to verify that the focus is the Land Use Plan itself, and not delving into details of the UDO. *Director Tanner* explained that recommendations for changes to the UDO may be a result of the Plan, but that changes would not be made as part of the Land Use Plan update.

*Member Langston* was concerned that there was overlap with the Land Use Plan and the current Transportation Plan update. *Director Tanner* replied that the two Plans are separate and there may be comments related to transportation, but that would be considered feedback. He also related this issue to the Town Center Plan. *Director Tanner* stated that the Town Center Plan was adopted in 2007, the vision of the Town Core had changed and could be addressed in the Land Use Plan. Further discussion could take place due to changes in the boundaries.

*Chairman Prichard* explained that Morrisville has expanded so quickly; therefore, most of the development is relatively new and there is less space left. How would the consultants look at this project, as being different from others? Mr. Davis stated that the Town's scenario, like similar communities, might look at directing and controlling growth as well as maintaining the character of the community.

For the first exercise, *Mr. West* passed out comment cards to each member and asked that they rank their 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> highest priority land use/development issue facing Morrisville. He then asked that each Planning and Zoning Board member read one of their items. The following comments were made:

- No recognizable Town Center
- Additional density around the Town Center
- Balance between growth and maintaining the small Town feeling
- Control growth – too many higher density projects such as multi-family projects
- Concern about potential for the future
- Incorporate and add interconnectivity of roads

The 2<sup>nd</sup> exercise wanted the Board to identify a specific project “if money wasn't an issue...” The following comments were made:

- All roads would at least 4 lanes
- All new/renovated projects would use solar energy
- Market driven project incorporated into Town Center Plan
- Place to keep people in Morrisville, instead of going through Morrisville
- Concrete set of Key Performance Indicators (KPI)

Lastly, the Planning and Zoning Board was asked to identify what they most liked about the 2009 Land Use Plan and what they disliked the most about the 2009 Land Use Plan. The Board would return these cards at the next meeting.

## **7. b. Draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update (CTP)**

*Director Tanner* introduced the comprehensive revision to the September 25, 2017 draft of the CTP. *Benjamin Howell, Long Range Planning Manager*, presented an overview and significant changes to the new draft CTP as well as a recommended schedule for public input opportunities.

*Mr. Howell* then gave an overview of each chapter and the related changes.

### Chapter 1 – Introduction

Chapter one provides an overview of the planning process as well as the implementation accomplishments and changes from the 2009 Transportation Plan. It describes the public engagement held to date. The guiding statements in this chapter were used to craft the recommendations found in the Plan.

The list of changes to this chapter are as follows:

- Added a section providing an overview of what has changed since the 2009 Transportation Plan was adopted
- Added implementation accomplishments from the 2009 Transportation Plan
- Included a table providing status updates on projects that were in the 2009 Transportation Plan
- Revised the layout on some of pages to improve the readability

### Chapter 2 – Existing Conditions

This report is divided into Land, People, and Transportation sections

- Land: Overview of current land uses and zoning, community facilities, and development constraints
- People: Overview of existing and future population growth, demographics and commuting patterns
- Transportation: Overview of existing traffic counts, congestion, crash statistics, and multimodal network

The changes to this chapter include the following:

- Added a new commuting patterns map (Figure 2-15)
- Updated multiple tables and graphics to improve legibility
- Revised layout on some pages to improve readability

### Chapter 3 -Roadways

Chapter 3 focuses on roadways – both committed and recommended improvements for thoroughfares and intersections, and future recommended road extensions funded by NCDOT and the Town. As depicted in Table 3-1, over \$230 million dollars are committed (i.e. funded) for road improvements.

The draft plan develops a street hierarchy of every roadway in Town based on function and characteristics. The Street Hierarchy for Morrisville is outlined on Pages 3-4 through 3-6.

The Plan recommends improvements for thoroughfares and intersections through Town. Thoroughfare improvements are specified as Widening or Access Management (Pages 3-7 through 3-8), while intersection improvements can be anything from signalization to access management to adding or extending turn lanes. The list of intersections and potential improvements are found on Page 3-9.

The recommended road extensions, or Connectivity-Enhancing Projects, are detailed on Page 3-10 of the draft Plan.

