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## VISION + INTENT

## VISION + INTENT

As referenced in Section 3.5.5 of the Town of Zebulon Unified Development Ordinance, Planned Developments are intended to encourage innovative land planning and site design concepts that support a high quality of life and achieve a high quality of development, environmental sensitivity, energy efficiency, and other Town goals and objectives As shown in the following pages, the Chamblee Lake Planned Development is structured to embody and support excellence in site design, circulation, environmental protection, and compatibility with neighboring properties. The Planned Development process encourages creativity in the design of development, but in return for this flexibility the expectation is for communities to:

- Promote a vibrant public realm by placing increased emphasis on active ground floor uses, pedestrian-oriented building façade design, intensive use of sidewalks, and establishment of public gathering areas.
- Provide for efficient use of land resulting in smaller networks of utilities and streets and thereby lowering development and housing costs.
- Promote quality design and environmentally sensitive development that respects surrounding established land use character and respects and takes advantage of a site's natural and man-made features, such as trees, estuaries, shorelines, special flood hazard area, and historic features.


## THE CHAMBLEE LAKE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

## How the Planned Development advances the public health, safety, or welfare.

The proposed Planned Development will provide a much-needed supply of housing in a regional market that is chronically undersupplied - resulting in significant housing affordability issues due to skyrocketing home prices. Furthermore, the proposed location of this development will result in a safe and convenient neighborhood within a 5 -minute drive to the Zebulon Community Park, and shopping in downtown Zebulon. The development will be within a 10-minute walkable and bikeable drive of Five County stadium, the local police station, and all levels of grade schools. Finally, with over $1 / 3$ rd of the gross acreage retained as open space, over 6 miles walking trails, sidewalks, and multi-use paths, outdoor exercise equipment, pollinator plants located throughout the community, and native and non-invasive plant species in the landscaping, the proposed Planned Development will help protect environmental health and promote a more active lifestyle.

## How the proposed Planned Development is appropriate for its proposed location, and is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the Town's adopted policy guidance.

This development abuts a previously approved satellite annexation known as Sidney Creek. Thus, municipal services are already being extended to this area. While Chamblee lake will connect to Sidney Creek and both new residential developments will mesh seamlessly, Chamblee Lake will offer a wider variety of housing options and amenities for residents, enhanced architectural commitments, and more environmental preservation, consistent with the Town's current planning policies. Furthermore, as indicated in Response \#1, this site is less than a 10 minute drive to the areas schools and downtown shopping.

The adopted Future Land Use Map designates this area as Suburban Residential (SR) and identifies one of the Primary Land Use Types for Suburban Residential as, "Planned developments that integrate other housing types (e.g., attached residential such as patio homes or townhomes) [in addition to Detached residential dwellings], with increased open space to preserve an overall suburban character." Thus, the proposed Planned Development with a mix of SFD detached dwellings, attached dwellings, and over $1 / 3$ rd of gross acreage as open space precisely fits the intended use and place type within the SR FLU designation.

Furthermore, this Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
[Land Use and Development - Goal 1] - "A land use allocation and pattern that advances Zebulon's objectives of achiever greater housing variety........with convenient resident access to schools, recreation, shopping and Services."

## - Supporting Statement(s):

- The site is located within a 5-minute drive to Zebulon Community Park, Downtown Zebulon Shopping, and less than 10 minutes from Fire/EMS and Zebulon elementary, middle, and high school.
- The proposed development includes a mix of rear-loaded homes SFD homes, frontloaded SFD homes, and Townhomes, providing a variety of housing options to suit different needs.
- The proximity of this site and it's proposed pedestrian improvements will help support Five County stadium.


## THE CHAMBLEE LAKE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

The Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
[Land Use and Development - Goal 3] - "Ongoing and effective collaboration between land use and transportation planning to ensure a well-connected community with adequate means and capacity to accommodate multiple forms of circulation between local destinations."

- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The proposed Planned Development incorporates a new E-W collector road free of driveways, which will form a direct connection between Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis road to the west. This new route will form a travel alternative for residents traveling between Perry Curtis road and Chamblee Road - one with significantly improved access management and which aligns through the Planned Development directly to the Sidney Creek subdivision to the east.
[Land Use and Development - Policy C] - "Emphasize compatible intensities and character when evaluating applications involving more intensive and/or non-residential development near existing homes and neighborhoods.
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The proposed Planned Development locates its denser Townhome units closer to Chamblee Road, where existing infrastructure is most capable of serving it. Furthermore, the location of townhomes on the east side of Chamblee Road connects to proposed Townhomes to be established as a future phase of the Sidney Creek development. Detached single family home lots are proposed along most of the project perimeter, where the proposed PD abuts existing subdivisions such as the Perry Creek and Fieldcrest Meadow subdivisions to the south. A riparian buffer and additional undisturbed open space is left along the site's northern boundary where it abuts the Carroll Heights subdivision.
[Land Use and Development - Policy D] - "Promote land use outcomes that further community objectives for preventing traffic congestion, ensuring more pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly design, and support expanded and viable public transit options."
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ As explained under the response for Goal 3 for Land Use and Development, the proposed E-W collector road will be unloaded with driveways and will incorporate on-street parking and a multi-purpose trail/sidepath, enhancing vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity. Additional trail networks within the site's open space will further support recreational bicycle and pedestrian use and allow residents to walk or bike to the Five County Stadium through Sidney Creek.


## THE CHAMBLEE LAKE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

The Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
[Land Use and Development - Policy E] - "Ensure development design respects the area's environmental assets and resource base, including waterways and their riparian buffers, unique landscapes, and mature tree stands, especially where there is potential for greenway and/or blueway acquisition."

- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ As proposed the Chamblee Lake Planned Development retains approximately $1 / 3$ rd of the site as open space (both passive and active). The site design integrates and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a $5+$ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter.
[Land Use and Development - Policy G] - "Ensure that all residential developments have multiple access points for public safety reasons and circulation options."
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The proposed Planned Development has multiple access points along Chamblee Road, connects to a future phase of the Sidney Creek approved development to the east, and connects to Perry Curtis Road via a direct connection, as well as an existing stub of Ridge Valley Way to the south. Roadway stubs will also be provided in 2 locations along the northern property boundary - to be extended by future development.
[General Policy - G1] - "Land uses should not detract from the enjoyment or value of neighboring properties."
- Supporting Statement(s):
> All proposed uses are residential in nature, abutting existing residential uses or vacant land. At a minimum, a Type B buffer ( $20^{\prime}$ width) is provided along the project perimeter (either as preserved vegetation or new plantings). Where the site abuts Perry Ridge Ct to the south, enhanced buffers are provided with fencing where existing vegetation is not present. In addition, the project will provide an enhanced Type C Streetscape Buffer (30' wide) on Chamblee Rd to soften views of the neighborhood from the road and maintain a small town feel for passerby.
[General Policy - G3] - "Adequate transportation access and circulation should be provided for uses that generate large numbers of trips. Pedestrian and bicycle access should be addressed where appropriate."
- Supporting Material:
$>$ The proposed Planned Development incorporates a new E-W collector road free of driveways, which will form a direct connection between Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis road to the west. The proposed E-W collector road will incorporate on-street parking and a multi-purpose trail/sidepath, enhancing vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity.
> Sidewalks shall be provided along all proposed streets and off-street pedestrian trails shall be provided to improve access to the site's natural features and active open spaces.


## THE CHAMBLEE LAKE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

The Planned Development advances the following goals and policies of the Town's adopted Comprehensive Plan:
[General Policy - G6] - "Environmentally sensitive areas should be protected, including wildlife habitat areas."

- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The proposed site design avoids any new vehicular crossings of riparian buffers, as well as works around a significant (>10 acre) wetland area in the southeastern portion of the site. Pedestrian access is provided to these areas to allow for community enjoyment and exposure to nature, but otherwise they are left undisturbed.
[Residential Policy - R1] - "Residential areas should not be located next to heavy industrial areas."
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ All adjacent zoning and existing uses are residential or agricultural in nature. No industrial areas are located adjacent to the proposed planned development.
[Residential Policy - R3] - "Schools, parks and community facilities should be located close to or within residential neighborhoods.
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The site has over 4 acres of private/active open space proposed within the residential neighborhood.
> The site is within a 5 -minute drive to Zebulon Community Park, Downtown Zebulon Shopping.
$>$ The site is less than a 10-minute drive to Fire/EMS \& elementary, middle, and high schools.
[Residential Policy - R4] - "Houses should have direct access to local residential streets but not to collector streets or thoroughfares.
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ No driveways are located along the site's proposed E-W collector road. All dwelling units have direct access to a local residential street or an alley.
[Residential Policy - R7] - "New residential developments should include adequate area for parks and recreation facilities, schools and places of worship.
- Supporting Statement(s):
$>$ The site has over 40 acres open spaces, including over 3 acres of private, active open space.
[Parks and Open space Policy - P5] - "Natural features should be used as buffers or preserved open space between or around developed areas."
- Supporting Statement(s):
> The proposed Planned Development utilizes both riparian buffers and wooded woodlands to provide natural buffers between developed areas.


## THE CHAMBLEE LAKE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

How the proposed Planned Development is reasonable and in the public interest. As indicated in the previous response statements, the proposed uses and density is aligned with the adopted Future Land Use Map and place types intended for the suburban residential designation. The site is adjacent to an large existing satellite annexation, meaning urban services have already been extended to this area and the extension of those services to this development will not incur any disproportionate ongoing costs to service agencies (police, fire, public works, etc.). Finally, the site protects a significant amount of natural areas, while providing an east-west collector road free of driveways to facilitate connectivity and ease the amount of traffic utilizing a portion of Perry Curtis road which does not have nearly as good access management as the proposed development.

## How the proposed Planned Unit Development provides for innovative land planning and site design concepts that support a high quality of life and achieve a high quality of development, environmental sensitivity, energy efficiency, and other Town goals and objectives.

The proposed Planned Development utilizes the natural features of the site as an asset to be built around, rather than as an obstacle to overcome. The site design integrates and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a 5+ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter. Existing wetlands and riparian buffers are preserved and used along the northern and southern property boundaries as natural perimeter buffers.

The proposed E-W collector street provides improved access and connectivity at a scale that does not split the community in terms of pedestrian cross-access. Furthermore, the absence of driveways along this collector street allows for a much more aesthetically pleasing and pedestrian friendly streetscape for the development's primary connecting street.

## How the how the proposed planned unit development provides improved means of access, open space, and design amenities.

The proposed layout provides 4 points of access along Chamblee Road, 3 local street stubs to be extended when future development is proposed, a connection which aligns with the proposed Sidney Creek street layout to the east and will provide direct access to Chamblee Road for this adjacent development, and a new collector street forming a direct connection between Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis Road.

Active open spaces are distributed throughout the development for convenient access and are located along the site's major internal roadway. The main amenity utilizes the large existing lake as a significant site feature. Architectural design standards are proffered for the development, as outlined in the Planned Development document.

## THE CHAMBLEE LAKE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:


#### Abstract

How the proposed Planned Unit Development provides a well-integrated mix of residential and nonresidential land uses in the same development, including a mix of housing types, lot sizes, and densities. Due to the future land use plan's 'Suburban Residential' designation for this area, non-residential land uses are not included in the overall layout. However, the site does include a mix of housing types, lot sizes, lot orientations, and densities in the form of single family detached dwellings and townhomes. Details on dimensional standards for the sites different residential products are contained in a later section of this document.


## How the proposed Planned Unit Development creates a system of incentives for redevelopment and infill in order to revitalize established areas.

The proposed development is primarily surrounded by vacant land, creating an incentive for 'development' rather than "redevelopment', as roadway and utility extensions included as part of this project make adjacent development more viable, including desired commercial development surrounding the Five County Stadium. Proposed water line extensions to be carried out by the developer from Chamblee Road to NC 96 to the west would support redevelopment opportunities in the future.

How the proposed Planned Unit Development promotes a vibrant public realm by placing increased emphasis on active ground floor uses, pedestrian-oriented building façade design, intensive use of sidewalks, and establishment of public gathering areas.
The layout for the proposed development is intentional in terms of its creation of public gathering areas in the form of active and passive open spaces. The primary amenity is centrally located within the development along the site's primary internal road and backing up to a large lake. This amenity will serve as the heart of this neighborhood, where both formal and informal events are held.

In addition to the site's active open spaces, the proposed Planned Development will have an extensive pedestrian trail system that facilitates the use of it's public gathering areas. All local new roads shall have sidewalks on both sides.

## How the proposed Planned Unit Development provides for efficient use of land resulting in smaller networks of utilities and streets and thereby lowering development and housing costs.

The proposed layout preserves approximately $1 / 3$ rd of its acreage as passive or active open space. The result of this type of layout is a more condensed development pattern with smaller lots served by less linear feet of infrastructure, surrounded by a significant amount of common open space in lieu of larger individual yards. The interconnected road network is only limited by the numerous environmental features which this site must accommodate.

## THE CHAMBLEE LAKE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ADHERES TO THE FOLLOWING LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS:

How the the proposed Planned Unit Development provides quality design and environmentally sensitive development that respects surrounding established land use character and respects and takes advantage of a site's natural and manmade features, such as trees, estuaries, shorelines, special flood hazard area, and historic features.
As mentioned in previous responses, the site design preserves and provides convenient access to several environmental features, including riparian buffers, over 10 acres of wooded wetlands, and a $5+$ acre lake. The main amenity for the development is located along this existing lake, letting the natural environment serve as an extension of and backdrop to this active open space. The site's larger residential lots back up to this lake, with a pedestrian trail network providing access along its perimeter.

Existing wetlands and riparian buffers are preserved and used along the northern and southern property boundaries in locations as natural perimeter buffers. Where these existing features are not present along the project perimeter, a minimum Type B Buffer is proposed.

To better align with nearby development, the site's Townhomes are clustered on the eastern side of the development, adjacent to approved Townhomes to be built as part of the Sidney Creek development.

## Other factors as the Board of Commissioners may determine to be relevant.

The inclusion of some front-loaded townhomes within the development helps create a more diverse and economically resilient residential offering and supports housing affordability by avoiding costs associated with rear-loaded alleys within this segment. While the majority of proposed Townhomes are rear loaded, including a smaller percentage of front-loaded homes allows select lots to protect and enjoy riparian buffers to the rear and provides the opportunities for back yard for home buyers prioritizing this feature.

Please refer to the associated Planned Development document for more information on proposed architectural conditions.


## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## EXISTING CONDITIONS SUMMARY

The Chamblee Lake Planned Development is located on a single parcel (+/-136-acres) near the intersection of Chamblee Rd and Perry Curtis Road ,along the southeastern boundary of Zebulon's zoning jurisdiction. The site is currently in Wake County's zoning jurisdiction, but a petition for annexation accompanies this rezoning request. The parcel is divided by Chamblee Road, with the majority of the site located to the west of Chamblee Road. The site is located generally between Snipes Creek to the west and Little Creek (west side) to the east, with both riparian buffers and jurisdcitional wetlands on site. The most prominent environmental features include $a+/-6$ acre pond located on the western side of Chamblee Road and a 10+ acre wetland area located along the southern property line. This project is free of any floodplain. The site generally slopes eastwards towards Little Creek, with some internal variation within the boundary. Two jurisdictional streams will be preserved during development with no vehicular stream crossings proposed. Current land cover includes large stands of trees and cleared fields used for agricultural purposes.

## VICINITY MAP



## CURRENT ZONING MAP




## 3 <br> PLAN CONSISTENCY I LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY

As previously stated in the 'legislative considerations' section of this narrative document, this rezoning is consistent with the Future Land Use Map (the "FLUM") and many goals and recommendations of the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

The adopted Future Land Use Map designates this area as Suburban Residential (SR) and identifies one of the Primary Land Use Types for Suburban Residential as, "Planned developments that integrate other housing types (e.g., attached residential such as patio homes or townhomes) [in addition to Detached residential dwellings], with increased open space to preservean overall suburban character."

