



Transportation Advisory Board

Date: May 20, 2021

7:30 pm

via Zoom

Meeting called by:

David Pcolar, Chair

Facilitator: Zach Hallock, Transportation Planner

Attendees:

Carrboro Transportation Advisory Board Members

----- Agenda Topics -----

1. Call to Order	Pcolar	7:30
2. Approval of minutes (May 6, 2021)	TAB	7:35
3. Action & Discussion Items: A. Bike Parking Regulations Discussion, cont.	TAB	7:40
4. Other Items	TAB/Staff	8:25
5. Adjourn	TAB	8:30

Other Information

To view the advisory board meeting, please email zhallock@townofcarrboro.org to receive an invitation to view the meeting. If you wish to make public comment, at the time of public comment, the staff person will be able to allow speakers to remotely enter the meeting one-by-one to comment. Please send any written statement or materials to the same email provided above. Requests to remotely attend the meeting shall be made within 24 hours of the meeting start time. The requester should also specify if they wish to make any comments in the email. All written statement and materials will be forwarded to the advisory board members.

Next meeting: June 3, 2021

TOWN HALL IS ACCESSIBLE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT ZACH HALLOCK AT 919-918-7329.

**TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES**

Thursday, May 6, 2021

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Dave Pcolar, Chair
Sarah Brown
Mark Alexander
David Swan
Cummie Davis
Lenore Jones-Peretto
Elyse Keefe
Barbara Foushee, Council Liaison

STAFF PRESENT

Zachary Hallock

I. Call to order

The meeting was called to order around 8:08pm.

II. Approval of Minutes (April 1, 2021)

Pcolar motioned to approve the minutes, Jones-Peretto seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Action & Discussion Items

• **Carrboro Connects Comprehensive Plan Goals and Strategies**

The TAB discussed topics within the Carrboro Connects Goals and Strategies documents including:

A disabled residents advisory group seems like a good idea, but it isn't clear how that would best align with the TAB. Hallock indicated that perhaps a sub-advisory board that meets along with the TAB could work. TAB members agreed.

Members highlighted the overlaps between the goals in both the transportation and affordable housing sections.

TAB recommends revising language to avoid the phrase "non-ambulatory" and to consider "mobility limited" or "mobility challenged".

TAB recommends adding language such as "the right to mobility" or "the right to safety and dignity while moving".

Alexander asked for a clarification as to what "disparate impacts of transportation" referred to. Hallock replied that the connectivity impacts of freeways or major road projects is one example.

Other TAB members indicated that the crash rates and safety issues experienced in disenfranchised communities is another example.

TAB members indicated that exceptions to the connector roads policy has been a recent issue as the policy is not applied consistently.

TAB members emphasized the need to show how the projects under one goal relate to another goal. There was a lot of crosscutting between the climate strategies section 1.2 with the transportation goal 3. Ideally these overlaps would be paired down, and simply reference the climate section (instead of creating most of the same content within transportation).

For Transportation strategy 1.2, there are very good related goals with affordable housing, but it seems like it needs to be reworded a bit.

Section 2.2 should look at adding a systemic analysis of safety for both access points to businesses and intersection complexity to reduce conflict points.

Goal 4 does not need to be a transportation goal; while it has implications for transportation projects all of the projects fall distinctly within the Green Infrastructure section.

Jones-Peretto asked what TDM was. Hallock provided an overview of general TDM strategies and what the Town currently does.

Project 5.1c seems like it would be better under strategies 2.1 or 2.2. Should look at adding something to section 2.2 about bikeshare and micromobility.

The total number of strategies needs to be paired down because there is a lot of overlap and it can be overwhelming.

TAB members indicated that there are two major priorities:

1. Projects that address multiple goals – like project 2.2d (Equity, Safety, Multimodal)
2. Anti-displacement policies and ensuring that transportation projects do not displace people or have disparate impacts on communities

- **Discussion of Proposed Land Use Ordinance Amendment Related to Electric Vehicle Charging Stations**

Hallock provided a general recap of the proposed ordinance.

The TAB discussed the benefits associated with EV charging stations for the community and the challenges associated with requiring them in developments including the following comments:

- How do we handle EV charging stations as a community? Do we need to build them out in every possible location?

- Can the charging station be placed in an ADA compliant space that is not marked as a handicap accessible space?
- Shouldn't expansion of EV charging requirements wait until there is more demand for them?
- Distribution of an EV charging network can help drive demand
- What would the future costs of installing the EV stations and EV ready infrastructure be after the development is completed?

Motion was made by Swan and seconded by Davis that the Transportation Advisory Board of the Town of Carrboro recommends that the Town Council approve the draft ordinance, provided the following concerns are addressed:

Under Section 2(i)(1), language is added to ensure that the placement of EV Stations does not interfere with ADA accessibility to the building, sidewalk, or other areas of the parking lot;

AND

Section 2(i)(1)(c) is revised to ensure that all EV charging stations are installed in a parking space that is an ADA compliant, non-reserved, accessible parking space.

Motion passes 5-2.

AYES: (5) Pcolar, Swan, Jones-Peretto, Brown, Keefe

NOES: (2) Alexander, Davis

By a unanimous show of hands, the TAB membership indicated that no members have any financial interests that would pose a conflict of interest to the adoption of this amendment.

Motion was made by Pcolar and seconded by Jones-Peretto that the TAB of the Town of Carrboro finds the proposed amendment is consistent with Carrboro's climate action policies as expressed by provisions in Carrboro Vision 2020, the Community Climate Action Plan; and the municipal focused Energy and Climate Protection Action Plan and that the TAB finds the proposed text amendment is reasonable and in the public interest by providing increased access to electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

Motion passes 6-1.