Finally, Chapter 3 includes more detailed information and specific recommendations for five Strategic Corridors: Town Hall Drive, McCrimmon Parkway, NC 54, Airport Boulevard, and Morrisville-Carpenter Road. The Strategic Corridors are on Pages 3-11 through 3-21 of the draft Plan.

The changes to Chapter 3 from the September 25<sup>th</sup> draft are as follows:

- Intersections
  - Added table of intersection improvement countermeasures
  - Removed committed intersection improvements
  - Added new intersection improvement projects
- Roadway Connectivity Projects
  - Removed map
  - Removed committed projects
  - Removed Green Drive Extension
  - Added conditions for Crabtree Crossing Parkway Extension, Stockton Gorge and Millicent Way
- Modified NC 147 alignment and removed Town Hall Drive connection to NC 147
- Updated multiple figures and tables to improve legibility
- Relocated Project Prioritization for the Roadway Section was moved to Chapter 5
- Revised the layout of some pages to improve readability

*Member Langston* wanted clarification on Intersection Improvement Countermeasures. *Mr. Howell* explained that the term is meant to be essentially a “toolbox” for intersection improvements available. *Member Acharya* asked if the countermeasures would identify how many roundabouts the Town could have. *Mr. Howell* indicated that the “toolbox” is not that specific. More studies would be required to see what countermeasures would apply to some intersections.

*Member Langston* then brought up an item on Page 3-13 regarding Airport Boulevard. He related this information to Figure 3-4 that identified new intersections at Town Hall Drive and Church Street. *Mr. Howell* said the Plan does include recommendations to extend Airport Boulevard. *Member Langston* understood this to mean that if the grade separation at Airport Boulevard takes place, there may not be the need for left turns, etc. that have been planned.

#### Chapter 4 Alternative Travel Modes

This chapter identifies the Alternative Travel Modes as Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit. This information has been divided in the chapter by modes: on-street bicycle facilities, multi-use path facilities, and transit

-On-Street Bicycle Facilities and Network

- Recommendations and specifications for types of facilities – bike lanes and sharrows
- Multi-Use Path Facilities and Network
- Recommendations and specifications for types of facilities – greenways, sidepaths, and greenway connectors
- Transit Network
- Overview of existing and proposed transit service funded by Wake Transit

The changes to Chapter 4 are as follows:

- Revised maps for on-street bicycle facilities and multi-use path facilities
- Moved the Project Prioritization section to Chapter 5
- Removed the Multi-Use Path Design Guidance Section since content was relocated to Appendix F
- Revised page layout to improve readability

### Chapter 5 Action Plan

This chapter includes the funding tables for the Blue Ribbon Commission report and an Action Plan for implementing the draft Plan.

The Action Plan includes:

- Existing Policies & Programs (Table 5-4), Policies & Programs currently under development (Pages 5-4 through 5-7), and Recommendations for new Policies & Programs (Pages 5-8 through 5-13)
- Roadway, Intersection and Multi-Use Path project prioritization

The changes to this chapter include the following:

- Consolidated all prioritization recommendations in Chapter 5
- Moved funding section to the front of Chapter
- Connected Guiding Principles to prioritization
- Combined roadway and intersection improvements and connectivity-enhancing projects into one table
- Provided a single map of all prioritized road projects
- Organized recommendations for Policies & Programs and Facility Improvements -
  - Near-Term: Less than 15 years.
  - Mid-Term: 15-24 years
  - Long-Term: greater than 25 years
- Provided a single map of all prioritized independent multi-use path projects
- Moved Transportation Technology section to Appendix G
- Revised layout of some pages to improve readability

*Member Acharya* asked about near, mid, and long-term project recommendations. He used Airport Boulevard Extension as an example. The project would have an incremental development effect for the Town. It might not need a huge investment upfront. *Mr. Howell* explained that the “terms” attempt to address the highest needs. One of the highest needs identified is the NC 54 widening. Widening some of our existing roads, especially on our main arteries such as NC 54, would be a higher priority over constructing a new road. *Director Tanner* added that this is a Plan. When developing policies and priorities, if the Board feels a priority is not appropriate it can be modified.

