

U.S. 1 COUNCIL OF PLANNING MEETING Feb 28, 2023 3:30 PM Webex Virtual Meeting

MEETING SUMMARY

Attendees		
MEMBERS	AGENCY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Scott Hammerbacher – Vice President	Franklin County	shammerbacher@franklincountync.us
Jennifer Currin	Town of Wake Forest	jcurrin@wakeforestnc.gov
Scott Wheeler	NCDOT Div 5 Dist 1	mwheeler@ncdot.gov
Kenneth Withrow	CAMPO	shelby.powell@campo-nc.us
Jason Myers	City of Raleigh	Jason.myers@raleighnc.gov
Jason Rogers	Franklin County	jrogers@franklincountync.us
Paul Black	GoTriangle	pblack@gotriangle.org
Melanie Rausch	GoRaleigh	melanie.rausch@raleighnc.gov
Erin Klinger	Youngsville	eklinger@townofyoungsville.org
Tim Gardiner	Wake County	
GUESTS/INVITED AGENCIES		
Bradley Kimbrell	City of Raleigh	Bradley.kimbrell@raleighnc.gov
Jon Frazier	Guest	jfrazier@flmengineering.com
Curtis White	Guest	
CAMPO COP Staff		
Gaby Lawlor	САМРО	Gaby.lawlor@campo-nc.us

Welcome/Introductions

Scott Hammerbacher, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order.

Adjustments to the Agenda

• None.

Old Business

• None

New Business

- Amavi Development in Raleigh
 - Jason Myers, City of Raleigh, provided an overview of the development site plan. The project is located in the northeast quadrant of Capital Boulevard at I-540; with the I-540/Triangle Town Boulevard interchange to the south, and to the east of where the Gresham Lake overpass over Capital Boulevard is planned. The applicant will subdivide the parcel and will build residential; there's an outparcel on the southern portion of the site where they expect to build apartments. The site plan is consistent with the City of Raleigh Street plan showing a two-lane divided extension of Triangle Town Boulevard, which will connect to Capital Boulevard. However, that is not consistent with US 1 plans. They also have Street "C" on the northern portion of the parcel, which is consistent, and they have matched up with what is shown on current U-5307 plans.
 - The City of Raleigh has a few concerns about the applicant submission. First that the developer has applied to the City for a right-in/right-out at the Triangle Town Boulevard extension and Capital Boulevard. The second concern is that the site plan does not show a completion of the Triangle Town Boulevard extension, to the south. It could be that the applicant intends to complete the extension to the south during a future phase of the project, but they may *not* intend to complete the extension at all. The City has asked for clarification and plans to enforce Raleigh's code to ensure the connection is completed.
 - Scott Wheeler inquired whether Terry Farr and the U-5307 project team has seen this project. Jason M. and Bradley Kimbrell confirmed that there has been coordination with Terry F. and the NCDOT District office, and there has been some indirect coordination with the applicant and Terry's group. Bradley K. added that there was discussion with NCDOT regarding the right-in/right-out access at Triangle Town Boulevard Extension and Capital Boulevard, and whether that will be allowed, given its proximity to the planned Gresham Lake Drive extension over Capital Boulevard. Scott W. responded that the current configuration of the site plan likely would not be allowed because it is not consistent with the U-5307 plans. Jason M. stated that the City of Raleigh does not disagree with that stance, but the District office may have indicated that early on there was enough commitment from the applicant and that the District could not necessarily deny that from their level; the City has not heard definitively one way or another.
 - Scott W. mentioned that there were conversations at the District office early on about potential development that might occur at this site and what site configuration would be ideal to avoid conflict with U-5307 plans.
 - Bradley K. explained that the City has concerns over the driveway configuration the applicant is proposing at Capital Boulevard and Triangle Town Boulevard extension, and potential safety issues between traffic exiting from the I-540 off-ramp and traffic attempting to make a right into the site. There is also concern that, if the Gresham Lake Drive overpass option is advanced, the intersection at Triangle Town Boulevard will likely not be at the appropriate elevation to receive it. Scott W. agreed with that concern and, explained that the assumption on NCDOT's end was that development at this site would connect to the stubbed road from the subdivision located to the north and that would serve as their access to Capital Boulevard, in the interim could that still be an option? Jason M. responded that the issue is that there are limited locations where this site can establish a public road connection. Other options that the applicant has: connection to Jacqueline Lane via a stub at Draper Court or a stubbed road at the northeast corner of the site this is something that the neighboring community is in favor of; another option would be to complete the connection to Triangle Town Boulevard to the south at the interchange with I-540. The City of Raleigh wants the developer to improve connectivity to the subdivision to the north, is discouraging the

applicant from pursuing direct connection to Capital Boulevard, knowing that it likely would be in conflict with the potential Gresham Lake Drive overpass and lead to more impacts. The City is trying to get a clear idea of what they can require, and is concerned that whatever the applicant constructs in the interim might not be safe, and has the potential to create more impacts if/when the overpass is constructed.

