



Wake County Planning Board

Meeting Agenda – WORK SESSION

Wednesday, July 21, 2021 – 1:30 p.m.
Wake County Justice Center – Room 2700
301 S. McDowell St. – Raleigh, N.C.

1. Call to Order – Mr. Asa Fleming, Vice Chair
2. Petitions and Amendments
3. Approval of Minutes from June 2, 2021
4. Northeast Area Study Update – CAMPO
5. PLANWake Work Plan
6. ETJ Criteria Discussion
7. Municipal Transition Standards Discussion
8. Reports
 - Committee Reports
 - Staff Reports
9. Chairman's Report
10. Adjournment



Planning, Development & Inspections

TEL (PLANNING) 919 856 6310
TEL (INSPECTIONS) 919 856 6222

A Division of Community Services
P.O. Box 550 • Raleigh, NC 27602
www.wakegov.com

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Wake County Planning Board

Wednesday July 21, 2021, 1:30 p.m.

Online Meeting via WebEx

Members Present: (6) Mr. Asa Fleming (Vice-Chair), Mr. Jason Barron, Ms. Brenna Booker-Rouse, Mr. Bill Jenkins, Mr. Ted Van Dyk, Mr. Thomas Wells

Members Absent: (4) Mr. Amos Clark (Chair), Ms. Meredith Crawford, Mr. Daniel Kadis, Mr. Tony Yao

Participating County Staff: (6) Mrs. Loretta Alston (Clerk to the Board), Mr. Steven Finn (Land Development Administrator), Mr. Tim Gardiner (Planner III), Mr. Tim Maloney (PDI Director), Ms. Terry Nolan (Planner III), Ms. Sharon Peterson (Planning Administrator)

County Attorney: (1) Mr. Kenneth Murphy (Senior Assistant County Attorney)

1. **Meeting Called to Order:** Mr. Fleming, Acting Chair, called the Planning Board meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.
2. **Petitions and Amendments:** None
3. **Approval of Minutes from June 2, 2021:** Motion to approve the minutes from June 2, 2021 was made by Mr. Barron and seconded by Mr. Wells. The minutes were unanimously approved as presented.
4. **Northeast Area Study Update – CAMPO**
Mr. Tim Gardiner gave a brief introduction to a pre-recorded video presentation of the Northeast Area Study. Mr. Brandon Watson of the North Carolina Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) provided the final briefing of the study via the following YouTube link:
<https://youtu.be/J16qjx4MgKY>

The goal was to provide the Board with a summary of the project in the Highway 401 and US Highway 1 corridors, by highlighting the work that had been completed and growth aspects, as well as providing a summary of their second round of outreach and the final product.

Board Discussion

Mr. Van Dyk asked Mr. Fleming, given how much has changed regarding commuter patterns, if he thought another, more immediate update to the plan is needed. Mr. Van Dyk stated that this plan is a pre-pandemic effort and wondered if it should be revisited more quickly than a typical long-term plan. Mr. Fleming and Mr. Jenkins both agreed that the organization did a great job at pivoting its modes of engagement to a virtual setting and transitioning with the post-pandemic setting.

Mr. Jenkins stated that he believes it is too early to redo the study, but that CAMPO has identified a number of 'hot spots' that need to be addressed. Mr. Jenkins went on to say that the projects that are further down the line will be reviewed and re-prioritized, and new plans will emerge over the next few years; thus, he is comfortable with the current plan.

Mr. Wells stated that he believes Mr. Van Dyk's comments are valid and agrees that the plan does not need to be reconstructed, but perhaps an addendum of proposed changes in priorities should be explored and possibly additional public input.

Mr. Barron believes the points raised are also extremely valid, but they are questions for which CAMPO will not have data for a few years. To revise the current analysis, he feels the Board should wait to hear from CAMPO or Stantec about how they plan to proceed with the need for revisions if they become necessary. Mr. Gardiner stated that the Board's comments about post-pandemic concerns would be passed along to CAMPO to ensure that the Board is involved as they develop the 2050 MTP.

Responding to an inquiry from Mr. Wells, Mr. Gardiner stated that the frequency of studying these areas is every three years. He stated the next area of study will be on the Southeast Area, and staff will be concerned with the Board's concerns being addressed within that plan as well. Mr. Wells stated that they need to be updated on a regular basis also due to economic changes in the County, with the announcement of all the corporations moving into the area. Mr. Van Dyk praised the amount of time spent on bicycle lanes and facilities and further stated that a two or three-year reevaluation of the general plan is a great idea because traffic patterns are changing versus increasing or waning.