Thus, the proposed Planned Development with a mix of SFD detached dwellings, attached dwellings, and over one third of gross acreage as open space precisely fits the intended use and place type within the Suburban Residential (SR) Future Land Use designation. It is also worth noting that the proposed site abuts a 'General Residential' (GR) Future Land Use area to the east, which is meant to support even more intense residential uses than Suburban Residential.


## LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

The proposed development is limited to detached single family detached lots and attached single family lots (aka townhouses). These proposed uses, and the development standards restricting those uses, are compatible with the adjacent communities, which are zoned and/or currently used for low to medium density residential uses.

The proposed development standards defined within this document and the associated concept plan will ensure quality of design across the entire development. The overall site layout is designed to create a cohesive environment by positioning the more dense residential uses along Chamblee Rd, adjacent to proposed Townhomes in the approved Sidney Creek subdivision. The site transitions to lower density single family homes along the edges of the community, and utilizes environmental features as natural buffers to adjoining property. The concept plan features a creative integration of residential uses, active open space, and preserved open space to create a cohesive environment. The design guidelines will ensure quality architectural features that are consistent across the community.

## COMPLIANCE WITH ADOPTED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

To better serve the future Chamblee Lake residents and the Town's overall transportation planning goals, the applicant proposes the following amendments to the 2045 Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP):

- Modify the proposed cross-section of Chamblee Road from its existing terminus at SR 1727 (Wake County Line Road) to south of SR 2346 (Temple-Johnson Road) from a 4-lane divided to a 2-lane divided roadway.
- Realign the proposed new E-W street section through the proposed development and modify the proposed cross-section to that of a 2-lane undivided roadway with on-street parking (on both sides) and a multi-purpose path (on one side with a sidewalk on the opposite side).

The amendments described above are contained within a separate CTP amendment request and are reflected within the associated Concept Plan.


## PLANNED DEVELOPMENT MASTER PLAN

## PLANNED DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN

## DEVELOPMENT DETAILS

Chamblee Lake is planned as a mixed-residential development consisting of a 360 units, designed to the Planned Development standards of the Town of Zebulon Unified Development Ordinance. Due to the site's proposed density of less than 3 DUA, the development shall use the R4 district as the base zoning of it's planned development, except as modified by this document. Chamblee Lake will provide a variety of housing choices for future residents as well as well-designed and multi-functional recreational amenities. The development will establish bicycle and pedestrian connections between proposed site amenities, while preserving a significant amount of natural areas comprised of wetlands, riparian buffers, and a sizable existing pond. Permitted uses shall be limited to single family detached dwellings, attached single family dwellings (townhomes), and customary residential accessory uses.

## DEVELOPMENT MIX

- Single Family Dwellings
- Townhomes

Total \# of Units
232
128

Estimated Percentage of Dev.
64.5\%
35.5\%


## FRONTLOADED SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS

## MODIFICATIONS TO UDO STANDARDS

The Town of Zebulon UDO requires that any lot less than 70 ' in width be accessed via rear lane access (or side on a corner lot). In order to accommodate a more compact design that supports preservation of environmental sensitive features, this project would permit front-loading of lots 50 ' and larger with a minimum lot size of 6000 sq. ft. The planned development proposes a mix of $50^{\prime}$ and $60^{\prime}$ wide front-loaded lots, as shown in the associated Concept Plan. The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for these units as a condition of the zoning approval.

To encourage interaction between the public and private realm, front-loaded single-family dwellings in Chamblee Lake will permit a minimum front setback of 20' feet, rather than the UDO requirement of 30 feet. Side and rear setbacks are also less than typical R4 requirements, as indicated below.

## FRONTLOADED SFD DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

> Min. Lot Area
> Min. Lot Width
> Front Setback (min)
> Side Setback (min)
> Corner Setback (min)
> Rear Setback (min)
> Maximum Height
> Permitted Front Porch Encroachment

6000 sf
$50^{\prime}$
$20^{\prime}$
$5^{\prime}$
15
$20^{\prime}$
$35^{\prime} / 3$ stories
5 ' into front setback

## REAR LOADED SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS

## MODIFICATIONS TO UDO STANDARDS

The Town of Zebulon UDO requires that any lot within the R4 district be a minimum of 6000 sq. feet or more in size. In order to accommodate a more compact design that supports preservation of environmental sensitive features, this project would permit rear-loading of lots 35 ' wide and larger with a minimum lot size of 4000 sq . ft. The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for these units as a condition of the zoning approval.

To encourage interaction between the public and private realm, rear-loaded single-family dwellings in Chamblee Lake will permit a minimum front setback of 10 feet, rather than the UDO requirement of 30 feet. Side and rear setbacks are also reduced compared to typical R4 requirements, as indicated below.

## REARLOADED SFD DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

| > Min. Lot Area | 4000 sf |
| :--- | :--- |
| > Min. Lot Width | $35^{\prime}$ |
| > Front Setback $(\mathrm{min})$ | $10^{\prime}$ |
| > Side Setback $(\mathrm{min})$ | $3^{\prime}$ |
| > Corner Setback $(\min )$ | $10^{\prime}$ |
| > Rear Setback $(\min )$ | $20^{\prime}$ |
| > Max Height | $35^{\prime} / 3$ stories |

## TOWNHOUSES

## MODIFICATIONS TO UDO STANDARDS

The Town of Zebulon UDO provides dimensional standards for attached single family development (i.e. Townhomes) based on the entire building unit. Rather than apply dimensional standards based on the entire Townhome building, Dory Meadows shall adhere to the following dimensional standards for each individual townhome lot (and be exempt from the dimensional standards contained in Section 3.3.4 of the UDO). Townhomes within Dory Meadows will be a mix of front-loaded and rear-loaded options. The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for these units as a condition of the zoning approval, and hereby limits townhome buildings to no more than 6 consecutive townhome lots.

## TOWNHOUSE DWELLING DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

- Min. Lot Area
- Min. Street Setback (front or corner)
- Min. Side Setback
- Min. Rear Setback
- Min. Building Separation
- Max Building Height
- Min. Lot Width

2000 SF
$5^{\prime}$ (20' for face of garage on front-loaded units)
N/A
20'
10'
42' / 3 stories
20'

## ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STANDARDS (Voluntary Commitments)

Chamblee Lake offers the following architectural design standards as they relate to detached and attached single family homes:

## Architectural Conditions for All Homes

1. All single - family homes and townhomes will have a two or more of the following design features on the front facade (not including foundation):
a. stone
b. brick
c. lap siding
d. shakes
e. board and batten
f. window pediments
g. recessed windows
h. side and/or front window box bays
i. roof gables
j. roof dormers
k. roofline cornices
l. metal roofing as accent
m. columns
n. shutters
o. other decorative features approved by the Planning Director
2. The exterior siding material on the side and rear facades will be fiber cement.
3. When two materials are used, the materials shall be different but complementary colors.
4. Vinyl siding shall not be permitted.
5. Vinyl may be used only for soffits, fascia, corner boards, decorative elements, trim and vinyl windows.
6. The use of corrugated metal siding, unpainted plywood, or smooth-face concrete block is prohibited.
7. All single-family attached and detached homes with crawlspaces, stem wall or poured concrete foundations shall have the front of the foundation wrapped in brick or stone; as well as on any foundation adjacent to a public right of way.
8. All street-facing garage doors shall contain window inserts and carriage-style adornments
9. Front and rear eaves shall project a minimum of 12 ". Side eaves shall be a min of 4 ". Eaves will be allowed to encroach into required setbacks.
10. No attached or detached home located adjacent, across the street, or diagonal shall have the same elevation and color combination.
11. Front doors shall be illuminated.
12. Each garage door shall be illuminated.
13. All exterior windows shall have a minimum 3 " trim.

## ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN CONDITIONS (Voluntary Commitments)

## Architectural Conditions for All Homes (continued)

14. No venting will be provided on any front facades except that when a bathroom is located on the front of the home, a vent of a similar color to either the siding or the trim may be provided on the front of the home.
15. Trim color shall be distinct from the façade color.
16. Porch railings, if included on homes, shall be a complimentary color of the house and shall be made of either aluminum, or composite material.
17. Windows on front and side elevations shall feature shutters or trim. Shutters, when provided, shall accommodate the width of the corresponding window.
18. Each house will have a min. of 1 story and a maximum of 3 stories.
19. Street-facing garage doors shall not exceed a maximum width of 18 feet per garage door.
20. Vegetative screening for HVAC units shall be provided
21. For all detached and attached lots, the entire yard will be sodded.
22. Accessory buildings, if constructed, shall be of similar materials and colors of the single-family dwelling.
23. The mail kiosk structure(s) shall be covered.
24. All lots shall be served by public water and sanitary sewer.
25. We commit to exceed the architectural requirements in Section 5.2.4 of the UDO. We will work with Town Planning and Building staff to provide additional architectural features with the exception of Section 5.2.4.E.3.e. Garage doors will not be required to be located at least two or more feet behind a front porch or the primary entrance to the dwelling.
26. Each front entrance shall contain a covered stoop or porch.

## Single-Family Attached Architectural Conditions

27. Single-family attached dwellings shall comply with all standards in UDO Section 4.3.3.O, except for 4.3.3.0.7.
28. Townhome main roof pitches (excluding porches) will be at least 6:12.
29. The roofline of each attached building cannot be a single mass; it must be broken up either horizontally and/or vertically between, at a minimum every two homes.
30. The building façade cannot be a single mass; it must be broken up by home articulations of at least 12 inches, at minimum, between every two homes.

## ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STANDARDS (Voluntary Commitments)

Single-Family Detached Architectural Conditions
31. Single-family detached dwellings shall comply with all standards in UDO SEction 4.3.3.P, except for Section 4.3.3.P.3.
32. UDO 4.3.3.P. 1 - Finished Floor Height, Except for single-family detached dwellings subject to a deed restricting limiting the age of residents to 55 years of age or older, the finished floor elevation shall be at least 18 inches above the finished grade adjacent to the home's primary entrance.
33. UDO 4.3.3.P. 2 - Single-family detached dwellings shall be configured so that each side of the dwelling includes some form of ingress or egress capable of allowing emergency exit from or entrance into the dwelling. Windows, doors, or other wall penetrations shall be credited towards these standards. Skylights shall also be credited towards these standards in cases where there is sufficient access to the ground from the room.
34. Single Family main roof pitches (excluding porches) will be at least 6:12.
35. A mail kiosk for the single family detached homes shall be located adjacent to the pool and clubhouse, subject to USPS Approval.

## Example Building Elevations

The following example building elevations are representative of the type of design features intended for SFD detached and attached homes in Chamblee Lake in keeping with the architectural standards committed to as part of the zoning approval. However, to the extent which any differences exist and for review of submitted building permits to follow, the list of Architectural Design Standards (Voluntary Commitments) provided on the previous page shall control.

## Front-Loaded SFD Example Elevations



Front－Loaded SFD Example Elevations



Front－Loaded SFD Example Elevations



## Front－Loaded SFD Example Elevations




Rear-Loaded SFD Example Elevations


Rear－Loaded SFD Example Elevations



Rear-Loaded SFD Example Elevations


## Rear－Loaded SFD Example Elevations（Rear Facades）



Townhome Example Elevations（Front Load）



Townhome Example Elevations（Front Load）



Townhome Example Elevations (Rear Load)



Townhome Example Elevations（Rear Loaded）


## HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for the Development, a Homeowners Association ('HOA') shall be formed to govern the affairs of Chamblee Lake. The HOA shall be responsible for maintaining the common areas of the Development including any shared stormwater facilities, landscaping, hardscape structures (such as signage, irrigation, lighting, and fountains), and recreation amenities.

## LANDSCAPING DESIGN STANDARDS

To ensure the proposed development both respects and enhances the natural environment and provides context sensitive landscaping and screening, the applicant hereby commits to adhere to the landscaping design standards contained below. To the extent which these standards differ from those contained with the Town's adopted Unified Development ordinance, the standards contained in this document shall prevail.

## Perimeter Buffers

Per Section 5.6.10 of the UDO, the proposed development will incorporate perimeter buffers along shared property boundaries with other parcels in order to create physical and visual separation between land uses in separate zoning districts. Said buffers will be split between 2 categories as defined below and will be identified on the associated Master Plan.

## - Type B Perimeter Buffer

- Where identified on the Master Plan, the Type B Perimeter Buffer shall adhere to the design and specifications outlined in Table 5.6.10.C of the UDO. This buffer shall have a minimum width of 20 ft , and shall be planted to 2 canopy trees, 4 understory trees, and 15 shrubs per linear feet. Final tree species shall be selected and approved by Town staff at a subsequent phase of development, but shall include fast-growing species.
- Type B Perimeter Buffer (with Privacy Fence requirement)
- To create greater visual separation between the proposed development and the adjacent neighborhood to the south, a 6' privacy fence must be added to any planted Type B Buffer along the applicant's shared boundary with any lot fronting Perry Ridge Ct or Ridge Valley Way. Where existing vegetation is retained which satisfies the requirements of a Type B Buffer, no privacy fence shall be required.


## LANDSCAPING DESIGN STANDARDS

## Streetscape Buffers

The proposed planned development includes Streetscape Buffers along Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis Road to soften the view of development from the Town＇s or NCDOT＇s street rights－of－way and maintain a more＇rural＇feel along these scenic viewsheds．Streetscape buffers shall not apply to the proposed Collector Road linking Perry Curtis and Chamblee road （internal to the development），as the majority of this road is fronted by rear－loaded units．
－The proposed development shall provide Streetscape Buffers which exceed the width requirements of Section 5．6．12 of the UDO．Streetscape Buffers shall maintain a minimum width of 30 feet and shall adhere to the following planting rates and spacing requirements：
－ 3 canopy trees per every 100 linear feet（maximum of 33 ft on－center spacing）
－ 6 understory trees per every 100 linear feet（maximum of 16 ft on center spacing）
－ 20 shrubs per every 100 linear feet（maximum of 5 feet on center spacing）

## Minimum Landscaping for Residential Lots

－Foundation Plantings：
－All residential lots shall contain foundation plantings in accordance with Section 5．6．11．D． 1 of the UDO．

## －Site Landscaping：

－All residential lots shall require minimum tree plantings based on the following rates．These trees may be located anywhere on the lot，or within adjacent open spaces where specified below．
$>$ Front loaded SFD lots： 1 canopy tree and 1 understory tree
$>$ Rear loaded SFD lots： 2 understory trees
$>$ Townhome lot： 1 tree（understory or canopy）or 2 ornamental trees per lot
－To avoid utility and driveway conflicts within Townhome areas， required residential site landscaping may be located either on the Townhome lot itself or within nearby HOA owned common areas．

## Street Trees

－All Town－maintained streets shall include street trees along both sides of the street in accordance with Section 5．6．13 of the UDO，with the following exception：
－Along street frontages with front－loaded townhomes，maximum street tree spacing may increase to 60＇OC（instead of 50＇OC）due to utility and driveway conflicts． The total number of street trees required along a given street segment shall be calculated based on 1 street tree per 50 LF．

## Median Planting Requirements

Please take this statement out．
－Medians proposed on divided roadways will－be subject to the following planting standard subject ta NCDAT review and－approvat．The applicant shall not be responsible for any median plantings which exceed that which is permitted by NCDOT within NCDOT maintained roadways．

Rate： 4 understory trees and 15 shrubs per 100 LF


## RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE + AMENITIES

## RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE AND AMENITIES

Dory Meadows will provide a diverse offering of active and passive recreation areas within the development. In total, over $33 \%$ of the gross acreage will be set aside as some form of open space.

## Open Space Standards

- Total open space required:
- Total open space provided:
- Active open space required:
- Active open space provided:
- Passive open space provided:


## 13.6 acres ( $10 \%$ gross site area)

+/-50 acres
3.4 acres
+/- 4.7 acres
+/- 45 acres

Chamblee Lake's recreational open space will be anchored by a primary amenity site centrally located along a new E-W collector road, utilizing a large existing pond as the backdrop to this active open space. A pedestrian trail network will circle the existing pond, and supporting park spaces will be provided to the east and west for convenient access for all neighborhood residents (including the portion on the east side of Chamblee Road. The primary amenity site will incorporate a pool and clubhouse, while the site's other active open spaces shall incorporate such elements as trails, playgrounds, a dog park, and outdoor living space as further detailed on the following page and within the Master Plan set. While the exact design and layout shown on the Character Board on the following page and Master Plan set is conceptual in nature, the applicant commits to providing the list of open space amenities included.




