

**TOWN COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2025, 6:00 PM
604 WEST KING STREET**

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Tim Futrelle, Mayor Pro Tem Dalton George, Todd Carter, and Virginia Roseman

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: Eric Plaag

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Frank Veno-Chair, Anne Pruitt-Vice-Chair, Garrett Kight, Declan King, Michael Mileski, Frida PazMiranda, and Adrian Tait

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, Justin Stines-Public Works Deputy Director, and Allison Meade-Town Attorney (via WebEx)

Call to Order

Mayor Futrelle called the Town Council to order at 6:00 p.m. Chair Veno called the Planning Commission to order at the same time. The meeting was held at the Jones House Cultural Center, located at 604 West King Street.

Moment of Silence

A moment of silence was observed.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Council Member Roseman moved to approve the September 22, 2025, Public Hearing minutes as written. Mayor Pro Tem George seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 3
Nay – 0
Absent – 1 (Plaag)

The motion passed.

Commission Member Tait moved to approve the September 22, 2025, Public Hearing and Planning Commission meeting minutes as written. Commission Member Kight seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 7
Nay – 0

The motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING

Case A25-0608 Hospital Signs – UDO Text Amendment

Consideration of a text amendment to exempt hospital (use 11.19) campus signage from general requirements outside of location and illumination requirements.

Jane Shook, Director of Planning & Inspections, presented the request. She referred to Subsection 26.06.05(K), which proposed to exempt from permitting any hospital campus signs that did not contain outside branding.

Ms. Shook then referred to Subsection 26.06.05(R), which proposed to exempt from permitting any sign that was required by law, statute, or ordinance.

Allison Meade, Town Attorney, expressed concern with the broad language of “authorized by statute” found in Subsection 26.06.05(R). She noted that billboards were authorized by statute. She suggested a narrower term, such as “government or nonprofit,” so that no one could argue that the statute allowed them to do something that was more of a commercial or private context. Ms. Shook suggested removing the words “or specifically authorized for” in the first sentence and changing the word “Authorized” in the heading to “Required”. Ms. Meade stated she would be comfortable with that. Ms. Shook noted that the word “authorized” in the second sentence would be changed to “required”.

Commission Member Tait asked if a wayfinding sign would be exempt if it were not required by law. Ms. Shook replied that as long as it met the requirements of either (K) or (R), it would be exempt.

Ms. Meade suggested, for clarity, removing “duly authorized” from Subsection 26.06.05(K).

Mayor Futrelle invited public comment. There was no public comment on this case.

With nothing further, Mayor Futrelle closed the public hearing for this case at 6:10 p.m.

Case A24-0077 Transportation Impact Analysis – UDO Text Amendment

Consideration of a text amendment to revise and expand the Town’s current transportation impact analysis (TIA) standards.

Ms. Shook began by stating that her expectation for the evening was to present the material and answer questions. If Council and Commission members felt comfortable, they could move the text forward for potential adoption. However, if they were not comfortable with the proposed text, revisions could be made and returned for consideration at a later date.

Ms. Shook stated that the current UDO requirements provided very little guidance for what the town wanted to see in a TIA. She explained that if a development triggered a TIA, the applicant was required to hire a consultant to conduct a transportation impact analysis. When board approvals were necessary, board members were, at times, confused or unknowledgeable about the findings and possible mitigation. Ms. Shook stated that the proposed process was an attempt to rectify those issues.

Ms. Shook noted that representatives from Kimley-Horn were present and would be able to explain more about the TIA process. She referred to the flow chart located on page 29 of the packet and stated that applicants would be required to meet with staff before submitting a development application. A pre-application determination form would be completed and submitted to the consultant to determine whether the project would require a transportation impact analysis. If a TIA is not required, the applicant could proceed with permitting. If a TIA were required, a mandatory scoping meeting would be held with the town, the applicant, the consultant, and NCDOT, when necessary. The consultant would then prepare a scoping document, and fees would be assessed, which the applicant would be required to pay. Once the fees were paid, the analysis would be completed. If no mitigation was recommended, the applicant would proceed with the permitting process. However, if mitigation was recommended, a mitigation agreement would be created that the applicant would have to agree to. Ms. Shook stated that the development plans for the proposed project could then be drawn to reflect any mitigation agreed to in the transportation mitigation agreement (TMA). The TMA would be included in a meeting packet so board

members could see what mitigation measures the applicant had agreed to. Ms. Shook noted that the new process would build transparency and trust into the process, where there was currently little.