- Jennifer Currin posed a question about whether there will be a conflict between the off-ramp for westbound I-540 traffic, exiting to go north on Capital Boulevard connecting to the frontage road (as shown on US 1 study maps) and the current site plan configuration. Jason M. pointed out that this is a good question that the City would like to discuss with the Council. Given that the U-5307 plans no longer show that off-ramp connection to a frontage road, through this site, City of Raleigh staff are considering taking an amendment to City Council to remove that portion of frontage road from their Street Plan. Jason M. pointed out that this inconsistency is also present in CAMPO's web map for the US 1 corridor, and that it should be addressed. Jennifer C. asked whether current U-5307 plans show the off-ramp connection to the frontage road. Jason M. responded that they do not.
- Kenneth Withrow asked Jason M. whether a gentleman named Bob Blank, a City resident who lives in the subdivision to the north of this site, has approached the City with concerns about the U-5307 plans and its impacts to that neighborhoods access. Jason M. responded that City staff recently met with Mr. Blank at the CAMPO office; additionally, several residents from this general area have approached City staff and Council regarding impacts from the U-5307 project and access/connectivity concern.
- Jason M. explained that the City has relayed all the concerns discussed with the Council and that they are awaiting response from the applicant, and asked what the next step should be with the Council. Scott W. stated that it sounds like City staff are on the right track and should continue to coordinate with Terry F. and the District office and suggested that no action be taken at this time and come back to the Council once the City and DOT staff are comfortable with the site plan design.

<u>Action</u>: A motion was made by Scott W., seconded by Jennifer C., that no action be taken at this meeting, and to table the Councils official finding until such a time that the applicant has modified the site plan so that the City and DOT are comfortable with its configuration.

- Holden Rd Commercial Development in Youngsville
 - Erin Klinger presented the plans for the mixed-use development, to the east of the Capital Boulevard on the northeast and southeast quadrant of the Holden Road and Fish Stallings Road intersection. There will be commercial use north of Holden Road and commercial and multi-family residential south of Holden Road. The developers have spent substantial time coordinating with DOT to realign Fish Stallings Rd to accommodate the frontage road that connects to Capital Boulevard further north, which is included in the US 1 Corridor plans.
 - Scott Hammerbacher asked whether a TIA was completed for this development. Erin K. responded that a TIA has not been completed.
 - Scott W. advised Youngsville to get guidance from the Council prior to the applicant spending money to complete TIA. The Council should provide comments on this concept first, and once the Council is in agreement that the concept is consistent with the US 1 Corridor plans, then the applicant should proceed with site plan and TIA.
 - Scott H. asked how much the Fish Stallings Road alignment is shifted in this site concept, compared to the alignment from US 1 Corridor study. Erin K. explained that the alignment shown in the site concept is shifter further east, and there is a little more of a curve to it. Scott H. asked Scott W. if that will work still be able to align with the frontage road that is planned further north, parallel to Gatekeeper Dr. Scott W. confirmed that it should work. Jason M.

asked whether the Council and NCDOT was confident that the shift in the alignment will not create issues. Scott W. explained that this shift in the alignment of Fish Stallings Road has been discussed for other development that has been permitted in the area and should not be an issue.

- Kenneth W. asked whether bike/pedestrian accommodations have been considered for the Fish Stallings Road profile. Erin K. stated that the applicant is not that far along in the process yet.
- Scott H. asked how many outparcels and how many units this project is proposing. Erin K. responded that it's 19 outparcels, not sure on number of units. Allen White (applicant group) responded that it's 19 outparcels, and 87 multi-family units. Allen W. explained that their group is looking for initial comments from the Council to ensure that they are on the right path before advancing with design.
- Jason M. suggested that the applicant provide access to other businesses fronting Capital Boulevard, that do not currently have access to Fish Stallings Road. Allen W. explained that they have been working with Youngsville and neighboring businesses to provide that access.

<u>No action requested.</u> Scott H. stated that the site concept, as presented, is generally in conformity with the US 1 Corridor Plan, and that the site plan should be presented to the Council again once the design is further along.

- Horsemans Trail Townhomes Development in Youngsville
 - Erin K. presented details for this residential development, which will include 112 townhomes, and is located directly east of previous project. The Town has asked that the developer provide stub outs to adjacent properties. This is a preliminary plan, and the applicant is still updating the plan in response to staff comments.
 - Scott H. echoed the Town's recommendations to provide east-west connectivity by including stub outs to the parcels' east and west boundaries.

<u>No action requested.</u> Jason M. move that the Council acknowledges having reviewed and approve of this plan and that there are no concerns from the Council.

Other Business

- Jason M. mentioned that there was a site plan in City of Raleigh he wanted to show the group, simply to determine whether the project should be brought back to the Council for review.
 - The project location is north of Gresham Lake Road, in between the railroad and Capital Hills Drive. All the required ROW in that area, required for the U-5307 plans, has already been dedicated. The project will include townhomes.
 - Gaby Lawlor explained that with all necessary ROW already having been dedicated and in the absence of any other concerns, the project does not need to come before the Council for consideration.
- Discussion: US 1 Council of Planning and S-Line Project Coordination.
 - Gaby L. posed question to the Council, asking whether there is interest among US 1 Council of Planning members to expand the Council's purview to include coordination with NCDOT Rail's S-Line effort.
 - Jennifer C. stated that it would be useful, and that from Wake Forest's perspective, there is an influx of development so expanding this groups purview to include ROW preservation along the S-Line corridor would be good. Scott H. and Paul Black agreed with this comment.

- Paul B. asked what the next step would be towards formally making that adjustment to expand the Council's responsibilities. Gaby L. responded that the next step would be for CAMPO to meet with NCDOT Rail and ensure that they are also in favor of this coordinated effort, and then the Council's Bylaws would need to be updated to reflect this change.
- Tim G. pointed out that there should be a clear understanding of the mechanics for this change and for the expectations of the Council.

<u>Adjourn</u>

There being no further business, Mr. Hammerbacher adjourned the meeting.