All property owners, tenants, and neighborhood associations within 300 feet of this rezoning have been notified per UDO Sec. 2.2.11 Public Notification.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Location: $\quad 3720$ Old US 1 Highway \& 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road
Applicant/Agent: Thurm Bowen, KB Home, Inc. Carolinas Division/Jeff Roach, Peak Engineering \& Design, LLC.
Owners: Myrtle H. Horton, Helon Joy Wellons, \& Ray E. Johnson

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

| Acreage: | $\pm 56.59$ acres |
| :--- | :--- |
| PINs: | 0710714834 \& 0710736732 |
| Current Zoning: | Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W) \& Wake County Residential-80W (R-80W) |
| Proposed Zoning: | Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ) |
| 2045 Land Use Map: | Low Density Residential \& Low Density Residential/Office Employment |
| Town Limits: | Currently in Wake County jurisdiction; to be annexed with rezoning |

## Adjacent Zoning \& Land Uses:

|  | Zoning | Land Use |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| North: | Planned Unit Development-Conditional <br> Zoning (PUD-CZ \#18CZ17) | Single-family Residential (Belterra <br> Subdivision) |
| South: | Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W) | Single-family Residential; Old US 1 <br> Highway |
| East: | Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W); <br> Mixed Office-Residential-Retail- <br> Conditional Zoning (MORR-CZ \#19CZ19) | Single-family Residential; Place of Worship <br> and Cemetery |
| West: | Planned Unit Development-Conditional <br> Zoning (PUD-CZ \#13CZ30 \& \#18CZ05); <br> Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W) | Single-family Residential (Country Acres, <br> Jordan Pointe and Jordan Oaks <br> Subdivisions) |

## EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The properties are situated on the north side of Old US 1 Highway and west of New Hill Olive Chapel Road. The properties are south of the Belterra subdivision and east of the Jordan Pointe subdivision. The northern property is vacant with existing vegetation and a stream that bisects the property from north to south. The southern property contains existing historic structures and residential structures, a stream that bisects the property from north to south, and existing vegetation.

## NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING:

The applicant conducted a neighborhood meeting on April 27, 2022. The neighborhood meeting report is attached.

## WCPSS Coordination:

A Letter of Impact from Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) was received for this rezoning and is included in the staff report packet. WCPSS indicates that elementary, middle, and high schools within the current assignment area for this rezoning/development are anticipated to have insufficient capacity for future students; transportation to schools outside of the current assignment area should be anticipated.

School expansion or construction within the next five years may address concerns at the elementary, middle, and high school grade level.

## 2045 LAND USE MAP:

The 2045 Land Use Map designates the subject properties as Low Density Residential and Low Density Residential/Office Employment. The proposed rezoning to Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ) is consistent with those Land Use Map designations.

## PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

The applicant is proposing a Planned Unit Development Plan with uses and development standards as follows:

## Permitted Uses:

The development will include residential uses. The Rezoned Lands may be used for, and only for, the uses listed below. The permitted uses are subject to the limitation and regulations stated in the UDO and any additional limitation or regulations stated below. For convenience, some relevant sections of the UDO may be referenced; such references do not imply that other sections of the UDO do not apply.

- Single-family
- Greenway
- Recreation facility, private
- Accessory apartment


## Proposed Design Controls:

Maximum Density: 2.0 units per acre
Maximum Number of units: 113 units
Minimum Lot Size: 6,000 sf
Maximum Built-Upon Area: 60\%
Minimum Lot Width: 50 feet
Maximum Building Height: 36 feet, no more than 2 stories

Setbacks

|  | Proposed Minimum Setbacks |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Single- <br> family | Front | Front (garage) (from sidewalk or back-of- |
|  | curb where no sidewalk exists) | $10^{\prime}$ |
|  | Side |  |
|  | Side (corner) | $20^{\prime}$ |
|  | Rear | $5^{\prime}$ |
|  | Building to buffer/RCA | $10^{\prime}$ |
|  | Parking to buffer/RCA | $10^{\prime}$ |
|  |  | $10^{\prime}$ |
| Private <br> Recreation <br> Facility | Front | $5^{\prime}$ |
|  | Front (garage) | Side |


| Proposed Minimum Setbacks |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Rear | $10^{\prime}$ |
| Building to buffer/RCA | $10^{\prime}$ |  |
| Parking to buffer/RCA | $5^{\prime}$ |  |

## Proposed RCA \& Buffers

Per UDO Sec. 8.1.2.C Size of the RCA, this development is exempt from initially providing RCA since the proposed low density single-family development has a maximum density of two (2) dwelling units per gross acre. However, per UDO Sec. 7.2.5.B.8, if any mass grading is proposed in the single-family sections of the PUD, the development shall provide an additional five percent (5\%) RCA.

Residential Buffers:

| Perimeter Buffers: | UDO Required | Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| North (Belterra) | $10^{\prime}$ Type B | $10^{\prime}$ Type B |
| Northern boundary (along existing properties <br> Miller, Vitek, \& Burroughs) | $20^{\prime}$ Type B | $10^{\prime}$ Type B |
| \& 20' |  |  |

Adjacent property redevelopment buffer:
The buffer can be removed in those locations along the following parcels or portion of parcels if the Wellons property (identified as the "Future Development Area" within the PUD Drawings) is redeveloped in conjunction with the adjacent N/F Andrew Martin (PIN 0710-83-5242), the N/F Ralph Miller property (PIN 0710-83-0487), and/or the N/F Richard Vitek property (PIN 0710-72-4872) as the Wellons property is too narrow to develop independent of such properties.

## ZONING CONDITIONS

The following conditions shall also apply:
A) A maximum of 113 residential units shall be permitted upon the property.
B) No covenant shall be placed on the property which prohibits accessory apartment as a use.
C) All residential dwellings and any amenity constructed on the property shall provide solar conduit for the installation of rooftop solar panels.
D) Stormwater controls for development shall be increased to the 25 -year storm as provided for in this PUD.
E) There shall not be any tree clearing, stormwater control measures (SCM), or other infrastructure in either zone of riparian buffers except for UDO permitted crossings and utilities.
F) Signage shall be provided by any homeowner's association regarding the need to reduce pet waste and eliminate fertilizer near SCMs. The project shall install at least one (1) sign per SCM about not using fertilizer near an SCM drainage area to reduce pet waste and eliminate fertilizer near SCMs. The sign(s) shall be installed in locations that are publicly accessible, such as adjacent to amenity centers, sidewalks, greenways, or side paths.
G) The project shall provide diverse and abundant pollinator sources and install pollinator-friendly
flora within SCM Planting areas.
H) The project shall include plantings within perimeter buffers and along streetscapes; the selected species shall be native species chosen from the Apex Design \& Development Manual or approved by Planning staff.
I) Deciduous shade trees shall be planted along southern sides of building elevations and the selected species shall be taken from the Apex Design \& Development Manual or approved by Planning staff.
J) Evergreen trees shall be planted along northern elevations of buildings and the selected species shall be taken from the Apex Design \& Development Manual or approved by Planning staff.
K) A minimum of three (3) native hardwood tree species shall be planted throughout the development.
L) The project shall increase biodiversity within the amenity area and recreational areas within the development by selecting and installing tree, shrub, and perennial species with special attention to providing diverse and abundant pollinator and bird food sources, including plants that bloom in succession from spring to fall. Subject to Condition $K$ above, no single species shall constitute more than $20 \%$ of the selected plants for each landscaping type (trees, shrubs and perennials.)
M) The project shall include landscaping that requires less irrigation and chemical use by planting warm season grasses and drought tolerant species for drought-resistance within perimeter buffers, SCMs, and along streets.
N) The exterior lighting for all non-residential buildings, parking lots, and amenity areas will consist of entirely of LED fixtures. The project shall install light timers, motion sensors, or other smart lighting technology for all lighting within the parking lots and private amenity areas.
a. The project within an amenity area shall use full cutoff LED fixtures that have a maximum color temperature of 3000 K for all exterior lighting located within parking lot, private amenity areas, and building mounted fixtures on non-residential buildings.
O) A minimum of three (3) pet waste stations shall be installed within the development located around the SCMs, play lawns, and gathering areas.
P) A minimum 4 kW solar PV system shall be installed on at least 3 homes within the development. All solar installation required by this condition shall be completed or under construction prior to $90 \%$ of the building permits being issued for the development. The lots on which these homes are located shall be identified on Master Subdivision Final Plat, which may be amended from time to time.
Q) Of the permitted residential single family detached dwellings, at least two (2) restricted medianincome affordable housing single family detached ownership units (Affordable Housing Units) shall be constructed on-site and sold at a mutually agreeable maximum affordable housing median-income ownership sales price (includes unit price and lot price) that is calculated based upon the one-hundred percent (100\%) of the Raleigh, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) Area Median Income (AMI) as most recently published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Affordable Housing Units shall be occupied by households earning no more than one hundred percent ( $100 \%$ - Median-Income) of the Raleigh, NC MSA AMI, adjusted for family size as most recently published by HUD. The two (2) Affordable Housing Unit lots shall be identified on the Master Subdivision Final Plat, which may be amended from time to time. A restrictive covenant (i.e. lot reservation agreement) shall be recorded against the two (2) Affordable Housing Unit lots prior to the issuance of a building permit for such lots and a separate restrictive covenant (i.e. resale deed restriction) with a minimum affordability period of twenty (20) years shall be recorded against each of the Affordable Housing Units at purchase closing to memorialize the affordable housing terms and conditions of the approved zoning condition. Final

Affordable Housing Unit floor plan selection which includes the unit size and bedroom size will be at the discretion of the developer.

## Architectural Standards

The proposed development offers the following architectural controls to ensure a consistency of character throughout the development, while allowing for enough variety to create interest and avoid monotony. Changes to the exterior materials, roof, windows, doors, process, trim, etc. are allowable with administrative approval at the staff level. Further details shall be provided at the time of Master Subdivision submittal. Except with respect to the existing historic home, the following conditions shall apply:
A. Vinyl siding is not permitted; however, vinyl windows, decorative elements, and trim are permitted.
B. Primary building materials shall be brick, stone, and fiber cement siding.
C. Windows that are not recessed shall be trimmed. Windows shall vary in size and/or type.
D. At least four of the following decorative features shall be used on each building:
decorative shake, board and batten siding, decorative porch rails and posts, shutters, decorative functional foundation and roof vents, recessed windows, decorative windows, decorative brick or stone, decorative gables, decorative cornices, or metal roofing.
E. A varied color palette shall be utilized throughout the development to include a minimum of three-color families for siding and shall include varied trim, shutter, and accent colors complementing the siding color.
F. The rear and side elevations of the units that can be seen from the right-of-way shall have trim around the windows.
G. Front facing garage doors must have windows, decorative details, or carriage-style adornments.
H. Entrances for units with front-facing garages shall have a prominent covered porch/stoop area leading to the front door.
I. Porches constructed with a dwelling unit shall be a minimum of six feet ( $6^{\prime}$ ) deep.
J. The front façade of any front-loaded garage shall not protrude farther than one (1) foot forward of (i) the front façade of the dwelling unit, or (ii) the front porch of the dwelling unit, whichever is closer to the right-of-way from which the dwelling unit is addressed.

## HISTORIC STRUCTURES

The North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) shows the properties are located within the New Hill Historic District and include the existing Utley-Horton Farm (Nommie Horton Farm - SHPO ID WA1098). In coordination with Capital Area Preservation, the PUD proposes to retain and preserve the historic home (in its current location) and two barns on the property (one relocation and one preservation).

## NATURAL RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DATA

The project is located within the Little Beaver Creek Basin and Cape Fear River Basin. The Town’s Watershed Protection Overlay District Map shows the site is within the Primary Watershed Protection Overlay District and contains FEMA designated 100-year floodplain.

## PARKING

Parking for the development shall meet the requirements of UDO Section 8.3.

## SIGNAGE

All signage for this PUD shall comply with Apex UDO Section 8.7 Signs.

## PUBLIC FACILITIES:

The proposed PUD shall be designed to comply with the Town's Sewer and Water Master Plan and Standards and Specifications. The development will be served water and sewer by the Town of Apex.

## STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:

The PUD stormwater control devices shall be designed and constructed to exceed UDO standards so that the post development peak runoff rate shall be limited to the pre-development peak runoff rate for the 2 -year, 10-year, and 25-year, 24-hour storm events. The development shall meet all stormwater management requirements for quality and quantity treatment in accordance with UDO Section 6.1.7.

## APEX TRANSPORTATION PLAN/ACCESS and CIRCULATION:

The proposed PUD is consistent with the Apex Transportation Plan and Bicycle Pedestrian System Plan.

## - Potential Access Points:

Potential Access Points shown on the Conceptual Site Plan / Conceptual Utility Plan (C100) are not shown in exact locations but show required connections. Connections can only be removed from the subdivision connectivity requirements of the PUD if the developer shows to the satisfaction of the Planning Director, in consultation with the Technical Review Committee (TRC), that the construction of the connection would be impractical based on environmental conditions found in the field at the time of Master Subdivision Plan approval.

- Transportation Improvements

All proposed driveway access and improvements on state-maintained roadways are subject to NCDOT review and approval. Roadway improvements are subject to modification and final approval by the Town of Apex and NCDOT as part of the Master Subdivision Plan and Construction Document approval process. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) has been performed as part of this PUD rezoning consistent with the Town's standards for the same. Based upon the TIA and staff review, the following traffic improvements are proposed for this development:

## Old US 1 and New Hill Olive Chapel Road/New-Hill Holleman Road:

- Developer shall construct an eastbound right turn lane with 175 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper. In the event there is insufficient right-of-way for this off-site transportation improvement, Developer shall use commercially reasonable efforts to acquire the right-of-way through good faith negotiations starting with an offer to the third party land owner(s) based upon an appraised value of the right-of-way to be acquired. In the event such negotiations are unsuccessful and the Town of Apex is unable or unwilling to assist Developer in acquiring the requisite right-of-way, Developer shall pay a fee-in-lieu in the amount of the appraised cost of the required right-of-way plus estimated construction cost of the turn lane.
Old US 1 and Site Driveways:
The Developer shall construct two access points on Old US 1 consisting of:
- Site Drive 1: A full-movement stop-controlled public street intersection approximately 1,200 feet west of the intersection of New Hill Olive Chapel Road, including an eastbound
left turn lane on Old US 1 with 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper.
- Site Drive 2: A full-movement stop-controlled public street intersection approximately 1,050 feet west of the intersection of Old US 1 and Site Drive 1, including an eastbound left turn lane on OId US 1 with 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper.


## ENVIROMENTAL ADVISORY BOARD:

The Apex Environmental Advisory Board (EAB) held a pre-application meeting for this rezoning on April 21, 2022. The zoning conditions suggested by the EAB are listed below along with the applicant's response to each condition.

| EAB Suggested Condition | Applicant's Response |
| :---: | :---: |
| Recommend that all homes be pre-wired for solar PV systems | Added |
| Recommend the storm water management system provide for the minimum 25-year storm with preference for managing the 100-year storm | Added |
| Twenty homes each have a solar PV system of minimum 4 kw (about 12 panels) | Added; zoning condition references at least three (3) homes. |
| Increase design storm pre- and post-attenuation requirement to the 25year storm | Added |
| Add a permit condition which does not allow for tree clearing, stormwater control measures (SCM), or infrastructure in either zone of the riparian buffer | Added |
| Install signage near environmental sensitive areas in order to: <br> - Reduce pet waste near SCM drainage areas <br> - Eliminate fertilizer near SCM drainage areas | Added |
| Plant trees as designed for efficiency <br> - Plant deciduous shade trees on southern side of buildings <br> - Plant evergreen trees as a windbreak on northern side of buildings | Added |
| Increase biodiversity <br> - Plant pollinator-friendly flora <br> - Plant native flora (Refer to the Apex Design \& Development Manual for approved native species) | Added |
| Increase landscaping that requires less irrigation and chemical use - Plant warm season grasses for drought-resistance | Added |
| Increase the number of native hardwood tree species planted to 3 | Added |
| Add information signage or other marking at the boundary of lots when they are adjacent to a wooded or natural condition resource conservation area (RCA) indicating that the area beyond the sign is RCA and is not to be disturbed | Not added |
| Install pet waste stations in neighborhoods | Added |
| Include International Dark Sky Association compliance standards <br> - Outdoor lighting shall be shielded in a way that focuses lighting to the ground <br> - Lighting that minimizes the emission of blue light to reduce glare shall be used | Added |


| EAB Suggested Condition | Applicant's Response |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lighting with a color temperature of 3000 K or less shall be used for <br> outside installations |  |

## PARKS, RECREATION, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMISSION:

The Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Advisory Commission reviewed the Utley Farms PUD project at their August 31, 2022 meeting. The Commission made a recommendation for a fee-in-lieu of dedication for 122 single-family detached units. The current 2022 rate of $\$ 3,753.89$ per single family detached unit would be deposited with the Town at the time the first final subdivision plat is approved for the units within each phase.

## PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Board held a public hearing on October 10, 2022 and unanimously recommended approval with conditions as proposed by the applicant.

## PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Planning staff recommends approval of Rezoning \#22CZ09 Utley Farms PUD as proposed by the applicant.

## ANALYSIS STATEMENT OF THE REASONABLENESS OF THE PROPOSED REZONING:

This Statement will address consistency with the Town's comprehensive and other applicable plans, reasonableness, and effect on public interest:

> The 2045 Land Use Map designates the subject properties as Low Density Residential and Low Density Residential/Office Employment. The proposed rezoning to Planned Unit DevelopmentConditional Zoning (PUD-CZ) is consistent with that Land Use Map designation.

> Approval of the proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest because it will allow development for single-family residential uses in a manner to be generally consistent with the surrounding properties. The proposed rezoning also provides additional environmental conditions and a minimum of two affordable housing units.

## PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND CONDITIONAL ZONING STANDARDS: Standards

In return for greater flexibility in site design requirements, Planned Development (PD) Districts are expected to deliver exceptional quality community designs that preserve critical environmental resources; provide high quality community amenities; incorporate creative design in the layout of buildings, Resource Conservation Area and circulation; ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses and neighborhood character; provide high quality architecture; and provide greater efficiency in the layout and provision of roads, utilities, and other infrastructure. The Planned Development (PD) Districts shall not be used as a means of circumventing the Town's adopted land development regulations for routine developments.

1. Planned Unit Development (PUD-CZ) District

In approving a Planned Development (PD) Zoning District designation for a PUD-CZ, the Town Council shall find the PUD-CZ district designation and PD Plan for PUD-CZ demonstrates compliance with the following standards:
a) Development parameters
(i) The uses proposed to be developed in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ are those uses permitted in Sec. 4.2.2 Use Table.
(ii) The uses proposed in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ can be entirely residential, entirely nonresidential, or a mix of residential and non-residential uses, provided a minimum percentage of non-residential land area is included in certain mixed use areas as specified on the 2045 Land Use Map. The location of uses proposed by the PUD-CZ must be shown in the PD Plan with a maximum density for each type of residential use and a maximum square footage for each type of non-residential use.
(iii) The dimensional standards in Sec. 5.1.3 Table of Intensity and Dimensional Standards, Planned Development Districts may be varied in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ. The PUD-CZ shall demonstrate compliance with all other dimensional standards of the UDO, North Carolina Building Code, and North Carolina Fire Code.
(iv) The development proposed in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ encourages cluster and compact development to the greatest extent possible that is interrelated and linked by pedestrian ways, bikeways and other transportation systems. At a minimum, the PD Plan must show sidewalk improvements as required by the Apex Transportation Plan and the Town of Apex Standard Specifications and Standard Details, and greenway improvements as required by the Town of Apex Parks, Recreation, Greenways, and Open Space Plan and the Apex Transportation Plan. In addition, sidewalks shall be provided on both sides of all streets for single-family detached homes.
(v) The design of development in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ results in land use patterns that promote and expand opportunities for walkability, connectivity, public transportation, and an efficient compact network of streets. Cul-de-sacs shall be avoided unless the design of the subdivision and the existing or proposed street system in the surrounding area indicate that a through street is not essential in the location of the proposed cul-desac, or where sensitive environmental areas such as streams, floodplains, and wetlands would be substantially disturbed by making road connections.
(vi) The development proposed in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ is compatible with the character of surrounding land uses and maintains and enhances the value of surrounding properties.
(vii) The development proposed in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ has architectural and design standards that are exceptional and provide higher quality than routine developments. All residential uses proposed in a PD Plan for PUD-CZ shall provide architectural elevations representative of the residential structures to be built to ensure the Standards of this Section are met.
b) Off-street parking and loading. The PD Plan for PUD-CZ shall demonstrate compliance with the standards of Sec. 8.3 Off-Street Parking and Loading, except that variations from these standards may be permitted if a comprehensive parking and loading plan for the PUD-CZ is submitted as part of the PD Plan that is determined to be suitable for the PUD-CZ, and generally consistent with the intent and purpose of the off-street parking and loading standards.
c) RCA. The PD Plan for PUD-CZ shall demonstrate compliance with Sec. 8.1.2 Resource Conservation Area, except that the percentage of RCA required under Sec. 8.1.2 may be reduced by the Town Council by no more than $10 \%$ provided that the PD Plan for PUD-CZ includes one or more of the following:
(i) A non-residential component;
(ii) An overall density of 7 residential units per acre or more; or
(iii) Environmental measures including but not limited to the following:
a. The installation of a solar photovoltaic (PV) system on a certain number or percentage of single-family or townhouse lots or on a certain number or percentage of multifamily, mixed-use, or nonresidential buildings. All required solar installation shall be completed or under construction prior to $90 \%$ of the building permits being issued for the approved number of lots or buildings. For single-family or townhouse installations, the lots on which these homes are located shall be identified on the Master Subdivision Plat, which may be amended;
b. The installation of a geothermal system for a certain number or percentage of units within the development; or
c. Energy efficiency standards that exceed minimum Building Code requirements (i.e. SEER rating for HVAC).
d) Landscaping. The PD Plan for PUD-CZ shall demonstrate compliance with the standards of Sec. 8.2 Landscaping, Buffering and Screening, except that variations from these standards may be permitted where it is demonstrated that the proposed landscaping sufficiently buffers uses from each other, ensures compatibility with land uses on surrounding properties, creates attractive streetscapes and parking areas and is consistent with the character of the area. In no case shall a buffer be less than one half of the width required by Sec. 8.2 or 10 feet in width, whichever is greater.
e) Signs. Signage in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ shall demonstrate compliance with Sec. 8.7 Signs, except that the standards can be varied if a master signage plan is submitted for review and approval concurrent with the PD plan and is determined by the Town Council to be suitable for the PUD-CZ and generally consistent with the intent and purpose of the sign standards of the UDO. The master signage plan shall have design standards that are exceptional and provide for higher quality signs than those in routine developments and shall comply with Sec. 8.7.2 Prohibited Signs.
f) Public facilities. The improvements standards and guarantees applicable to the public facilities that will serve the site shall comply with Article 7: Subdivision and Article 14: Parks, Recreation, Greenways, and Open Space.
(i) The PD Plan for PUD-CZ demonstrates a safe and adequate on-site transportation circulation system. The on-site transportation circulation system shall be integrated with the off-site transportation circulation system of the Town. The PD Plan for PUD-CZ shall be consistent with the Apex Transportation Plan and the Town of Apex Standard Specifications and Standard Details and show required right-of-way widths and road sections. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be required per Sec. 13.19.
(ii) The PD Plan for PUD-CZ demonstrates a safe and adequate on-site system of potable water and wastewater lines that can accommodate the proposed development, and are efficiently integrated into off-site potable water and wastewater public improvement plans. The PD Plan shall include a proposed water and wastewater plan.
(iii) Adequate off-site facilities for potable water supply, sewage disposal, solid waste disposal, electrical supply, fire protection and roads shall be planned and programmed for the development proposed in the PD Plan for PUD-CZ, and the development is conveniently located in relation to schools and police protection services.
(iv) The PD Plan shall demonstrate compliance with the parks and recreation requirements of Sec. Article 14: Parks, Recreation, Greenways, and Open Space and Sec. 7.3.1 Privatelyowned Play Lawns if there is a residential component in the PUD-CZ.
g) Natural resource and environmental protection. The PD Plan for PUD-CZ demonstrates compliance with the current regulatory standards of this Ordinance related to natural resource
and environmental protection in Sec. 6.1 Watershed Protection Overlay District, Sec. 6.2 Flood Damage Prevention Overlay District, and Sec. 8.1 Resource Conservation.
h) Storm water management. The PD Plan shall demonstrate that the post-development rate of on-site storm water discharge from the entire site shall not exceed pre-development levels in accordance with Sec. 6.1.7 of the UDO.
i) Phasing. The PD Plan for PUD-CZ shall include a phasing plan for the development. If development of the PUD-CZ is proposed to occur in more than one phase, then guarantees shall be provided that project improvements and amenities that are necessary and desirable for residents of the project, or that are of benefit to the Town, are constructed with the first phase of the project, or, if this is not possible, then as early in the project as is technically feasible.
j) Consistency with 2045 Land Use Map. The PD Plan for PUD-CZ demonstrates consistency with the goals and policies established in the Town's 2045 Land Use.
k) Complies with the UDO. The PD Plan for PUD-CZ demonstrates compliance with all other relevant portions of the UDO.

## CONDITIONAL ZONING STANDARDS:

The Town Council shall find the PUD-CZ designation demonstrates compliance with the following standards. 2.3.3.F:

## Legislative Considerations

The applicant shall propose site-specific standards and conditions that take into account the following considerations, which are considerations that are relevant to the legislative determination of whether or not the proposed conditional zoning district rezoning request is in the public interest. These considerations do not exclude the legislative consideration of any other factor that is relevant to the public interest.

1) Consistency with 2045 Land Use Map. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's appropriateness for its proposed location and consistency with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the 2045 Land Use Map.
2) Compatibility. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's appropriateness for its proposed location and compatibility with the character of surrounding land uses.
3) Zoning district supplemental standards. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's compliance with Sec 4.4 Supplemental Standards, if applicable.
4) Design minimizes adverse impact. The design of the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's minimization of adverse effects, including visual impact of the proposed use on adjacent lands; and avoidance of significant adverse impacts on surrounding lands regarding trash, traffic, service delivery, parking and loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration and not create a nuisance.
5) Design minimizes environmental impact. The proposed Conditional Zoning District use's minimization of environmental impacts and protection from significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources.
6) Impact on public facilities. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's avoidance of having adverse impacts on public facilities and services, including roads, potable water and wastewater facilities, parks, schools, police, fire and EMS facilities.
7) Health, safety, and welfare. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's effect on the health,
safety, or welfare of the residents of the Town or its ETJ.
8) Detrimental to adjacent properties. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use is substantially detrimental to adjacent properties.
9) Not constitute nuisance or hazard. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use constitutes a nuisance or hazard due to traffic impact or noise, or because of the number of persons who will be using the Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use.
10) Other relevant standards of this Ordinance. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use complies with all standards imposed on it by all other applicable provisions of this Ordinance for use, layout, and general development characteristics.


## Public Works \& Transportation

September 9, 2022

Danielle Troutman, E.I.
Ramey Kemp \& Associates, Inc. 5808 Faringdon Place, Suite 100
Raleigh, NC 27609
Subject: $\quad$ Staff summary and comments for the Utley Farms TIA (04/29/2022).

Ms. Troutman:
Please review the following summary of my comments and recommendations. You may schedule a meeting with me and your client to discuss at your convenience.

## Study Area

The TIA includes analysis of two (2) new full movement access driveways off of Old US Hwy 1 as well as the intersection of Old US Hwy 1 and New Hill Olive Chapel Road/New Hill Holleman Road.

## Trip Generation

The proposed development is proposed to consist of 140 single-family detached homes. The projected trip generation is approximately 26 new trips entering and 75 new trips exiting the site during the weekday A.M. peak hour and 86 new trips entering and 50 new trips exiting the site during the weekday P.M. peak hour. The development is expected to add a total of 1,380 new weekday trips to the adjacent roadway network.

## Background traffic

Background traffic consists of 3\% annual background traffic growth from base year (2022) compounded to projected build out year (2026), and traffic from the following approved developments:

- Gracewood PUD
- Belterra
- Olive Ridge
- Jordan Manors (20\% of remaining build-out traffic)

TOWN OF APEX

The Peak of Good Living
PO Box 250 Apex, NC 27502 | (919) 249-3400 | www.apexnc.org

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

Trip distribution to and from the development is as follows:

- $10 \%$ to/from the north via New Hill Olive Chapel Road
- $50 \%$ to/from the south via New Hill-Holleman Road
- $35 \%$ to/from the east via Old US Hwy 1
- $5 \%$ to/from the west via Old US Hwy 1


## Traffic Capacity Analysis and Recommendations

Level of Service (LOS) is a grade of A through F assigned to an intersection, approach, or movement to describe how well or how poorly it operates. LOS A through D is considered acceptable for peak hour operation. LOS E or F describes potentially unacceptable operation and developers may be required to mitigate their anticipated traffic impact to improve LOS based on the Apex Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

Tables 1 through 3 describe the levels of service (LOS) for the scenarios analyzed in the TIA. " $N A$ " is shown when the scenario does not apply. The scenarios are as follows:

- Existing 2022 - Existing year 2022 traffic.
- No Build 2026 - Projected year (2026) with background growth and background improvements.
- Build 2026 - Projected year (2026) with background traffic, background improvements, site build-out traffic, and recommended improvements.


## Old US Hwy 1 and Site Drive 1

| Table 1: Weekday A.M. / P.M. Unsignalized Peak Hour Levels of Service <br> Old US Hwy 1 and Site Drive 1 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | Build <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Overall |
| Eastbound (OId US Hwy 1) | NA |
| Westbound (OId US Hwy 1) | A/ A |
| Southbound (Site Drive 1) | NA |

1. Level of service for major-street left turning vehicles
2. Level of service for stop controlled minor-street

TIA recommendations:

- The TIA recommends the construction of a full movement stop-controlled southbound approach with a single lane of ingress and a single lane of egress on Old US Hwy 1, approximately 1,200 feet west of the intersection of Old US Hwy 1 and New Hill Olive Chapel Road/New Hill Holleman Road. Additionally, the TIA recommends construction of a westbound right turn lane with 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper as it's warranted per NCDOT turn lane warrants. Alternatively, the TIA recommends construction of an eastbound left turn lane with 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper. Even though it's not warranted per NCDOT turn lane warrants, it's common safety practice to provide a left turn lane on rural type major thoroughfares with higher speed limits.

Apex staff recommendations:

- Apex staff recommends providing an eastbound left turn lane at Site Drive 1 in lieu of the westbound right turn lane, as recommended in the TIA.
- With the recommended improvements the stop-controlled minor street approach will operate at LOS C during both peak hours. Queues are projected to be minimal.


## Old US Hwy 1 and Site Drive 2

| Table 2: Weekday A.M. / P.M. Unsignalized Peak Hour Levels of Service <br> Old US Hwy 1 and Site Drive 2 |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | Build |
|  | 2026 |
| Overall | NA |
| Eastbound (Old US Hwy 1) | A/ $A^{1}$ |
| Westbound (Old US Hwy 1) | NA |
| Southbound (Site Drive 2) | $C / C^{2}$ |

1. Level of service for major-street left turning vehicles
2. Level of service for stop controlled minor-street

TIA recommendations:

- The TIA recommends the construction of a full movement stop-controlled southbound approach with a single lane of ingress and a single lane of egress on Old US Hwy 1, approximately 1,050 feet west of the intersection of Old US Hwy 1 and Site Drive 1. Additionally, the TIA recommends construction of a westbound right turn lane with 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper as it's warranted per NCDOT turn lane warrants. Alternatively, the TIA recommends construction of an eastbound left turn lane with 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper. Even though it's not warranted per NCDOT turn lane warrants, it's common safety practice to provide a left turn lane on rural type major thoroughfares with higher speed limits.

Apex staff recommendations:

- Apex staff recommends providing an eastbound left turn lane at Site Drive 2 in lieu of the westbound right turn lane, as recommended in the TIA.
- With the recommended improvements the stop-controlled minor street approach will operate at LOS C during both peak hours. Queues are projected to be minimal.

| Table 3: Weekday A.M. / P.M. Signalized Peak Hour Levels of Service Old US 1 and New Hill Olive Chapel Road/New Hill Holleman Road |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | No Build 2026 w/out Gracewood | Build 2026 w/out Gracewood | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No Build } \\ & 2026 \text { w/ } \\ & \text { Gracewood } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Build } \\ 2026 \text { w/ } \\ \text { Gracewood } \end{gathered}$ |
| Overall | B/B | C/F | C/E | D / E | D/E |
| Eastbound (OId US 1) | $B / B$ | $C / B$ | $C / C$ | D / E | $E / E$ |
| Westbound (Old US 1) | $B / B$ | $B / C$ | $B / F$ | D / D | D / E |
| Northbound (New Hill Holleman Road) | $B / B$ | $C / F$ | $C / F$ | D / D | D/D |
| Southbound (New Hill Olive Chapel Road) | $B / B$ | D/E | $C / C$ | D / F | D / F |

TIA recommendations:

- The TIA recommends that an eastbound right turn lane with 175 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper be constructed to mitigate traffic impacts by the development. This recommendation was a result of a TIA Addendum submitted by the Engineer. The Addendum also notes that this length is shorter than the NCDOT recommendation of 225 feet of eastbound right turn storage. Based on Synchro and SimTraffic analysis the 175 feet of storage capacity is projected to adequately meet the right turn queue demand for this movement.
- It should be noted that previously the Gracewood development has also committed to constructing the following improvements at this intersection:
- Eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along Old US Highway 1 with a minimum of 250 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Northbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Southbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Southbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.