Mr. Wells inquired if CAMPO was seeking endorsement or approval from the Planning Board and what were the next steps for the Board. Mr. Gardiner stated that this is a guidance document that will influence the next MTP process, and unless the board announces any major 'red flags,' county staff is comfortable with the amount of engagement the Board has had with the plan thus far. Mr. Wells asked staff if local municipalities had endorsed the plan; Mr. Gardiner replied that CAMPO and the consultant team are seeking endorsements from those groups.

Mr. Barron inquired about the timeframe for engaging local municipalities in northeastern Wake County for feedback once CAMPO has adopted the plan. Mr. Barron expressed concern for the speed at which CAMPO is endorsing thoroughfare plan updates when this area is growing and changing so significantly. Mr. Van Dyk agreed and recommended that the Board make a statement of our support yet request that they evaluate future data. Mr. Gardiner stated that staff shares some of the same concerns and are working with the municipalities on the general progress of the changes as well.

Ms. Booker-Rouse noted her main concern was how long it would take to implement the plan if it was updated or changed at this point in the implementation process. Mr. Gardiner stated that is a concern, as these processes are lengthy depending on which issue poses the concern. He stated there is still time to perfect some items.

5. PLANWake Work Plan

Mr. Maloney reminded the Board of the high-level overview of the PlanWake roadmap that staff presented at the virtual meeting on June 2, 2021. The document was sent via email by the Clerk (and is also available on PlanWake.org) and outlines the workplan to implement all the changes that are needed in relation to Land Use Policy, Area Plans, Unified Development Ordinance Amendments, and Performance Metrics. Mr. Maloney introduced the next two items on the agenda as the first of many items that the Board will need to address in the coming months.

6. Extra Territorial Jurisdiction (ETJ) Criteria Discussion

Ms. Terry Nolan presented a basic summary of the newly adopted ETJ criteria for the walkable centers and community designations in Wake County jurisdiction and noted that there were eight reduced down to six. The new criteria are:

- 1- Request should be in line with Development Framework Map
- 2- Request should be an area jointly planned for municipal development
- 3- Municipal Comprehensive Planning has taken place
- 4- Municipality is ready to provide services
- 5- Municipality has engaged affected residents about the request
- 6- Municipality is advancing County-wide goals

Ms. Nolan noted that the previous criteria did not include requirements for public engagement, but communities have been doing it as part of their requests for years. Criteria 1-5 are not major changes, but the sixth criterion is a new requirement. Ms. Nolan further acknowledged that this added criterion is a way for the County to acknowledge the important role municipalities play in providing the housing and transportation choices residents want.

Ms. Nolan summarized some of the concerns regarding this criterion expressed by County commissioners and by elected town officials, including different priorities between municipalities and the County, possible broad scope of goals that would not be applicable to the criterion, and municipality access to resources.

To combat some of the concerns, staff focused on four topic areas that municipalities could target as their goals.

- 1- Transportation/Walkability
- 2- Housing Choices
- 3- Impacts of planning decision on vulnerable communities
- 4- Environment

Transportation

- Describe municipal efforts to plan for and provide public transit in the community, including how municipal plans align with the Wake County Transit Plan.
- How do municipal plans, policies, and ordinances support safe transportation alternatives?
- How is the municipality working cooperatively with other jurisdictions and partners, including Wake County, to support safe transportation alternatives?

Housing

- Describe municipal efforts to plan for and provide housing choices and affordable housing through planning and development policies, ordinances, and plans such as a municipal affordable housing plan, residential density, ADUs, zoning districts or form-based code, or incentives.
- How is the municipality working cooperatively with other jurisdictions and partners, including Wake County, to support housing affordability?

Vulnerable Communities

- Describe how vulnerable communities are identified and considered in the planning and development process, such as methods to evaluate impacts of planning/zoning decisions.

Sustainability/Resiliency

- How is the municipality advancing sustainability and resiliency through planning and development policies, ordinances, and plans such as urban forestry plans, green stormwater infrastructure, open space acquisition, floodplain protection and restoration policies/initiatives, or incentives for best practices?
- How is the municipality working cooperatively with partners and stakeholders, including Wake County, to support sustainability and resiliency?

Board Discussion

Mr. Wells asked if Ms. Nolan had access to the criteria that is currently in place for review.

Mr. Fleming expressed his appreciation that staff is attempting to create synergy between municipalities and the County, especially with vulnerable communities.

Mr. Van Dyk asked if funding plans and timeline for completion of services is part of the new criteria. Mr. Barron agreed, and shared his frustrations that residents have in growing areas regarding slowly advancing transportation improvements that do not happen until property development is complete. Mr. Barron pointed out that there needs to be a way for the County to be able to gauge the degree that local governments are going to accept most of the financial responsibility associated with these costs. Mr. Van Dyk and Mr. Fleming agreed.

