

TOWN COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, MAY 18, 2026, 6:00 PM
1500 BLOWING ROCK ROAD AND WEBEX

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Dalton George, Mayor Pro Tem Todd Carter (via WebEx), Anne Pruitt, Virginia Roseman, and Adrian Tait

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Frank Veno, Garrett Kight, Declan King, David Luther, and Michael Mileski (via WebEx)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT: Frida Paz-Miranda

PLANNING STAFF PRESENT: Jane Shook-Director of Planning & Inspections, Brandon Wise-Deputy Director of Planning & Inspections, Jessica Mitchell-Advanced Planning Specialist (via WebEx), and Brenda Henson-Board Clerk

OTHER TOWN STAFF OR REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Todd Moody-Public Works Director, and Allison Meade-Town Attorney

Call to Order

Mayor George called the Town Council to order at 6:03 p.m. Chair Veno called the Planning Commission to order at the same time. The meeting was held at the Town Council Chambers, located at 1500 Blowing Rock Road, Boone, and via WebEx.

Moment of Silence

A moment of silence was observed.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Council Member Roseman made a motion, seconded by Council Member Pruitt, to approve the April 27, 2026, Public Hearing/Planning Commission meeting minutes.

VOTE: Aye – 4
Nay – 0

The motion passed.

Commission Member King made a motion to approve the April 27, 2026, Public Hearing/Planning Commission meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Kight.

VOTE: Aye – 5
Nay – 0
Absent – 1 (Paz-Miranda)

The motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING

Case A24-0077 Transportation Impact Analysis – UDO Text Amendment

A text amendment to UDO Article 4 and Appendix C to modify transportation impact analysis (TIA) provisions. Modifications include changes to process, content, and mitigation.

Jane Shook, Director of Planning & Inspections, introduced Thomas Shirley, a traffic consultant with Kimley-Horn, and Todd Moody, Public Works Director.

Ms. Shook reviewed the staff report as presented in the board packet and noted that this material was revised based on the discussion from the initial presentation of the material in October. Ms. Shook reviewed

the process graphic provided in the staff report that reviewed the new process for a transportation impact analysis (TIA). Ms. Shook stated that all steps would be completed before the proposed development submitted their development application. She noted that a potential trigger for a conditional district would be discussed later in the meeting.

Ms. Shook noted that as requested a table had been added to illustrate the types of development that could trigger a TIA. She then referenced a change on packet page 26, item R. 4. to remove the word "and" and replace it with the word "or" so that the sentence reads, "The Synchro 95th percentile or SimTraffic Maximum queue increases 75 feet or more *or* exceeds storage for a turn lane."

Ms. Shook offered the following new paragraph to be inserted as the second paragraph below item R. 4.: *With respect to mitigation that may be affected through on-site infrastructure, such as a turning lane into a development's driveway, mitigation measures must fully mitigate the impact of the proposed project to the fullest extent that can be accommodated on-site.*

Allison Meade, Town Attorney, noted that the text would help draw a distinction between property under the developer's full control versus property outside the control of the developer. If the developer had the capacity to provide on-site mitigation on their own parcel, it needed to be fully done.

Ms. Shook stated that specific language for the potential CD trigger had not been drafted, but hoped that the Planning Commission could recommend approval of the text amendment tonight, with the stipulation that this language be presented to the Council next week for approval. Ms. Shook explained that if the study recommended mitigation and the developer was unable to adequately host those improvements on their own property or within an existing right-of-way for off-site improvements, a conditional district would be triggered. This would allow for a larger conversation of the impacts on the community and the area as a whole.

Ms. Meade clarified that if mitigation was required off-site, but the developer could obtain the right-of-way or the agreement of whoever was involved to do that mitigation, then a CD would not be required. However, if the off-site mitigation could not be completed, the CD would be triggered.

Ms. Shook noted that she would like to make the TIA regulations effective on January 1, 2027. This would allow the staff time to work out details related to the administration of the new process.

Ms. Meade suggested adding language stating that the contract must be legally binding.