## STREETS + SIDEWALKS

All streets within Chamblee Lake shall be designed to meet the standards of the Town of Zebulon, except as otherwise modified by this document or its associated concept plan set (subject to NCDOT review and approval along NCDOT maintained roadways).

- Frontage along Chamblee Road shall be improved to a modified 2-lane divided cross-section along the project's half of the centerline (widened from the Town's typical 2-lane divided roadway to accommodate fire access and NCDOT clearance zones for the median).
- Perry Curtis Road will be widened to the ultimate cross-section, with a fee in lieu applied for the median due to the site's limited frontage.
- All proposed roads shall be public right-of-way.
- All proposed roads shall have pedestrian facilities on both sides of the road.


## STORMWATER

The proposed development will require stormwater management measures for quality and quantity treatment in accordance with the Town of Zebulon's adopted stomwater ordinance (enforced by Wake County). A network of storm drainage conveyances will transport storm drainage from impervious areas to the proposed Stormwater Control Measures (SCM). Preliminary locations of these SCMS are provided in the Concept Plan which accompanies this planned development request, based on existing drainage basins. The majority of the site drains internally towards the existing lake. Location and adequate sizing for the proposed stormwater devices will be verified during final design. All stormwater management will be required to meet North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality and Town of Zebulon design requirements at the time of site construction drawing submittal.

## WATER \& SEWER

There are two existing waterline stubs to the south side of the Town of Zebulon. Each stub is a 6 " main, one being on the south side of the Zebulon Community Park of South Arendell Avenue (HWY 96) and the other is stubbed 500 ' south of the intersection of East Horton Street and the Norfolk Southern Rail right of way. In either case, a 12 " water main would tie to the 6 " stub and extend to the property from the south side of the Town of Zebulon. The preferred alignment would be to utilize the HWY 96 NCDOT right of way and extend the watermain on the north side of Perry Curtis Road to the subject property. That water main would pass through the subject site and connect to an existing 12" water main stub that was placed within the Sidney Creek Subdivision east of the subject development. The Sidney Creek site pulls water from the CORPUD water network existing off Old US HWY 264. Through it's waterline extensions, the proposed development will create an interconnected grid network with two feeds, providing a much greater resiliency in this southern side of Zebulon on the very outer reach of CORPUD's distribution system.

There is an existing waste water treatment facility that the Town of Zebulon built along the Little Creek system (Little Creek WWTP) that CORPUD assumed control/ownership over when the merger happened in the early 2000's. From the existing WWTP, there is a sewer main that runs west of the little creek WWTP to serve the Sidney Creek subdivision. This 8 " sewer main ties to the upstream receiving SSMH for the WWTP, and then runs over the creek to serve the wester side of this creek. The Chamblee Road site can gravity sewer to an existing 8 " stub that is proposed with the Sidney Creek Phase 2 development approved by CORPUD. A sewer analysis is being performed to validate the capacity of this existing 8 " sewer system. It is envisioned that the entirety of the proposed development will be served by the 8 " sewer stub and any ensuing upsizing of that receiving gravity line that ties directly to the Little Creek WWTP.


## - TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

## TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS SUMMARY

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was conducted by McAdams for the proposed development in accordance with the Zebulon (Town) Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) and North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) capacity analysis guidelines. A full copy of the TIA was submitted for review and approval with the PD submittal. A summary of the preliminary recommended traffic improvements is provided below for reference. The listed recommended improvements are subject to additional DOT review and revision.

## STUDY AREA

The study area for the TIA was determined through coordination with the Town and NCDOT and consists of the following existing intersections:

> Chamblee Road/ E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnson Road<br>> NC 96 and Temple-Johnson Road<br>> NC 96 and Perry Curtis Road<br>> Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court<br>> Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way<br>> Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road<br>> NC 39 and Wake County Line Road<br>> NC 39 and Old US 264<br>> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1<br>> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2<br>> Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3

## RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

Based on the analysis of the TIA (including improvements to be installed by the adjacent Sidney Creek development), the following improvements have been recommended to be constructed by the developer to mitigate traffic impacts by the proposed development.

## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1

- Construct Site Drive \#1 as the westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Note: This intersection will be restricted to right-in/right-out operations.
- Provide stop control on the westbound approach of the site drive.


## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2

- Construct Site Drive \#2 with a full movement eastbound and westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane each, respectively.
- Provide stop control on the eastbound and westbound approaches of the site drives.
- Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
- Construct a southbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.


## RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS (continued)

## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3

- Construct Site Drive \#3 as a full movement eastbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Provide stop control on the eastbound approach of the site drive.
- Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.


## Perry Curtis Road and Site Drive \#4

- Construct Site Drive \#4 as a full movement southbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Provide stop control on the southbound approach of the site drive.
- Construct an eastbound left turn lane on Perry Curtis Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.


## Perry Curtis Road and NC 96 (Arendell Avenue)

- Construct a southbound left-turn lane on NC 96 (Arendell Avenue) with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
- Restripe the westbound approach of Perry Curtis Road to provide an improved alignment.


## Wake County Line Road and NC 39

- Construct a southbound right-turn lane on NC 39 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
- Restripe the eastbound approach of Wake County Line Road to provide an improved alignment.


## Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road

- Monitor for all-way stop-control warrants and convert to an all-way stop-control intersection when warranted and approved by NCDOT.



## ZONING CONDITIONS

## UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) CONSISTENCY

Chamblee Lake has been designed to meet the requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance where practical and achievable. There are some instances where due to site constraints or desires to maximize open space preservation through more compact design, it is reasonable to deviate from the typical requirements of the Ordinance through customized dimensional standards. Furthermore, to enhance the design and quality of the development, there are instances where the applicant proposes to surpass code requirements through committed site elements and standards. The section below summarizes the project's customized dimensional standards and zoning conditions.

## 1. DRIVEWAY ORIENTATION / ACCESS

In order to accommodate a more compact design that supports preservation of environmental sensitive features, this project would permit front-loading of SFD detached lots 50 ' and larger (rather than 70'). The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for these units as a condition of the zoning approval.

## 2.SFD DETACHED LOT DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

To facilitate a more compact design and support preservation of open space and environmental sensitive features, Chamblee Lake proposes the following permitted dimensional standards. The applicant has offered tailored architectural standards for all SFD as a condition of the zoning approval.

|  | Proposed Standard | Notes |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Min Lot Area | 4000 SF Rear Load / 6000 SF Front-Load |  |
| Min Lot Width | $35^{\prime}$ Rear Load / 50' Front Load |  |
| Front Setback (min) | $20^{\prime}\left(10^{\prime}\right.$ for Rear-Load SFD) | $20^{\prime}$ normally allowed by UDO for porch |
| Rear Setback (min) | $20{ }^{\prime}$ |  |
| Side Setback (min) | $3^{\prime}$ or 5' (based on lot width) |  |
| Front Porch Encroachment | $5^{\prime}$ into front setback | ONLY permitted for front-loaded lots |

## 3. TOWNHOME DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

To facilitate a more compact design and support preservation of open space and environmental sensitive features, Chamblee Lake proposes custom Townhome dimensional standards, based on individual townhome lots, rather than townhome buildings. These custom Townhome dimensional standards are contained within Section 3 of this document, and copied below for reference.

- Min. Lot Area
- Min. Street Setback (front or corner)
- Min. Side Setback
- Min. Rear Setback
- Min. Building Separation
- Max Building Height
- Min. Lot Width

2000 SF
$5^{\prime}$ (20' for face of garage on front-loaded units)
N/A
$20^{\prime}$
$10^{\prime}$
42' / 3 stories
20'

## UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) CONSISTENCY

## 4. COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (CTP) MODIFICATION

The adopted Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) calls for a 4-lane divided roadway to traverse the northern portion of this property, west of Chamblee Road. As explained in the applicant's CTP amendment request, there is strong justification for a different road section to be applied. As such, this planned development shows a proposed 2-lane collector road with on-street parking connecting directly to Perry Curtis Road (in lieu of the CTP's proposed 4lane divided E-W roadway). This plan also incorporates a 2-lane divided section with a multi-purpose path on one side for Chamblee Road.

## 5. MAX LOT COVERAGE

Chamblee Lake will applya 35\% maximum impervious requirement for the development as a whole (based on total acreage).

## 6. PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Pursuant to UDO Section 3.5.5.B.4, the applicant requests an exemption from subsequent site plan review. This PD includes a master plan that is detailed and meets the requirements for a site plan, as demonstrated by the included Zebulon Site Plan Checklist. Therefore, upon approval of this PD, the applicant shall be exempt from subsequent site plan review.

## 7. ENHANCED STREETSCAPE, PERIMETER BUFFER, AND MEDIAN STANDARDS

- The applicant commits to providing 30' wide streetscape buffers (exceeding the UDO required 15')
- The applicant commits to providing a 20' wide TypeB buffer along it's shared southern boundary with Perry Ridge Ct (exceeding the UDO required 10' Type A buffer). Where existing vegetation is not used to satisfy the Type B buffer requirement, a 6 ' privacy fence will also be provided.
- The applicant commits (subject to NCDOT review and approval) to providing 13' wide planted areas within medians (exceeding the UDO required 11')
- Perimeter and streetscape buffers shall be comprised of native or adaptive species.


## 8. ENHANCEDOPEN SPACE DEDICATOIN AND TREE SAVE

Based on the site's acreage, the UDO would require a minimum of 13.6 acres of dedicated open space ( $10 \%$ of the site) and 6.8 acres of Tree Save ( $5 \%$ of the site). The applicant hereby commits to providing a minimum of 41 acres of open space ( $30 \%$ of the site) and 13.6 acres of Tree Save ( $10 \%$ of the site).

## 9. ACTIVE BY DESIGN / FOOD TRUCK ACCOMODATION

To support community gatherings and active neighborhoods, the development's main amenity site and 2 pocket parks will incorporate off-street parking or marked on-street parking to accommodate visitors without impeding travel lanes. Said parking provides a safe and convenient location for food trucks to locate in support of community functions. Furthermore, the applicant commits to providing a minimum of 2 larger parking spaces within the main amenity site designed for food trucks or delivery vehicles, with an electrical outlet available.

## UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (UDO) CONSISTENCY

## 10. ENHANCED BIKE / PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

In addition to providing (at a minimum) sidewalks on both sides of all roads ( subject to NCDOT approval along DOT maintained roadways ), the proposed development will further support pedestrian and bicycle access through the incorporation of a multi-use path along Chamblee Road and the site's proposed East-West collector road. Furthermore, Chamblee Lake will provide an off-street pedestrian trail network (both paved and unpaved) of a least 1 mile in length, with a minimum of 4 exercise stations along the trail. This pedestrian network, in connection with Sidney Creek's committed improvements, will provide a direct connection to Five County Stadium.

## 11. SITE IMRPOVEMENTS AND NCDOT APPROVAL

All planned improvements to roadways and right-of-way owned and maintained by the NC Department of Transportation (NCDOT), including improvements that require off-site property acquisition and/or easements, are subject to NCDOT approval during subsequent phases of development. If any improvements are not approved by NCDOT, alternative designs may be administratively approved by Town staff.

## 12. POOL/CLUBHOUSE

Construction of a pool and clubhouse structure shall be completed at the earlier of either 24 months from recordation of the Phase 1 plat, or prior to issuance of the 150th Certificate of Occupancy.

## 13. CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC ACCESS

In order to protect adjacent neighborhoods, no construction traffic will utilize Perry Ridge Court or Ridge Valley Way as a means of access.

## 14. ENTRY FEATURES

Chamblee Lake shall include a prominent entry feature at the primary entrances on Chamblee Road.

## 15. STORMWATER CONTROL PONDS

At least one stormwater control pond shall contain a fountain. At least seventy-five percent (75\%) of any required plants in the Stormwater Control Measure ponds, excluding grasses, shall be pollinator plants such as native milkweeds and other nectar-rich flowers.

## 16. BUS STOP

If a bus pickup location is approved by Wake County Public Schools in the neighborhood, one bust stop area, including a shelter, a bench, a trash can, and at least 5 bicycle spaces shall be provided with the second phase of development.

## 17. PET WASTE STATIONS

A minimum of four (4) pet waste stations shall be provided along the site's sidewalks, paths, or trails.

# Dory Meadows Utility Allocation Worksheet 

Base Points Provided: 10

Bonus Points Required: 50

## BASE POINTS: List of Preferred Land Uses and Required Characteristics:

The uses listed below have been determined to be the most desirable and important uses for the Town of Zebulon to promote and maintain economic and housing diversity. Only projects that completely meet the stated performance characteristics will be considered for utility allocation. Please select one of the following Base Point classifications.

| 60 Base Points | Single Family Homes (Expedited Subdivision or Recombination) <br> Newly constructed Single Family Homes built upon new lots created via the minor <br> subdivision, exempt subdivision, expedited subdivision (3 or fewer lots) or <br> recombination process. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 60 Base Points | Change of Use <br> This category captures renovation, rehabilitation, up-fit or retrofit of existing <br> buildings or portions of buildings that pre-date this policy and require a code <br> summary sheet, change in building occupancy, certificate of occupancy, building <br> permit and/or building inspections and do not increase the utility demand from <br> the previous use of the building. |
| 45 Base Points | Business Office/Finance/ Insurance / Professional Services Center - Large <br> Qualifying projects must exceed 100,000 square feet of heated floor space and <br> create at least 150 employment positions that exceed the average annual Wake <br> County salary according to Wake County Economic Development or the |
| Employment Security Commission. Employees perform professional, scientific, <br> and technical services for others. Such services require a high degree of expertise <br> and training and provide high salaried employment opportunities. Examples <br> include software engineering, legal, medical, accounting, consulting, <br> architectural, biomedical, chemical, research and development, and <br> administrative services. Finance or Insurance Centers shall also pool financial risks <br> by underwriting insurance and annuities. Some establishments support employee <br> benefit programs. Examples include bank or credit union headquarters, <br> brokerages, investments, insurance, financing, and data processing <br> establishments. |  |
| 45 Base Points | Manufacturing/Industrial Employment Center <br> Manufacturing or Industrial establishments in this category exceed 200,000 <br> square feet of floor space located in plants, factories, or mills and employ power- |


|  | driven machines and materials-handling equipment. They may also employ workers who assemble or create new products by hand, without the characteristic machinery-intensive enterprise. Many manufacturing establishments process products of agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, or quarrying as well as products of other manufacturing establishments. Most manufacturing establishments have some form of captive services (e.g., research and development, and administrative operations, such as accounting, payroll, or management) in conjunction on-site. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 45 Base Points | Governmental Uses/Public Administration <br> This category encompasses centers for all government functions; it includes federal, state, and local government agencies that administer, oversee, and manage public programs and budgets and have executive, legislative, or judicial authority. Establishments develop policy, create laws, adjudicate civil and criminal legal cases, and provide for public safety and national defense. |
| 40 Base Points | Single Use Retail <br> Newly constructed single use, stand-alone building used primarily for retail, restaurant, or similar commercial use. |
| 40 Base Points | Hotels, Motels, or other Accommodation Service Establishments <br> This category serves lodging and short-term accommodations for travelers. They may offer a wide range of services, from overnight sleeping space to full-service hotel suites. They may offer these services in conjunction with other activities, such as entertainment or recreation. Stays in these establishments are generally less than one month. This classification does not include boarding or rooming houses. |
| 40 Base Points | Arts/Entertainment/Museums <br> These establishments operate facilities or provide services for a variety of cultural, entertainment, and performing art functions. Establishments include those that produce, promote, or participate in live performances, events, or exhibits intended for public viewing; those that preserve and exhibit objects and sites of historical, cultural, or educational interest; and those that operate facilities or provide services to serve activities associated with the aforementioned. |
| 40 Base Points | Amusement, Sports or Recreational Establishment <br> Establishments in this category operate either indoor or outdoor facilities offering family activities (i.e. sports, recreation, or amusement) and provide services, such as facilitating amusement in places operated by others, operating recreational sports groups and leagues. Examples include golf courses, indoor sports venues, bowling alleys, miniature golf courses, athletic clubs, skating rinks and arcades. This category may be used in conjunction with a commercial or residential development as a mixed use development. |
| 40 Base Points | Mixed Use Development (Transit Oriented) <br> Newly constructed or substantially rehabilitated collection of vertically mixed retail, office and residential uses in multi-story buildings centered within a onehalf mile radius of an existing rail or bus transit station or the intersection of |