Apex staff recommendations:

- Apex staff concurs with the recommendation in the TIA. The 175 -feet long eastbound right turn storage lane mitigates traffic impacts of the development at this intersection per the UDO. It should be noted that this intersection is still projected to operate with long delays and queues in the PM peak hour in the build condition without the improvements committed by Gracewood. Additional geometric improvements committed by the Gracewood development will further improve traffic operations at this intersection.

Please coordinate with the NCDOT District Engineer's Office concerning recommended improvements. Town staff will be available for meetings with NCDOT staff to discuss improvements on state maintained roadways as needed.

Sincerely,


Serge Grebenschikov, P.E. Traffic Engineer 919-372-7448


## Planned Unit Development Application

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.

| Application \#: | 22 CZO9 |  | Submittal Date: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\$$ | Check \# Paid | $\$$ |

PETITION TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING DISTRICT MAP
Project Name: Utley Farms
Address(es): 3720 Old US 1 Highway (Horton) \& 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Rd (Wellons) $\operatorname{PIN}(\mathrm{s}) \quad 0710-71-4834 \& 0710-73-6732$
Acreage: 56.59

Current Zoning: R-40W \& R-80W Proposed Zoning: PUD-CZ
Current 2045 LUM Designation: Low Density Residential and Low Density/Office Employment
Is the proposed rezoning consistent with the 2045 LUM Classification(s)? Yes $\square \quad$ No $\square$

If any portion of the project is shown as mixed use (3 or more stripes on the 2045 Land Use Map) provide the following:

| Area classified as mixed use: | Acreage: | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ <br> Area proposed as non-residential development: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percent of mixed use area proposed as non-residential: | Acreage: |  |
|  | Percent: | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |

## Applicant Information

Name: KB Home, Inc. - Carolinas Division (attn: Thurm Bowen)
Address: 4506 S. Miami Blvd \#100
city: Durham state: NC zip: 27703

Phone: (919) 768-7976
e-mail: rtbowen@kbhome.com

## Owner Information

Name: See attached
Address:
City: State:

Zip:
Phone: $\qquad$ E-mail:

## Agent Information

Name: $\quad$ Peak Engineering \& Design, PLLC (attn: Jeff Roach, P.E.)
Address: 1125 Apex Peakway
city: Apex state: NC zip: 27502
Phone: (919) 439-0100 e-mail: jroach@peakengineering.com
other contacts: Jason Barron - Morningstar Law Group (jbarron@morningstarlawgroup.com)

## UTLEY FARMS PUD

Property Owner - Exhibit ' $A$ '

Application \#: 22CZO9 Submittal Date: 5/2/22

## PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT STANDARDS:

In return for greater flexibility in site design requirements, Planned Development (PD) Districts are expected to deliver exceptional quality community designs that preserve critical environmental resources; provide high quality community amenities; incorporate creative design in the layout of buildings, Resource Conservation Area and circulation; ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses and neighborhood character; provide high quality architecture; and provide greater efficiency in the layout and provision of roads, utilities, and other infrastructure. The Planned Development (PD) Districts shall not be used as a means of circumventing the Town's adopted land development regulations for routine developments. The PD text and plan should demonstrate how the standards of Sec. 2.3.4.F are met be the proposed rezoning.

## LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATIONS - CONDITIONAL ZONING

The applicant shall propose site-specific standards and conditions that take into account the following considerations, which are considerations that are relevant to the legislative determination of whether or not the proposed conditional zoning district rezoning request is in the public interest. These considerations do not exclude the legislative consideration of any other factor that is relevant to the public interest. Use additional pages as needed.

1) Consistency with 2045 Land Use Map. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's appropriateness for its proposed location and consistency with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the 2045 Land Use Map.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

2) Compatibility. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's appropriateness for its proposed location and compatibility with the character of surrounding land uses.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

3) Zoning district supplemental standards. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's compliance with Sec 4.4 Supplemental Standards, if applicable.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

4) Design minimizes adverse impact. The design of the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's minimization of adverse effects, including visual impact of the proposed use on adjacent lands; and avoidance of significant adverse impacts on surrounding lands regarding trash, traffic, service delivery, parking and loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration and not create a nuisance.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

5) Design minimizes environmental impact. The proposed Conditional Zoning District use's minimization of environmental impacts and protection from significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

6) Impact on public facilities. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's avoidance of having adverse impacts on public facilities and services, including roads, potable water and wastewater facilities, parks, schools, police, fire and EMS facilities.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

7) Health, safety, and welfare. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's effect on the health, safety, or welfare of the residents of the Town or its ETJ.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

8) Detrimental to adjacent properties. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use is substantially detrimental to adjacent properties.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

9) Not constitute nuisance or hazard. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use constitutes a nuisance or hazard due to traffic impact or noise, or because of the number of persons who will be using the Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use.

## Answered within the PD Text document.

10) Other relevant standards of this Ordinance. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use complies with all standards imposed on it by all other applicable provisions of this Ordinance for use, layout, and general development characteristics.

## Answered within the PD Text document.



## Town of Apex Staff Approval:

Date

## UTLEY FARMS PUD

Property Owner - Exhibit ' $A$ '


## UTLEY FARMS

## PUD ZONING DOCUMENTS

## MYRTLE H. HORTON PROPERTY

## Application \#:

## Submittal Date:

# Town of Apex <br> 73 Hunter Street <br> P.O. Box 250 Apex, NC 27502 <br> 919-249-3400 <br> WAKE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA CUSTOMER SELECTION AGREEMENT 

Utley Farms (Horton and Wellons properties)
(the "Premises")

The Town of Apex offers to provide you with electric utilities on the terms described in this Offer \& Agreement. If you accept the Town's offer, please fill in the blanks on this form and sign and we will have an Agreement once signed by the Town.
the undersigned customer ("Customer") hereby irrevocably chooses and selects the Town of Apex (the "Town") as the permanent electric supplier for the Premises. Permanent service to the Premises will be preceded by temporary service if needed.

The sale, delivery, and use of electric power by Customer at the Premises shall be subject to, and in accordance with, all the terms and conditions of the Town's service regulations, policies, procedures and the Code of Ordinances of the Town.

Customer understands that the Town, based upon this Agreement, will take action and expend funds to provide the requested service. By signing this Agreement the undersigned signifies that he or she has the authority to select the electric service provider, for both permanent and temporary power, for the Premises identified above.

Any additional terms and conditions to this Agreement are attached as Appendix 1. If no appendix is attached this Agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the parties.

Acceptance of this Agreement by the Town constitutes a binding contract to purchase and sell electric power.
Please note that under North Carolina General Statute §160A-332, you may be entitled to choose another electric supplier for the Premises.

Upon acceptance of this Agreement, the Town of Apex Electric Utilities Division will be pleased to provide electric service to the Premises and looks forward to working with you and the owner(s).

ACCEPTED:


TOWN OF APEX

BY:
Authorized Agent
DATE: $\qquad$

## Agent Authorization Form

Application \#:
$m_{\text {late }}$ |tit He eth
application is being submitted:

Submittal Date: $\qquad$ is the owner* of the property for which the attached
(.) Rezoning: For Conditional Zoning and Planned Development rezoning applications, this authorization includes express consent to zoning conditions that are agreed to by the Agent which will apply if the application is approved.
( Site Plan
(1) Subdivision
$\square \quad$ Variance
Other:
The property address is:
3720 Old US 1 (04710-71-4834)
The agent for this project is: Peak Engineering \& Design, PLLC
$\square I$ am the owner of the property and will be acting as my own agent
Agent Name: Jeff Roach, P.E.

Address:
1125 Apex Peakway, Apex, NC 27502
Telephone Number:
(919) 439-0100

EMail Address:
jroach@peakengineering.com


Type or print name
Date
Attach additional sheets if there are additional owners.
*Owner of record as shown on the latest equalized assessment rolls of Wake County. An option to purchase does not constitute ownership. If ownership has been recently transferred, a copy of the deed must accompany this authorization.

Pursuant to Article 40 of Chapter 66 of the North Carolina General Statutes (the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act) this application and all documents related hereto containing an electronic or digitized signature are legally binding in the same manner as are hard copy documents executed by hand signature. The parties hereby consent to use electronic or digitized signatures in accordance with the Town's Electronic Signature Policy and intend to be bound by the application and any related documents. If electronic signatures are used the application shall be delivered in an electronic record capable of retention by the recipient at the time of receipt.

AFFIDAVIT OF OWNERSHIP
Application \#:
The undersigned, $\qquad$ Myrtle tout forster
$\square$
Submittal Date: $\qquad$ (the "Affiant") first being duly sworn, hereby swears or affirms as follows:

1. Affiant is over eighteen (18) years of age and authorized to make this Affidavit. The Affiant is the sole owner, or is the authorized agent of all owners, of the property located at 3720 Old US 1 Highway. New Hill, NC and legally described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein (the "Property").
2. This Affidavit of Ownership is made for the purpose of filing an application for development approval with the Town of Apex.
3. If Affiant is the owner of the Property, Affiant acquired ownership by deed, dated 6/22/2012 and recorded in the Wake County Register of Deeds Office on 6/22/2012 , , in Book 13-E , 2029 If Affiant is the authorized agent of the owners) of the Property, Affiant possesses documentation indicating the agency relationship granting the Affiant the authority to apply for development approval on behalf of the owner (s).
4. If Affiant is the owner of the Property, from the time Affiant was deeded the Property on 6/22/2012 $\qquad$ , Affiant has claimed sole ownership of the Property. Affiant or Affiant's predecessors in interest have been in sole and undisturbed possession and use of the property during the period of ownership. Since taking possession of the Property on 6/22/2012 $\qquad$ , no one has questioned Affiant's ownership or right to possession nor demanded any rents or profits. To Affiant's knowledge, no claim or action has been brought against Affiant (if Affiant is the owner), or against owners) (if Affiant is acting as an authorized agent for owner(s)), which questions title or right to possession of the property, nor is any claim or action pending against Affiant or owners) in court regarding possession of the Property.

This the $\qquad$ day of April $\qquad$


STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY OF


I, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the county of Horsy th, hereby certify that Myrtle Holt Hortzon, Affiant, personally known to me or known to me by said Affiant's presentation of said Affiant's Myrtle Holt Horton, personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due and voluntary execution of the foregoing Affidavit.


Affidavit of Ownership: Exhibit A - Legal Description
Application \#:
Submittal Date:

## Insert legal description below.

BEING THE OUTER BOUNDARY OF 2 PARCELS, ONE NOW ORFORIEERLY OF HELONJ. WELLONS AND RAYE. JOHNSON (PIN 0/10-/3-6/32) AND THE ФTHER NOW OR FORMERLY OF MYRTLE H. HORTON (PIN 0710-71-4834), EXCLUDING THAT PORTION OF THE MYRTLE H. HORTON PARCEL LYING TO HE SOUTH OF OLD U.S. HIGHWAY 1, LOCATED IN THE TOWN OF NEW HILL, BUCKHORN TOWNSHIP, WAKE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT A 3/4" IRON PIPE FOUND ON THE NORTHEASTERN CORNER OF THE PROPERTY NOW OR FORMERLY OF HELON J. WELLONS AND RAY E. JOHNSON AND THE WESTERN RIGHT OF WAY OF NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL ROAD, SAID IRON BEING THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING AND HAVING NORTH CAROLINA STATE PLAIN COORDINATES OF $N=703,604.52^{\prime}$ AND $E=2,018,799.66^{\prime}$; THENCE, FROM THE POINT OF BEGINNING AND WITH THE WESTERN RIGHT OF WAY OF NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL ROAD, S $14^{\circ} 25^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF 66.83 FEET TO A 5/8" IRON REBAR FOUND; THENCE, LEAVING SAID RIGHT OF WAY, N88ํ11'18"W A DISTANCE OF 188.21 FEET TO A $5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ IRON REBAR FOUND; THENCE N88¹1 '18"W A DISTANCE OF 25.93非ET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE SET; THENCE, N62²4'56"W A DISTANCE OF 207.03 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N87³1' $49^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF $j, 326.61$ FEET TO A $3 / 4$ " IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S $00^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 51 "$ W A DISTANCE OF 657.49 FEET TO A $3 / 4 "$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, $\$ 00^{\circ} 28^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 459.96 FEET TO A 1" CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S88 $54^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF 376.22 FEET TO A 1 " CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE S $88^{\circ} 54^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF 760.21 FEET TO A 1" IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, $04^{\circ} 27^{\prime} 54^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 193.23 FEET TO A 2" IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE S4029'33"W A DISTANCE OF 39.06 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE SET; THENCE, S $20^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 148.77 FEET TO A $1^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S $04^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime W}$ A DISTANCE OF 74.66 FEET TO A $1^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S21²56'17"E A DISTANCE OF \$0.03 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE SET; THENCE, S $21^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 17{ }^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF 82.07 FEET TO A $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND ON THE NORTHERN RIGHT OF WAY OF OLD US HIGHWAY 1 ; THENCE, WITH SAID RIGHT OF WAY, $544^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 57.11 FEET TO A $3 / 4$ " IRON PIPE SET; THENCE $\$ 04^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 47.21 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT IN THE CENTERLINE OF OLD US HIGHWAY 1 ; THENCE, WITH SAID CENTERLINE, $\$ 44^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 01$ "W A DISTANCE OF 117.34 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S46 $50^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 75.89 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S5100'53"W A DISTANCE OF 86.92 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; HHENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S $54^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 187.44 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID ¢ENTERLINE, S $54^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 11$ "W A DISTANCE OF 166.66 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S55³7'49"W A DISTANCE OF 181.50 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF $1,538.08$ FEET AND A CHORD OF 222.64 FEET BEARING S $62^{\circ} 15^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$, A DISTANCE OF 222.83 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF $1,502.64$ FEET AND A CHORD OF 205.36 FEET BEARING $\$ 70^{\circ} 54^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$, A DISTANCE OF 205.52 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID RIGHT OF WAY, S $74^{\circ} 32^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 335.97 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S76¹4'37"W A DISTANCE OF 79.04 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, LEAVING SAID CENTERLINE, N01 $40^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF 31.15 FEET TO A $1^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND ON THE NORTHERN RIGHT OF WAY ФF OLD US HIGHWAY 1; THENCE, LEAVING SAID RIGHT OF WAY, N0140'52"E A DISTANCE OF 525.44 FEET TO A 1 " IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N $01^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime}$ E A DISTANCE OF 164.11 FEET TO A 3/4" CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N01 $40^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF 87.06 FEET TO A 3/4" CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N0140'52"E A DISTANCE OF 296.27 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N01² $43^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF 54.39 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N $01^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ E A DISTANCE OF 230.39 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N $88^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 226.32 FEET TO A $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N00² $29^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF $1,013.85$ FEET TO A 1 " CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND THENCE, N27º $07^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF 180.77 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ PINCHED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S89ํ14'14"E A DISTANCE OF $\$ 77.99$ FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE SET; THENCE, S89 ${ }^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF $1,126.48$ FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S $01^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime} W$ A \$ISTANCE OF 33.00 FEET TO A 3/4" BENT IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S $62^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime}$ E A DISTANCE OF 222.99 FEET TO A 1" BENT IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S89³1'44"E A DISTANCE OF 181.71 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. SAID BOUNDARY CONTAINING 2,465,206 SQUARE FEET (56.59 ACRES), MORE OR LESS.

## UTLEY FARMS

## PUD ZONING DOCUMENTS

HELON JOY WELLONS \& RAY E. JOHNSON PROPERTY

## Application \#:

## Submittal Date:

# Town of Apex <br> 73 Hunter Street <br> P.O. Box 250 Apex, NC 27502 <br> 919-249-3400 <br> WAKE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA CUSTOMER SELECTION AGREEMENT 

Utley Farms (Horton and Wellons properties)
(the "Premises")

The Town of Apex offers to provide you with electric utilities on the terms described in this Offer \& Agreement. If you accept the Town's offer, please fill in the blanks on this form and sign and we will have an Agreement once signed by the Town.
the undersigned customer ("Customer") hereby irrevocably chooses and selects the Town of Apex (the "Town") as the permanent electric supplier for the Premises. Permanent service to the Premises will be preceded by temporary service if needed.

