

04-06-2022 Town Council Meeting
Responses to Council Questions

ITEM #11: Open Legislative Hearing for a Land Use Management Ordinance Text Amendment Related to Payments-In-Lieu of Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure and Provide Feedback on Draft Amendments to the Code of Ordinances Related to the Vision Zero Resolution

Council Question:

What is the PC's rationale for proposing a PIL when street frontage is on a Town-maintained road?

Staff Response:

As the board that reviews minor subdivisions, the Planning Commission must determine if the ordinance is being met, including if the subdivision is located on a street that meets Town standards. These subdivisions may occur in older neighborhoods that have no sidewalks, or where sidewalks may be seen as being out of character with the neighborhood, and in these situations the Planning Commission has been reluctant to require a small section of sidewalk to be built.

Council Question:

What if there is existing sidewalk/bike infrastructure – can we require a payment in lieu anyway or is that requirement waived?

Staff Response:

The Town would not request a payment-in-lieu if a sidewalk exists on the property's frontage. The payment-in-lieu can only be collected in lieu of upgrading a street to meet the Town standard.

04-06-2022 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions #2

ITEM #11: Open Legislative Hearing for a Land Use Management Ordinance Text Amendment Related to Payments-In-Lieu of Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure and Provide Feedback on Draft Amendments to the Code of Ordinances Related to the Vision Zero Resolution

Council Question:

Are we coordinating with Carrboro on any of these actions since, from the perspective of drivers, the two Towns are quite connected?

Staff Response:

This ordinance change is not being coordinated with Carrboro. Carrboro does not have the same requirement for subdivisions to front on a street meeting Town standards.

Council Question:

On page 182, the reason for a PIL proposed by staff is only for “physical” issues. Might it also make sense for there to be a PIL in cases where an isolated sidewalk segment would be created with no plans/ability to connect to anything else for five or more years?

Staff Response:

The staff recommendation is to limit payments where sidewalks are not "practicable" - properties with physical limitations. The Planning Commission recommended that the ordinance allow payments where sidewalks are not "practicable or reasonable" - which would allow payments when a sidewalk segment would be isolated and not connect to other facilities.

Council Question:

On page 183, the amount of a PIL is to be based on the costs of past improvements. Can that be modified to be based on those costs, plus a factor for inflation to the date when construction would have taken place, i.e., when the actual project is expected to be constructed?

Staff Response:

Staff recommends the current language to provide more clarity for applicants looking at a payment-in-lieu. Recent bids for sidewalks in our NCDOT region are publicly available, and would be the point of reference for the payment amount.

04-06-2022 Town Council Meeting Responses to Council Questions #2

Council Question:

Would scooters be covered as well as bike and ped in the dooring ordinance, under “moving traffic”?

Staff Response:

Yes, the language is such that it is inclusive of all modes (vehicles, bikes, peds, wheelchair uses, scooters, e-bikes, roller blades, etc.).

Council Question:

Which town roads would not be reduced to 25MPH?

Staff Response:

No Town road speed limits would be changed by this ordinance. Almost all Town roads are already 25mph (instead of 35mph), so this is a change to officially make 25mph the default speed limit, unless posted otherwise. A handful of streets are currently 20mph (North Street, Brookstone Drive, Rosemary St) and two, Piney Mountain Road and Legion Road, are 35mph.