|  | Horton Street and North Arendell Avenue in Downtown Zebulon. In order to <br> qualify as mixed use, developments must dedicate at least one-third of the total <br> heated square footage to residential use and the remainder to a mix of retail and <br> office uses. All three use types must be represented and at least 10\% of the <br> heated square footage must be dedicated to street level, storefront retail uses. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 40 Base Points | Mixed Use Development (Urban Infill) <br> Newly constructed or substantially rehabilitated collection of mixed retail, office <br> and residential uses in a multi-story building on a previously developed parcel <br> within the corporate limits. In order to qualify as mixed use, developments must <br> dedicate at least one-third of the total heated square footage to residential use <br> and the remainder to a mix of retail and office uses. All three use types must be <br> represented and at least 10\% of the heated square footage must be dedicated to <br> street level, storefront retail uses. |
| 30 Base Points | Base Points <br> 30 Mixed Use Development (Greenfield) <br> Newly constructed collection of mixed retail, office and residential uses in a multi- <br> story building or buildings on a previously undeveloped parcel. In order to qualify <br> as mixed use, developments must dedicate at least one-third of the total heated <br> square footage to residential use and the remainder to a mix of retail and office <br> uses. All three use types must be represented and at least 10\% of the heated <br> square footage must be dedicated to street level, storefront retail uses. |
| 35 Base Points | Business Office/Finance/ Insurance / Professional Services Center - Medium <br> Qualifying projects must exceed 50,000 square feet of heated floor space and <br> create at least 75 employment positions that exceed the average annual Wake <br> County salary according to Wake County Economic Development or the |
| Retail/Commercial Center |  |
| Newly constructed center of at least 50,000 square feet, typically containing an |  |
| anchor such as a grocery store and other smaller spaces and/or outparcels for |  |
| subordinate uses. Uses are entirely consumer-driven and include all manner of |  |
| retail, service and office possibilities. |  |


|  | Employment Security Commission. Employees perform professional, scientific, <br> and technical services for others. Such services require a high degree of expertise <br> and training and provide high salaried employment opportunities. Examples <br> include software engineering, legal, medical, accounting, consulting, <br> architectural, biomedical, chemical, research and development, and <br> administrative services. Finance or Insurance Centers shall also pool financial risks <br> by underwriting insurance and annuities. Some establishments support employee <br> benefit programs. Examples include bank or credit union headquarters, <br> brokerages, investments, insurance, financing, and data processing <br> establishments. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 30 Base Points | Business Office/Finance/ Insurance / Professional Services Center - Small <br> Qualifying projects 50,000 square feet of heated floor space or less. Employees <br> perform professional, scientific, and technical services for others. Such services <br> require a high degree of expertise and training and provide high salaried <br> employment opportunities. Examples include software engineering, legal, <br> medical, accounting, consulting, architectural, biomedical, chemical, research and <br> development, and administrative services. Finance or Insurance Centers shall also <br> pool financial risks by underwriting insurance and annuities. Some establishments <br> support employee benefit programs. Examples include bank or credit union <br> headquarters, brokerages, investments, insurance, financing, and data processing <br> establishments. |
| 30 Base Points | Multi-Tenant Retail Center <br> Newly constructed center 50,000 square feet or less, typically containing a more <br> than one tenant space within a single structure. Uses are entirely consumer- <br> driven and include all manner of retail, service and office possibilities. |
| 30 Base Points | Intensive Industrial Uses: <br> Uses classified as Special Land Uses within the Industrial Classification. |
| 30 Base Points | Single Use Office <br> Newly constructed single use, stand-alone building used primarily for office and <br> professional. |
| 25 Base Points Points | Buse Points |
| Bungalow Court or Pocket Neighborhood <br> Newly constructed Bungalow Court or Pocket Neighborhood per the standards of <br> the Unified Development Ordinance. |  |
| Distribution/Trucking Center <br> Newly constructed center of at least 500,000 square feet where products and <br> resources are transported to and delivered from via truck or rail. |  |
| Warehouse <br> Newly constructed center of at least 500,000 square feet where products and <br> resources are stored. |  |
| worship by a non-profit organization and their customarily related uses. |  |
| Any faility such as a church, temple, synagogu, mosque or monastery used for |  |
| Religious Institutions |  |


| 20 Base Points | Multi-Family Residential \& Condo Units |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 Base Points | Major Subdivision 4- 25 Lots <br> Any subdivision of land of four (4) - 25 Lots. |
| 10 Base Points | Major Subdivision 26 lots or more <br> Any subdivision of land of 26 or more lots. |
|  | All Other Uses Not Categorized <br> This category of use captures all other uses not categorized elsewhere. <br> Allocations for such uses are left to the discretion of the Town's Board of <br> Determination <br> Commissioners upon recommendation of the Planning Board and acted on a case- <br> by-case basis. |

## BONUS POINTS

Proposed projects can gain BONUS POINTS by agreeing to provide any of the following items over and above the UDO or Standard Specification requirements for their development proposal.

NOTE: No bonus points are given for UDO requirements.
CATEGORY 1 - Non-Conformity Abatement and Public Infrastructure Improvements

| Section 1A - Abatement of Nonconformities |  | (Max-3 points) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Abatement of any existing non-conforming structures | 3 |
|  | Abatement of any existing non-conforming use of land | 2 |
|  | Abatement of any existing non-conforming lots | 1 |


| Section 1B Roadway Infrastructure Not Warranted by TIA/UDO/CTP |  | (Max - 10 points) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Construction of full cross section of existing off-site public street | 5 |
|  | Nearby intersection improvements | 5 |
|  | Traffic signal improvements | 4 |
|  | Signage or striping improvements | 1 |


| Section 1C - Off-Site Public Greenway Improvements |  | (Max - 10 points) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Construct more than 4000 linear feet of 10-foot-wide path | 10 |
|  | Construct more than 3000 linear feet of 10-foot-wide path | 8 |
|  | Construct more than 2000 linear feet of 10-foot-wide path | 6 |
|  | Construct more than 1000 linear feet of 10-foot-wide path | 4 |
|  | Construct 500 to 1000 linear feet of 10-foot-wide path | 2 |

Section 1D - Off-Site Bike-Ped Improvements
Construction of off-site sidewalk improvements (Subject to TRC Approval)
Construction of off-site bike lane improvements (Subject to TRC Approval)

We would only count the acres that are being used for the fitness trail as it states that the area has to meet the Active Open Space requirements.

CATEGORY 2. Green Development Standards/Building \& Site Design


| Section 2B - Parking |  | (Max -15 points) | Points <br> Earned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Structured Parking Facilities - must reduce footprint by 20\% | 10 |  |
|  | EV Charging Stations (two-port) | 5 |  |
|  | Provision of on-street public parking (1 point per stall up to 10 Max) | $1-10$ | 10 |


| Section 2C - Stormwater SCM's |  | (Max-10 points) | Points <br> Earned |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Stormwater - Restored Riparian Buffer | 10 |  |
|  | Construct a fountain or other stormwater amenity within the <br> BMP/SCM <br> (as approved by Staff) | 4 | 4 |
|  | Stormwater - Landscaped Green Roof | 5 |  |
|  | Stormwater - Underground capture system for on-site irrigation | 5 |  |
|  | Stormwater - Bioretention | 5 |  |
|  | Stormwater - Wetland | 5 |  |
|  | Exclusive use of porous pavement in parking areas where suitable | 2 |  |



| Section 2F - Historic Preservation |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Historic Structure Preservation via Deed Restriction (Determined by <br> TRC) | 10 |
|  | Restoration of Historic Structure (Must be approved by TRC) | 5 |


| Section 2G - LEED Certification |  | (Max-10 points) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | LEED Certification for Neighborhood Development (LEED ND) | 10 |
|  | Platinum LEED Certification | 10 |
|  | Gold LEED Certification | 8 |
|  | Silver LEED Certification | 6 |
|  | Bronze LEED Certification | 4 |
|  | LEED Certified Certification | 2 |

## CATEGORY 3 - Outdoor Enhancement and Transit Improvements

| Section 3A - Outdoor Enhancement |  | (Max-12 points) |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | Construction of a Parkway Street Section on a Collector level street | 5 |

Please label on the site plan where the pollinator garden will be located.

|  | Construct on or Preservation of Gateway Landscaping or Structure (Subject to Comprehensive Plan Consistency and TRC approval) | 5 | Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Outdoor Display of Public Art (Subject to TRC Approval) | 4 |  |
|  | Public Facing Outdoor Mural (Subject to TRC Approval) | 4 |  |
|  | Maintenance of Roadside Gateway Plant Bed (requires maintenance agreempent) | 3 |  |
|  | Planting Pollinator Garden (225 Square Foot Minimum) | 3 | 3 |
| $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
|  | Enhanced Roadside Landscaping (Subject to TRC Approval) | 2 |  |
|  | Enhanced Buffer Landscaping (Subject to TRC Approval) | 2 |  |
|  | Construction of a Parkway Street Section on a Local level street | 2 |  |
|  | Installation of Native Shade Tree Species (per Tree up to 10 Trees) | 1 |  |


| Section 3B - Transit (Pursuant to location being adjacent to a planned or <br> active transit route) | (Max - 8 points) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Provision of more than 50 designated Park \& Ride Stalls | 8 |
|  | Provision of 25 designated Park \& Ride Stalls | 5 |
|  | Provision of 10 designated Park \& Ride Stalls | 3 |
|  | Provision of mass transit easement w/ structure (bus stop with <br> shelter \& bench) | 2 |

## CATEGORY 4 - Amenities

| Section 4A - Private Greenway |  | (Max-3 points) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Construction of more than 3000 linear feet private greenway <br> meeting Town of Zebulon standards | 3 |
|  | Construction of more than 2000 linear feet of private greenway <br> meeting Town of Zebulon standards | 2 |
|  | Construction of more than 1000 linear feet of private greenway <br> meeting Town of Zebulon standards | 1 |


| Section 4B - Pool (Combinations may be approved by TRC) | (Max -8 points) | Points <br> Earned |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Olympic Pool and Aquatic Center | 8 |  |
|  | Junior Olympic Pool | 5 |  |
|  | Lap Pool (four lane minimum) | 3 |  |
|  | Resort Style Pool | 2 | 2 |
|  | Any Other Pool | 1 |  |


| Section 4C - Outdoor Deck/Patio |  | (Max -3 points) | Points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Earned |  |  |
|  | Deck/Patio - More than 3000 square feet | 3 |  |
|  | Meck/Patio - More than 2000 square feet | 2 |  |


| Points <br> Parned Jacuzzi/Hot Tub/Whirlpool |  | 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Water Playground with apparatus | 2 | 2 |
|  | Sauna/Steam room | 2 |  |


| Section 4E - Clubhouse | (Max - 10 points) | Points <br> Earned |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Commercial Coffee Shop with at least 10 designated public seating <br> spaces. | 10 |  |
|  | With full kitchen and over 4000 square feet of meeting space | 10 |  |
|  | With full kitchen and less than 4000 square feet of meeting space | 9 |  |
|  | Meeting space without kitchen more than 3500 square feet | 8 |  |
|  | Meeting space without kitchen 2500-3499 square feet | 7 |  |
|  | Meeting Space without kitchen 1500-2499 square feet | 5 |  |
|  | Meeting Space without kitchen less than 1500 square feet | 4 | 3 |
|  | No meeting space, bathrooms and changing rooms only | 3 |  |


| Section 4F - Additional Active Recreation | (Max -10 points) | Points <br> Earned |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Gymnasium (regulation size indoor basketball court) | 10 |  |
|  | Baseball/Softball Field (regulation size) | 5 |  |
|  | Football/Soccer Field (regulation size) | 5 |  |
|  | Skate Park | 5 |  |
|  | Tennis Courts (two regulation courts, fenced) | 5 |  |
|  | Multi-Use Hardcourt (two regulation basketball courts, street <br> hockey, fenced) | 5 |  |
|  | Pickleball Court (three regulation courts, fenced) | 5 | 3 |
|  | Pocket Park - 5,000 square feet | 3 | 4 |
|  | IPEMA Certified Playground Equipment | 3 |  |
|  | Lighted Field of Play for nighttime use | 3 |  |
|  | Electronic Scoreboard or Covered Dugouts or Bleachers |  |  |
|  | Community Garden -15-foot by 15-foot, with water access and <br> potting shed. | 3 |  |


| Section 4G - Additional Urban Open Space Enhancements (Within Non <br> Residential Zoning Districts) | (Max - 10 points) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Fountain | 2 |
|  | Canopy Including Fixed Permanent Seating | 2 |
|  | Drinking Fountain with Pet Fountain | 2 |
|  | Permanent Game Tables | 1 |
|  | Permanent Tables with Shade Cover | 1 |
|  | All Weather Bulletin Board | 1 |
|  | Covered or Internal Bicycle Parking | 1 |
|  | Artist-Design Bicycle Racks | 1 |
|  | Little Free Library | 1 |
|  | Drinking Fountain | 1 |
|  | Public Work Bike Stand With Tools | 1 |

CATEGORY 5 - Affordable Housing

| Inclusion of a percentage of the provided housing stock of a proposed <br> development cost no more than 30\% of a household income not exceeding <br> 80\% of the Area Median Income (AMI) | (Max-10 Points |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $15 \%$ Affordable Housing |

CATEGORY 6 - Other
(Max 5 Points)

|  | Integrated public safety operation systems (EX. Flock Safety or others <br> as approved by the Police Department) | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Smart Waste and Recycling Stations | 2 |


| Total Points <br> Earned |
| :---: |
| 67 |
| $(10+57$ Bonus $)$ |

August 4, 2023

Michael J. Clark, AICP, CZO
Town of Zebulon
1003 North Arendell Avenue
Zebulon, NC 27597
919.823.1808

RE: Chamblee Lake - Zebulon, North Carolina - Traffic Impact Analysis Addendum

Dear Mr. Clark,

## TIA ADDENDUM

This letter presents updated analysis as an addendum to the previously completed Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Chamblee Lake development that was completed in November of 2022 by McAdams. The Town of Zebulon (Town) TIA reviewer issued comments dated January 9, 2023, and North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) approved the TIA on November 29, 2022. These comments and approvals are provided in the attachments. The proposed residential development will be located along Chamblee Road north of Perry Curtis Road in Zebulon, North Carolina. The purpose of this TIA Addendum is to determine the potential traffic impacts of the proposed development as it relates to the change in development density and site access from the previously completed TIA, as well as to identify transportation improvements that may be required to mitigate the development's impact on the surrounding roadway network. This addendum reviews the operations at all study intersections from the original TIA under revised Build (2027) traffic conditions. Since background assumptions are not expected to change within this addendum, capacity analysis results from Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions from the original TIA are utilized. Refer to the previously completed TIA for a breakdown of the assumed methodology and depiction of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) traffic volumes.