*Member Taylor* brought up the NC 54 grade separation for Airport Boulevard. From the Planning and Zoning Board recommendations, he recalled this project as being on the near-term list. He wondered if Town Council moved it to the mid-term. *Mr. Howell* said he would be reviewing the prioritization to verify its placement. *Director Tanner* verified that *Member Taylor* was correct regarding the recommendation for the NC 54/Airport Boulevard grade separation being short-term.

*Member Taylor* also brought up the Airport Boulevard Extension, which was long-term. He further added that he wondered if these projects should be linked. *Director Tanner* explained that they would still connect, but probably not to Town Hall Drive or Church Street. It would not be a full length connection. She asked the Board how they would want to prioritize these projects. The consensus of the Board was to align the extension with the grade separation. *Mr. Howell* said that the Airport Boulevard Extension project was split into two phases in the plan – the grade separation extension at Church Street and the Church Street to Town Hall drive section. These projects could be identified as Phase 1 (short-term) and Phase 2 (mid-term).

A number of new appendices have been added or changed. Those changes were:

#### Appendix A – Glossary

- This is a new appendix
- A glossary of terms was added, as directed by the Planning and Zoning Board which includes a list of acronyms and terms frequently used in the CTP and their definitions

*Member Acharya* asked if there was a hyperlink in the electronic copy that links to the terms that are in the glossary. *Mr. Howell* replied that it isn't set up at present, but could be something that could be looked into for the final version.

*Member Taylor* commented that the information on Figure 5-2 was confusing. For example, it shows the 147 Extension connection to Davis Drive marked in red as committed. He thinks there should be a better way to represent that information, such as using dashed lines. *Director Tanner* stated that it is a committed project. *Mr. Howell* explained that the project has significant money earmarked; however, the alignment is not established yet. He suggested perhaps using a different color and noting that in the legend.

#### Appendix B – Standardized Cross Sections (Previously Appendix A)

- Includes the eleven standardized cross sections for roads in Morrisville
  - Includes the Street Design guide cross-referencing the street hierarchy classifications. Cross-sections include both standard and alternative dimensions.
- Added Morrisville Roadway Inventory Table, which identifies the cross-section type

The changes to this appendix include:

- Revised Street Design table to be more user-friendly
- Revised standard street cross-sections to include standard and alternative dimensions
- Added a Morrisville Roadway Inventory Table that provides recommended cross-sections for some roadways

### Appendix C – Project Sheets (Previously Appendix B)

This appendix includes all the project sheets for thoroughfare improvements and collector-level roadway extension projects.

- Each Project Sheet includes all planning level cost estimates, 2010/2040 Volume and Congestion, the 3-year Crash History, the Project Length and Extent, and Roadway Classification

The changes to this appendix are as follows:

- Reorganized introductory section to explaining how project sheet data was developed
- Reorganized Project Sheets in alphabetical order

### Appendix D – Engagement Summary (Previously Appendix C)

This appendix provides an overview of the public engagement during the planning process. The process included the following:

- Community Events, Public Workshops, Public Open Houses
- Board and Council presentations and Work Sessions
- Online Survey and interactive mapping results

Changes made to this appendix are as follows:

- Reorganized several tables to make them easier to read
- Combined online survey results onto one map
- Used high-resolution graphics to ensure all images were readable
- Converted all scanned comments into a table format

### Appendix E – Scenario Planning

- This is a new appendix
- Includes the Scenario Planning process, the maps and report cards for McCrimmon Parkway, NC 54, and Town Hall Drive (3 corridors selected for Scenario Planning).

### Appendix F – Multi-Use Path Design Guidelines

- This is a new appendix
- Includes detailed design guidelines for construction of multi-use paths and amenities with the goal to establish a Town-wide standard. For example, Table F-1 specifies different widths for potential multi-use paths and where they should be used.