The sale, delivery, and use of electric power by Customer at the Premises shall be subject to, and in accordance with, all the terms and conditions of the Town's service regulations, policies, procedures and the Code of Ordinances of the Town.

Customer understands that the Town, based upon this Agreement, will take action and expend funds to provide the requested service. By signing this Agreement the undersigned signifies that he or she has the authority to select the electric service provider, for both permanent and temporary power, for the Premises identified above.

Any additional terms and conditions to this Agreement are attached as Appendix 1. If no appendix is attached this Agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the parties.

Acceptance of this Agreement by the Town constitutes a binding contract to purchase and sell electric power.
Please note that under North Carolina General Statute §160A-332, you may be entitled to choose another electric supplier for the Premises.

Upon acceptance of this Agreement, the Town of Apex Electric Utilities Division will be pleased to provide electric service to the Premises and looks forward to working with you and the owner(s).

ACCEPTED:


TOWN OF APEX

BY:
Authorized Agent
DATE: $\qquad$

## Agent Authorization Form

Application \#:
Submittal Date: $\qquad$

## Jorod U. Hollows K.

is the owner* of the property for which the attached application is being submitted: Melon J. Wellons

R Rezoning: For Conditional Zoning and Planned Development rezoning applications, this authorization includes express consent to zoning conditions that are agreed to by the Agent which will apply if the application is approved.
T Site Plan
$\square$ Subdivision
$\square$ Variance
$\square \quad$ Other:
The property address is: $\quad 0$ New Hill Olive Chapel Road (0710-73-6732)
The agent for this project is:
Peak Engineering \& Design, PLLCI am the owner of the property and will be acting as my own agent
Agent Name:
Address:
Jeff Roach, P.E.
1125 Apex Peakway, Apex, NC 27502
(919) 439-0100

Telephone Number:
EMail Address:
jroach@peakengineering.com


Attach additional sheets if there are additional owners.
*Owner of record as shown on the latest equalized assessment rolls of Wake County. An option to purchase does not constitute ownership. If ownership has been recently transferred, a copy of the deed must accompany this authorization.

Pursuant to Article 40 of Chapter 66 of the North Carolina General Statutes (the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act) this application and all documents related hereto containing an electronic or digitized signature are legally binding in the same manner as are hard copy documents executed by hand signature. The parties hereby consent to use electronic or digitized signatures in accordance with the Town's Electronic Signature Policy and intend to be bound by the application and any related documents. If electronic signatures are used the application shall be delivered in an electronic record capable of retention by the recipient at the time of receipt.

Application \#:
The undersigned, Toul \&. Cublows th swears or affirms as follows: Hel on J. Wellons

1. Affiant is over eighteen (18) years of age and authorized to make this Affidavit. The Affiant is the sole owner, or is the authorized agent of all owners, of the property located at 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road, New Hill, NC and legally described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein (the "Property").
2. This Affidavit of Ownership is made for the purpose of filing an application for development approval with the Town of Apex.
3. If Affiant is the owner of the Property, Affiant acquired ownership by deed, dated $10 / 1 / 2020$ and recorded in the Wake County Register of Deeds Office on 10/1/2020_, in Book 20-E Page 556
4. If Affiant is the authorized agent of the owners) of the Property, Affiant possesses documentation indicating the agency relationship granting the Affiant the authority to apply for development approval on behalf of the owners).
5. If Affiant is the owner of the Property, from the time Affiant was deeded the Property on 10/1/2020 in interest have been in sole and undisturbed possession and use of the property during the period of ownership. Since taking possession of the Property on 10/1/2020 $\qquad$ , no one has questioned Affiant's ownership or right to possession nor demanded any rents or profits. To Affiant's knowledge, no claim or action has been brought against Affiant (if Affiant is the owner), or against owner(s) (if Affiant is acting as an authorized agent for owner(s)), which questions title or right to possession of the property, nor is any claim or action pending against Affiant or owners) in court regarding possession of the Property.

This the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 20 $\qquad$ -

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY OF WHEE $\qquad$


1, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the County of WAKE, hereby certify that JOHN + HELON WELLONS, Affiant, personally known to me or known to me by said Affiant's presentation of said Affiant's DRIVGRS LILENSE , personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due and voluntary, queexuiem oof the foregoing Affidavit.



Notary Public DANIEL N, WOODS
State of North Carolina
My Commission Expires: $\qquad$

## Affidavit of Ownership

Application \#:
Submittal Date:
JANET O JOHNSON
The undersigned, RAY E. JOHNSON (the "Affiant") first being duly sworn, hereby swears or affirms as follows:

1. Affiant is over eighteen (18) years of age and authorized to make this Affidavit. The Affiant is the sole owner, or is the authorized agent of all owners, of the property located at 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road, New Hill, NC and legally described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein (the "Property").
2. This Affidavit of Ownership is made for the purpose of filing an application for development approval with the Town of Apex.
3. If Affiant is the owner of the Property, Affiant acquired ownership by deed, dated 10/1/2020 and recorded in the Wake County Register of Deeds Office on 10/1/2020_, in Book 20-E Page 556
4. If Affiant is the authorized agent of the owners) of the Property, Affiant possesses documentation indicating the agency relationship granting the Affiant the authority to apply for development approval on behalf of the owners).
5. If Affiant is the owner of the Property, from the time Affiant was deeded the Property on 10/1/2020 , Affiant has claimed sole ownership of the Property. Affiant or Affiant's predecessors in interest have been in sole and undisturbed possession and use of the property during the period of ownership. Since taking possession of the Property on 10/1/2020 , no one has questioned Affiant's ownership or right to possession nor demanded any rents or profits. To Affiant's knowledge, no claim or action has been brought against Affiant (if Affiant is the owner), or against owner(s) (if Affiant is acting as an authorized agent for owners)), which questions title or right to possession of the property, nor is any claim or action pending against Affiant or owners) in court regarding possession of the Property.
This the
 day of


## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

## COUNTY OF WAKE

I, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the County of WAKE , hereby certify that
BAY + TANGT SOHNSON, Affiant, personally known to me or known to me by said Affiant's presentation of said Affiant's DRHWERS LLCENSE , personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the due and vary m



Notary Public DANIEL W.WOODS
State of North Carolina
My Commission Expires $\qquad$

## Agent Authorization Form

## Application \#:

RA4E, Johnson Janet O. Johnson

Submittal Date: is the owner* of the property for which the attached application is being submitted:
$\square$ Rezoning: For Conditional Zoning and Planned Development rezoning applications, this authorization includes express consent to zoning conditions that are agreed to by the Agent which will apply if the application is approved.

## ■ Site Plan

$\square$ Subdivision
$\square \quad$ Variance
$\square \quad$ Other:
The property address is: $\quad 0$ New Hill Olive Chapel' Road (0710-73-6732)
The agent for this project is:
Peak Engineering \& Design, PLLCI am the owner of the property and will be acting as my own agent
Agent Name:

> Jeff Roach, P.E.

1125 Apex Peakway, Apex, NC 27502
Address:
(919) 439-0100

Telephone Number:
E-Mail Address:
jroach@peakengineering.com


Attach additional sheets if there are additional owners.
*Owner of record as shown on the latest equalized assessment rolls of Wake County. An option to purchase does not constitute ownership. If ownership has been recently transferred, a copy of the deed must accompany this authorization.

Pursuant to Article 40 of Chapter 66 of the North Carolina General Statutes (the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act) this application and ail documents related hereto containing an electronic or digitized signature are legally binding in the same manner as are hard copy documents executed by hand signature. The parties hereby consent to use electronic or digitized signatures in accordance with the Town's Electronic Signature Policy and intend to be bound by the application and any related documents. If electronic signatures are used the application shall be delivered in an electronic record capable of retention by the recipient at the time of receipt.

Affidavit of Ownership: Exhibit A - Legal Description
Application \#:
Submittal Date:

## Insert legal description below.

BEING THE OUTER BOUNDARY OF 2 PARCELS, ONE NOW ORFORIEERLY OF HELONJ. WELLONS AND RAYE. JOHNSON (PIN 0/10-/3-6/32) AND THE ФTHER NOW OR FORMERLY OF MYRTLE H. HORTON (PIN 0710-71-4834), EXCLUDING THAT PORTION OF THE MYRTLE H. HORTON PARCEL LYING TO HE SOUTH OF OLD U.S. HIGHWAY 1, LOCATED IN THE TOWN OF NEW HILL, BUCKHORN TOWNSHIP, WAKE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
BEGINNING AT A 3/4" IRON PIPE FOUND ON THE NORTHEASTERN CORNER OF THE PROPERTY NOW OR FORMERLY OF HELON J. WELLONS AND RAY E. JOHNSON AND THE WESTERN RIGHT OF WAY OF NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL ROAD, SAID IRON BEING THE TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING AND HAVING NORTH CAROLINA STATE PLAIN COORDINATES OF $N=703,604.52^{\prime}$ AND $E=2,018,799.66^{\prime}$; THENCE, FROM THE POINT OF BEGINNING AND WITH THE WESTERN RIGHT OF WAY OF NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL ROAD, S $14^{\circ} 25^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF 66.83 FEET TO A 5/8" IRON REBAR FOUND; THENCE, LEAVING SAID RIGHT OF WAY, N88ํ11'18"W A DISTANCE OF 188.21 FEET TO A $5 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ IRON REBAR FOUND; THENCE N88¹1 '18"W A DISTANCE OF 25.93非ET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE SET; THENCE, N62²4'56"W A DISTANCE OF 207.03 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N87³1' $49^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF $j, 326.61$ FEET TO A $3 / 4$ " IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S $00^{\circ} 29^{\prime} 51 "$ W A DISTANCE OF 657.49 FEET TO A $3 / 4 "$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, $\$ 00^{\circ} 28^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 459.96 FEET TO A 1" CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S88 $54^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF 376.22 FEET TO A 1 " CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE S $88^{\circ} 54^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF 760.21 FEET TO A 1" IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, $04^{\circ} 27^{\prime} 54^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 193.23 FEET TO A 2" IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE S4029'33"W A DISTANCE OF 39.06 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE SET; THENCE, S $20^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 148.77 FEET TO A $1^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S $04^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime W}$ A DISTANCE OF 74.66 FEET TO A $1^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S21²56'17"E A DISTANCE OF \$0.03 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE SET; THENCE, S $21^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 17{ }^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF 82.07 FEET TO A $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND ON THE NORTHERN RIGHT OF WAY OF OLD US HIGHWAY 1 ; THENCE, WITH SAID RIGHT OF WAY, $544^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 57.11 FEET TO A $3 / 4$ " IRON PIPE SET; THENCE $\$ 04^{\circ} 26^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 47.21 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT IN THE CENTERLINE OF OLD US HIGHWAY 1 ; THENCE, WITH SAID CENTERLINE, $\$ 44^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 01$ "W A DISTANCE OF 117.34 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S46 $50^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 75.89 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S5100'53"W A DISTANCE OF 86.92 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; HHENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S $54^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 28^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 187.44 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID ¢ENTERLINE, S $54^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 11$ "W A DISTANCE OF 166.66 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S55³7'49"W A DISTANCE OF 181.50 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF $1,538.08$ FEET AND A CHORD OF 222.64 FEET BEARING S $62^{\circ} 15^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$, A DISTANCE OF 222.83 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF $1,502.64$ FEET AND A CHORD OF 205.36 FEET BEARING $\$ 70^{\circ} 54^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$, A DISTANCE OF 205.52 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID RIGHT OF WAY, S $74^{\circ} 32^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 335.97 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, CONTINUING WITH SAID CENTERLINE, S76¹4'37"W A DISTANCE OF 79.04 FEET TO A COMPUTED POINT; THENCE, LEAVING SAID CENTERLINE, N01 $40^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF 31.15 FEET TO A $1^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND ON THE NORTHERN RIGHT OF WAY ФF OLD US HIGHWAY 1; THENCE, LEAVING SAID RIGHT OF WAY, N0140'52"E A DISTANCE OF 525.44 FEET TO A 1 " IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N $01^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime}$ E A DISTANCE OF 164.11 FEET TO A 3/4" CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N01 $40^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF 87.06 FEET TO A 3/4" CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N0140'52"E A DISTANCE OF 296.27 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N01² $43^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF 54.39 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N $01^{\circ} 45^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ E A DISTANCE OF 230.39 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N $88^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ W A DISTANCE OF 226.32 FEET TO A $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, N00² $29^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime E}$ A DISTANCE OF $1,013.85$ FEET TO A 1 " CAPPED IRON PIPE FOUND THENCE, N27º $07^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF 180.77 FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ PINCHED IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S89ํ14'14"E A DISTANCE OF $\$ 77.99$ FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE SET; THENCE, S89 ${ }^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime} E$ A DISTANCE OF $1,126.48$ FEET TO A $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S $01^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime} W$ A \$ISTANCE OF 33.00 FEET TO A 3/4" BENT IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S $62^{\circ} 23^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime}$ E A DISTANCE OF 222.99 FEET TO A 1" BENT IRON PIPE FOUND; THENCE, S89³1'44"E A DISTANCE OF 181.71 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. SAID BOUNDARY CONTAINING 2,465,206 SQUARE FEET (56.59 ACRES), MORE OR LESS.

|  |  |  | Developer Company Information |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Company Name | KB Home |  |  |
| Company Phone Number | (919) 768-7972 |  |  |
| Developer Representative Name | Thurm Bowen |  |  |
| Developer Representative Phone Number | same |  |  |
| Developer Representative Email | rtbowen@kbhome.com |  |  |


| New Residential Subdivision Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date of Application for Subdivision | May 2, 2022 |
| City, Town or Wake County Jurisdiction | Town of Apex |
| Name of Subdivision | Utley Farms |
| Address of Subdivision (if unknown enter nearest cross streets) | 3720 Old US 1 Highway, New Hill, NC |
| REID(s) | $0033299 \& 0080810$ |
| PIN(s) | $0710-71-4834 \& 0710-73-6732$ |

Please complete each section of this form and submit with your application.

Town of Apex staff will enter this information into the online WCPSS form.

Please send any questions about this form to: studentassignment-gisgroup@wcpss.net

## Projected Dates Information

| Subdivision Completion Date | August 2026 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subdivision Projected First Occupancy Date | August 2024 |


| Lot by Lot Development Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Total \# of Units |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 음 } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underline{0}$ 읗 © N |  | $\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon \\ & \underline{0} \\ & \text { oㅎ } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \dot{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | Square Foot Range |  | Price Range |  | Anticipated Completion Units \& Dates |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Min | Max | Low | High | Year | \# Units | Year | \# Units | Year | \# Units |
| Single Family | 113 |  |  |  |  |  | 113 | 1445 | 3174 |  |  | 2024 | 30 | 2025 | 50 | 2026 | 33 |
| Townhomes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## NOTICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.
April 13, 2022
Date

Dear Neighbor:
You are invited to a neighborhood meeting to review and discuss the development proposal at
0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road
0710-73-6732
3720 Old US 1 Highway
0710-71-4834

## Address(es)

PIN(s)
in accordance with the Town of Apex Neighborhood Meeting procedures. This meeting is intended to be a way for the applicant to discuss the project and review the proposed plans with adjacent neighbors and neighborhood organizations before the submittal of an application to the Town. This provides neighbors an opportunity to raise questions and discuss any concerns about the impacts of the project before it is officially submitted. If you are unable to attend, please refer to the Project Contact Information page for ways to contact the applicant. Notified neighbors may request that the applicant provide updates and send plans via email or mail. Once an application has been submitted to the Town, it may be tracked using the Interactive Development Map or the Apex Development Report located on the Town of Apex website at http://www.apexnc.org/180/Planning-Community-Development.

A Neighborhood Meeting is required because this project includes (check all that apply):

| Application Type |  | Approving Authority |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\square$ | Rezoning (including Planned Unit Development) | Town Council |
| $\square$ | Major Site Plan | Technical Review <br> Committee (staff) |
| $\square$ | Special Use Permit | Board of Adjustment <br> (QJPH*) |
| $\square$ | Residential Master Subdivision Plan (excludes exempt subdivisions) | Technical Review <br> Committee (staff) |

*Quasi-Judicial Public Hearing: The Board of Adjustment cannot discuss the project prior to the public hearing.
The following is a description of the proposal (also see attached map(s) and/or plan sheet(s)):
KB Homes is proposing to annex and rezone the Property to facilitate the development of a residential community consisting of around 110 single family detached homes. Currently, the property is zone R-80W \& R40-W in Wake County. KB Homes is proposing to rezone it to PUD-CZ in Apex.