## BUILD TRAFFIC

The original TIA considered a density of 211 single family detached homes and 119 townhomes. The revised analysis in this addendum considers an updated buildout density of 232 single family detached homes and 128 townhomes, as well as a proposed site driveway on Perry Curtis Road that was not previously considered at the time of preparation of the original TIA. Based on the Institute for Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition, and the suggested method of trip calculations provided in NCDOT's Rate vs. Equation spreadsheet, trips for the proposed development were calculated for weekday daily, weekday AM peak hour, and weekday PM peak hour. Refer to Table 1, on the following page, for the trip generation for the proposed land uses.

| TABLE 1: TRIP GENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use (ITE Code) | Density | Calculation Methodology | Daily <br> Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single family detached (210) | 232 units | Adjacent / Equation | 2,189 | 40 | 120 | 160 | 138 | 81 | 219 |
| Townhomes (215) | 128 units | Adjacent / Equation | 925 | 15 | 46 | 61 | 43 | 30 | 73 |
|  |  |  | 3,114 | 55 | 166 | 221 | 181 | 111 | 292 |

Site trips were distributed according to the approved regional distributions in the original TIA with modifications made to the way traffic was assumed to enter and exit the site due to the change in the site access for the proposed site. Refer to Figure 1 in the attachments for the detailed trip distribution percentages within the study area.

The trip distribution was applied to the updated trip generation to determine the trip assignment for the proposed development at all study intersections. Refer to Figure 2 in the attachments for the site trip assignment. To determine the future traffic volumes at the study intersections with buildout of the proposed site, the No-Build (2027) traffic volumes from the original TIA were added to the updated site trip assignment to determine Build (2027) traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 3 in the attachments for the Build (2027) traffic volumes.

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS

The intersections and analysis scenarios included in this study were analyzed to determine the potential impact by the proposed development and to recommend improvements to mitigate any potential impacts. The capacity analysis reviews the level of service (LOS), delay, and vehicle queues expected under each analysis scenario utilizing the methodology contained in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, published by the Transportation Research Board.

LOS is a qualitative measurement of traffic operations based on the average total vehicle delay of the movement, approach, or intersection. The HCM includes six levels of service, ranging from level " A " (free flow conditions) to level " F " (where over-saturated conditions are evident).

A computer software package, Synchro (version 11.1), was utilized for the analysis of operations within this study. Within this software package, SimTraffic was also used to review queue lengths and the operations of intersections within the context of location and spacing in the study area. The capacity analysis summary table for each study intersection provides the delay and LOS for each approach and overall intersection, when appropriate. More detailed queues and delay information is provided in the attachments.

## CHAMBLEE ROAD / E. HORTON STREET + TEMPLE-JOHNSTON ROAD

The intersection of Chamblee Road / E. Horton Street and Temple-Johnston Road is an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions in this addendum, with analysis of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions provided from the previously completed TIA.

Table 2 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | A (9) <br> A (7) | N/A | A (9) <br> A (7) | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | A (9) <br> A (7) | N/A | A (9) <br> A (7) <br> -- | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | A (9) <br> A (7) | N/A | A (9) <br> A (7) <br> -- | N/A |

1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the minor-street approach and major-street left-turn movement at the intersection of Chamblee Road / E. Horton Street and TempleJohnston Road are expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Due to the minor impacts at this intersection by the proposed development and expected acceptable future operations, no improvements are recommended.

## 凹 MCADAMS

## TEMPLE-JOHNSTON ROAD + NC 96

The intersection of Temple-Johnston Road and NC 96 is an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions in this addendum, with analysis of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions provided from the previously completed TIA.

Table 3 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 3: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF TEMPLE-JOHNSTON ROAD + NC 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & A \\ & P \\ & P \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & A \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & H \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and <br> Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and <br> Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{WB} \mathrm{~B}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}{ }^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{RT} \\ & 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{TH} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (11) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & --(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{WB} B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{RT} \\ & 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{TH} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (11) } \\ & --\quad \text { ( } 8 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(11) \\ & -\quad A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline W B^{2} \\ N B \\ S B^{1} \end{array}$ | 1 LT-RT 1 TH-RT 1 LT-TH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & -- \text { ( } 8 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & B(12) \\ & --(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the major-street leftturn movement and minor-street approach at the intersection of Temple-Johnston Road and NC 96 are expected to operate at LOS B or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Based on comparison of No-Build (2027) and Build (2027) conditions, the proposed development is expected to account for a negligible increase in delay to the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach. Additionally, the site trips from the proposed development are not expected to have a high level of utilization for Temple-Johnston Road due to the more direct access on Perry Curtis Road. Under Build (2027) conditions, the proposed development is expected to add approximately three (3) southbound left-turns during the weekday AM peak hour and nine (9) southbound left-turns during the PM peak hour. Due to the minor impacts at this intersection by the proposed development and expected acceptable future operations, no improvements are recommended.

## PERRY CURTIS ROAD + NC 96

The intersection of Perry Curtis Road and NC 96 is an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions in this addendum, with analysis of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions provided from the previously completed TIA. Based on NCDOT comments on the previously completed TIA, the following improvement is required to be constructed by the developer:
> Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on NC 96 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Table 4 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 4: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY CURTIS ROAD + NC 96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | A$\mathbf{P}$$\mathbf{P}$R$\mathbf{O}$$\mathbf{A}$$\mathbf{C}$$\mathbf{H}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & W B B^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (10) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (10) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & W^{2} \\ & N B \\ & \text { SB }^{1} \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-RT <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (11) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W^{2}{ }^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{B}(12) \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (14) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

Improvements by Developer are shown in BOLD.
1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the major-street leftturn movement and minor-street approach at the intersection of Perry Curtis Road and NC 96 are expected to operate at LOS B or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Based on comparison of No-Build (2027) and Build (2027) conditions, the proposed development is expected to account for a minor increase in delay to the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach. Based on coordination with NCDOT, the developer is expected to construct a southbound left-turn lane on NC 96.

## PERRY CURTIS ROAD + PERRY RIDGE COURT

The intersection of Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court is an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions in this addendum, with analysis of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions provided from the previously completed TIA.

Table 5 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 5: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY CURTIS ROAD + PERRY RIDGE COURT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & W^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH } \end{aligned}$ | A (9) $A(7)$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (7) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & W^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-RT <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (7) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & W^{2} \\ & N B \\ & \text { SB }^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (7) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the major-street leftturn movement and minor-street approach at the intersection of Perry Curtis Road and Perry Ridge Court are expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Based on comparison of No-Build (2027) and Build (2027) conditions, the proposed development is expected to account for a negligible increase in delay to the minorstreet approach and major-street left-turn movement. Due to the minor impacts at this intersection by the proposed development and expected acceptable future operations, no improvements are recommended.

## PERRY RIDGE COURT + RIDGE VALLEY WAY

The intersection of Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way is an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions in this addendum, with analysis of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions provided from the previously completed TIA.

Table 6 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 6: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY RIDGE COURT + RIDGE VALLEY WAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | A$\mathbf{P}$$\mathbf{P}$ROACH | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{aligned}$ | A (7) A (9) | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{aligned}$ | A (7) <br> A (9) | N/A | A (7) <br> A (9) | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $E B^{1}$ <br> WB <br> $S^{2}{ }^{2}$ | 1 LT-TH <br> 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-RT | A (7) A (9) | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (7) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (9) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the major-street leftturn movement and minor-street approach at the intersection of Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Way are expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Due to the minor impacts at this intersection by the proposed development and expected acceptable future operations, no improvements are recommended.

## 凹 MCADAMS

## PERRY CURTIS ROAD / WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + CHAMBLEE ROAD

The intersection of Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road is an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions in this addendum, with analysis of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions provided from the previously completed TIA.

Table 7 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & A \\ & P \\ & P \\ & R \\ & \text { O } \\ & A \\ & C \\ & H \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS and <br> Approach <br> Delay <br> (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and <br> Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB}^{\mathrm{SB}} \end{aligned}$ | $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1$ RT <br> $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH}$ <br> 1 TH, 1 RT | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & -- \\ & \text { A }(9) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & -- \\ & A(9) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & E B^{1} \\ & W B \\ & \text { SB }^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1$ RT $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1$ TH 1 TH, 1 RT | $\begin{aligned} & A(7) \\ & --1(9) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & A(8) \\ & --(10) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{WB} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{aligned}$ | A (7) $\text { A }(10)$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & A(8) \\ & --(11) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the major-street leftturn movement and minor-street approach at the intersection of Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road are expected to operate at LOS B or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Due to the minor impacts at this intersection by the proposed development and expected acceptable future operations, no improvements are recommended.

The potential need for a multi-way stop control was evaluated based on the guidelines contained within the Manual on Uniform Control Devices (MUTCD) due to previous comments provided by the Town TIA reviewer. Weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes analyzed under Build (2027) conditions were utilized to evaluate the potential need for multi-way stop control based on the vehicular volume thresholds outlined in the MUTCD. Based on the results, this intersection is not expected to satisfy the minimum volume thresholds during either the weekday AM or PM peak hours and as such, is not expected to satisfy these thresholds for the extended 8 -hour period required for consideration of conversion to multi-way stop control. Based on the low expected traffic volumes at this intersection upon buildout of the development, conversion of this intersection to a multi-way stop control is not recommended. Refer to Table 14 for a summary of the multi-way stop control warrant analysis.

## WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + NC 39

The intersection of Wake County Line Road and NC 39 is an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions in this addendum, with analysis of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions provided from the previously completed TIA. Based on NCDOT comments on the previously completed TIA, the following improvement is required to be constructed by the developer:
> Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane on NC 39 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Table 8 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

TABLE 8: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF WAKE COUNTY LINE ROAD + NC 39

| Conditions | APPROACH | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (13) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (12) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B (14) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{TH} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}-\mathrm{TH} \\ & 1 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C (17) } \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ -- | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C (19) } \\ & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

Improvements by Developer are shown in BOLD.
1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Existing (2022), No-Build (2027), and Build (2027) conditions indicate that the major-street leftturn movement and minor-street approach at the intersection of Wake County Line Road and NC 39 are expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Based on comparison of No-Build (2027) and Build (2027) conditions, the proposed development is expected to account for a minor increase in delay to the majorstreet left-turn movement and minor-street approach. Based on coordination with NCDOT, the developer is expected to construct a southbound right-turn lane on NC 39.

## NC 39 + OLD US 264

The intersection of NC 39 and Old US 264 is currently an unsignalized, four-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions in this addendum, with analysis of Existing (2022) and No-Build (2027) conditions provided from the previously completed TIA. Based on coordination with City and NCDOT staff, Sidney Creek is expected to construct improvements at the subject intersection prior to the 2027 buildout of the proposed development. These improvements were included under all future year analyses (No-Build and Build conditions). The improvements included as adjacent development improvements are:
> Monitor for signalization and install once warranted and approved by NCDOT.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
$>$ Construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct and exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 125 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
$>$ Extend the existing southbound left-turn lane on NC 39 to provide a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Table 9 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

## TABLE 9: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF NC 39 + OLD US 264

| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Existing (2022) <br> From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{WB}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & C(16) \\ & C(21) \\ & A(8) \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & F(76) \\ & D(32) \\ & A(8) \\ & A(8) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| No-Build (2027) From Original TIA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}}{1}, 1 \mathrm{TH}, \frac{1 \mathrm{RT}}{1 \mathrm{LT}} 1 \mathrm{TH}, \underline{1 \mathrm{RT}} \\ & \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT}}{} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH} \text {-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(38) \\ & D(38) \\ & C(29) \\ & C(25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(43) \\ & D(40) \\ & C(32) \\ & C(29) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (33) \end{aligned}$ |
| Build (2027) | EB <br> WB <br> NB <br> SB | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}}{1 \mathrm{l}} 1 \mathrm{TH}, \underline{1 \mathrm{RT}} \\ & \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}}{1 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT}} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ & 1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D(39) \\ & D(40) \\ & C(30) \\ & C(25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & (31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D (47) } \\ & \text { D (46) } \\ & \text { C (33) } \\ & \text { C (30) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D \\ & (35) \end{aligned}$ |

[^0]Capacity analysis of Existing (2022) conditions indicate that the intersection of NC 39 and Old US 264 currently operates at LOS A for the major-street left-turn movement and at LOS D or better for the minor-street approach during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the eastbound approach (LOS F) during the PM peak hour. Under future 2027 conditions, the Sidney Creek adjacent development is expected to install a traffic signal in addition to constructing geometric improvements at this intersection. Capacity analysis of No-Build (2027) and Build (2027) conditions indicate that this intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The proposed development is expected to add 1 second of delay during the weekday AM peak hour and 2 seconds of delay during the weekday PM peak hour. Due to the minor impacts at this intersection by the proposed development and expected acceptable future operations, no improvements are recommended.

## CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#1

The proposed intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1 is expected to operate as an unsignalized, three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions. The driveway is expected to be restricted to right-in/right-out (RIRO) operations. Based on review of the capacity analysis, the following improvements are recommended to be constructed by the developer:
> Construct Site Drive \#1 as the westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
$>$ Provide stop-control for the westbound approach of the site drive.

Table 10 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 10: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | A$\mathbf{P}$$\mathbf{P}$ROACH | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{W B}^{1} \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1 RT 1 TH-RT 1 TH | A (9) - -- -- | N/A | A (9) | N/A |

Improvements by Developer are shown in BOLD.

1. Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Build (2027) conditions indicate that the minor street approach of the intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1 is expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

## CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#2

The proposed intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2 is expected to be an unsignalized, four-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions. Based on coordination with NCDOT, exclusive left-turn lanes are expected to be required along Chamblee Road for the northbound and southbound approaches. These improvements were included under Build (2027) conditions. The improvements included as developer improvements are:
> Construct Site Drive \#2 with a full movement eastbound and westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane for each approach.
> Provide stop-control on the eastbound and westbound approaches of the site drives.
> Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Table 11 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 11: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & A \\ & P \\ & P \\ & R \\ & X \\ & A \\ & C \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E B}^{2} \\ & \mathbf{W B}^{2} \\ & \mathrm{NB}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{SB}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT, 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT, 1 TH-RT | A (9) <br> A (10) <br> A (7) <br> A (7) | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & A(10) \\ & B(10) \\ & A(8) \\ & A(7) \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

Improvements by Developer are shown in BOLD.
1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Build (2027) conditions indicate the major-street left-turn movements at the intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2 are expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The minor-street approaches are expected to operate at LOS B or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Based on coordination with NCDOT, the developer is expected to construct northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on Chamblee Road.

## CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#3

The proposed intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3 is expected to be an unsignalized three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions. Based on coordination with NCDOT, an exclusive leftturn lane is expected to be required along Chamblee Road for the northbound approach. This improvement was included under Build (2027) conditions. The improvement included as a developer improvement is:
> Construct Site Drive \#3 as the eastbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
> Provide stop-control for the eastbound approach of the site drive.
> Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Table 12 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 12: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF CHAMBLEE ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & E B B^{2} \\ & N B^{1} \\ & S B \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & \text { A (7) } \\ & \text {-- } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | A (9) <br> A (8) <br> -- | N/A |

Improvements by Developer are shown in BOLD.
1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Build (2027) conditions indicate that the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach at the intersection of Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3 are expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Based on coordination with NCDOT, the developer is expected to construct a northbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road.

## PERRY CURTIS ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#4

The proposed intersection of Perry Curtis Road and Site Drive \#4 is expected to be an unsignalized three-leg intersection. This intersection was analyzed under Build (2027) conditions. Based on coordination with NCDOT, a turn lane is expected to be required along Perry Curtis Road for the southbound approach. This improvement was included under Build (2027) conditions. The improvement included as a developer improvement is:
$>$ Construct Site Drive \#4 as the westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
$>$ Provide stop-control for the westbound approach of the site drive.
> Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on Perry Curtis Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Table 13 provides the capacity analysis for the subject intersection with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in the table. Refer to the attachments for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

| TABLE 13: CAPACITY ANALYSIS SUMMARY OF PERRY CURTIS ROAD + SITE DRIVE \#4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{D} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \end{aligned}$ | Lane Configurations | Weekday AM Peak Hour |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) | LOS and Approach Delay (seconds) | Overall Delay (seconds) |
| Build (2027) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB }{ }^{2} \\ & N B \\ & S B^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-RT } \\ & 1 \text { TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (10) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A (9) } \\ & -- \\ & \text { A (8) } \end{aligned}$ | N/A |

Improvements by Developer are shown in BOLD.
1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

Capacity analysis of Build (2027) conditions indicate that the major-street left-turn movement and minor-street approach at the intersection of Perry Curtis Road and Site Drive \#4 are expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. According to the NCDOT warrant for left and right-turn lanes at unsignalized driveways chart contained within the NCDOT Driveway Manual, a southbound left-turn lane on Perry Curtis Road is recommended. Based on coordination with NCDOT, the developer is expected to construct a 100-foot left-turn lane on Perry Curtis Road.

