

This summary is provided as a convenience and service to the public, media, and staff. It is not the intent to transcribe proceedings verbatim. Any reproduction of this summary must include this notice. Public comments are noted and heard by Council, but not quoted. This document includes limited presentation by Council and invited speakers in summary form. This is an official record of the Milton City Council Meeting proceedings. Official Meetings are audio recorded.

The Work Session of the Mayor and Council of the City of Milton was held on November 9, 2009 at 6:00 PM, Mayor Joe Lockwood presiding.

Council Members Present: Councilmember Karen Thurman, Councilmember Julie Zahner Bailey, Councilmember Bill Lusk, Councilmember Burt Hewitt, Councilmember Alan Tart

Council Member Absent: Councilmember Tina D'Aversa was absent/excused.

Mayor Lockwood

- There are four items on the agenda.
- Item number 2, discussion on the Tree Ordinance has been removed.
- Public comment is allowed that is germane to the agenda item.
- If you wish to speak, you are required to fill out a public comment card and turn it in to our City Clerk staff.
- Public comment will be allowed for a total of ten minutes per agenda item and no more than two minutes per person.
- Public comment will be heard at the beginning of each item.
- Once the item is called no other public comment cards will be accepted.
- We do not typically call roll but Councilmember D'Aversa is not going to be here tonight and she says she will be unable to attend tonight's meeting due to a previously scheduled teaching seminar for certification with the state.

City Clerk Marchiafava read agenda item #1.

Discussion on the City of Milton Comprehensive Plan.

George Ragsdale, Chairman CPAC

- The subject for tonight is really aligning expectations.
- We would like to try and make sure that we are aligned with the Council in terms of what work is remaining to be done to get this plan put to bed.
- There was a draft plan that was prepared by ECOS and CPAC.
- Either the old Focus Fulton 2025 plan or the Milton Partial Update Plan is going to form the basis for how we talk about accomplishments and short term work.
- The integration of the agenda with the financial model will be the last critical step before we complete the plan.
- Our intent is to try and present Council with a draft at the same time we are going through our final review process. The status of the financial model and expense assumptions have been established. The expense assumptions have been loaded into the model.
- Our next steps are to load the revenue assumptions and then to develop the specific alternatives scenarios and then select the alternative that we believe is the most appropriate going forward.
- From the standpoint of integration and again the subject here is alignment, one of the things that we keep struggling with is how to integrate some of these other things that are ongoing.
- One of the things that we would like to be able to do is to have the benefit of the transportation plan so that we are presenting a comprehensive plan with enough understanding.
- The transportation plan is dependent in some respects on what the comp plan is and the comp plan in some respects is dependent on what the transportation plan is and we cannot make a recommendation in certain areas then the City be developed differently than they are now if the transportation plan is inconsistent with that.

- Conversely, they want the transportation plan to match what is the appropriate development plan for the city so we have to work more closely in the next couple of months with the Transportation Planning Committee to make sure that we bring those things together.
- The Highway 9 plans, the same kind of discussion, there is work going on there that we do not want to just make reference to as something in the future and we want to try and integrate it as much as we can.
- There is also the City Council work plan.
- The short term work plan and the comprehensive plan ought to mirror that.
- The assessment and participation plan were developed and submitted and approved by Council eighteen months ago.
- They were approved by DCA and ARC in May 2008, however, they were never adopted by the Council.
- We can move forward without those formally being adopted.
- The Partial Update Plan is a little different story.
- The DCA required that we either submit a partial update plan by the end of last year or that we had to have the agenda done by August of last year.
- We chose to submit the Partial Update Plan and it was submitted on December 15, 2008.
- It was approved by ARC and DCA in February of this year but it has never been adopted by the Council.
- This plan either has to be adopted or replaced by February 12, 2010 in order to retain our status as a qualified city.
- The reason for the February 12th date is that they allow you one year from the date that it was approved.
- We either have to have the Partial Update Plan approved by February 12 or we have to have the agenda approved by February 12th.
- We need some direction from Council as to which way we are going to go.
- If we adopt the partial update plan then we have the ability to use that as our platform and report on accomplishment and short term work with that as the base.
- Our recommendation is that we get the partial update plan adopted by the City Council sometime between now and February 12th so we can complete the comprehensive plan with that as the base.
- From an overall timeline standpoint, we believe we need four more meetings to finish the work on the financial model.
- We need five more meetings to finish off the agenda and then we get to the approval process.
- Our intent is to submit a draft plan to Council after our first review of the document.
- One of the things that we have to talk about or think about is the transitions that are going to take place in the next couple of months and how it fits into the timeline along with City Council changes and potential changes in CPAC that may result from that.
- In summary our recommendation is that the partial update plan be adopted as soon as possible.
- We will submit the first draft eight weeks after we get that plan adopted.