### Appendix G – Transportation Technology

- This is a new appendix
- Provides an overview of emerging transportation technology
- Includes a list of near-term planning strategies for Morrisville

*Member Acharya* had questions regarding technology that controls traffic flow by controlling the speed limits. *Mr. Howell* explained that would be considered an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS). This would depend on what roads the Town wanted to pursue this type of use on. It would probably be best served on State roads, which the Town has no control over. CAMPO is looking into a regional ITS plan. Page 5-6 does have recommendations for using ITS. There is

some traffic signal technology used and the Town is on the Town of Cary's coordinated signal system.

#### Appendix H – Plan & Policy Review

- This is a new appendix
- Provides an overview of all adopted Town, Regional and Statewide plans, ordinances, and policies that were reviewed during the draft CTP development

#### Appendix I – Crabtree Crossing Extension Analysis

- This is a new appendix
- Consists of an overview of all analysis of the Crabtree Crossing Parkway Extension (CCPE) conducted at the Planning and Zoning Board's request
- Planning and Zoning Board used analysis, in addition to public comments, to formulate changes to the September 25<sup>th</sup> draft
- Consists of ten scenarios run by the consultants using the Triangle Regional Travel Demand Model.

Recommended modifications based on staff review of the February 23, 2018 version include:

- Figure 3-2
  - Includes additional road names
- Figure 5-2
  - Renumber to Figure 5-3
- Figure 5-3
  - Renumber to Figure 5-4
  - Label greenways
  - Move location of sidepath on Airport Blvd.
- Include hyperlinks in the Table of Contents.
- Ensure project lengths on Project Sheets match project sheets in Table 3-3.
- Revise the right-of-way widths for cross-sections in Appendix B to be sure the widths can accommodate all the elements
- Add new project sheets in Appendix C
  - Marcom Drive Extension
  - Morrisville East Connector
  - Southport Drive Extension
- Add Town Hall Drive Extension
  - No connection to NC 147
  - Design consistent with direction provided by RTP at March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - Recommend extending Town Hall Drive north to provide secondary access to neighborhoods accessed off Church Street between McCrimmon Parkway and NC 540

*Member Acharya* asked if a Town Hall Drive Extension would then end as a dead-end road or connect to the Keystone Park. *Mr. Howell* said one option could be to take the road to Providence Place. *Director Tanner* added that Keystone is not in the Town, and the Town cannot take the road past our 540 boundary. Providence Place is the farthest north the road could extend.

Staff's recommendation for the Planning and Zoning Board review of the draft CTP was as follows:

- March 8, 2018 - Staff Presentation
- April 12, 2018 - Open Public Comment Session
- May 10, 2018 - Continue Public Comment Session
- June 14, 2018 - Planning and Zoning Board Recommendation

Staff has scheduled the following community events:

- Morrisville Transportation Fair – March 22
- Bike Safety Rodeo sponsored by Fire & Rescue Department - April 7
- Pre-Council meeting event - April 24
- Park West Village Concert Series (booth) - May 3
- Spring Fest (booth) - May 19
- Chamber of Commerce – possibly Coffee & Connection (unscheduled)

Staff is also scheduling neighborhood meetings with the following:

- Drop in at Cedar Fork Community Center - April 4
- Perimeter Park – Perimeter Perk space - April 17
- Drop in at Cedar Fork (Senior Friday) - April 27
- Morrisville Aquatics & Fitness Center - May 7
- Morrisville Community Park - May 12
- Triangle Rock Club - May 23
- Several HOA meetings are in the process of being scheduled

*Member Acharya* had questions regarding comments from the public commonly being predominantly against a project He wanted direction on how to assess feedback that is “lopsided”, or leans strongly in one direction. *Director Tanner* explained that there is no good way to measure. She added that this is why it is important to listen to all comments and then make conscious decisions on how to make changes. This is a vision of the Town so all the competing needs must be balanced and the best recommendation made.

*Mr. Howell* then told the Board that public outreach would include press releases, social media, the Town website and the Transportation Plan Update web page. There will be at least one postcard mailing. There is an effort to get as broad a reach as possible. The Public Comment Portal is open on the website found on the Transportation Plan Update webpage. New comments will be compiled and provided with the new revised draft CTP.

Once the Planning and Zoning Board makes its recommendation, the Town Council will then review the CTP as well as hold at least one public hearing.

Chairman Prichard said that he believes that the CTP has a better flow now and that the plans for outreach are very comprehensive.