Ms. Shook provided members with a handout showing examples of the proposed uses that would trigger a TIA based on the number of daily trips or trips during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Todd Moody, Public Works Director, felt that the proposed change would be a significant adjustment compared to what people were used to. He believed it would be better for the town to hire a consultant to perform TIA's, because the Town would be more likely to receive an objective evaluation and develop effective mitigation strategies. Mr. Moody noted that this amendment would increase the current TIA standards from approximately six sentences to 14 or 15 pages, so it was a significant change.

Ms. Shook stated that, if the amendment were to move forward, an effective date would need to be determined. She added that there were projects currently planning to submit, and they may have already hired a consultant.

The Kimley-Horn representatives, Thomas Shirley, Steve Blakely, and Brady Finklea, introduced themselves. Mr. Finklea stated that a TIA had historically been referred to as a traffic impact analysis, but the town preferred to call it a transportation impact analysis because transportation encompassed not only vehicles but also bicycles, pedestrians, and other modes of transportation, such as transit. He explained that a TIA consisted of an evaluation of existing and projected data, accounting for regional growth, including upcoming developments. The proposed development's projected traffic numbers would be added to arrive at the development's proposed impacts. Mitigation would then be based on those impacts. Mr. Finklea emphasized that the proposed development was not responsible for mitigating all the traffic impacts already occurring at an impacted intersection but rather for the additional impacts that their development would cause.

Ms. Shook stated that payment in lieu of making the required transportation improvements could be requested from the Town Council if funded transportation projects overlapped with the development's recommended mitigation.

Mr. Shirley addressed Section C3.04 Required Analysis Content, briefly reviewing the subsections. It was noted that the level of service (LOS) was based on the time spent at an intersection, not the safety of the intersection.

Mayor Futrelle acknowledged the considerable effort that went into creating the proposed amendment.

Council Member Carter felt that the recommended changes to the TIA process were needed.

Mr. Blakely stated that it would take time for everyone to absorb the changes. Still, he felt they offered consistency, reliability, transparency, and provided a sense of trust that had been missing under the current guidelines.

Council Member Carter noted that the change in wording from "traffic" to "transportation impact analysis" was positive.

Council Member Roseman stated that she liked the limited payment-in-lieu requirements. She added that she never liked that a developer hired their own consultant to perform a TIA. Council Member Roseman noted that she was proud of the staff for working together and working with the consultants to develop the proposed amendment.

Ms. Shook noted that if the text amendment were to be sent to the Planning Commission for recommendation tonight, parameters for consultant selection would need to be established by Council. This discussion could be held at the next Town Council meeting, if possible. For example, who would be

on call, how would they be on call, and what would the contract look like? Ms. Shook stated that she and Mr. Moody had a discussion and agreed that utilizing a single consultant would provide more consistency and transparency regarding product and pricing. She added that applicants were not always large developers, but also included small business owners who would be impacted by these changes.

Mayor Pro Tem George asked Mr. Moody about the capacity of Public Works to handle the additional workload involved with the proposed TIA process. Mr. Moody replied that there would be some extra work for his department, but the consultant would be handling the major part of the work. Mayor Pro Tem George pointed out a typographical error in Section 3.03.02 Mandatory Scoping Meeting. The “comma or” in the first sentence should be removed.

Vice-Chair Pruitt asked how the engineering firms would be chosen. Mr. Moody explained that the town would put out a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for on-call engineers. Currently, the town has 5-6 on-call engineers. He agreed that staying with one consultant created consistency. Mr. Moody stated that engineering firms were selected every three years, and every firm in the state had an opportunity to submit an RFQ.

Commission Member King questioned the cost difference for applicants. Mr. Shirley replied that there would not be a considerable cost difference. Mr. Finklea added that sometimes the cost was less because there was less back-and-forth in the process. He noted that the town had added more requirements that could increase the price, but he thought the trust and transparency that would be gained would be worth the cost.