Estimated submittal date: May 3, 2022

## MEETING INFORMATION:

Property Owner(s) name(s):
Applicant(s):
Contact information (email/phone):
Meeting Address:
Date/Time of meeting**:

Ray Wellons \& Mrytle Horton
KB Homes
jbarron@morningstarlawgroup.com/919-590-0371
https://morningstarlaw.group/04272022mtg
Wednesday, April 27, 2022 starting at 5PM
Welcome: 5:00PM Project Presentation: 5:03PM Question \& Answer: 5:10PM
**Meetings shall occur between 5:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m. on a Monday through Thursday (excluding Town recognized holidays). If you have questions about the general process for this application, please contact the Planning and Community Development Department at 919-249-3426. You may also find information about the Apex Planning Department and ongoing planning efforts at http://www.apexnc.org/180/Planning-Community-Development.

## PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.

## Development Contacts:



Please note that Town staff will not have complete information about a proposed development until the application is submitted for review. If you have a question about Town development standards and how they relate to the proposed development, please contact the appropriate staff person listed below.

## Town of Apex Department Contacts

| Planning and Community Development Department Main Number <br> (Provide development name or location to be routed to correct planner) | (919) 249-3426 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Parks, Recreation \& Cultural Resources Department <br> Angela Reincke, Parks and Greenways Planner | (919) 249-7468 |
| Public Works - Transportation <br> Russell Dalton, Senior Transportation Engineer | (919) 249-3358 |
| Water Resources Department <br>  <br> Erosion Control) | (919) 249-3537 |
| James Gregg, Utility Engineering Manager (Water \& Sewer) <br> Rodney Smith, Electric Technical Services Manager | (919) 249-3324 |

SITE ADDRESS
3500 RECLAMATION RD
2625 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD
3437 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3429 JORDAN SHIRES DR 2704 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 2508 LASHLEE WAY
3507 JOHNSON GRANT DR
3413 JORDAN SHIRES DR
3409 JORDAN SHIRES DR
2609 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 2620 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 3445 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3401 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3912 OLD US 1 HWY 0 OLD US 1 HWY
2912 NEW HILL HOLLEMAN RD 3405 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3433 JORDAN SHIRES DR 2537 LASHLEE WAY 2600 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 2937 LANDON RIDGE DR 3720 OLD US 1 HWY 2701 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 0 JOHNSON GRANT DR 0 JOHNSON GRA 3425 JORDAN SHIRES DR 8621 ATHLETE DR 621 ATHLETE DR 5500 JOHNSON GRANT DR 509 LASHLEE WAY 321 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3701 OLD US 1 HWY 3700 OLD US 1 HWY

## PEX TOWN OF

ATKINS LAURA B
BOISVERT-ROACH, NOELLE ROACH, SHAD
BOWERS, SARA BOWERS, MATTHEW
BROADWELL, ANNIE RUTH L
BURROUGHS, RICHARD S TRUSTEE
CAPANO, NICHOLAS G JR CAPANO, THERESA F
CLARK, MARSLYN KAY CLARK, JEFFERY ALAN
COSTAKES, GREGORY EUBANKS, AMBER
CUSUMANO, JOSEPH DAVID CUSUMANO, REAGAN LAYNE DHILLON, HARDIP SINGH DHILLON, GURMINDER KAUR DICUS, DERRIN LEE DICUS, ANDREA KAY
EHRHARDT, VINCENT ROBERT SANTAMARIA, AMANDA DELIA ESKRIDGE, CAMPBELL D JR ESKRIDGE, JO ANN
ESKRIDGE, CAMPBELL D JR ESKRIDGE, JOANN
GARDNER, THELMA D
HAROLD, ADAM J HAROLD, LAUREN E
HENAO, MANUEL IGNACIO MALDONADO, MONICA
HEPBURN, DAVID M
HICKS, MICHAEL N HICKS, ASHLEY FAY
HOPFER, PAUL A HOPFER, ELIZABETH N
HORTON, MRYTLE H
HUDSON, CLAUDE LEE JR HUDSON, JUDY A JORDAN POINTE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION INC KB HOME RALEIGH-DURHAM INC
KB HOME RALEIGH-DURHAM INC
MARTIN, ANDREW T
MARTIN, ANDREW T OHNSTON-MEYERS, ERIN E
MIILER, RALPH G JR MILIER OENISE
NAFKE, ALEXA J
NAGLE, MICHAEL A NAGLE, DORIS J
NEW HILL BAPTIST CHURCH \& CEMETERY TRUSTEES

## MAILING ADDRESS

## O BOX 250

OO BOX 217
3437 JORDAN SHIRES DR
3429 JORDAN SHIRES DR
2704 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD
508 LASHLEE WAY
3507 JOHNSON GRANT DR
313 JORDAN SHIRES DR
409 JORDAN SHIRES DR
2609 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 5785 OLD US 1 HWY
3445 JORDAN SHIRES DR
3401 JORDAN SHIRES DR
PO BOX 187
PO BOX 187
2912 NEW HILL HOLLEMAN RD
3405 JORDAN SHIRES DR
3433 JORDAN SHIRES DR
1976 OLD BYRE WAY
600 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 2937 LANDON RIDGE DR
PO BOX 312
POBOX 7
PPM
PPM
506 S MIAMI BLVD STE 100 3425 JORDAN SHIRES DR 105 DUNEDIN CT
3500 JOHNSON GRANT DR 2509 LASHLEE WAY
3421 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3701 OLD US 1 HWY \# 1 3700 OLD US 1 HWY

APEX NC 27502-0250
NEW HILL NC 27562-0217 NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 NEW HILL NC 27562-9176 NEW HILL NC 27562-9607 NEW HILL NC 27562-9313 NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 NEW HILL NC 27562-9175 NEW HILL NC 27562-8965 NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 EWW HILL NC 27562-918 EW HIL NC 27562-0187 NEW HILL NC 27562-924 NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 APEX NC 27502-9113 NEW HILL NC 27562-9174 NEW HILL NC 27562-9305 NEW HILL NC 27562-0312 NEW HILL NC 27562-0007 11010 RAVEN RIDGE RD 11010 RAVEN RIDGE RD NEW HILL NC 27562-9310 CARY NC 27511-6405 CARY NC 27511-6405 EW HIL NC 27562-9313 NEW HIL NC 27562-9310 NEW HIL NC 27562-9763 NEW HILL NC 27562-9763

3504 JOHNSON GRANT DR 3917 OLD US 1 HWY 2941 LANDON RIDGE DR 3441 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3453 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3600 OLD US 1 HWY 3900 OLD US 1 HWY 3501 JOHNSON GRANT DR 3431 HORTON RIDGE BLVD 417 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3449 JORDAN SHIRES DR 2504 LASHLEE WAY NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 2931 JORDAN POINTE BLVD 2709 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 3700 COUNTRY ACRES LN

RICE, OLIVIA RICE, JUSTIN P
ROBERTS, SANDRA
ROCCARO, ANTHONY M ROCCARO, JERI M
SCHLUETER, UWE SCHLUETER, TAMARA
SHOOK, JAMES BRIAN SHOOK, JESSICA HIPPO

## HRI VARNILIC

KKOU, MARTIN JOHANNES HVIRVELKAER SKOU, VANESSA LEE STRANDH DANIEL STRANDH, MARLA
TAYLOR MORRISON OF CAROLINAS INC
URNER, BENJAMIN S
VETTER, CATHERINE L VETTER, RICHARD B VITEK, RICHARD P
WELLONS, HELON JOY JOHNSON, RAY E WS-JPA LLC
YOUNG, LORETTA ROUNDY
ZIPSER, NEAL ZIPSER, CHERYL
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant
current Tenant
Current Tenant
Current Tenant

3504 JOHNSON GRANT DR PO BOX 512
2941 LANDON RIDGE DR 3441 JORDAN SHIRES DR 453 JORDAN SHIRES DR 1812 VENEZIA WAY 900 OLD US 1 HWY 3501 JOHNSON GRANT DR 15501 WESTON PKWY STE 100 417 JORDAN SHIRES DR 3449 JORDAN SHIRES DR 2504 LASHLEE WAY 400 JOHNSON FARM RD 660 STEAMBOAT RD FL 3 2717 NEW HILL OLIVE CHAPEL RD 5020 DARCY WOODS LN
3700 Country Acres LN
3431 Horton Ridge BLVD
335 Horton Ridge BLVD
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Parcel and Current Zoning Map


## Disclaime

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.

## NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.
Meeting Address: See attached information regarding the neighborhood meeting and sign in sheet
Date of meeting: April 27, 2022
Time of meeting: 5:00-7:00
Property Owner(s) name(s): See attached documents
Applicant(s):
Please print your name below, state your address and/or affiliation with a neighborhood group, and provide your phone number and email address. Providing your name below does not represent support or opposition to the project; it is for documentation purposes only. For virtual meetings, applicants must include all known participants and request the information below.

|  | NAME/ORGANIZATION | ADDRESS | PHONE \# | EMAIL | SEND PLANS \& UPDATES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. |  |  |  |  |  |

Use additional sheets, if necessary.

## UTLEY FARMS - NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING ATTENDEE LIST

| Name | email address | Address 1 | Address 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| David Hepburn |  | 1976 Old Byre Way | Apex, NC 27502 |
| Neal Zipser |  | 5020 Darcy Woods Ln | Fuquay Varina, NC 27526 |
| Cheryl Zipser |  | 5020 Darcy Woods Ln | Fuquay Varina, NC 27526 |
| Martin Skou |  | 3900 Old US 1 Highway | New Hill, NC 27562 |
| David Horton |  | 1581 Martin Road | Mount Airy, NC 27030 |
| Andrew MacNair |  |  | Apex, NC 27539 |
| Daniel Strandh |  | 3501 Johnson Grant Dr | New Hill, NC 27562 |
| Leslie Fetzer |  | 4208 Olive Branch Ln | New Hill, NC 27562 |
| Cate Vetter |  | 3449 Jordan Shires Dr | New Hill, NC 27562 |
| Billy Jones |  | 1024 Bolejack Road | Germanton, NC 27019 |
| Jeff Roach |  | 1125 Apex Peakway | Apex, NC 27502 |
| Jason Barron |  | 421 Fayetteville St Suite 350 | Raleigh, NC 27601 |
| Roman Acosta |  | 4506 S. Miami Blvd | Durham, NC 27703 |
| Thurm Bowen |  | 4506 S. Miami Blvd | Durham, NC 27703 |
| Doug Schwartz |  | 4506 S. Miami Boulvard | Durham, NC 27703 |

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION FROM THE NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.

Property Owner(s) name(s): Horton and Wellons/Johnson
Applicant(s): $\qquad$
Contact information (email/phone): Jeff Roach, Peak Engineering \& Design \& Jason Barron (Morningstar Law)
Meeting Address: VIRTUAL MEETING
Date of meeting: April 27, 2022_Time of meeting: 5:00-7:00
Please summarize the questions/comments and your responses from the Neighborhood Meeting or emails/phone calls received in the spaces below (attach additional sheets, if necessary). Please state if/how the project has been modified in response to any concerns. The response should not be "Noted" or "No Response". There has to be documentation of what consideration the neighbor's concern was given and justification for why no change was deemed warranted.

Question/Concern \#1:
See attached list of comments/questions from the neighborhood meeting

## Applicant's Response:

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Question/Concern \#2:
$\qquad$

Applicant's Response:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Question/Concern \#3:
$\qquad$

Applicant's Response:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Question/Concern \#4:
$\qquad$

Applicant's Response:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## UTLEY FARMS

## NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING REPORT

Q. Looking for the timeline. When will clearing begin? Start of construction?
A. "Zoning - Takes about 4 to 5.5 months;
B. Subdivision Process - Takes about 9-12 months;
C. Build out - Start about Fall of 2023. About an 11 month development cycle."
Q. What privacy barriers will be put in place between neighboring land?
A. Proposing perimeter buffers consistent with the Town's ordinances. 10-ft buffer along along most of the boundary. Along US-1, a 30-ft buffer. 20-ft buffer in some areas.
Q. Has apex already annexed the property?
A. No. We will be applying for annexation which should be voted upon at the same time as the rezoning.
Q. Also it seems this is a done deal if the land has already purchased by a developer. True?
A. The developer is under contract to purchase the land and has not yet purchased it. The developer would not close on the property if the rezoning is not approved.
Q. Units would be in the 'yellow' sections, correct?
A. Yes. Single-family homes are proposed in the areas shaded in yellow.
Q. Or rather - Not 'below' the red asterisks in the section w/ the 'arm' branch.
A. There will not be anything developed on the west side of the stream
Q. Will there be a wood fence with landscaping around the buffer zone?
A. Our plans do not include a wood fence at this time.
Q. So historic home would go across US1?
A. That is what we believe but this has not yet been decided.
Q. 10 foot buffer on country acres land seems narrow.
A. This was discussed with the attendees and due to the existing stream buffer and adjacent access easement (Country Acres Lane), the 10' buffer is proposed in this location. We will continue to evaluate buffers throughout the development during zoning and MSP designs.
Q. This question is probably for Jeff, I'm wondering about the availability of water and sewer access for the future commercial properties to the north/east off Lashlee Way (Hepburn), plus Patel's gas station on the corner of NHOC and Old US1, plus Martin's property behind Miss Annie's property on NHOC Rd.
A. This project does not contemplate extending sewer towards Patel's gas station. The property in question is not upstream of the Utley Farm project and therefore will not be served through this development.
Q. On the Wellon's property, will all the trees be left in place to the west side of the larger creek? (between the creek and jordan pointe)
A. Yes. Anything shown in grey will be left along except where sewer crosses over. Specifically in a location along the western boundary of the Wellons property abutting the Jordan Pointe HOA property.
Q. Our Country Acres road is a legal easement that is to be maintained by our neighbor and us. It appears you have a road joining to our easement. Does that mean that be taken by the City and they would pave and manage the road?
A. No, it does not. We will not be sending traffic towards a privately maintained road. We will be providing street stubs to some adjacent properties to allow for future connectivity. This is one of those street stubs for future connection by others.
Q. Are you aware of the sewer odor from Jordan Pointe. Will this development use this as air relief ?
A. The pump station west of Jordan Point is a public pump station. The sewage from this project should be going north towards Beaver Creek. We are not aware of an odor issue or from where it may be stemming. Contact public works about this.
** Additional information was provided and the Town of Apex Public Works Department contacted concerning the Air Release Value (ARV) on Old US 1 near 3900 Old US 1 property. This has been an ongoing discussion with the property owner and Town of Apex staff.
Q. The easement along country acres lane is our property. Why only 10 feet?
A. The use adjacent to Utley Farms is a roadway access. Any redevelopment of the property would be in keeping with the proposed Utley Farms density/use which would require the $10^{\prime}$ buffer. Being adjacent to the street dictates the $10^{\prime}$ buffer as a reasonable transition between uses.
Q. If I understand correctly where the existing historic house temporary move was contemplated, across Us 1 that is not part of the current property under contract.
A. The property on the south side of Old US 1 IS part of the Horton property. The attendees were shown the Wake County GIS website for the property boundaries.
Q. We have tried.
A. A question concerning the Jordan Pointe pump station odor. Comment addressed above with a conversation with staff after the neighborhood meeting.
Q. If construction vehicles do use our road, who do we contact to prevent that? It can be expensive to maintain if big construction vehicles use it. It can get quite muddy and create ruts, and we would want recourse. We had to chain our driveway to to prevent Jordan Pointe construction folks from driving up and down our driveway, thinking it was an access.
A. This project has direct access and a large amount of frontage on Old US 1. The construction vehicles will not be directed to Country Acres Ln so we do not expect this to be an issue during construction. Signage will be posted on the site to notify contractors of the project access points.
Q. We live on old us 1 . There have been several exchanges with govt. folks regarding the smell in JP.
A. (live answered) See above response concerning the Jordan Pointe pump station odor.
Q. 3900 old us 1. Air release is on our property (concerning the pump station ARV)
A. Comment related to the Jordan Pointe pump station ARV.
Q. Is the being recorded? If so will it be made available?
A. Yes.
Q. Just to be clear no land will be moved or trees taken down until fall 2023?
A. yes, it will take that long to go through the design and approval process (estimated approval time)
Q. Is the Wellons section of the neighborhood going to be developed at roughly the same time? It looks like there is no access to the wellons side from the horton side.
A. no, construction will not occur until access can be provided. Access from Horton to Wellons is restricted by buffers and other environmental features.
Q. And we presume all 2 story homes?
A. Yes, with the possibility of a ranch plans.
Q. How frequent will meetings like this be held so neighbors can stay informed?
A. No additional rezoning neighborhood meeting, but we are happy to meet to discuss further if folks desire. The design team and builder is also available to answer questions via email/phone.
Q. So to know when you are close to taking down trees, starting construction, etc. We can learn this by attending public hearings?
A. In addition to those public meetings, there also will be a neighborhood meeting for the subdivision that will occur after the rezoning. The design team also provided a link to the Town's Interactive Development Map and contacts for Jason Barron (Morningstar Law Group) and Jeff Roach (Peak Engineering \& Design) to answer additional questions after this meeting.
Q. So roughly 9-12 months before commencement of activities would be the Master Subdivision meeting? And thank you!
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you know if the sewer air relief from new development will also be going to the one on our property? 3900 old us 1 We believe our sewer line with go north of Jordan Pointe. It will follow the same path, but we are not pumping directly to that point. So will get worse with new homes!
A. This was answered above and the Town contacted to determine what is going on. We hope that is not the case and will work with the town to help you get to the root of the issue.
Q. Maybe town of apex could move it to their land? (Jordan Pointe pump station question)
A. We are not sure, but will work with you and the Town to get to the root of the issue
Q. It can be moved but they didn't want to spend the $\$ \$$. FYI (Jordan Pointe pump station ARV question)
A. Good to know. Thanks.
Q. Thank you all! Was helpful. very welcome
Q. In Martin's defense, that valve can smell pretty ripe. Anyone that lives along that row of homes on country acres and old US1 may have certain times of day they would not be comfortable sitting in their new backyard. ©:)
A. Understand. We will talk with staff to see what the situation is. Thanks
Q. Is there somewhere we can get a PDF or equivalent of the map you showed? I took a screenshot but the image is scaled down.
A. Yes, we will send a pdf to everyone after the meeting. Please remember that the sketch are preliminary and WILL CHANGE through the Master Subdivision Plan design reviews.
Q. Thanks guys, signing off now. Will follow up with Jeff.
A. Thanks. I will let him know to be on the lookout.
Q. Did you say you'll send out the recording?
A. Yes, we will send out the recording as well as the maps that were shared.
Q. I remember seeing the 2045 map of Apex that showed the entire North-west corner of the Old US 1_New Hill Olive Chapel Road intersection (to include the horton and wellons property) as commercial/business. It sounds like you're anticipating the Lashlee properties to become residential neighborhoods as well at some point. Should be assume any of the north-west corner of that intersection becomes commercial?
A. yes, the Town updated its plans to shift the residential limits to the east. These parcels (north of the Horton property) are now designated low density residential.
Q. Gotcha. Thanks. Gas/grocery/coffee? (corner of Old US 1 and NHOC/NHH Road)
A. Not sure what type, but the land use plan calls for commercial for the parcels in the vicinity of the intersection of NHOC and Old HWY1.
Q. Did you mention anything regarding entrances to the property from Old US 1? Jordan point has a short dedicated turn lane to enter the neighborhood from the westbound direction. Would there be the same type of setup for Wellons property? I would guess in the future the road would need to be widened to handle the traffic increase. Any idea on future outlook in that regard?
A. Widening will occur along the frontage of our site, with two anticipated access points along Old HWY 1. We will know more details on turn lanes into the site when we get into the subdivision stage, as NCDOT will have to approve driveway permits for the property. This is also being reviewed as part of the TIA related to the zoning application but it will take some time to get the final improvements confirmed with Town and NCDOT staff.