Mayor Lockwood read the next agenda item.

Final Recommendations of the City of Milton Transportation Master Plan.

James Fowler, Kimley Horn & Associates

- We want to focus on some of the key decision points and we are asking Council to return comments back to us just on these recommendations and big picture items by November 16th.
- We will incorporate those and provide you with a full version of this report on November 20th.
- The big picture concept for these improvements is to widen corridors around the outsides of Milton to attract some of that commuter traffic that will certainly come to the north Fulton area and surrounding counties but attract the commuter traffic away from the rural interior of Milton which is key to preserve.
- Forsyth County community leadership and Forsyth County are pushing for this McGinnis Ferry interchange and if that happens a logical improvement might be to widen this short section of Morris Road to make that a continuous four lane section.

- During the last Council work session we discussed a new road connection from New Providence Road and in discussing that with TSAC there were some differing opinions.
- In general TSAC felt like it was not beneficial for Milton to have that so we pulled it off for this going forward.
- Next on the list are intersection improvements and these are all intersections that were identified by some need whether it was through public input or public works input or from TSAC and we asked TSAC to look at intersections that are not currently being addressed.
- We identified five that rose to the surface of being the most critical out of that discussion with TSAC.
- Three of the five that TSAC felt were important priorities in terms of intersections happen to be ones that we felt like were potential locations for round-a-bouts.

Christina Pastore, Kimley Horn & Associates

- To move to a slightly more detailed look from our full CTP recommendations, I want to talk to you a little about Crabapple.
- We have been doing some work actually since probably November of last year on the Crabapple area.
- We had a Charette with some of the stakeholders in the Crabapple area.
- We have also had a follow up stakeholder meeting and now we have come forward with some preliminary recommendations that we have shown to TSAC.
- The full detailed report of the traffic studies included in the back of the recommendations, there is also a summary of all of the work that we have done for Crabapple but in your packet you have three different sheets that show what we call our 2030 without any further improvements if we leave Crabapple as it exist today and just have the traffic and what happens to the intersection in Crabapple.
- We looked at 12 different intersections in and around the Crabapple area and this map is showing you what it would be like in 2030 if we made absolutely no transportation improvements around the Crabapple area.
- Actually in the am it is projected to be about five hundred seconds of delay per person which is about 8 minutes of delay that you could sit at the intersection if we keep everything the same and the additional traffic comes.
- There are not enough gaps on the main line.
- Additionally with Itasca walk we witnessed a lot of that happening out there, a lot of unsafe movements, people trying to get out and they sneak out into traffic and they get part way out and trying to see if they can turn.
- It is really an unsafe situation right now because of the ques that are backing all the way out.
- Additionally Metworth we will probably have an F in the am and pm. Same type of issue, the gaps being able to get out and then also the south bound movement on Charlotte at Mid Broadwell will be an E and that is mostly because of the initial traffic coming through here and the difficulty of making that left turn.
- First and foremost one of the things that we think you could do in the short term is some signal timing improvements at the intersection.
- One of the things that we noticed is the north/south movement has a lot of time and the east/west does not have as much so there may be a way to reallocate some of that time to give a little more time to the east/west movement.
- Additionally we heard a lot about pedestrians having difficulty crossing the intersection and some confusion about when the little walk symbol comes up and people being able to cross fast enough so we think there are some very basic recommendations that we can make now that may help the pedestrian experience as well as the vehicular operations at the intersection.
- That is immediate short term.
- In terms of maybe the next five years there are some additional things that we would recommend and those are primarily recommendations at Crabapple intersection in the form of north and south bound turn lanes and also we have this east bound right turn and it is pretty underutilized and it is very large and sweeping.
- We decided it would be better to have a left turn lane there instead of a right turn lane.