A recess was taken at 8:32 pm.

The meeting was resumed at 8:40 pm.

## **8. Old Business – Public Comment**

None

## 9. Old Business

None

## 10. Staff Comments

*Current Planning Manager Stegall* reviewed the Draft Planning and Zoning Board Handbook. This one handbook pulled together information from a number of sources; such as the UDO, Public Bodies Administrative Policy, General Statutes, and Robert's Rules of Order to provide a resource for the Board. Dylan Bruchhaus, Planner I, played a role in completing this project.

*Ms. Stegall* then reviewed each section. The UDO establishes what the powers, duties and responsibilities of the Planning and Zoning Board are.

She began with Section II, which provides the Establishment and Authority of the Board. Section III explains the membership, including the State law requirement for an ETJ member. Wake County appoints this member. The officers' duties and responsibilities are outlined in Section IV. Section V reviews staff's role as being a general resource and providing support for the Board.

*Ms. Stegall* described the first sections as coming directly from the UDO. Meetings, Section VI, comes more from NC State Statues in terms of how to adopt a schedule each year, when agendas must be published and the required timeframes.

*Chairman Prichard* stated that he felt a time limit of 11:00 pm to end meetings by was a good rule to have in place.

*Member Langston* wanted clarification on the 2/3s vote. *Chairman Prichard* stated it would be based on the number of members present; 4 of 5 members present would be 2/3rds.

Section VII describes the rules of procedures. This includes how the agenda is prepared, items being placed on the agenda by request by the chair, staff or Town Council, and the order of the agenda. One item pertaining to the agenda order highlighted is Public Address.

*Chairman Prichard* brought up the issue of confidential material. *Ms. Stegall* explained that there may be instances when a document marked confidential might be sent to the Board with their packet. The *Chair* suggested that Section VII.A.1. should be modified to read "*Board members shall not discuss any confidential materials at any **open** meeting or with any members, or with any members of the public.*"

*Vice Chairwoman Botha* wanted to know what the difference is between Public Address and Public Comment. *Ms. Stegall* explained that public comment refers to speaking on a specific agenda item and public address refers to an opportunity for someone to speak to the Board for 3 minutes about any topic that may not be on the agenda. *Member Acharya* wanted clarification on Old or New Business with Public Comment. *Ms. Stegall* explained that these comments were usually in reference to a specific development item on the agenda.

*Member Willis* had questions regarding Upcoming Events. *Director Tanner* explained that this was a preferred item on Council's agenda and it is on the Planning and Zoning Board agenda as a link to the Town calendar.

*Member Acharya* thought that Public Address should be moved to after New Business on the agenda. *Chairman Prichard* was not in favor of changing the agenda order as it might encourage

comments on the comments or require an individual that wishes to speak for 3 minutes to wait through a long meeting to do so. *Director Tanner* agreed with the Chairman's opinion.

*Chairman Prichard* commented that Section VII.C.2. Work Session should read *work session(s)* in the first sentence.

In the Public Participation section (VIII), the Public Address item would be kept in the Type of Participation based on the prior discussion. This section does touch on the public comment portal as a way to encourage people to submit comments. This section also includes the time allotment of 3 minutes per individual and no more than 6 minutes for a group.

*Member Acharya* wanted to know if there are other avenues for comments. *Ms. Stegall* explained the process to sign up to speak or submit an "e-comment". Comments can be submitted in writing through the Planning Department.

*Chairman Prichard* brought up the difficulty of maintaining the order of speakers, as well as obtaining the names and addresses. *Director Tanner* explained that there is an on-line system that will be available and will streamline the process.