Vice-Chair Pruitt asked Ms. Shook if she had spoken to other towns that had implemented something similar and what kind of feedback they had received. Ms. Shook stated that she had spoken with other towns, and they all liked the process. Implementation was somewhat challenging, as applicants were accustomed to a process where they selected their own consultant; however, with time and adjustment, things eventually smoothed out.

Chair Veno questioned the cons for developers. Ms. Shook replied that the applicant could feel a lack of control because they could no longer hire their own engineer to perform the TIA. Additionally, the timing of the new process might be considered a con for the developer.

Commission Member Kight stated that the town of Boone basically had two different population levels, depending on the season or month. He asked if that variation would be accounted for in the TIA's. Mr. Shirley replied that the intent was to collect data during times when school was in session and consider winter versus summer months. Ms. Shook added that systems were not designed based on the worst possible day of traffic, but on an average day.

Mayor Futrelle invited public comment. There was no public comment on this case.

Commission Member Tait inquired whether the town was currently utilizing the same type of consultant process. Mr. Moody replied that the town currently selects firms that they use multiple times over a three-year period.

Commission Member Tait felt the proposed amendment offered a proactive approach to making better development decisions. He asked how the TIA would integrate pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Mr. Finklea explained that they would conduct the pedestrian analysis using the Synchro program, an industry-standard system. Each study intersection would have the vehicular capacity studied and the delay created. This would also include pedestrian traffic, such as crossing distance and green time. He added that the consultant would review the town's adopted plans, such as greenway, bike, or sidewalk plans, which traditional TIA's would not typically consider.

Commission Member Tait asked how many TIA's were typically performed in a year. Ms. Shook did not know. She stated that conditional district projects, larger new development construction, and sometimes smaller commercial projects would trigger a TIA. Commission Member Tait noted that the proposed process could benefit smaller developers, as they would not have to find their own consultant. He suggested that the town consider a similar process for stormwater.

Commission Member Mileski referred to the data collection that would be maintained by the town and asked how that information would help the town. Mr. Finklea explained that the NCDOT collected data from traffic incidents, and the TIA consultant gained access to that data to analyze it and determine if any issues could be mitigated. Commission Member Mileski asked if the collection of data could help mold the UDO. Mr. Finkley replied that as the data compiled and became more informative, it was possible that it could be used to create a more positive vision for public safety.

Mayor Futrelle stated that there seemed to be good direction to move the proposed amendment on to the Planning Commission for their recommendation.

Ms. Meade questioned the timeline for adoption of the amendment, stating that she still had some specific questions and comments. Ms. Shook noted that some of the language needed to be revised and some errors corrected before the Town Council could vote to adopt the amendment. She was unsure of an effective date, once approved. Ms. Shook asked Ms. Meade if her concerns were substantive or smaller items. Ms. Meade replied that there were smaller items, such as incorrect section callouts and grammatical errors, as well as some more substantive issues.

Ms. Meade referred to Section C3.02.02 and noted she felt the text contained redundancy that may confuse the user. After a brief discussion, Ms. Shook indicated she would work with the consultants to resolve this issue.

Ms. Meade asked if a TIA was required, with or without mitigation required, would further demands, requirements, or conditions be allowed to be placed on the development through board approval beyond what was found to be appropriate in the TIA. She also questioned projects that did not trigger a TIA and inquired if mitigation would be considered by the BOA or Town Council. Ms. Meade felt it was a difficult position to put applicants in, requiring them to obtain a TIA and undertake any mitigation the TIA required, only to have the decision-making board impose even more requirements on them. Ms. Shook noted that the idea was that the TMA should be the final decision on improvements, but that the text didn't specify that additional improvements couldn't be specified. Ms. Shook also noted that the UDO was silent about what the expectations were when no mitigation was required. Ms. Shook explained that mitigation was based on the report, so to an extent, it removed any politics from the decision because the mitigation was planned and discussed by the TIA experts and agreed upon by the applicant before board approval. This eliminated the burden on the board of trying to come up with transportation mitigation and created a certainty for the applicant that they did not currently have. Ms. Meade stated that this was a major selling point of the proposed amendment.

Ms. Shook felt that the examples shown in C3.02.02(1-6) provided more clarity for the applicant, but the language might need to be revised.