## 凹MCADAMS

## MULTI-WAY STOP CONTROL WARRANT ANALYSIS

Per coordination with Town staff on the recommendations of the November 2022 TIA, analysis of the potential need for multi-way stop control at the intersection of Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road was performed to determine the potential need for conversion upon buildout of the proposed development. Weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes analyzed under Build (2027) conditions were evaluated based on the vehicular volume thresholds outlined in Criteria C within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). Refer to the Table 14 for a summary of the multi-way stop control warrant analysis under Build (2027) conditions.

| TABLE 14: MULTI-WAY STOP CONTROL WARRANT ANALYSIS SUMMARY |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Volumes (vph) |  | Criteria |  |  |
|  | Major-Street | Minor-Street | C1 + C2 |  | C3 |
|  |  |  | Major (300 vph) | Minor (200 vph) | 70\% of Threshold |
| AM Peak Hour | 119 | 138 | N | N | N |
| PM Peak Hour | 264 | 108 | N | N | Y |
| Criteria Met | NO | NO |  |  |  |

Based on a review of the volume-based criteria for the intersection of Perry Curtis Road / Wake County Line Road and Chamblee Road, this intersection is not expected to satisfy these thresholds during either the weekday AM or PM peak hours and as such, is not expected to satisfy these thresholds for the extended 8 -hour period required for consideration of conversion to multi-way stop control. Based on a review of the capacity analysis results of this intersection, this intersection is expected to operate at acceptable levels-of service under Build (2027) conditions. Based on the low expected traffic volumes at this intersection upon buildout of the development, conversion of this intersection to a multi-way stop control is not a recommended improvement by the proposed development.

## SUMMARY / RECOMMENDATIONS

This letter presents the results of the capacity analysis of the TIA Addendum for the proposed Chamblee Lake development in Zebulon, NC. This addendum serves to provide an updated analysis of buildout conditions surrounding the proposed Chamblee Lake development as a result of a change in density and site access compared to the original TIA prepared in November of 2022 by McAdams. Based on the findings of this study and coordination during the review of the original TIA, the following improvements summarized below have been identified or are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. Refer to Figure 4 in the attachments for a graphical representation of the recommended improvements at the study intersections.

## Improvements by Sidney Creek

## NC 39 and Old US 264

> Monitor for signalization and install once warranted and approved by NCDOT.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct and exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 125 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Construct an exclusive westbound left-turn lane on Old US 264 with a minimum of 50 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
> Extend the existing southbound left-turn lane on NC 39 to provide a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

## Perry Curtis Road and NC 96

> Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on NC 96 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

## Wake County Line Road and NC 39

$>$ Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane on NC 39 with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#1

> Construct Site Drive \#1 as the westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
> Provide stop-control for the westbound approach of the site drive.

## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#2

> Construct Site Drive \#2 with a full movement eastbound and westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane for each approach.
> Provide stop-control on the eastbound and westbound approaches of the site drives.
> Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.
$>$ Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

## Chamblee Road and Site Drive \#3

$>$ Construct Site Drive \#3 as the eastbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
> Provide stop-control for the eastbound approach of the site drive.
$>$ Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane on Chamblee Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

## Perry Curtis Road and Site Drive \#4

> Construct Site Drive \#4 as the westbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
> Provide stop-control for the westbound approach of the site drive.
$>$ Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on Perry Curtis Road with a minimum of 100 feet of full width storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

If you should have any questions or comments relative to this study, please feel free to contact me at 919.287.0741.

## Sincerely,

## MCADAMS



## CC: NCDOT District Office <br> NCDOT Congestion Management

Attachments: Town TIA Review
NCDOT TIA Review
Site Plan
Figures
Capacity Analysis Reports

| Date: | January 9, 2023 |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Michael Clark, AICP, CZO, Planning Director, Town of Zebulon <br> Nate Bouquin, PE, PTOE, Traffic Engineering Lead, M cAdams |
| From: | Sravya Suryadevara, PE, Traffic Engineering Director, WSP USA Inc. |
| Subject: | Chamblee Property Traffic Impact Analysis Review \#2 |

Per your request, WSP has performed a review of the Chamblee property traffic impact study submitted by M cAdams, dated November 1, 2022, and the additional information provide via email on December 7, 2022. We have the following comments:

## Site Plan and Site Access:

- The site plan provided with the TIA does not include the following and hence could not be reviewed:
a. Right-of-way lines, easements and restrictions, if any, and property lines.
b. Driveway approaches and roadway alignment.
c. Interior drives, channelization, traffic flow pattern, traffic control devices, pavement markings, internal truck, service and delivery routing, emergency vehicle access, etc.
d. Distance of intersecting roads, streets, driveways within the study area
e. Width of rights-of-way and sight distance areas
f. Width and type of adjacent road surface
g. Width, radii, and lane use of the proposed driveways or streets
h. Existing/proposed speed limits
i. Width of property frontage.
j. Distance between driveways being requested.
k. Location of sidewalks and crosswalks
- The access to/from Perry Curtis Road is provided through the Perry Ridge neighborhood via Perry Ridge Court and Ridge Valley Road although the site has frontage along Perry Curtis Road. Consider providing access directly to Perry Curtis Road to avoid traffic through an existing neighborhood.


## Traffic Volumes:

- The revised Build (2027) Peak Hour Traffic Volumes along Chamblee Road are accurate. There is no need for additional analysis to reflect this change.


## Conclusions/Recommendations:

- As per the Town's 2045 Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), Chamblee Road, Perry Curtis Road, and Future Collector Street within the proposed development, are planned to be four-lane divided roadways. The Town expects this development to construct the collector street within the property as well as widen Perry Curtis Road and Chamblee Road along the property's frontage to provide the future cross-sections as per the Town's 2045 CTP.
- Perry Curtis Road and Chamblee Road Intersection
- Convert this stop-controlled intersection to an all-way stop-controlled intersection.
- NC 39 and Wake County Line Road Intersection
- A significant portion of the site traffic (40\%) is anticipated to travel through this skewed-angle intersection making a sharp left and right-turning movements between eastbound Wake County Line Road and southbound NC 39. A Google Streetview of this intersection shows tire marks of cars making these maneuvers and indicates safety concerns. The intersection is recommended to be realigned such that Wake County Line Road intersects NC 39 as close to perpendicular as possible.
- NC 96 (SArendell Avenue) and Perry Curtis Road Intersection
- This intersection is also a skewed angle and is recommended to be realigned such that Perry Curtis Road intersects NC 96 as close to perpendicular as possible.

The attached figure shows the recommended lane configuration. If you have any questions about this review, please do not hesitate to contact me at 984-389-2944 or sravya.suryadevara@wsp.com.


|  |  |  |  |  | E G EN D |  |  | CHAMBLEE PROPERTY ZEBULON, NC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Existing Roadway | \% | reld Control |  |  |  |
|  |  | - | Turning Movement | ST0 | Stop Control <br> Signal Control | $\longrightarrow{ }^{\mathrm{I}}$ | Improvements by Sidney Creek <br> Recommended by Town / WSP | Recommended |
|  |  |  | Posted Speed Limit |  | Recommended Stop Control |  |  | DATE: December 2022 |

# State of North Carolina <br> DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

## Chamblee Property

## Traffic Impact Analysis Review Report Congestion Management Section

TIA Project: SC-2022-329
Division:
County: Wake


Clarence B. Bunting, IV, P.E. Regional Engineer Charles Sorrell, Project Design Engineer

| Chamblee Property TIA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SC-2022-329 | Zebulon | Wake County |  |

Per your request, the Congestion Management Section (CMS) of the Transportation Mobility and Safety Division has completed a review of the subject site. The comments and recommendations contained in this review are based on data for background conditions presented in the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and are subject to the approval of the local District Engineer's Office and appropriate local authorities.

| Date Initially Received by CMS | $11 / 1 / 22$ | Date of Site Plan | N/A |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Date of Complete Information | $11 / 14 / 22$ | Date of Sealed TIA | $11 / 1 / 22$ |

## Proposed Development

The TIA assumes the development is to be completed by 2027 and consist of the following:

| Land Use | Land Use Code | Size |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Single-Family Detached Housing | 210 | 211 units |
| Single-Family Attached Housing | 215 | 119 units |


| Trip Generation - Unadjusted Volumes During a Typical Weekday |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| AM Peak Hour | 55 | 148 | 203 |
| PM Peak Hour | 164 | 103 | 267 |
| Daily Trips |  |  |  |

## General Reference

For reference to various documents applicable to this review please reference the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/Pages/Congestion-Management.aspx

Once the driveway permit has been approved and issued, a copy of the final driveway permit requirements should be forwarded to this office. If we can provide further assistance, please contact the Congestion Management Section.

## Improvements By Others

The analysis includes background improvements by others. If these improvements are not in place at the time of construction, the site should provide these improvements or analysis demonstrating mitigation is not necessary.







| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  |  | -1 | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 12 | 33 | 61 | 21 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 12 | 33 | 61 | 21 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 13 | 37 | 68 | 23 | 4 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  |  | -1 | l |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 45 | 23 | 38 | 75 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 45 | 23 | 38 | 75 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 50 | 26 | 42 | 83 | 4 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mi |  | $\boldsymbol{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 33 | 428 | 4 | 11 | 153 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 33 | 428 | 4 | 11 | 153 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 37 | 476 | 4 | 12 | 170 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 672 | 478 | 0 | 0 | 480 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 478 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 194 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 421 | 587 | - | - | 1082 | - |
| Stage 1 | 624 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 839 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 416 | 587 | - | - | 1082 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 416 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 624 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 829 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.9 |  | 0 |  | 0.6 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 562 | 1082 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.073 | 0.011 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.9 | 8.4 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.2 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mi |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | -1 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 29 | 325 | 4 | 46 | 500 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 29 | 325 | 4 | 46 | 500 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 32 | 361 | 4 | 51 | 556 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1021 | 363 | 0 | 0 | 365 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 363 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 658 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 262 | 682 | - | - | 1194 | - |
| Stage 1 | 704 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 515 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 246 | 682 | - | - | 1194 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 246 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 704 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 483 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.9 |  | 0 |  | 0.7 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NB | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 561 | 1194 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.065 | 0.043 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.9 | 8.2 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.2 | 0.1 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | MF |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | a | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 24 | 181 | 248 | 9 | 45 | 108 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 24 | 181 | 248 | 9 | 45 | 108 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 100 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 27 | 201 | 276 | 10 | 50 | 120 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 501 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 286 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 281 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 220 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 530 | 758 | - | - | 1276 | - |
| Stage 1 | 767 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 817 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 509 | 758 | - | - | 1276 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 509 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 767 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 785 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 12.3 |  | 0 |  | 2.3 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 717 | 1276 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.318 | 0.039 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 12.3 | 7.9 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.4 | 0.1 | - |



| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1027 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 254 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 237 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 790 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 260 | 802 | - | - | 1311 | - |
| Stage 1 | 802 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 447 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 214 | 802 | - | - | 1311 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 214 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 802 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 367 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.5 |  | 0 |  | 3.5 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 585 | 1311 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.281 | 0.178 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 13.5 | 8.3 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 1.1 | 0.6 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | -1 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 4 | 123 | 4 | 4 | 41 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 4 | 123 | 4 | 4 | 41 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 4 | 137 | 4 | 4 | 46 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 193 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 139 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 54 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 796 | 909 | - | - | 1442 | - |
| Stage 1 | 888 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 969 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 794 | 909 | - | - | 1442 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 794 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 888 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 966 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.3 |  | 0 |  | 0.7 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 848 | 1442 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.01 | 0.003 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.3 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mi |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 6 | 89 | 4 | 6 | 139 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 6 | 89 | 4 | 6 | 139 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 7 | 99 | 4 | 7 | 154 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 269 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 101 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 168 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 720 | 954 | - | - | 1489 | - |
| Stage 1 | 923 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 862 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 716 | 954 | - | - | 1489 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 716 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 923 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 858 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.3 |  | 0 |  | 0.3 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 842 | 1489 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.013 | 0.004 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.3 | 7.4 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  | r |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |



5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  | r |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 22 | 27 | 35 | 35 | 84 | 54 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 22 | 27 | 35 | 35 | 84 | 54 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 24 | 30 | 39 | 39 | 93 | 60 |


| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 78 | 0 | - | 0 | 137 | 59 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 59 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 78 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1520 | - | - - | - | 856 | 1007 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 964 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 945 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1520 | - | - - | - | 842 | 1007 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - - | - | 842 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - - | - | 949 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - - | - | 945 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 3.3 |  | 0 |  | 9.8 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | A |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT WBR SBLn1 |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1520 | - | - | - | 900 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.016 | - | - | - | 0.17 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.4 | 0 | - | - | 9.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0 | , | - |  | 0.6 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | -1 | F |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 64 | 65 | 39 | 96 | 67 | 41 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 64 | 65 | 39 | 96 | 67 | 41 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 72 | 43 | 107 | 74 | 46 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 150 | 0 | - | 0 | 311 | 97 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 97 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 214 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | - | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1431 | - | - | - | 681 | 959 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 927 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 822 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1431 | - | - | - | 646 | 959 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 646 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 879 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 822 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 3.8 |  | 0 |  | 10.8 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 1431 | - | - | - | 737 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.05 | - | - | - | 0.163 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 7.6 | 0 | - | - | 10.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | A | A | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.2 | - | - |  | 0.6 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{r}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{A}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 81 | 27 | 43 | 427 | 161 | 29 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 81 | 27 | 43 | 427 | 161 | 29 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | 100 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 90 | 30 | 48 | 474 | 179 | 32 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | MF |  |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 68 | 57 | 50 | 331 | 369 | 91 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 68 | 57 | 50 | 331 | 369 | 91 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | 100 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 76 | 63 | 56 | 368 | 410 | 101 |



|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\square$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 1 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 5 | 30 | 32 | 16 | 87 | 172 | 56 | 602 | 35 | 94 | 225 | 10 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 5 | 30 | 32 | 16 | 87 | 172 | 56 | 602 | 35 | 94 | 225 | 10 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.992 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1848 | 0 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1848 | 0 | 1770 | 1852 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1272 |  |  | 1346 |  |  | 8116 |  |  | 1238 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 15.8 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 100.6 |  |  | 15.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 6 | 33 | 36 | 18 | 97 | 191 | 62 | 669 | 39 | 104 | 250 | 11 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 6 | 33 | 36 | 18 | 97 | 191 | 62 | 708 | 0 | 104 | 261 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial ( $s$ ) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 14.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 14.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 14.0 | 61.0 |  | 17.0 | 64.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.7\% | 23.3\% | 23.3\% | 11.7\% | 23.3\% | 23.3\% | 11.7\% | 50.8\% |  | 14.2\% | 53.3\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 7.0 | 54.0 |  | 10.0 | 57.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min |  | None | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.0 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 10.0 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 10.0 | 42.3 |  | 12.0 | 44.3 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.49 |  | 0.14 | 0.51 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.24 | 0.55 | 0.31 | 0.79 |  | 0.43 | 0.28 |  |
| Control Delay | 47.2 | 38.1 | 38.6 | 47.1 | 35.7 | 42.2 | 49.4 | 28.7 |  | 48.8 | 15.0 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 47.2 | 38.1 | 38.6 | 47.1 | 35.7 | 42.2 | 49.4 | 28.7 |  | 48.8 | 15.0 |  |
| LOS | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | C |  | D | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 39.1 |  |  | 40.4 |  |  | 30.3 |  |  | 24.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | P | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 3 | 15 | 16 | 9 | 45 | 95 | 33 | 318 |  | 54 | 78 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 18 | 51 | 54 | 38 | 116 | 219 | 94 | 638 |  | 138 | 174 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1192 |  |  | 1266 |  |  | 8036 |  |  | 1158 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 203 | 548 | 465 | 203 | 555 | 471 | 203 | 1248 |  | 271 | 1297 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.17 | 0.41 | 0.31 | 0.57 |  | 0.38 | 0.20 |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other

Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 86.9
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.79

| Intersection Signal Delay: 31.4 | Intersection LOS: C |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $62.8 \%$ | ICU Level of Service B |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |

Splits and Phases: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | \% | $V$ |  | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 24 | 122 | 99 | 29 | 74 | 109 | 65 | 360 | 29 | 187 | 623 | 19 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 24 | 122 | 99 | 29 | 74 | 109 | 65 | 360 | 29 | 187 | 623 | 19 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  |  | 0.850 |  |  | 0.850 |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.996 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1842 | 0 | 1770 | 1855 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1842 | 0 | 1770 | 1855 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1272 |  |  | 1346 |  |  | 8116 |  |  | 1238 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 15.8 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 100.6 |  |  | 15.3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 27 | 136 | 110 | 32 | 82 | 121 | 72 | 400 | 32 | 208 | 692 | 21 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 27 | 136 | 110 | 32 | 82 | 121 | 72 | 432 | 0 | 208 | 713 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 14.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 14.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 15.0 | 53.0 |  | 30.0 | 68.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 11.7\% | 19.2\% | 19.2\% | 11.7\% | 19.2\% | 19.2\% | 12.5\% | 44.2\% |  | 25.0\% | 56.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 7.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 7.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 8.0 | 46.0 |  | 23.0 | 61.0 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 | -2.0 |  | -2.0 | -2.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | Min |  | None | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.0 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 10.0 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 10.6 | 33.2 |  | 18.4 | 45.9 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.37 |  | 0.21 | 0.51 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.14 | 0.45 | 0.43 | 0.16 | 0.27 | 0.47 | 0.34 | 0.63 |  | 0.57 | 0.75 |  |
| Control Delay | 49.5 | 45.8 | 46.7 | 49.7 | 42.8 | 47.8 | 51.3 | 29.8 |  | 43.9 | 26.2 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 49.5 | 45.8 | 46.7 | 49.7 | 42.8 | 47.8 | 51.3 | 29.8 |  | 43.9 | 26.2 |  |
| LOS | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | C |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 46.6 |  |  | 46.3 |  |  | 32.8 |  |  | 30.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | * | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $>$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 16 | 80 | 65 | 19 | 47 | 72 | 44 | 223 |  | 122 | 385 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 51 | 164 | 139 | 57 | 107 | 151 | 104 | 366 |  | 227 | 567 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1192 |  |  | 1266 |  |  | 8036 |  |  | 1158 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 197 | 415 | 352 | 197 | 415 | 352 | 219 | 1094 |  | 547 | 1359 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.14 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.39 |  | 0.38 | 0.52 |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other

Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 89.7
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.75

| Intersection Signal Delay: 35.2 | Intersection LOS: D |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $68.7 \%$ | ICU Level of Service C |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |

Splits and Phases: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |  |  | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 10 | 85 | 4 | 0 | 33 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 10 | 85 | 4 | 0 | 33 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 11 | 94 | 4 | 0 | 37 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{T}$ | $\boldsymbol{f}$ |  |  | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 7 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 120 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 7 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 120 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 8 | 60 | 4 | 0 | 133 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | 7 | $\hat{F}$ |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 4 | 24 | 20 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 66 | 6 |  | 23 | 6 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 4 | 24 | 20 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 66 | 6 | 4 | 23 | 6 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - |  | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | - | 100 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mumt Flow | 19 | 4 | 27 | 22 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 73 | 7 | 4 | 26 | 7 |  |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Yr |  | 1 | 4 | 个 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 15 | 5 | 76 | 66 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 15 | 5 | 76 | 66 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | 100 | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 17 | 6 | 84 | 73 | 4 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 4 |  | 1 | 个 | t |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 10 | 16 | 86 | 112 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 10 | 16 | 86 | 112 | 5 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | 100 | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 11 | 18 | 96 | 124 | 6 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  | \% | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 66 | 122 | 4 | 22 | 34 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 66 | 122 | 4 | 22 | 34 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Star | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 100 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 73 | 136 | 4 | 24 | 38 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 224 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 140 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 138 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 86 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 764 | 910 | - | - | 1443 | - |
| Stage 1 | 889 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 937 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 751 | 910 | - | - | 1443 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 751 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 889 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 921 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.5 |  | 0 |  | 3 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 890 | 1443 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.092 | 0.017 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.5 | 7.5 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0.1 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{r}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  | 7 | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 44 | 86 | 9 | 72 | 139 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 44 | 86 | 9 | 72 | 139 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 100 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 7 | 49 | 96 | 10 | 80 | 154 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 415 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 101 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 314 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 594 | 954 | - | - | 1485 | - |
| Stage 1 | 923 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 741 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 562 | 954 | - | - | 1485 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 562 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 923 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 701 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.4 |  | 0 |  | 2.6 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 880 | 1485 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.063 | 0.054 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.4 | 7.6 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.2 | 0.2 | - |

1: Chamblee Road/E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 8.1 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 1.0 |

3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 9.4 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 3.0 |

## 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.8 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 1.6 |

6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/ $\operatorname{Veh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 1.7 |

7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 10.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 4.0 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | SBR

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 1.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 28.2 |

9: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 |

10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tonied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Deh (s) | 3.9 | 4.2 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.5 |

11: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#3 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.3 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 |

12: Perry Curtis Road \& Site Drive \#4 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 5.9 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.5 |

Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.8 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 24.0 |

Intersection: 1: Chamblee Road/E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | EB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 25 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 24 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1058 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 | 27 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 16 | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 | 19 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1187 | 1196 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 103 | 52 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 21 | 10 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 59 | 35 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1072 |  |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 100 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |

## Intersection: 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 | 23 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 10 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 | 8 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 410 | 695 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 9 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 31 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 998 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 28 | 66 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 3 | 31 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 16 | 49 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2528 | 1499 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( ft$)$ |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 | 91 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 6 | 11 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 21 | 47 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2444 | 1184 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 11 | 52 | 42 | 38 | 124 | 166 | 250 | 395 | 136 | 160 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 33 | 63 | 47 | 206 | 54 | 74 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 6 | 28 | 27 | 19 | 82 | 139 | 146 | 372 | 111 | 136 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1212 |  |  | 1286 |  |  | 7962 | 1181 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 1 |  | 18 | 3 | 3 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 1 |  | 10 | 8 | 3 |

Intersection: 9: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#1

| Movement | WB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 18 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 16 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1010 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2

| Movement | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 20 | 35 | 8 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 13 | 10 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 28 | 24 | 3 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1066 | 1072 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 100 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 11: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#3

| Movement | EB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 16 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 8 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 20 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 972 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 12: Perry Curtis Road \& Site Drive \#4

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 53 | 26 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 31 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 49 | 18 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1021 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Bk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |
| Network wide Queuing Penalty: 32 |  |  |

1: Chamblee Road/E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/ \operatorname{Veh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 |

2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 8.5 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 1.5 |

3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 13.4 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 3.0 |

## 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court Performance by movement

| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.4 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 |

5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 1.3 |

6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 1.8 |

7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del $/$ Veh (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Total Del/ $\operatorname{seh}(\mathrm{s})$ | 24.0 | 0.2 | 13.6 | 9.1 | 4.0 | 11.3 | 11.1 | 10.0 |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

|  |  | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Movement | 3.6 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 3.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 1.0 |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 52.2 | 30.9 | 34.8 | 45.2 | 34.4 | 36.9 | 53.5 | 30.1 | 24.9 | 49.0 | 30.7 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) |  | 23.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

8: NC 39 \& Old US 264 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 1.3 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 34.4 |

9: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#1 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.9 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 |

10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SBR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 4.9 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 4.2 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.5 |

## 10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2 Performance by movement

| Movement | All |
| :--- | :---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 1.3 |

11: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#3 Performance by movement

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 3.8 | 2.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.6 |

12: Perry Curtis Road \& Site Drive \#4 Performance by movement

| Movement | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | All |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 2.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.0 |

Total Network Performance

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Denied Del/Veh (s) | 1.0 |
| Total Del/Veh (s) | 29.9 |

Intersection: 1: Chamblee Road/E. Horton Street \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 28 | 27 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 16 | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 33 | 18 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1058 | 1661 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 2: NC 96 \& Temple-Johnston Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 | 71 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 18 | 10 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 | 41 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1188 | 1189 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: NC 96 \& Perry Curtis Road

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 64 | 75 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 | 38 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 35 | 64 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1068 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 100 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |

## Intersection: 4: Perry Curtis Road \& Perry Ridge Court

| Movement | WB |
| :--- | :---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 11 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 410 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 5: Perry Ridge Court \& Ridge Valley Way

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 6 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 27 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 998 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 6: Perry Curtis Road/Wake County Line Road \& Chamblee Road

| Movement | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | TR | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 48 | 18 | 51 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 | 1 | 27 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 27 | 6 | 41 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2535 | 1202 | 1500 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist ( ft$)$ |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 7: NC 39 \& Wake County Line Road

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 124 | 178 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 26 | 44 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 81 | 117 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 2449 | 1186 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 8: NC 39 \& Old US 264

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 61 | 134 | 83 | 55 | 74 | 106 | 250 | 382 | 200 | 523 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 25 | 41 | 33 | 11 | 22 | 30 | 68 | 176 | 125 | 281 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 56 | 96 | 75 | 34 | 63 | 77 | 178 | 306 | 223 | 475 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1212 |  |  | 1286 |  |  | 7962 |  | 1181 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 50 |  | 125 | 50 |  | 125 | 150 |  | 100 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 4 | 8 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |  | 11 | 13 | 26 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 9 | 10 |  | 1 | 9 | 0 |  | 7 | 86 | 49 |

Intersection: 9: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#1

| Movement | WB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 19 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 11 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1010 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 10: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#2

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | L | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 43 | 38 | 17 | 16 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 14 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 | 27 | 9 | 8 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1066 | 1062 |  |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 100 | 100 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 11: Chamblee Road \& Site Drive \#3

| Movement | EB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 16 | 23 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 6 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 19 | 8 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 962 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 100 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 12: Perry Curtis Road \& Site Drive \#4

| Movement | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR | L |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 30 | 50 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 25 | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 44 | 29 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1022 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 100 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Bk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |
| Network wide Queuing Penalty: 171 |  |  |

## REZONING OF PROPERTY CONSISTING OF +/- 136 ACRES, LOCATED ALONG CHAMBLEE ROAD AND PERRY CURTIS ROAD, IN THE TOWN OF ZEBULON <br> REPORT OF VOLUNTARY 2ND NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING WITH NEIGHBORING PROPERTY OWNERS AND TENANTS

ON JULY 25, 2023
In order provide updates to neighbors who participated in the first neighborhood meeting (On October 17, 2022) and to expand outreach to residents within 750 feet of the subject property in recognition of amended notification requirements, a voluntary second neighborhood meeting was held with respect to a potential rezoning with neighboring property owners and tenants on Tuesday, July 25 , 2023, from 7:00 p.m. to $8: 30 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. The property considered for this potential rezoning totals approximately 136 acres, and is located along Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis Road, in the Town of Zebulon, having Wake County Parcel Identification No. 2715101559. This meeting was held at the Zebulon Community Center (301 S Arendell Ave, Zebulon, NC 27597) from 7:00pm to $8: 30 \mathrm{pm}$. All owners and tenants of property within 750 feet of the subject property were invited to attend the meeting.

Attached hereto as Exhibit $\mathbf{A}$ is a copy of the neighborhood meeting notice. A copy of the required mailing list for the meeting invitations and pictures of the on-site signage posted is attached hereto as Exhibit B. The sign-in sheet showing the individuals who attended the meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit C. A summary of the items discussed at the meeting (issue/response sheet) is attached hereto as Exhibit D. The site plan shared with those in attendance as the primary talking point is attached hereto as Exhibit E.

EXHIBIT A - NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTICE

July 14, 2023

## NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTICE

Dear Property Owner:
You are invited to a neighborhood meeting to learn more about a proposed project adjacent to or near your property. This invitation represents a second neighborhood meeting held for the proposed Dory Meadows project. The first neighborhood meeting was held at the Zebulon Community Center on October 17, 2022, prior to project submittal. This additional neighborhood meeting is a voluntary effort undertaken by the applicant to provide notification to a wider range of area residents and project updates to those who attended the original neighborhood meeting. The meeting will be an opportunity for residents and property owners to learn more about the project and provide feedback.

Meeting Date: July 25, 2023 Meeting Time: 7PM-8PM
> Meeting Location: Zebulon Community Center (301 S Arendell Ave, Zebulon NC 27597)
> Application Type: Planned Unit Development
> Submittal Status: Submitted November 2022
> Property Owner(s) Name(s): Chamblee, R M Heirs; C/O Jim Edwards
> Applicants: McAdams (Engineer), DR Horton (Developer), and Parker Poe (Attorney)
> Primary Contact: Ashley Honeycutt Terrazas (Parker Poe)

- Phone: 919-835-4043
- Email: ashleyterrazas@parkerpoe.com
> Property Address: 1509 Chamblee Rd, Zebulon NC (PIN \# 2715101559)

Project Description: Dory Meadows is a proposed Planned Development application for a mixed residential neighborhood with ~ 360 homes (single family detached and townhomes) that spans from Chamblee Rd and Perry Curtis Rd (136-acre tract).

To ensure that all neighbors have a full understanding of the proposal, you will find the following items included in this mailer:

1. An agenda
2. A vicinity map
3. A copy of the conceptual site plan (an enlarged version will be shown at the Neighborhood Meeting. The development team is working on a new Project Name, which is reflected on the site plan)

If you have questions, or cannot attend the meeting but would like further information, please feel free to contact Ashley Honeycutt Terrazas with Parker Poe by email (ashleyterrazas@parkerpoe.com) or by phone (919-835-4043).

# Dory Meadows Planned Dev. - Neighborhood Meeting Agenda 

Location: 301 S Arendell Ave., Zebulon NC 27597 (Zebulon Community Center)

Date: July 25, 2023

Time: 7:00 P.M. - 8:00 P.M.