*Ms. Stegall* asked for the Board's guidance regarding setting a time limit on the pro and con public comment period. *Member Acharya* suggested increasing the time to 30 minutes for each group. *Chairman Prichard* felt that it would not be fair to limit the number of speakers or their time limit of 3 minutes per individual/6 minutes for a group for public comment. *Member Willis* concurred. *Director Tanner* explained that many speakers will submit their concerns in writing as well as choosing to speak at a Planning and Zoning Board meeting. *Chairman Prichard* suggested editing the language to read "the Board may reserve the right to.... cut off public comments" in light of other items on the agenda. *Vice Chairwoman Botha* felt that if there are those wishing to speak at the public meeting they should be allowed to. *Director Tanner* did address the case of 100s of people present to speak and indicated that the Board could ask for a representative to speak on behalf of the group which could assist in time management, but a policy in place could support that action by the Board. For example, the Board could then vote to continue to hear public comments at the next meeting. She has also suggested that a large group wear one color and have a representative speak. The themes of the comments may be conflicting, as in wanting connectivity but not near my home. *Chairman Prichard* suggested changing the language of this section to reflect the discussion to give the Board some discretion.

Section IX covers Robert's Rules of Order, which directs the meeting procedures, how to make a motion, and voting requirements. This includes abstaining from voting on an item. *Member Willis* stated that in the past she has abstained from a vote. *Ms. Stegall* stated that a majority is required for a vote to pass. The *Chair* was concerned that an abstention might be similar to a "no" vote and therefore affect the majority vote.

*Vice Chairwoman Botha* inquired about the wording in the Section about making a motion to table or continue. *Ms. Stegall* explained that if you make a motion to table or continue an item, that motion must pass or the Board would have to return to consideration of the original motion. This wording can be edited to make the section clearer.

*Chairman Prichard* stated that he has never had to take a roll call vote. *Ms. Stegall* explained that this is a member by member vote verbally. A voice vote is when there is a simultaneous voice vote of all members in favor of an item and all members opposed to an item. The difference

was not clear to the *Chair*, since in most cases the Board has voted by voice vote. *Member Taylor* does not remember the Board using a roll call vote since his membership on the Planning and Zoning Board.

*Ms. Stegall* then briefly reviewed the types of decisions as described in Section X being Administrative and Legislative decisions. The *Chair* asked about voluntary conditions that the applicant has agreed to. *Ms. Stegall* explained that there was nothing preventing the Board from making suggestions that an applicant may or may not choose to voluntarily agree to.

Open Meetings Law (Section XI) addresses meetings being broadcast, streamed and recorded. There are seldom situations for the Planning and Zoning Board to hold closed sessions, but a rare possibility. Careful use of emails should be taken. Replying to “all” would constitute a meeting. *Member Acharya* asked if remote call or video conference would be permitted to participate. *Director Tanner* added that there would be no voting rights for remote or video “attendance”. *Member Acharya* wanted verification regarding attendance.

Lastly, *Ms. Stegall* addressed Section XII General Conduct. This section reviews attendance, conduct, and conflicts of interest. *Director Tanner* did have concerns regarding absences, since it affects the decisions made by the Board. There is an attendance policy in place that should be a consideration when agreeing to sit on the Board. *Member Taylor* added that the public is showing up, staff is showing up, the Board too should show up. A quorum should be present. A member can submit their comments if unable to attend a meeting.

*Ms. Stegall* stated that adjustments would be made and brought back to the next meeting.

*Director Tanner* reviewed the February 2018 Planning Newsletter. A new application was submitted for the Broadside Trailside Multifamily project. WaterWalk Hotel was approved. Two items reviewed by this Board, the special use permit for the Shiloh Crossing Shopping Center and the conditional rezoning for the parking lot associated with the Historic Christian Church, were approved by the Town Council.

She also reminded the Board of the link to the interactive development map that is found at the bottom of the Planning Newsletter.

The Transportation Fair will be held on March 22 at the Fire Station 1.

*Ms. Stegall* reminded the Board that there is an opportunity for training available April 5<sup>th</sup> in Raleigh sponsored by the UNC School of Government.

#### **11. Planning and Zoning Board Comments**

*Chairman Prichard* congratulated *Vice Chairwoman Botha* on her confirmation as Vice-Chair of the Planning and Zoning Board.

#### **12. Upcoming Term Expirations**

None

#### **13. Upcoming Events**

None

**14. Adjournment**

*Member Langston* made a motion to adjourn the meeting. *Vice Chairwoman Botha* seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:44 pm.

---

Peter Prichard,  
Planning and Zoning Board Chair

---

Marty Saunders,  
Secretary to the Board

---

Date

---

Date