Based on Ms. Meade's concerns, Ms. Shook asked Council members if they would like to have the text revised before the Planning Commission made recommendations. Mayor Futrelle stated that he liked what was presented, but understood that there were areas that needed improvement. He suggested having further discussion during a work session of the Council. Ms. Shook suggested that the discussion take place at Town Council's November meeting, with the revised text going back to Public Hearing in January 2026.

With nothing further, Mayor Futrelle closed the public hearing for this case at 7:52 p.m.

Adjournment of Town Council

Mayor Pro Tem George moved to adjourn the Public Hearing at 7:52 p.m. Council Member Carter seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 3
Nay – 0
Absent – 1 (Plaag)

The motion passed.

Tim Futrelle, Mayor

Brenda Henson, Board Clerk

Frank Veno, Planning Commission Chair

PLANNING COMMISSION

Chair Veno called a break in the meeting from 7:52 pm until 8:02 p.m.

Case A25-0608 Hospital Signs – UDO Text Amendment

Consideration of a text amendment to exempt hospital (use 11.19) campus signage from general requirements outside of location and illumination requirements.

Ms. Shook reminded Planning Commission members of the discussion during the Public Hearing, noting that the word “authorized” would be removed from 26.06.05(K) and (R) when referring to signs required by law. It was also noted that there were two subsections listed as 26.06.05(V). Ms. Shook stated that this would be corrected.

Commission Member Tait inquired whether this exemption would also apply to other ancillary medical offices within the UNC Health system. Ms. Shook replied that the exemption applied only to the main hospital campus signage.

Chair Veno asked if there would be any limitations on the hospital’s signage. Ms. Shook stated that there would be limitations to the location and illumination of the signs.

First Motion and Vote: Commission Member Tait 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, with the removal of references to the word “authorized” in 26.06.05(K) and (R), because of the following from Boone Next:

Planning Principle 2: Emphasize quality design to create an attractive, inspiring public and private realm – architecture, streetscape, corridors, gateways, and edges – that is uniquely Boone. *Public areas (streetscapes, sidewalks, parks, plazas, etc.) and private areas (building facades, landscaping, parking facilities, etc.) will be planned, arranged, and designed with quality materials to celebrate a sense of place*

and character by balancing function, appearance, and affordability, while fostering creativity, innovation, and human-scale design that is true to Boone.

Commission Member Kight seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 7
Nay – 0

The motion passed.

Second Motion and Vote: Commission Member Kight made a motion that the Planning Commission recommends approval of Ordinance A25-0608 within Exhibit A, and approval is reasonable and in the public interest because the hospital campus needs to be easily navigable by vehicle and multimodal, so the public can find where they need to go. Commission Member Tait seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 7
Nay – 0

The motion passed.

Case A24-0077 Transportation Impact Analysis – UDO Text Amendment

Consideration of a text amendment to revise and expand the Town’s current transportation impact analysis (TIA) standards.

Ms. Shook stated that, based on the discussion at the Public Hearing, the Planning Commission would not make a recommendation on this case tonight. She noted that some language cleanup was necessary, and the situation of having a project that did not trigger a TIA but still required board approval needed to be addressed. Ms. Shook explained that the staff would have a work session with the Town Council at their November meeting to iron out timeframes and logistics. The revised text would be brought back to a future Public Hearing/Planning Commission meeting, and the Town Council would make the final decision at a subsequent meeting.

Commission Member PazMiranda asked whether the public would have access to the transportation database that the town would maintain. Ms. Shook replied that compiling the data would take a long time, but once compiled, it could be obtained through a public records request.

Commission Member Tait felt that the new TIA process would be a positive change for the town and developers.

Other Matters

Chair and Vice-Chair Appointments by Town Council

Commission Member Tait congratulated Frank Veno and Anne Pruitt for being appointed by the Town Council as Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission.

Ms. Shook stated that the next Public Hearing/Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for Monday, November 24, 2025, at the newly renovated Town Council Chambers.

Adjournment

Commission Member Mileski made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:26 p.m. Commission Member Tait seconded the motion.

Vote: Aye – 7
Nay – 0

The motion passed.

Frank Veno, Planning Commission Chair

Brenda Henson, Board Clerk