AYES: (6) Pcolar, Swan, Jones-Peretto, Brown, Keefe, Davis

NOES: (1) Alexander

IV. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned around 10:20 pm.

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD

AGENDA ITEM ABSTRACT

MEETING DATE: THURSDAY, MAY 6, 2021

SUBJECT: BICYCLE PARKING REGULATIONS

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING DEPARTMENT	PUBLIC HEARING: YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ATTACHMENTS: A. DRAFT BICYCLE PARKING REGULATIONS UPDATE	FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Zachary Hallock, Transportation Planner, 919-918-7329 or zhallock@townofcarrboro.org

PURPOSE & INFORMATION

The Carrboro Town Council directed the Transportation Advisory Board to assess the Town's regulations related to bicycle parking design standards, in particular the location and placement of bicycle parking within a development. Attachment A, the current draft ordinance for bicycle parking design requirements, has been cleaned and tracked changes hidden. All changes to the document have been based on previous discussion by the TAB. There are two remaining questions seeking additional input, they relate to section (a) & (f) of the ordinance and are outlined below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Town staff recommends that the TAB review/discuss the attached draft ordinance and provide comments taking into consideration the following:

1. Is the language in section 15-295.1(a) – “It shall be located no further from the entrance it serves than the closest non-accessible auto parking space or within 100 feet (whichever is lesser).” sufficient or is further modification needed?
2. Is the language in section 15-295.1(f) which identifies minimum clearances and preferred clearance acceptable?

Section 15-295.1 Design Standards for Bicycle Parking (AMENDED 6/19/12; 11/19/13)

(a) Bicycle parking may be located in any parking area or in other locations that are easily accessible, clearly visible from the entrance it serves and do not impede pedestrian or motorized vehicle movement into or around the site. It shall be located no further from the entrance it serves than the closest non-accessible auto parking space or within 100 feet (whichever is lesser). At least 50 percent of bicycle parking shall be sheltered. Designating space for bicycle parking within buildings is an option to consider when feasible.

(b) When a percentage of the required motorized vehicle spaces are provided in a structure, an equal percentage of the required bicycle spaces shall be located inside that structure, unless an equivalent number of other accessible covered bicycle parking spaces are located elsewhere on the site. For spaces located within a structure, they shall be located on the ground level or other level with direct access to adjacent uses which the parking is meant to serve, and not require the use of stairs or elevators to access. Spaces provided within a structure are not subject to the distance from the entrance requirements in section (a).

(c) Where bicycle parking is not located as to be clearly visible to approaching cyclists, signs shall be posted to direct cyclists to the bicycle parking.

(d) Each bicycle parking space shall be provided with some form of stable frame permanently anchored to a foundation to which a bicycle frame and both wheels may be conveniently secured using either a chain and padlock or a U-lock. The frame shall support a bicycle in a stable position without damage to the frame, wheels, or components. The rack designs commonly known as "inverted U", "A", "post-and-loop", "wheelwell-secure" and "staggered wheelwell-secure" are approved types. Use of multiple rack types is encouraged, and the differences in age and ability of people using bicycle parking shall be considered when selecting rack types and locations. (AMENDED 11/19/13)

(e) Any bike rack design which would either require a bicycle to be lifted over the rack (which can potentially damage a bicycle or fail to accommodate all bicycle types) or have an insecure locking configuration (such as only being able to lock the front wheel to the rack, which poses security issues for bicycle with a quick-release on the front wheel) are prohibited.

(f) Bicycle parking shall be designed/located to provide at least a 30 inch clearance from the centerline of each adjacent bicycle rack/support structure, with a 36 inch clearance being preferred and at least 24 inches from walls or other obstructions (including the edge of a street, or on-street automobile parking), with a 36 inch clearance being preferred.

(1) Sidewalk bike racks adjacent to on-street automobile parking shall be placed between parking stalls to avoid conflicts with opening car doors.

(2) Sidewalk bike racks shall be placed in line with other sidewalk obstructions to maintain a clear line of travel for all users.

(g) When bicycle parking is provided in 2 or more rows of parallel racks, an aisle or other space shall be provided for bicycles to enter and leave the parking area. The aisle shall have a width of

at least four feet to the front or the rear of a standard six-foot bicycle parked in the facility, with a five foot aisle being preferred.

(h) Each bicycle parking space shall be sufficient to accommodate a bicycle at least six feet in length and two feet wide, with an additional buffer space of two feet being preferred. Overhead clearance shall be at least seven feet.

(i) Bicycle parking spaces shall be clearly marked as such and shall be separated from non-bicycle parking by some form of physical barrier designed to protect a bicycle from being hit by an automobile or larger vehicle.

(j) The Bicycle rack spacing requirements defined in this section are based on the placement graphic in the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals "Essentials of Bike Parking" which can be found as Appendix C-16 of this ordinance.

DRAFT

Appendix C-16

PLACEMENT

The following minimum spacing requirements apply to some common installations of fixtures like inverted-U or post-and-ring racks that park one bicycle roughly centered on each side of the rack. Recommended clearances are given first, with minimums in parentheses where appropriate. In areas with tight clearances, consider wheelwell-secure racks (page 6), which can be placed closer to walls and constrain the bicycle footprint more reliably than inverted-U and post-and-ring racks. The footprint of a typical bicycle is approximately 6' x 2'. Cargo bikes and bikes with trailers can extend to 10' or longer.