- The left turn is much more needed and left turning traffic has the ability to cause longer delays because everybody that is sitting behind you while you wait for a gap in the opposing traffic, everybody just sits there behind you and that is really what is going on at this intersection is people are sitting and waiting for gaps in the opposite direction so north and south bound turn lane and changing this from a right turn to a left turn.
- Those three things alone have the ability to take what could be 500 seconds of delay in the am down to fifty.
- If you take out that really big radius and make it a tighter turn, people have to pay a little more attention and if you take out the right turn lane they are also going to have to do it a little slower.
- Also we want to put in a median and the median would help a couple of different things, one it is obviously an aesthetic improvement.
- It serves as pedestrian refuge where people try to cross and you would have important locations where you could create crosswalks that would allow the pedestrians to cross and if they cannot make it all the way across the street they have a safe place to stand in the middle of traffic zooming past them in both directions.
- It also serves as access management so that cars cannot turn wherever they feel like and if there is a median they have to make a right turn.
- Growth projections do take into account the widening of Arnold Mill and Rucker Road to try and divert some of that traffic away.
- Option two includes everything in option one with one additional major improvement which is the southern connection all the way from MidBroadwell to Broadwell and then up to what would be the connection to Dunwoody.
- We feel very strongly about the intersection improvements, about the streetscaping improvements, we think the northern bypass system is feasible and probably more long term perspective.
- The southern bypass is more up for debate.
- The real value of this southern bypass is the people that are currently coming across MidBroadwell up Charlotte making the left and either coming, of course up this way or across, this bypass helps with this movement with people making the right turn.
- The people coming up MidBroadwell to Charlotte and coming through the intersection still have to do that with the bypass because obviously they are not going to go all the way around.
- This southern bypass allows them to divert away from the intersection and come out and make that left onto Crabapple without having to come through this intersection and you will notice it was B and D before and it is D and C now so what we have done is pull quite a bit of the west bound through movement and even some of the east bound through movement that is coming down so that would definitely be from a transportation perspective an enhancement to keep the operations of this intersection moving well.
- The obvious difficulty is some of the right of ways used and some of the neighborhood issues that would come up.
- This is all right of way that would need to be acquired and this is not a specific alignment, this is just very conceptual but because on this side we do have an existing roadway that would be the logical alignment.

Faye DiMassimo, Kimley Horn & Associates

- One of the other things that we have worked with TSAC on is we have developed implementation strategies for all of the projects that are on this list.
- We need to get comments back by the 16th and then we will give a final report to review.
- We will be back to present the final report on the December 14th and I will be back on December 21st.

Mayor Lockwood read the next agenda item.

Discussion on the Telecommunications Ordinance.

Tom Wilson, Interim Community Development Director

- This ordinance provides for the regulations relating to the development of new cell towers and the placement of antennas on existing towers on preserving the health, safety and welfare of the Milton citizens and preserves the aesthetic integrity of the community.
- This ordinance was first presented to the Council in 2007, but was rejected by the Council because of exemptions to the processes here and for new towers located on city owned property.
- Specifically the exemption would allow proposed towers sited on city owned properties to skip the public hearing process.
- On page 12 of the document any exemption for city owned property has been removed.
- The City Attorney has not yet provided his comments so you may see some changes when this gets back to you at the November 16th City Council meeting under first presentation.

Councilmember Zahner Bailey

- One of the things they had talked about was distance between towers.

Councilmember Thurman

- She said they could always deny it on a case by case basis and asked if one mile was the minimum.

City Attorney Jarrard

- Yes, but the federal law does limit our ability.
- He thinks you have to have a substantial justification before you deny a tower.

Councilmember Zahner Bailey

- She asked what would be the greatest distance that is reasonable that would still allow for justifiable consideration.

Tom Wilson, Interim Community Development Director

- The applicant has to prove that there is not an existing cell tower that he can co-locate on and still achieve his goal so whether it is a mile or two miles or five miles he has to prove that there is no existing tower anywhere around there that he can co-locate on and achieve his transmission.

Mayor Lockwood

- They would have to provide the engineer and technical information.

After no further discussion, the Work Session adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Date Approved: December 7, 2009



Jeanette R. Marchiafava, City Clerk



Joe Lockwood, Mayor