Council Member Tait asked what the cost would be for a pre-application meeting and the TIA. Ms. Shook replied that the cost for TIA's would vary based on the scope, so it would be project-dependent. Mr. Shirley noted that the consultant would run a trip generation to determine whether a TIA was required. A pre-application meeting to discuss the scoping process would then be scheduled. Mr. Shirley estimated that a pre-application meeting would cost \$3,000 to \$5,000, and a TIA would cost \$10,000 to \$30,000, depending on the project's size. Mr. Shirley added that the cost would be the same whether a developer contracted the TIA or the town did. Ms. Shook stated that cost recovery would need to be considered to compensate for staff time spent managing this process. These costs would be in addition to the consultant fees.

Mayor Pro Tem Carter asked whether the fee structure would need to be presented to the Town Council before the regulations take effect on January 1, 2027. Ms. Shook replied that a public hearing could be held at a Council meeting to consider revisions to the fee schedule.

Council Member Roseman referred to Section 3.03.04, which stated that within 5 business days of receiving the fully executed scoping document, the transportation consultant shall submit a summary of consultant fees for preparing the analysis. She expressed concern that this timeframe was a quick turnaround. Ms. Shook noted that the timeframes were set up to provide assurance to the developer about the timeliness of the new procedure.

Ms. Shook explained that the proposed process would require developers to have firmer plans before they could submit their formal application, and noted that if a CD was triggered, there would be additional time

added to the process because the CD process required a neighborhood meeting. She suggested revisiting the text several months after adoption to discuss how the process was working.

Council Member Tait complimented the document's depth.

Ms. Shook stated that a mitigation agreement must be signed by the applicant prior to submitting any permit application. If the development did not trigger a CD, the mitigation agreement would be administered at a staff level by Public Works, Planning & Inspections, and NCDOT when applicable.

Commission Member Luther asked whether there would be a cumulative impact if someone did not meet one of the mitigation triggers. Mr. Shirley explained that scoping meetings accounted for adjacent development that was underway or proposed. He stated that a third development in the same area could trigger mitigation, even though the first two did not. Mr. Shirley noted that this was one of the imperfections of the TIA process.

Commission Member Luther asked whether he understood correctly that if one development was 14% and another was 16%, and together they were over 25%, the third development that actually triggered mitigation would be the one responsible for everything. Mr. Shirley replied that any development that exceeded the threshold would be required to implement mitigation measures. He explained that if an intersection had a level of service (LOS) B and 15% was added, the next development might drop the LOS to a C, which would trigger mitigation, so they were accounting for each other. Commission Member Luther asked whether all intersections were treated the same. Mr. Shirley noted that yes in the text all intersections would be treated the same though some jurisdictions provided different ways to handle different intersections based on location.

Chair Veno asked for clarification of how fees for the transportation consultant would be collected. Ms. Shook replied that the initial consultation to determine if a TIA would be triggered would be at no cost. The first fee would be for the scoping meeting. The second fee would be for the transportation impact analysis. Ms. Shook stated that the consultant would bill the town, the town would pay the consultant, then the town would bill the applicant the consulting fee plus any staff administrative costs.

Council Member Tait asked how the town would choose a consultant. Todd Moody, Public Works Director, explained that the town currently has three or four on-call consultants that could handle the scoping meetings and TIA's. Council Member Tait asked how the town would choose among those consultants. Mr. Moody replied that they would use Kimley-Horn for the first TIA and then rotate through the list of consultants based on their availability.

Council Member Roseman questioned a developer's ability to use a TIA completed within the past two years. She expressed concern that other projects could have been developed in the area during those two years. Ms. Shook replied that the allowance to use an older TIA was qualified based on the administrator's finding there had not been access changes resulting in a 10% or more increase in site traffic at any level at an intersection.

Commission Member Luther expressed concern that the mitigation language was not clear enough for him to understand the additive effect, as he read it to mean that an individual development would be responsible for all mitigation. Mr. Shirley replied that an individual development that triggered improvements would be responsible for mitigation. He stated that if growth was occurring in the area of the development, it would be accounted for in the analysis, along with the site's specific impact. Mr. Shirley provided the example of filling a glass with water: each development added more water to the glass, and the development that caused the glass to overflow was the one that must provide mitigation measures.

There was no public comment.

With nothing further, Mayor George closed the public hearing for this case at 6:43 p.m.