## AFFIDAVIT OF CONDUCTING A NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING, SIGN-IN SHEET AND ISSUES/RESPONSES SUBMITTAL

This document is a public record under the North Carolina Public Records Act and may be published on the Town's website or disclosed to third parties.

## I, Jeffrey A. Roach, P.E. <br> $\qquad$ do hereby declare as follows: <br> Print Name

1. I have conducted a Neighborhood Meeting for the proposed Rezoning, Major Site Plan, Residential Master Subdivision Plan, or Special Use Permit in accordance with UDO Sec. 2.2.7 Neighborhood Meeting.
2. The meeting invitations were mailed to the Apex Department of Planning and Community Development, all property owners and tenants abutting and within 300 feet of the subject property and any neighborhood association that represents citizens in the notification area via first class mail a minimum of 14 days in advance of the Neighborhood Meeting.
3. The meeting was conducted at a ZOOM meetings $\qquad$ (location/address) on April 27, 2022 (date) from $5: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ _(start time) to $7: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ _(end time).
4. I have included the mailing list, meeting invitation, sign-in sheet, issue/response summary, and zoning map/reduced plans with the application.
5. I have prepared these materials in good faith and to the best of my ability.

April 28, 2022

## Date



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

## COUNTY OF WAKE

Sworn and subscribed before me, PANIEL N,WOODS, a Notary Public for the above State and County, on this the 28 day of ApRIL_, 2022.


My Commission Expires:
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## Section 2: Vicinity Map



The Utley Farms PUD is located in New Hill, Buckhorn Township, and is anticipated to be developed within the Town of Apex corporate limits. The property sits along the north side of Old US 1 Highway, with limited frontage along New Hill Olive Chapel Road. North and west of the site have been developed for single-family homes located within Belterra and Jordan Pointe, respectively. To the west of the site are rural developments on large lots. To the east are parcels planned for office and commercial uses.

## Section 3: Project Data

## A. Name of Project:

Utley Farms PUD
B. Property Owners:

Myrtle H. Morton
PO Box 312
New Hill, NC 27562-0312

Helon J. Wellons<br>Raye E. Johnson<br>400 Johnson Farm Road<br>New Hill, NC 27562-8839

## Prepared By:

Jason Barron and Nil Ghosh
Morningstar Law Group
421 Fayetteville St | Ste 530
Raleigh, NC 27601
C. Current Zoning Designation:

R-40W and R-80W (Wake County)
D. Proposed Zoning Designation:

Planned Unit Development - Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)
E. Current 2045 Land Use Map Designation:

Low Density Residential
F. Proposed Use

- Single-family Residential
G. Size of Project

A total of $+/-56.59$ acres

## Section 4: Purpose Statement

The Utley Farms PUD development will be a single-family detached residential community developed at low density residential along Old US 1 Highway west of its intersection with New Hill Olive Chapel Road. The intent is for the site to develop consistent with the land use intensities contemplated by the recent updates to the Town's 2045 Land Use Designation Map.

This concept is consistent with the Town's stated PUD goals to provide site-specific, high-quality neighborhoods that exhibit natural feature preservation as well as compatibility with, and connectivity to, surrounding land uses. More specifically, this plan will:

- Allow uses that are compatible with Section 4.2.2, Use Table of the UDO
- Provide for the preservation of existing environmentally sensitive areas.
- Provide for site specific and appropriate stormwater controls that exceed the requirements of the UDO.
- Provide appropriate buffering and screening from the proposed use to the existing residential areas.
- Offer low density housing in an area that was very recently updated by the Town to include such uses on the 2045 Land Use Designation Map.
- Demonstrate dimensional standards that are consistent with the UDO, and where variations occur, said variations will be included herein and subject to Council approval.
- Provide a high-quality community that is linked by a network of connected streets and pedestrian sidewalks that promotes connectivity, walkability, and healthy lifestyles.
- Exhibit character and quality that is compatible with surrounding communities, which is expected to enhance the value of surrounding land uses.
- Provide open space and walkable trails to promote pedestrian activity, while appropriately buffering adjacent residential areas.
- Preserve the existing historic home on the property along with two existing barns.

All site-specific standards and conditions of this PUD Plan shall be consistent with all Conditional Zoning (CZ) District standards set forth in UDO Section 2.3.3, Conditional Zoning Districts and UDO Section 2.3.4.F.1, Planned Unit Development (PUD-CZ) District, except as provided for herein. The proposed PUD will provide a development density that is consistent with principles found throughout Advance Apex 2045.

## Section 5: Permitted Uses

The subject property may be used for, and only for, the uses listed immediately below. The permitted uses are subject to the limitations and regulations stated in the UDO, except as modified herein. For convenience, some relevant sections of the UDO may be referenced; such references do not imply that other sections of the UDO do not apply. Specifically, the permitted uses include:

- Single-family - Park, active
- Greenway
- Park, passive
- Recreation facility, private
- Utility, minor
- Accessory apartment

Additionally, the following conditions shall apply:
A. A maximum of 113 residential units shall be permitted upon the property.
B. No covenant shall be placed on the property which prohibits accessory apartment as a use.
C. All residential dwellings and any amenity constructed on the property shall provide solar conduit for the installation of rooftop solar panels.
D. Stormwater controls for development shall be increased to the 25-year storm as provided for in this PUD.
E. There shall not be any tree clearing, stormwater control measures (SCM), or other infrastructure in either zone of riparian buffers except for UDO permitted crossings and utilities.
F. Signage shall be provided by any homeowner's association regarding the need to reduce pet waste and eliminate fertilizer near SCMs. The project shall install at least one (1) sign per SCM about not using fertilizer near an SCM drainage area to reduce pet waste and eliminate fertilizer near SCMs. The sign(s) shall be installed in locations that are publicly accessible, such as adjacent to amenity centers, sidewalks, greenways, or side paths.
G. The project shall provide diverse and abundant pollinator sources and install pollinatorfriendly flora within SCM Planting areas.
H. The project shall include plantings within perimeter buffers and along streetscapes; the selected species shall be native species chosen from the Apex Design \& Development Manual or approved by Planning staff.
I. Deciduous shade trees shall be planted along southern sides of building elevations and the selected species shall be taken from the Apex Design \& Development Manual or approved by Planning staff.
J. Evergreen trees shall be planted along northern elevations of buildings and the selected species shall be taken from the Apex Design \& Development Manual or approved by Planning staff.
K. A minimum of three (3) native hardwood tree species shall be planted throughout the development.
L. The project shall increase biodiversity within the amenity area and recreational areas within the development by selecting and installing tree, shrub, and perennial species with special attention to providing diverse and abundant pollinator and bird food sources, including plants that bloom in succession from spring to fall. Subject to

Condition $K$ above, no single species shall constitute more than $20 \%$ of the selected plants for each landscaping type (trees, shrubs and perennials.)
$M$. The project shall include landscaping that requires less irrigation and chemical use by planting warm season grasses and drought tolerant species for drought-resistance within perimeter buffers, SCMs, and along streets.
N . The exterior lighting for all non-residential buildings, parking lots, and amenity areas will consist of entirely of LED fixtures. The project shall install light timers, motion sensors, or other smart lighting technology for all lighting within the parking lots and private amenity areas.
a. The project within an amenity area shall use full cutoff LED fixtures that have a maximum color temperature of 3000 K for all exterior lighting located within parking lot, private amenity areas, and building mounted fixtures on non-residential buildings.
O. A minimum of three (3) pet waste stations shall be installed within the development located around the SCMs, play lawns, and gathering areas.
P. A minimum 4kW solar PV system shall be installed on at least 3 homes within the development. All solar installation required by this condition shall be completed or under construction prior to $90 \%$ of the building permits being issued for the development. The lots on which these homes are located shall be identified on Master Subdivision Final Plat, which may be amended from time to time.
Q. Of the permitted residential single family detached dwellings, at least two (2) restricted median-income affordable housing single family detached ownership units (Affordable Housing Units) shall be constructed on-site and sold at a mutually agreeable maximum affordable housing median-income ownership sales price (includes unit price and lot price) that is calculated based upon the one-hundred percent (100\%) of the Raleigh, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) Area Median Income (AMI) as most recently published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Affordable Housing Units shall be occupied by households earning no more than onehundred percent (100\% - Median-Income) of the Raleigh, NC MSA AMI, adjusted for family size as most recently published by HUD. The two (2) Affordable Housing Unit lots shall be identified on the Master Subdivision Final Plat, which may be amended from time to time. A restrictive covenant (i.e. lot reservation agreement) shall be recorded against the two (2) Affordable Housing Unit lots prior to the issuance of a building permit for such lots and a separate restrictive covenant (i.e. resale deed restriction) with a minimum affordability period of twenty (20) years shall be recorded against each of the Affordable Housing Units at purchase closing to memorialize the affordable housing terms and conditions of the approved zoning condition. Final Affordable Housing Unit floor plan selection which includes the unit size and bedroom size will be at the discretion of the developer.

## Section 6: Proposed Design Controls

## A. Residential Densities and Design Controls

Maximum Density:
2.0 Units/Acre
(includes RCA and rights-of-way)
113
6,000 SF
60\%
50 feet
36 feet, no more than 2 stories

Note: Porches, patios, decks and other accessory structures may encroach into building setbacks as allowed by the Town of Apex UDO.

Minimum Building Setbacks:

|  | Single-family (feet) | Private Recreation <br> Facility |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Front | 10 | 10 |
| Front (garage) | 20 (from sidewalk or <br> back-of-curb where <br> no sidewalk exists) | N/A |
| Side | 5 | 10 |
| Side (corner) | 10 | 10 |
| Rear | 10 | 10 |
| Building-to-buffer/RCA | 10 | 10 |
| Parking-to-buffer/RCA | 5 | 5 |

## B. Buffers

Perimeter Buffers: as per Sheet C100 of PUD Plan as noted below.

| Location | Buffer Provided | UDO Standard | Property Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North (Belterra) | 10' Type B | 10' Type B |  |
| Northern boundary (ex properties) | 10' Type B \& 20' Type B | 20' Type B | Includes Miller, Vitek, \& Burroughs property |
| West (Jordan Pointe \& Country Acres Lane) | 10' Type B | 10' Type B \& 20' Type B | Includes Jordan Pointe \& Country Acres Lane property |
| East <br> (ex properties) | 10' Type B | $\begin{gathered} 20 \text { Type B } \\ \text { \& } \\ 20 \text { Type A } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | MORR-CZ for the ex Church and Cemetery |
| Old US 1 Highway | 30' Type B | 30' Type B | Frontage |
| New Hill Olive Chapel Road | 30' Type B | 30' Type B | Frontage |

Note: Where perimeter buffers coincide with stream buffers or 100-year floodplain, existing vegetation will be used to meet the buffer width and opacity.

Thoroughfare and Collector Street Buffers
As depicted on the PD Plan, a 30' Type B Buffer shall be established along Old US 1 Highway.

Adjacent property redevelopment buffer:
The buffer can be removed in those locations along the following parcels or portion of parcels if the Wellons property (identified as the "Future Development Area" within the PUD Drawings) is redeveloped in conjunction with the adjacent N/F Andrew Martin (PIN 0710-83-5242), the N/F Ralph Miller property (PIN 0710-83-0487), and/or the N/F Richard Vitek property (PIN 0710-72-4872) as the Wellons property is too narrow to develop independent of such properties.

## Section 7: Proposed Architectural Controls

The proposed development offers the following architectural controls to ensure a consistency of character throughout the development, while allowing for enough variety to create interest and avoid monotony. Changes to the exterior materials, roof, windows, doors, process, trim, etc. are allowable with administrative approval at the staff level. Further details shall be provided at the time of Master Subdivision submittal.

Except with respect to the existing historic home, the following conditions shall apply:

## Single-family Residential:

A. Vinyl siding is not permitted; however, vinyl windows, decorative elements, and trim are permitted.
B. Primary building materials shall be brick, stone, and fiber cement siding.
C. Windows that are not recessed shall be trimmed. Windows shall vary in size and/or type.
D. At least four of the following decorative features shall be used on each building: decorative shake, board and batten siding, decorative porch rails and posts, shutters, decorative functional foundation and roof vents, recessed windows, decorative windows, decorative brick or stone, decorative gables, decorative cornices, or metal roofing.
E. A varied color palette shall be utilized throughout the development to include a minimum of three-color families for siding and shall include varied trim, shutter, and accent colors complementing the siding color.
F. The rear and side elevations of the units that can be seen from the right-of-way shall have trim around the windows.
G. Front facing garage doors must have windows, decorative details, or carriage-style adornments.
H. Entrances for units with front-facing garages shall have a prominent covered porch/stoop area leading to the front door.
I. Porches constructed with a dwelling unit shall be a minimum of six feet ( 6 ') deep.
J. The front façade of any front-loaded garage shall not protrude farther than one (1) foot forward of (i) the front façade of the dwelling unit, or (ii) the front porch of the dwelling unit, whichever is closer to the right-of-way from which the dwelling unit is addressed.

## Section 8: Parking and Loading

Parking for the development shall meet requirements of UDO Section 8.3.

## Section 9: Signage

All signage for this PUD shall comply with Apex UDO Section 8.7, Signs, of the Town of Apex UDO.

## Section 10: Natural Resource and Environmental Data

## A. River Basins and Watershed Protection Overlay Districts

The project is located within the Little Beaver Creek Basin and Cape Fear River Basin. The Town's Watershed Protection Overlay District Map shows the site is within the Primary Watershed Protection Overlay District and contains FEMA designated 100year floodplain.