Agenda details:

7:00 PM Welcome \& Introductions

7:05 PM Purpose of the Meeting

7:10 PM Planned Development Review Process

7:15 PM Project Overview
A. Description of Property
B. Current Zoning
C. Policy Guidance
D. Proposed Zoning \& Concept Updates
E. Next Steps

7:35 PM Question and Answer Period

8:00 PM Adjourn


Chamblee Rd PD - Vicinity Map
\& Existing Zoning


## Disclaimer

Maps makes every effort to produce and publish the most current and accurate information possible. However, the maps are produced for information purposes and are NOT surveys. No warranties, expressed or implied
are provided for the data therein, its use,or its interpretation

## PROPOSED NAME HERE cONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN



EXHIBIT B - NOTICE MAILING LIST
\& ON-SITE SIGNAGE POSTED

STRICKLAND, FRANCES MARIE STRICKLAND, ROGER L 1101 FIELD MEADOWS DR ZEBULON NC 27597-6852

STOKES, ELLIS EARL STOKES, MARY B 1401 CHAMBLEE RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-9669

FOUNTAIN, JAMES I III FOUNTAIN, LAURA E 10405 PERRY RIDGE CT ZEBULON NC 27597-6844

BOONE, CHARLES E 1509 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9641

DRSFA LLC
2099 GAITHER RD STE 600
ROCKVILLE MD 20850-4018

KILLETTE, PHILLIP KILLETTE, LINDA W 929 PERRY CURTIS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-8886

JOHNSON, DEWEY L JOHNSON, DOROTHY H 220 BEAVER RIDGE DR YOUNGSVILLE NC 27596-8776

DOZIER, CLARA RHODES 255 DAVIS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-7046

HP FLEMING FAMILY LLC
308 WESTRIDGE DR
RALEIGH NC 27609-5219

TAYLOR, JOSEPHINE
1320 CHAMBLEE RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-9666

LIVERMAN, LORAINE A 1404 CHAMBLEE RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9668

SHERROD, THELMA M 1505 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9641

POOLE, JOSHUA
1516 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9640

HERNDON, JAMES M 1521 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9641

LASKIN, RHONDA ANN
1513 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-9641

BECK, KAYE M BECK, RICHARD D
PO BOX 518
ZEBULON NC 27597-0518

CRENSHAW, BARRY A
833 PERRY CURTIS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-8884

MITCHELL, FRANK W MITCHELL, JANE H
504 PERRY CURTIS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-8877

PATE FAMILY I LTD PTNRP
2333 ZEBULON RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-8155

KIRIAZES, KENNETH E KIRIAZES, MARIE A 10401 PERRY RIDGE CT
ZEBULON NC 27597-6844

VINSON, THOMAS EDWARD VINSON, APRIL R 520 PERRY CURTIS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-8877

ROSE, LUTHER ROSE, KATIE M 1404 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9638

ANGELES, SILVIA TEPETATE 6100 DOGTROTT CT RALEIGH NC 27616-6126

RAZAI, SAM
2025 PORT ROYAL RD RALEIGH NC 27609-4131

MITCHELL, F WADDELL MITCHELL, JANE H 504 PERRY CURTIS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-8877

JOHNSON, DEWEY L JOHNSON, DOROTHY H 220 BEAVER RIDGE DR
YOUNGSVILLE NC 27596-8776

KILLETTE, PHILLIP KILLETTE, LINDA W
929 PERRY CURTIS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-8886

ROBERTSON, ROBERT J 1512 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9640

KHALIOUI, YOUNES
1520 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9640

BRODEUR, MADELINE 10413 PERRY RIDGE CT ZEBULON NC 27597-6844

HINNANT, HULEY JR HINNANT, GERALDINE 10409 PERRY RIDGE CT ZEBULON NC 27597-6844

HORTON, MARSHALL L HORTON, FLONNIE T 1317 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9637

MATTHEWS, DALE SCOTT MATTHEWS, GINGER FAYE 203 EAGLEWOOD DR MIDDLESEX NC 27557-8235

FAULKNER, AUBREY LEROY FAULKNER, PEGGY 10404 PERRY RIDGE CT
ZEBULON NC 27597-6843

CHAMBLEE, R M HEIRS; C/O JIM EDWARDS 2711 ROYSTER ST RALEIGH NC 27608-1529

TORRES, BENITO TORRES, EMMA 10300 PERRY RIDGE CT
ZEBULON NC 27597-6841

CURTIS, ANNIE GOUDE 101 BENT BRANCH LOOP APT 102 CLAYTON NC 27527-5468

JUAREZ, PEDRO CARREON JUAREZ, MARIA DEL 1408 CHAMBLEE RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-9668

SMITH, KENNETH R SMITH, TONYA K 10417 PERRY RIDGE CT
ZEBULON NC 27597-6844

FRICK, SANDRA HAYNES
1320 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-9632

MATTHEWS, RALPH C MATTHEWS, MARY A 1317 CHAMBLEE RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9667

HINTON, REBECCA H
409 S ARENDELL AVE ZEBULON NC 27597-2807

CHAMBLEE, CAROLYN P
1922 TRAWICK RD
RALEIGH NC 27604-3839

HARBAR, LINDA WATKINS, ANGELA
1501 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD
ZEBULON NC $27597-9641$

MOZINGO, JUDY B
708 PERRY CURTIS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-8881

CHAMBLEE, CAROLYN P
1922 TRAWICK RD
RALEIGH NC $27604-3839$

VALERIO, JUANA QUIRA FERNANDEZ 1313 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9637

## M3A PROPERTY MANAGEMENT LLC 2616 ROCKWOOD DR <br> RALEIGH NC 27610-5216

SESSOMS, SHARON
10416 PERRY RIDGE CT
ZEBULON NC 27597-6843

HERNDON, JAMES M MASSENGILL, COLLEEN J 1521 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9641

LUVIANOS CALDERON, SALOMON LOPEZ AYALA, ELIZABETH
4715 WENDELL BLVD
WENDELL NC 27591-6920

CURTIS, BETTY M; CO EDWARD DENMARK 1207 RAINESVIEW LN
APEX NC 27502-7151

GRISWOLD RENTAL \& REAL ESTATE INC 2021 WYNNSCOTT FARM LN ZEBULON NC 27597-7392

AGUILAR, SANDRA E REYES, PEDRO P 1405 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9639

BLOUNT, JERRY BLOUNT, DOROTHY 1117 FIELD MEADOWS DR ZEBULON NC 27597-6852

SARNA, KERRY RICHARD 1001 RIDGE VALLEY WAY ZEBULON NC 27597-6845

GONZALEZ, ALFONSO GONZALEZ 10303 PERRY RIDGE CT ZEBULON NC 27597-6842

LAND, MARK LAND, PAMELA 10400 PERRY RIDGE CT
ZEBULON NC 27597-6843

KRS AND ASSOCIATES INC 1001 RIDGE VALLEY WAY ZEBULON NC 27597-6845

RUSSELL, ROBERT F 1421 HUNTING RIDGE RD RALEIGH NC 27615-7023

MITCHELL, FRANK WADELL MITCHELL, JANE H 504 PERRY CURTIS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-8877

MCNABB, WILLIAM R
204 W GANNON AVE
ZEBULON NC 27597-2626

TELLEZ MAGANA, MARIA TERESA
1508 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-9640

ALVAREZ, ABIGAIL CRUZ AVILES, JOSE ARTEMIO CARBA 651 THOMAS ARNOLD RD ZEBULON NC 27597-5828

ORIOL INVESTMENTS LLC
202 LANE OF SIR GAWAINE GARNER NC 27529-9550

BAKER, ASHLEY N 10408 PERRY RIDGE CT ZEBULON NC 27597-6843

NORRIS, MARK A NORRIS, MARTHA R 1312 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9632

HAUGH, HEATHER
1532 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-9640

GORE, KAY
10412 PERRY RIDGE CT
ZEBULON NC 27597-6843

JORDAN, CHRISTOPHER L WILSON, REBECCA
1325 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-9637

FOCA, KIMBERLY
706 PERRY CURTIS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-8881

WALL, JODY C
133 W 1ST ST
WENDELL NC 27591-7600

JONES, CANDICE D EVERETT, KENNETH
817 PERRY CURTIS RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-8884

HOME RE-DO INC
1121 OAKGROVE DR
KNIGHTDALE NC 27545-9299
hoad, RYAN PATRICK HOAD, JAMIE LEIGH
10421 PERRY RIDGE CT
ZEBULON NC 27597-6844

NUNEZ, RICARDO RODRIGUEZ, ANGELICA MARIA 10301 PERRY RIDGE CT ZEBULON NC 27597-6842

ALVAREZ-CORNEJO, AZUCENA 1104 FIELD MEADOWS DR
ZEBULON NC 27597-6852

DAN RYAN BUILDERS - NORTH CAROLINA LLC
2099 GAITHER RD STE 600
ROCKVILLE MD 20850-4018

BEDELL, DEANA KAREN 1316 CARROLL HEIGHTS RD ZEBULON NC 27597-9632

WYNN, JACQUELINE ROLLINS
PO BOX 1053
MORRISVILLE NC 27560-1053

ALVAREZ, ABIGAIL CRUZ AVILES, JOSE ARTEMIO CARBA
651 THOMAS ARNOLD RD
ZEBULON NC 27597-5828

ASARO, VITO
1116 FIELD MEADOWS DR
ZEBULON NC 27597-6852

JOHNSON, PATRICK H
PO BOX 1334
ZEBULON NC 27597-1334

GALEAS, OSWALDO M GALEAS, GABINA PAZOS-CANALES 1121 FIELD MEADOWS DR
ZEBULON NC 27597-6852

OLVERA, RAMON HERNANDEZ

Chamblee Lake $2^{\text {nd }}$ Neighborhood Meeting: On-site Signs Posted
Chamblee Road Location


Perry Curtis Road Location


## EXHIBIT C - MEETING ATTENDEES

Neighborhood Meeting for Chamblee Lake Planned Development
Zebulon Community Center, 301 S. Arendell Ave., Zebulon, NC 27597
Date: July 25, 2023


## EXHIBIT D - ITEMS DISCUSSED

## 7/25/23 Chamblee Rd: $2^{\text {nd }}$ Voluntary Neighborhood Meeting Log

Ashley Honeycutt Terrazas with Parker Poe provided a summary of the basis for zoning, the Planned Development process in Zebulon specifically, and the reasons for holding a voluntary second neighborhood meeting. Using the updated illustrative site plan, Ashley explained that the renamed 'Chamblee Lake' project would be a quality development with a range of uses, lot types (front loaded and rear loaded) and product types. She said the overall design of this development would provide an abundance of open space and amenities. Ashley said this development, in terms of its uses and density, was aligned with the Town's future land use plan, would help support the Mudcats stadium, and would bring significant utility extensions to the area to serve as a safety net to county residents in the event they had issues with their wells in the future.

Following Ashley's presentation, she opened the floor for neighbor's questions. The section below summarizes questions and concerns expressed by residents, and responses provided by the development team.

- Concern / Question: A resident asked where the new E-W collector road would access Perry Curtis in relation to her driveway.
- Response: The development team explained that they only had approximately 250 LF of road frontage, and the access drive would be centered within that space, probably $120-$ 150 east of the trailer she said she owned.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked if the majority of her neighbors in her neighborhood wanted to annex, could she be forced to annex as well.
- Response: The development team explained state law makes it nearly impossible for the Town to attempt involuntary annexation, even if they were so inclined. She would not be required to annex unless she voluntarily petitioned for it.
- Concern / Question: Multiple residents raised concerns over the level of traffic this development would generate and stated that there were no plans for road improvements in this area.
- Response: The development team explained that the TIA's recommended traffic improvements would be funded by developers. They explained that many road widening and intersection improvements were conducted by developers as a result of these TIAs, and the private sector could incrementally help provide needed improvements even if DOT didn't have the funding. They said the improvements to the site's frontage roads went above and beyond what was called for by the TIA.
- Concern / Question: Residents expressed general concerns over the amount of development occurring in this region and how it was impacting rural areas.
- Response: The development team said they understood the concern. They said this whole region was experiencing growing pains, but at least in this case over $1 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ of the site would remain as open space.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked how many trips the TIAs traffic counts show for the intersection of Chamblee Road and Perry Curtis Road.
- Response: Nate responded that the existing traffic counts were recorded based on highest peak hour (not daily) and that that the highest peak hour trips were still less than 30. He clarified that this figure was for existing conditions and that additional trips created by the development were separately accounted for in the TIA.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked about the anticipated price target for the homes in the proposed development and what they would sell for if they were built today.
- Response: The development team explained that with the rate of inflation, changing interest rates, and crazy price fluctuations in home prices, it was impossible to anticipate accurate home prices 2 years from now. A real estate agent present (not part of the development team) stated that he was seeing Townhomes in this area currently starting in the mid 200's and SFD detached homes in the high 200's or low 300's. He said that the final price was typically significantly higher as add-ons and features were selected.
- Concern / Question: A resident stated that stormwater drainage would be a big problem for his development. He said that there were existing perking problems, and that he had a video of standing water on the subject property.
- Response: The development team explained that this area generally had a lot of clay soil, which does not perk or drain well. However, as part of the development, the site would be engineered and graded to direct the flow of water to inlets and catch-basins and ultimately to stormwater control measures. One positive thing about this site is that it largely drains internally towards the existing lake. The project would be subject to strict stormwater regulations that prevented post-development runoff from exceeding pre-development runoff. By law, the developer would not be able to negatively impact the surrounding properties due to stormwater runoff.
- Response: Ryan Akers said he would be happy to meet the neighbor on site to discuss drainage concerns if that would help.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern over the proposed connection to Ridge Valley way and said that the proposed development would draw more traffic through their neighborhood to the south.
- Response: The development team explained that concern over cut-through traffic was the primary driver for the change made to create a direct connection not Perry Curtis Road. They said that the new road contained within Chamblee Lake would be the most direct and most logical route for motorists to take. They said that the Town required the Ridge Valley Way connection due to the existing stub. This connection should draw very little through traffic but allows residents or children from one neighborhood to reach the other without going on Perry Curtis Road.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked for details on the proposed buffer along the southern perimeter.
- Response: The development team stated that the proposed buffer is an enhanced 20' Type B buffer. They said the Town's regulations only required a 10' Type A buffer since their neighborhood is outside the Town's zoning jurisdiction. However, the development team is proposing a $20^{\prime}$ buffer that would also include a $6^{\prime}$ privacy fence along any portion of the buffer that did not use existing vegetation in order to give more immediate privacy as the buffer grows and fills out.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern that the $20^{\prime}$ buffer would block runoff coming off the rears of the neighboring lots to the south, causing it to pool in their back yards.
- Response: The development explained that they would be grading the internal portions of their site down, but they would not be creating any type of berm along the buffer edge that would block drainage. With that said, while their development can't drainage or runoff, they also aren't responsible for fixing existing off-site drainage issues. Sometimes development will improve a neighbor's drainage issues, but that is not the responsibility of the developer.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked if the buffer along the site's southern boundary would keep the existing trees.
- Response: The development team explained that many of those trees were in a wetland and would remain. They said that outside of the wetland, it could be that the buffer retains existing trees or plants new trees, depending on how the site needs to be graded and whether that grading allows the existing trees to stay. They said where they could retain trees and make the grading work, that was the preference.
- Concern/Question: A resident asked what type of buffer would be along the northern side of the development along Chamblee Road.
- Response: The development team explained that on the west side of Chamblee, the site would have a 20 ' Type B buffer. Along the eastern side of Chamblee, the buffer would be significantly larger, as there is a protected Neuse riparian buffer there and some trees further north of that buffer that would remain as well.
- Concern / Question: A resident complained that the Town was moving their Fire/EMS station further away from the neighborhood.
- Concern / Question: A resident said that she had been told that this property was subject to use limitations under a land trust.
- Response: The development team said that following the first neighborhood meeting their lawyers looked over the title documents and found the land to be free of any such encumbrances that would prohibit development.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern that development would reduce the amount of farmland in the area.
- Response: The development team said they understood this would take this land out of agricultural use, but that the owner still had the right to sell his land if he wished.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concerns about construction traffic using Perry Ridge Ct.
- Response: The development team said construction traffic would not utilize Perry Ridge Court and they were happy to add that as a zoning condition to provide more assurances.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern over water quality impacts.
- Response: The development explained that they would be subject to soil and erosion control standards, which regulate nitrogen and suspended solids. They said they would look into this further to ensure that their development would not negatively impact water quality in the area.
- Concern / Question: A resident asked where the proposed trails would be, would they be open to the public, and would they connect to any regional trails.
- Response: The development explained that the development would include over a mile of trails and indicated where they would be located on the map. They said that the trails were technically for the use of Chamblee Lake residents, but so long as nobody was creating a nuisance, no one would be policing who walks along a trail. They said that there were no adopted public greenways going through this land, but that there were some planned greenways further north from the site, so they had provided a stub of their trail networking circling the lake to their northern property boundary.
- Concern / Question: A resident expressed concern over the lack of maintenance occurring along Perry Ridge Ct.
- Response: The development team said Perry Ridge Court was a DOT maintained roadway. They said they couldn't control how well or often DOT performed maintenance, but they could do some digging to determine if this roadway was in DOT's schedule to be resurfaced in the next 5 years.
- Concern/Question: A resident expressed concern that the additional impervious surface from this development would negatively impact the aquifer and cause wells to run dry.
- Response: The development team stated that the geotechnical studies had not showed any large deposits of rock. They said negative impact on wells, while rare, usually happen when there is blasting, but they weren't aware of any need for blasting on this site. They said, in their professional opinion, they could see no reason why this development would impact neighbor's water level in their wells.


## EXHIBIT E - SITE PLAN PRESENTED




[^0]:    Background Improvements by Sidney Creek are shown underlined.
    1.Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
    2.Level of service for minor-street approach.