Adjournment of Town Council

Mayor George adjourned the Town Council at 6:43 p.m.

Dalton George, Mayor

Brenda Henson, Board Clerk

Frank Venio, Planning Commission Chair

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Chair Venio called a break in the meeting from 6:43 p.m. until 6:47 p.m.

Discussion and Recommendation on Case(s) Heard at the Public Hearing

Case A24-0077 Transportation Impact Analysis – UDO Text Amendment

A text amendment to UDO Article 4 and Appendix C to modify transportation impact analysis (TIA) provisions. Modifications include changes to process, content, and mitigation.

Commission Member King stated he appreciated the depth of the work on this text. Chair Venio agreed, adding that the text would make the process for transportation impact analyses easier to understand.

Commission Member Mileski asked whether a fee-in-lieu could be used as a tool for TIA's. Ms. Shook stated that options for payment in lieu had been reduced and were really only allowed if funded transportation projects overlap with the improvements associated with the development's recommended mitigation. This would ensure that improvements wouldn't be installed and then removed when the funded project was constructed.

Commission Member Kight asked whether the table shown on page 17 of the packet would remain in the text. Ms. Shook replied that it would remain and would be updated periodically. Commission Member Kight asked how often the table would be updated. Mr. Shirley stated that ITE updated its manual every four years. Ms. Shook added that the table served only as a reference. She noted that if the ITE manual changed before the UDO could be updated, the standards in the updated ITE manual would be used. Commission Member Kight pointed out that the ITE acronym was referenced in the text before the Institute of Transportation Engineers was spelled out. Ms. Shook stated that she would make that correction. Commission Member Kight asked if the transportation consultant would attend Planning Commission and Town Council meetings. Mr. Shirley replied that a transportation consultant would attend meetings only if a developer or the town requested it.

Commission Member Luther stated that developers should not be held responsible for what was happening 5 miles down the road regarding the cascading impacts of other projects. He asked whether any thought had been given to how to take that into consideration. Ms. Shook replied that the study area was proposed to be up to 1 mile, which was larger than required previously. Mr. Shirley added that a joint TIA could be conducted if multiple developments along the same corridor were planned in a similar timeframe. Ms. Shook stated that there was no proportionate way to distribute incremental impacts across different developments prior to mitigation being triggered.

Vote 1

Commission Member King made a motion that the proposed amendment to the Town's Unified Development Ordinance is consistent with the Town's current comprehensive plan and any other adopted plan(s) of the Town that are applicable because of the following from Boone Next:

Planning Principle 8: Encourage development and connections that better balance the needs of pedestrians, drivers, cyclists, and transit users.

Goal 1.2: Development True to Boone's Vision: Boone's development and redevelopment will enhance the best of the town's existing built environment and reinforce the vision set forth in this plan.

Goal 2.1: Increase Mobility Through a Safe System Approach: By fostering partnerships and focusing on data-driven solutions, the town will address roadway safety challenges, enhance intersection functionality, and manage traffic effectively.

Commission Member Kight seconded the motion.

VOTE: Aye – 5
Nay – 0
Absent – 1 (Paz-Miranda)

The motion passed.

Vote 2

Chair Veno made a motion, seconded by Commission Member King, that the Planning Commission recommends approval of Ordinance A24-0077 within Exhibit A with the revisions discussed during the Public Hearing, and approval is reasonable and in the public interest because this amendment provides more transparency to the process, it makes mitigation requirements easier to navigate, and the language is clearer and more comprehensive than what we originally had.

VOTE: Aye – 5
Nay – 0
Absent – 1 (Paz-Miranda)

The motion passed.

Other Matters

Planning Commission Vice-Chair

Ms. Shook explained that the annual selection of Chair and Vice-Chair would begin in July, so recommendations would be postponed until the July meeting. She asked that anyone interested in applying for Chair or Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission submit an application to the Board Clerk by July 10, 2026.

Adjournment of Planning Commission

Commission Member Kight made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:09 p.m. Commission Member King seconded the motion.

VOTE: Aye – 5
Nay – 0
Absent – 1 (Paz-Miranda)

The motion passed.

Frank Veno, Planning Commission Chair

Brenda Henson, Board Clerk