## B. Resource Conservation Areas (RCA) - Required and Provided

This PUD will be subject to, and meet the requirements of, Section 8.1.2 of the UDO, Resource Conservation Area and Section 2.3.4, Planned Development Districts. Per UDO Section 7.2.5.B.8, if any mass grading is proposed in the single-family sections of the PUD, the following provision will apply to lot coverage area for single-family: An additional five percent (5\%) Resource Conservation Area (RCA) shall be set aside. This requirement is added to the standard RCA percentage requirement found in Sec. 8.1.2.C Size of the RCA.

## C. Historic structures

The North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) shows the properties within the new Hill Historic District and the existing Utley-Horton Farm (Nommie Horton Farm - SHPO ID WA1098). In coordination with Capital Area Preservation, the PUD proposes to retain and preserve the historic home (in its current location) and two barns on the property (one relocation and one preservation).

## Section 11: Stormwater Management

Development shall meet all stormwater requirements listed in the UDO, including limiting the post-development stormwater flows to not exceed the pre-development rates. In addition, the post-development peak runoff rate shall be limited to the pre-development peak runoff rate for the 2 -year, 10 -year, and 25 -year, 24 -hour storm events. The development shall meet all stormwater management requirements for quality and quantity treatment in accordance with Section 6.1.7 of the UDO, such that post development peak runoff shall not exceed pre-development peak runoff rate for the storm events previously noted.

## Section 12: Parks and Recreation

Utley Farms PUD \#22CZ09 was reviewed at the August 31, 2022 PRCR Advisory Commission. Following is the recommendation which was provided:

Staff recommends a fee-in-lieu of dedication for 122 single-family detached units. The current 2022 rate of $\$ 3,753.89$ per single family detached unit would be deposited with the Town at the time the first final subdivision plat is approved for the units within each phase.

The language has been added to the PUD Drawing documents as well as the PD Text.
Per Article 14 of the UDO, any credit for greenway construction against fees requires the approval of construction plans, contingent upon approval of an engineer's estimate of probable cost for greenway construction.

## Section 13: Public Facilities

The proposed PUD shall meet all Public Facilities requirements as set forth in UDO Section 2.3.4(F)(1)(f) and be designed according to sound engineering standards and shall comply with Town of Apex Sewer and Water Master Plan and the Town of Apex Standards and Specifications. Specifically, road and utility infrastructure shall be as follows:

- General Roadway Infrastructure

Developer shall provide minimum frontage widening based on $1 / 2$ of the ultimate cross section as shown on the adopted Transportation Plan in effect at time of Master Subdivision Plan submittal. The road network will promote connectivity wherever possible to adjacent neighborhoods and undeveloped property. Further, cul-de-sacs will be avoided except where environmental features make through streets unfeasible. Sidewalks will be provided on both sides of streets internal to the site as required by the UDO.

Refer to sheet C100 of the PUD plan for proposed access points, stub street extensions, and planned vehicular connectivity.

- Potential Access Points:

Potential Access Points shown on the Conceptual Site Plan / Conceptual Utility Plan (C100) are not shown in exact locations but show required connections. Connections can only be removed from the subdivision connectivity requirements of the PUD if the developer shows to the satisfaction of the Planning Director, in consultation with the Technical Review Committee (TRC), that the construction of the connection would be impractical based on environmental conditions found in the field at the time of Master Subdivision Plan approval.

- Transportation Improvements

All proposed driveway access and improvements on state-maintained roadways are subject to NCDOT review and approval. Roadway improvements are subject to modification and final approval by the Town of Apex and NCDOT as part of the Master Subdivision Plan and Construction Document approval process. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) has been performed as part of this PUD rezoning consistent with the Town's standards for the same. Based upon the TIA and staff review, the following traffic improvements are proposed for this development:
a. Old US 1 and New Hill Olive Chapel Road/New-Hill Holleman Road.

- Developer shall construct an eastbound right turn lane with 175 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper. In the event there is insufficient right-of-way for this off-site transportation improvement, Developer shall use commercially reasonable efforts to acquire the right-ofway through good faith negotiations starting with an offer to the third party land owner(s) based upon an appraised value of the right-of-way to be acquired. In the event such negotiations are unsuccessful and the Town of Apex is unable or unwilling to assist Developer in acquiring the requisite right-of-way, Developer shall pay a fee-in-lieu in the amount of the appraised cost of the required right-of-way plus estimated construction cost of the turn lane.
b. Old US 1 and Site Driveways

The Developer shall construct two access points on Old US 1 consisting of:

- Site Drive 1: A full-movement stop-controlled public street intersection approximately 1,200 feet west of the intersection of New Hill Olive Chapel Road, including an eastbound left turn lane on Old US 1 with 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper.
- Site Drive 2: A full-movement stop-controlled public street intersection approximately 1,050 feet west of the intersection of Old US 1 and Site Drive 1, including an eastbound left turn lane on Old US 1 with 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration length and taper.
- Wayfinding Improvements

Wayfinding measures at the site shall be provided to facilitate the movement of vehicles and pedestrians to and within the development.

- Water and Sanitary Sewer

All development within the project shall be served by the Town of Apex water and sanitary sewer facilities. The utility design will be finalized at the time of development plan review and approval upon available facilities adjacent to the site at that time. A conceptual utility plan is included in the PUD plan for reference. All utility infrastructure shall meet current Town Water and Sewer Master Plans.

- Other Utilities

Electricity will be provided by Apex Electric. Phone, cable, and gas will be provided by the developer and shall meet the Town of Apex standards as outlined in the UDO.

## Section 14: Phasing Plan

This PUD and all improvements required to support the uses contemplated by the PUD, including without limitation infrastructure and public facilities, may be completed in multiple phases, with construction anticipated to begin in 2023. Project phasing will be planned to ensure the points of access, RCA, stormwater controls and other design standards are met in accordance with the UDO. A final phasing plan will be incorporated within the Master Subdivision Plans (MSP) for review and approval through the Technical Review Committee.

## Section 15: Consistency with the 2045 Land Use Map

The proposed land use is consistent with the Town of Apex's 2045 Land Use Map.

## Section 16: Compliance with the UDO

The development standards adopted for this PUD are in compliance with those set forth in the current version of the Town's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Any deviations from UDO requirements have been specifically defined within this document. No deviations from the UDO are currently anticipated with the project zoning documents.

## Section 17: Compliance with Comprehensive Transportation Plan and Bicycle Plan

Development plans submitted pursuant to this rezoning shall comply with the adopted Advance Apex: The 2045 Transportation Plan in effect at the time of the development plan submittal, as provided for in the Unified Development Ordinance. Further, development of the property shall be consistent with the Town's adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan in effect at the time of the development plan submittal.
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# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS UTLEY FARMS APEX, NORTH CAROLINA 

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## 1. Development Overview

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was conducted for the proposed Utley Farms development in accordance with the Apex (Town) Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) and North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) capacity analysis guidelines. The proposed development is to be located north of Old US Highway 1, west of New Hill-Olive Chapel Road in Apex, North Carolina. The proposed development is expected to be a maximum of 140 singlefamily home development and estimated to be built out by 2026. Site access is proposed via two (2) full movement driveways along Old US Highway 1.

The study analyzes traffic conditions during the weekday AM and PM peak hours for the following scenarios:

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2026 No-Build Traffic Conditions without Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 No-Build Traffic Conditions with Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 Build Traffic Conditions without Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 Build Traffic Conditions with Gracewood Improvements


## 2. Existing Traffic Conditions

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

- Old US Highway 1 and New Hill - Olive Chapel Road / New Hill - Holleman Road

Existing peak hour traffic volumes were determined based on traffic counts conducted at the study intersection of Old US Highway 1 and New Hill - Olive Chapel Road / New Hill -

Holleman Road in February of 2022 during typical weekday AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools were in session for in person learning.

## 3. Site Trip Generation

The proposed development is assumed to consist of a maximum of 140 single-family homes. Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Table E-1 provides a summary of the trip generation potential for the site.

Table E-1: Site Trip Generation

| LAND USE (ITE Code) | INTENSITY | DAILY TRIPS (VPD) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { WEEKDAY } \\ & \text { AM PEAK } \\ & \text { HOUR (VPH) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { WEEKDAY } \\ & \text { PM PEAK } \\ & \text { HOUR (VPH) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Enter | Exit |
| Single Family Homes (210) | 140 units | 1,380 | 26 | 75 | 86 | 50 |

## 4. Future Traffic Conditions

Through coordination with the Town and NCDOT, it was determined that an annual growth rate of 3\% would be used to generate 2026 projected weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. The following adjacent developments were identified to be considered under future conditions:

- Gracewood Residential
- Olive Ridge
- Jordan Manors - $80 \%$ built out, $20 \%$ included as adjacent development traffic
- Belterra (New Hill Assembly aka Jordan Vistas)


## 5. Capacity Analysis Summary

The analysis considered weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic for 2022 existing, 2026 no-build, and 2026 build conditions. Refer to Section 7 of the TIA for the capacity analysis summary performed at each study intersection.

## 6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric and traffic control improvements have been identified at study intersections. The improvements are summarized below and are illustrated in Figure E-1.

## Background Improvements by Gracewood Residential Development Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road

- Construct exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along Old US Highway 1 with a minimum of 250 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.


## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road
A proportional fee-in-lieu is recommended for these improvements based on an engineering estimate for their construction prior to the $51^{\text {st }}$ unit.

- Construct exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along Old US Highway 1 with a minimum of 250 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.


## Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1

- Construct the southbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Provide an exclusive westbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach.
- Although an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is not warranted, this improvement would not be uncommon along the major thoroughfare (Old US Highway 1) due to the high posted speed limit ( 55 mph ) and the traffic growth expected in the future. At this site driveway, the proposed development could construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane in place of the recommended exclusive westbound right-turn lane.

Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 2

- Construct the southbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Provide an exclusive westbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach.
- Although an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is not warranted, this improvement would not be uncommon along the major thoroughfare (Old US Highway 1) due to the high posted speed limit ( 55 mph ) and the traffic growth expected in the future. At this site driveway, the proposed development could construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane in place of the recommended exclusive westbound right-turn lane.

*Note: Proportional fee-in-lieu by Developer

|  | Utley Farms <br> Apex, NC | Recommended Lane <br> Configurations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure E-1 |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION ..... 1
1.1. Site Location and Study Area .....  1
1.2. Proposed Land Use and Site Access ..... 2
1.3. Adjacent Land Uses ..... 2
1.4. Existing Roadways ..... 2
2. 2022 EXISTING PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS ..... 6
2.1. 2022 Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes ..... 6
2.2. Analysis of 2022 Existing Peak Hour Traffic Conditions ..... 6
3. 2026 NO-BUILD PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS ..... 8
3.1. Ambient Traffic Growth ..... 8
3.2. Adjacent Development Traffic ..... 8
3.3. Future Roadway Improvements ..... 9
3.4. 2026 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic Volumes ..... 10
3.5. Analysis of 2026 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic Conditions ..... 10
4. SITE TRIP GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION ..... 16
4.1. Trip Generation ..... 16
4.2. Site Trip Distribution and Assignment ..... 16
5. 2026 BUILD TRAFFIC CONDITIONS ..... 19
5.1. 2026 Build Peak Hour Traffic Volumes ..... 19
5.2. Analysis of 2026 Build Peak Hour Traffic Conditions ..... 19
6. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS PROCEDURE ..... 22
6.1. Adjustments to Analysis Guidelines ..... 22
7. CAPACITY ANALYSIS ..... 23
7.1. Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill- Holleman Road ..... 23
7.2. Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1 ..... 27
7.3. Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 2 ..... 28
8. CONCLUSIONS ..... 29
9. RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 33

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - Site Location Map ..... 3
Figure 2 - Preliminary Site Plan ..... 4
Figure 3 - Existing Lane Configurations ..... 5
Figure 4-2022 Existing Peak Hour Traffic ..... 7
Figure 5-2026 Projected Peak Hour Traffic ..... 11
Figure 6a - Adjacent Development Trips without Gracewood Improvements12
Figure 6b - Adjacent Development Trips with Gracewood Improvements. 13
Figure 7a - 2026 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic without GracewoodImprovements14
Figure 7b - 2026 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic with Gracewood Improvements15
Figure 8 - Site Trip Distribution ..... 17
Figure 9 - Site Trip Assignment ..... 18
Figure 10a - 2026 Build Peak Hour Traffic without Gracewood Improvements ..... 20
Figure 10b - 2026 Build Peak Hour Traffic with Gracewood Improvements

$\qquad$ ..... 21
Figure 11 - Recommended Lane Configurations ..... 35
LIST OF TABLES
Table 1: Existing Roadway Inventory ..... 2
Table 2: Adjacent Development Information ..... 9
Table 3: Trip Generation Summary ..... 16
Table 4: Highway Capacity Manual - Levels-of-Service and Delay ..... 22
Table 5: Analysis Summary of Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road ..... 23
Table 6: Analysis Summary of Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1 ..... 27
Table 7: Analysis Summary of Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 2 ..... 28

## TECHNICAL APPENDIX

Appendix A: Scoping Documentation
Appendix B: Traffic Counts
Appendix C: Adjacent Development Information
Appendix D: Capacity Calculations - Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road

Appendix E: $\quad$ Capacity Calculations - Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1
Appendix F: $\quad$ Capacity Calculations - Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 2
Appendix G: SimTraffic Queuing Reports
Appendix H: Turn Lane Warrant Charts

# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS <br> UTLEY FARMS <br> APEX, NORTH CAROLINA 

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The contents of this report present the findings of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) conducted for the proposed Utley Farms development to be located north of Old US Highway 1, west of New Hill-Olive Chapel Road in Apex, North Carolina. The purpose of this study is to determine the potential impacts to the surrounding transportation system created by traffic generated by the proposed development, as well as recommend improvements to mitigate the impacts.

The proposed development, anticipated to be completed by 2026, is assumed to consist of a maximum amount of 140 single family homes.

The study analyzes traffic conditions during the weekday AM and PM peak hours for the following scenarios:

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2026 No-Build Traffic Conditions without Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 No-Build Traffic Conditions with Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 Build Traffic Conditions without Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 Build Traffic Conditions with Gracewood Improvements


### 1.1. Site Location and Study Area

The development is proposed to be located north of Old US Highway 1, west of New HillOlive Chapel Road in Apex, North Carolina. Refer to Figure 1 for the site location map.

The study area for the TIA was determined through coordination with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the Town of Apex (Town) and consists of the following existing intersections:

- Old US Highway 1 and New Hill - Olive Chapel Road / New Hill - Holleman Road

Refer to Appendix A for the approved memorandum of understanding (MOU).

### 1.2. Proposed Land Use and Site Access

The site is expected to be located north of Old US Highway 1, west of New Hill - Olive Chapel Road. The proposed development, anticipated to be completed by 2026, is assumed to consist of a maximum amount of 140 single family homes.

Site access is proposed via two (2) full movement driveways along Old US Highway 1. Refer to Figure 2 for a copy of the preliminary site plan.

### 1.3. Adjacent Land Uses

The proposed development is located in an area consisting primarily of undeveloped land and residential development.

### 1.4. Existing Roadways

Existing lane configurations (number of traffic lanes on each intersection approach), lane widths, storage capacities, and other intersection and roadway information within the study area are shown in Figure 3. Table 1 provides a summary of this information, as well.

Table 1: Existing Roadway Inventory

| Road Name | Route <br> Number | Typical <br> Cross <br> Section | Speed Limit | Maintained <br> By | 2020 AADT <br> (vpd) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Old US Highway <br> 1 | SR 1011 | 2-lane <br> undivided | 55 mph | NCDOT | 10,500 |
| New Hill-Olive <br> Chapel / New <br> Hill-Holleman | SR 1141 | 2-lane <br> undivided | 45 mph | NCDOT | 4,900 |






## 2. 2022 EXISTING PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

### 2.1. 2022 Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Existing peak hour traffic volumes were determined based on traffic counts conducted at the study intersection of Old US Highway 1 and New Hill - Olive Chapel Road / New Hill Holleman Road in February of 2022 during typical weekday AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools were in session for in person learning.

Refer to Figure 4 for 2022 existing weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. A copy of the count data is located in Appendix B of this report.

### 2.2. Analysis of $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ Existing Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

The 2022 existing weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes were analyzed to determine the current levels of service at the study intersections under existing roadway conditions. Signal information was obtained from NCDOT and is included in Appendix C. The results of the analysis are presented in Section 7 of this report.



|  | Utley Farms <br> Apex, NC | 2022 Existing <br> Pamey Kemp associates Hour Traffic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 4 |

## 3. 2026 NO-BUILD PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

In order to account for growth of traffic and subsequent traffic conditions at a future year, nobuild traffic projections are needed. No-build traffic is the component of traffic due to the growth of the community and surrounding area that is anticipated to occur regardless of whether or not the proposed development is constructed. No-build traffic is comprised of existing traffic growth within the study area and additional traffic created as a result of adjacent approved developments.