Mr. Barron stated that there needed to be some clarity within the new criteria, regarding anticipated land use plans within the areas, and making sure those decisions are being made in a way that makes sense and is reasonable and responsible. Mr. Barron provided additional feedback on housing and sustainability, that he thought it was important to not only include mandatory requirements in the ordinance, but to also be creative and include incentives for developers to think outside the box, and to also consider what the local governments have already done within their jurisdictions to align with County goals. Mr. Van Dyk agreed that this would be a great approach. Ms. Sharon Peterson confirmed that the municipal planners already voiced this concern, and the County will take the comprehensive actions of the entire jurisdictions into account, not only the ETJ areas.

Mr. Jenkins asked staff about scoring future requests against these criteria and Ms. Nolan stated that would be to the discretion of the board, as staff's duty would be to bring the best and most complete request, taking into account what the board has deemed most important.

7. Municipal Transition Standards Discussion

Mr. Gardiner gave a brief presentation on the Municipal Transition Standards (MTS) UDO amendment, to direct new development toward cities and towns.

Mr. Gardiner stated that the current tools for managing water and sewer connection to municipalities are that state law requires for higher density residential and commercial subdivisions to be connected to water and sewer systems, typically 1.45 units per acre which is reflected in the 2005 Traditional Urban Development Standards (TUDs) policy.

The policy contains the following:

- Subdivisions are required to connect to an existing municipal water or sewer utility if located within a distance that equals 50' per dwelling unit or a maximum of 2,500'
- Planning Director can issue waiver based on efforts made by the developer and town; or physical/legal conditions that make connection infeasible.

The Proposed Municipal Transition Standards contains:

- The existing connection requirements and waiver that's in our TUDs

- Expanded to include commercial development
- Requirement of subdivisions and commercial development in the Community or Walkable Center Area to consult with the municipality first about feasible utility connection
- Can a feasible connection be made in two years (or another time frame deemed appropriate)?

Mr. Gardiner asked the Board if they still support this approach, what information is needed before making a recommendation, and are there any technical details needed prior to viewing a request for a UDO text amendment?

Board Discussion

Mr. Fleming inquired whether staff had received any pushback from any municipalities or homebuilders. Mr. Gardiner speculated that there might be developers who would question the definition of feasible and requesting waivers as a result.

Mr. Barron commented that a process that creates incentives for the local government to participate financially in these plans, so that the county achieves the goal of municipal density in those areas rather than issuing the waivers. Mr. Maloney stated that staff needs to have discussions with the municipalities on how to effectively build in those incentives to be able to achieve the shared goals.

Mr. Gardiner stated that the goal is to provide the municipalities with three options, with a possible fourth.

- 1- Develop under full municipal standards
- 2- Develop under quasi-municipal standards
- 3- Develop in phases
- 4- Develop under County standards

Mr. Maloney stated that the next step for both the ETJ and MTS topics will be similar. Staff will update both plans with the comments and feedback from today's discussion. The ETJ criteria will be shared with the municipalities for their feedback, after which the Board will discuss changes and possible recommendation. The MTS plan will be shared with the municipalities at an upcoming meeting and will then be shared with homebuilders' groups, before coming back to the Board for discussion and recommendation.

Mr. Maloney confirmed with the Board if it was still their desire to meet as a full body, and not at committee level on PlanWake goals. Mr. Jenkins confirmed that he preferred that the full board meet via a work session format, and Mr. Wells agreed depending on the workload of the full board.

8. Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

Staff Report

Ms. Peterson informed the board that recommendations on a new area plan boundary will be presented for Board input, as well as a Land Use Plan Amendment/ Zoning case to come before the board soon.

The Micro Transit Study for on-demand service and express routes for rural areas, is set to launch in early fall.

Mr. Steven Finn updated the Board with the renovation of the Current Planning office space, notably working in swing space on the fifth floor of the County Building until mid-Fall. He advised that the zoning applications, site plans and subdivision reviews were literally 50-50 in terms of applications by

type. He further noted that we have three preliminary subdivisions recently received totaling over 60 lots and remain active with development applications.

Mr. Maloney informed the board that it will continue to meet in person until further notice, there will be no hybrid option at this time. Virtual meetings are still an option if meetings are to be informational only. The next board meeting will be August 4, 2021.

9. Chairman's Report

None

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

=====

REGULAR MEETING
WAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
July 21, 2021

Vice Chair Asa Fleming declared the regular meeting
of the Wake County Planning Board for
Wednesday, July 21, 2021 adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Asa Fleming
Wake County Planning Board

=====