### 3.1. Ambient Traffic Growth

Through coordination with the Town and NCDOT, it was determined that an annual growth rate of $3 \%$ would be used to generate 2026 projected weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 5 for 2026 projected peak hour traffic.

### 3.2. Adjacent Development Traffic

Through coordination with the Town and NCDOT, the following adjacent developments were identified to be included as an approved adjacent development in this study:

- Gracewood Residential
- Olive Ridge
- Jordan Manors - $80 \%$ built out, $20 \%$ included as adjacent development traffic
- Belterra (New Hill Assembly aka Jordan Vistas)

Table 2, on the following page, provides a summary of the adjacent developments.

Table 2: Adjacent Development Information

| Development <br> Name | Location | Build- <br> Out <br> Year | Land Use / Intensity | TIA <br> Performed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gracewood <br> Residential | Northwest of the <br> intersection of Old US <br> 1 at Horton Road | 2024 | 448 single family homes | April 2021 by <br> KHA |
| Olive Ridge | East of New Hill Olive <br> Chapel Road, across <br> from Jordan Manors <br> Drive | 2022 | 169 single family homes | December <br> 2018 by RKA |
| Jordan Manors | West side of New Hill <br> Olive Chapel Road | 2018 | 240 single family homes | May 2015 by <br> KHA |
| Belterra (New <br> Hill Assembly <br> aka Jordan <br> Vistas) | West of New Hill <br> Olive Chapel Road, <br> north of Old US 1 | 2022 | 152 single family homes | April 2018 by <br> RKA |

For the purposes of this study, future conditions were analyzed with and without future roadway improvements associated with the Gracewood Residential development. Under future conditions without Gracewood Improvements, the Gracewood Residential development is expected to consist of 270 single family homes. Analysis of future conditions with Gracewood Improvements includes $85 \%$ of the development's density at full build out as adjacent development trips as this study assumes $85 \%$ of the Gracewood Residential development is to be constructed prior to the build out of the proposed development. It should be noted that the adjacent developments were approved, during scoping, by the Town and NCDOT. Adjacent development trips are shown in Figure 6. Adjacent development information can be found in Appendix D.

### 3.3. Future Roadway Improvements

Based on coordination with the NCDOT and the Town, it was determined that the roadway improvements associated with the Gracewood Residential development would be analyzed under future conditions with Gracewood Improvements.

The following improvements are committed by the Gracewood Residential development: Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road

- Construct exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along Old US Highway 1 with a minimum of 250 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Install a traffic signal when warranted.


### 3.4. 2026 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

The 2026 no-build traffic volumes were determined by projecting the 2022 existing peak hour traffic to the year 2022, and adding the adjacent development trips. Refer to Figure 7a for an illustration of the 2026 no-build peak hour traffic volumes without Gracewood Improvements and Figure 7b for the 2026 no-build peak hour traffic with Gracewood Improvements at the study intersections.

### 3.5. Analysis of 2026 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

The 2026 no-build AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections were analyzed with future geometric roadway conditions and traffic control. The analysis results are presented in Section 7 of this report.

\[

\]
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|  | Utley Farms <br> Apex, NC | 2026 Projected <br> Pamey Kemp associates Hour Traffic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 5 |
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|  | Utley Farms Apex, NC | Adjacent Development Trips - without Gracewood Improvements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 6a |


|  | LEGEND |
| :---: | :---: |
| $8$ | Signalized Intersection |
| X / Y - | Weekday AM / PM Peak Hour Adjacent Development Trips |



|  | Utley Farms <br> Apex, NC | Adjacent Development <br> Trips - with Gracewood <br> Improvements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 6 b |
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| LEGEND <br> Signalized Intersection $\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{Y} \rightarrow \begin{aligned} & \text { Weekday AM / PM Peak } \\ & \text { Hour Traffic } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |



| RAMEY KEMP ASSOCIATES | Utley Farms Apex, NC | 2026 No-Build <br> Peak Hour Traffic - with Gracewood Improvements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 7b |

## 4. SITE TRIP GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION

### 4.1. Trip Generation

The proposed development is assumed to consist of a maximum amount of 140 single family homes. Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition. Table 3 provides a summary of the trip generation potential for the site.

Table 3: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use <br> (ITE Code) | Intensity | Daily <br> Traffic <br> (vpd) | Weekday <br> AM Peak Hour <br> Trips (vph) |  | Weekday <br> PM Peak Hour <br> Trips (vph) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit |  |  |
| Single Family Homes | 140 units | 1,380 | 26 | 75 | 86 | 50 |

It is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 1,380 total site trips on the roadway network during a typical 24-hour weekday period. Of the daily traffic volume, it is anticipated that 101 trips ( 26 entering and 75 exiting) will occur during the weekday AM peak hour and 136 trips ( 86 entering and 50 exiting) will occur during the weekday PM peak hour.

### 4.2. Site Trip Distribution and Assignment

Trip distribution percentages used in assigning site traffic for this development were estimated based on a combination of existing traffic patterns, population centers adjacent to the study area, and engineering judgment. It is estimated that the site trips will be regionally distributed as follows:

- $10 \%$ to/from the north via New-Hill Olive Chapel Road
- $50 \%$ to/from the south via New-Hill Holleman Road
- $35 \%$ to/from the east via Old US Highway 1
- $5 \%$ to/from the west via Old US Highway 1

Refer to Figure 8 for the site trip distribution and Figure 9 for the site trip assignment.


| LEGEND <br> 0 | Unsignalized Intersection |
| ---: | :--- |
| 8 | Signalized Intersection |
| $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{Y} \rightarrow$ | Weekday AM / PM Peak |
| Hour Site Trips |  |



## 5. 2026 BUILD TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

### 5.1. 2026 Build Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

To estimate traffic conditions with the site fully built-out, the total site trips were added to the 2026 no-build traffic volumes to determine the 2026 build traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 10a and Figure 10b for an illustration of the 2026 build peak hour traffic volumes without and with the Gracewood Improvements, respectively, both with the proposed site fully developed.

### 5.2. Analysis of 2026 Build Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

Study intersections were analyzed with the 2026 build traffic volumes using the same methodology previously discussed for existing and no-build traffic conditions. Intersections were analyzed with improvements necessary to accommodate future traffic volumes. The results of the capacity analysis for each intersection are presented in Section 7 of this report.

|  LEGEND <br> 0 Unsignalized Intersection <br> 8 Signalized Intersection <br> $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{Y}$ $\rightarrow$Weekday AM / PM Peak <br> Hour Traffic |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |





## 6. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Study intersections were analyzed using the methodology outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition published by the Transportation Research Board. Capacity and level of service are the design criteria for this traffic study. A computer software package, Synchro (Version 10.3), was used to complete the analyses for the study area intersections. Please note that the unsignalized capacity analysis does not provide an overall level of service for an intersection; only delay for an approach with a conflicting movement.

The HCM defines capacity as "the maximum hourly rate at which persons or vehicles can reasonably be expected to traverse a point or uniform section of a lane or roadway during a given time period under prevailing roadway, traffic, and control conditions." Level of service (LOS) is a term used to represent different driving conditions, and is defined as a "qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, and their perception by motorists and/ or passengers." Level of service varies from Level "A" representing free flow, to Level "F" where breakdown conditions are evident. Refer to Table 4 for HCM levels of service and related average control delay per vehicle for both signalized and unsignalized intersections. Control delay as defined by the HCM includes "initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay". An average control delay of 50 seconds at a signalized intersection results in LOS "D" operation at the intersection.

## Table 4: Highway Capacity Manual - Levels-of-Service and Delay

| UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION |  | SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEVEL <br> OF <br> SERVICE | AVERAGE <br> CONTROL DELAY <br> PER VEHICLE <br> (SECONDS) | LEVEL OF <br> SERVICE | AVERAGE <br> CONTROL DELAY <br> PER VEHICLE <br> (SECONDS) |
| A | $0-10$ | A | 0 |
| B | $10-15$ | B | 010 |
| C | $15-25$ | C | $20-20$ |
| D | $25-35$ | D | $20-35$ |
| E | $35-50$ | E | $35-55$ |
| F | $>50$ | F | $>80$ |

### 6.1. Adjustments to Analysis Guidelines

Capacity analysis at all study intersections was completed according to the NCDOT Congestions Management Guidelines.

## 7. CAPACITY ANALYSIS

### 7.1. Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-

 Holleman RoadThe existing unsignalized intersection of Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road was analyzed under 2022 existing, 2026 no-build without Gracewood Improvements, 2026 no-build with Gracewood Improvements, 2026 build without Gracewood Improvements and 2026 build with Gracewood Improvements traffic conditions with lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 5. Refer to Table 5 for a summary of the analysis results. The with Gracewood Improvement scenarios under 2026 no-build and 2026 build conditions analyzed the intersection with exclusive turn lanes on all approaches to be constructed by the Gracewood Residential development at its build out. Refer to Appendix E for the Synchro capacity analysis reports. SimTraffic queuing reports can be found in Appendix H .

Table 5: Analysis Summary of Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road

$$
/ \text { New Hill-Holleman Road }
$$

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LANE } \\ \text { CONFIGURATIONS } \end{gathered}$ | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | Overall (seconds) | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2022 Existing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { B } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { B } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (16) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 No-Build without Gracewood Improvements | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { C } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { C } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { B } \\ & \text { C } \\ & \text { F } \\ & \text { E } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (108) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 No-Build with Gracewood Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1$ TH-RT $1 \mathrm{LTT}, 1$ TH-RT $1 \mathrm{LLT}, 1$ TH-RT $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D } \\ (45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ (60) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Build without Gracewood Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \\ & 1 \text { LT-TH-RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{~B} \\ & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{E} \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D } \\ (44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{B} \\ & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (160) \end{gathered}$ |

Background improvements by the Gracewood Residential development shown underlined.
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## Table 5: Analysis Summary of Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road (continued)

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | A$\mathbf{P}$$\mathbf{P}$$\mathbf{R}$$\mathbf{O}$$\mathbf{A}$$\mathbf{C}$$\mathbf{H}$ | LANE <br> CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | Overall (seconds) | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2026 Build with Gracewood Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \frac{1 \mathrm{LT}}{1 \mathrm{LT}}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ \underline{1 \mathrm{LT}}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ \underline{1 \mathrm{LT}}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ \underline{1 \mathrm{LT}}, 1 \mathrm{TH}, \underline{1 \mathrm{RT}} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { E } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D } \\ (53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} \\ \mathrm{E} \\ \mathrm{D} \\ \mathrm{~F} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} E \\ (67) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Build without Gracewood Improvements 50 Lots | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { C } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ (64) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Build without Gracewood Improvements with FIL Improvements | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT, 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT, 1 TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D } \\ & \text { C } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D } \\ (43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F } \\ & \text { F } \\ & \text { F } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} \\ (79) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2026 Build with Gracewood Improvements Signal Timing Modifications | EB <br> WB <br> NB SB | 1 LT, 1 TH-RT <br> $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1$ TH-RT <br> $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1$ TH-RT <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { D } \\ (47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{E} \\ (58) \end{gathered}$ |

Background improvements by the Gracewood Residential development shown underlined. Improvements to be paid via fee-in-lieu by the Developer shown in bold.

Capacity analysis of 2022 existing conditions indicates that the intersection of Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road is expected to operate at an overall LOS B during the weekday AM peak hour and PM peak hours. Under 2026 no-build and 2026 build conditions without Gracewood Improvements the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D or better during the weekday AM peak hour and an overall LOS F during the weekday PM peak hour. For the purposes of this study, future conditions were also analyzed with improvements committed to by the Gracewood Residential development. These improvements include providing exclusive turn lanes on all approaches. Capacity analysis of 2026 no-build and 2026 build conditions with the

Gracewood Improvements indicates that the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour.

Signal timing modifications were considered at this intersection under 2026 build conditions with the Gracewood Improvements to mitigate an overall poor level of service experienced during the weekday PM peak hour. With this improvement, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour with delays better than 2026 no-build conditions during the weekday PM peak hour. The signal timing modifications are expected to improve delay to the better than 2026 no-build conditions during the weekday PM peak hour. While this study analyzes the signal with optimization, NCDOT periodically undertakes this at all signals to account for changes in traffic patterns.

2026 build conditions without Gracewood Improvements was analyzed with 50 single family homes built out to determine the impacts on the surrounding roadway network. With 50 single family homes, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS C during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour with delays equal to or better than 2026 no-build conditions without Gracewood Improvements.

Under 2026 build - without Gracewood Improvements conditions, the intersection was analyzed with exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along the major-street (Old US Highway 1) in order to mitigate poor levels-of-service experienced during the weekday PM peak hour. With these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour under 2026 build conditions with delays better than 2026 no-build conditions during the weekday PM peak hour.

These improvements are not recommended to be constructed by the proposed development as they are already committed to by the Gracewood Residential development to be built out once completed. The Gracewood development has additional improvements at the subject intersection that will be constructed at time of their improvements. In order to not have
continuous intersection improvements being undertaken at the subject intersection, it is recommended that these turn lanes be constructed once triggered by the Gracewood Residential development. The costs of these improvements are significant and beyond the impacts caused solely by the proposed development; therefore, a proportional fee in lieu is recommended for the Utley Farms development. An additional phased analysis scenario was provided to demonstrate the operations at the intersection with buildout of 50 units. Acceptable levels of service are expected under this scenario; therefore, it is recommended that the proportional fee in lieu for these improvements be assessed prior to the $51^{\text {st }}$ single family home.

Per Section 13.19.2 of the Town's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), improvements to minimize delay are to be required for intersections operating at poor levels of service under future conditions when the traffic generated by the proposed development is at least $10 \%$ of the projected total weekday AM or PM peak hour traffic at the intersection. The proposed development is expected to only account for approximately $6 \%$ of the overall traffic at the intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the Gracewood Improvements. Without the Gracewood Improvements, the proposed development is expected to only account for approximately $6 \%$ of the overall traffic during the weekday AM peak hour and approximately $7 \%$ of overall traffic during the weekday PM peak hour. Additionally, the proposed development is only expected to add approximately eight seconds to the overall delay during the weekday AM peak hour and approximately seven seconds to the overall delay during the weekday PM peak hour under 2026 build conditions with Gracewood Improvements.

RAMEY KEMP ASSOCIATES
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### 7.2. Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1

The proposed unsignalized intersection of Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1 was analyzed under 2026 build without Gracewood Improvements and 2026 build with Gracewood Improvements traffic conditions with lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 6. Refer to Table 6 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix F for the Synchro capacity analysis reports. SimTraffic queuing reports can be found in Appendix H.

Table 6: Analysis Summary of Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \end{aligned}$$\mathbf{H}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2026 Build without Gracewood Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ 1 \text { TH, } 1 \text { RT } \\ 1 \mathbf{L T}-\mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/ A |
| 2026 Build with <br> Gracewood Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ 1 \text { TH, } 1 \text { RT } \\ 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | A -- $\mathrm{C}^{2}$ | N/ A |

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

Improvements by Developer shown in bold.

Capacity analysis of 2026 build with Gracewood Improvements and 2026 build without Gracewood Improvements indicates that the major-street left-turn movement and the minorstreet approach at the intersection of Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1 are expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Turn lanes were considered at this intersection according to the NCDOT Policy on Street and Driveway Access to NC Highways (Driveway Manual). Based on the Driveway Manual, an exclusive westbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length is warranted and recommended by the proposed development. Turn lane warrant charts can be found in Appendix H. Due to a low volume of left-turning movements into the proposed development, an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is not
warranted based on the criteria within the Driveway Manual. Although an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is not warranted, this improvement would not be uncommon along the major thoroughfare (Old US Highway 1) due to the high posted speed limit ( 55 mph ) and the traffic growth expected in the future. At this site driveway, the proposed development could construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane in place of the recommended exclusive westbound right-turn lane.

### 7.3. Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 2

The proposed unsignalized intersection of Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 2 was analyzed under 2026 build without Gracewood Improvements and 2026 build with Gracewood Improvements traffic conditions with lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 7. Refer to Table 7 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix G for the Synchro capacity analysis reports. SimTraffic queuing reports can be found in Appendix H.

Table 7: Analysis Summary of Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 2

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | A$\mathbf{P}$$\mathbf{P}$$\mathbf{R}$$\mathbf{O}$$\mathbf{A}$$\mathbf{C}$$\mathbf{H}$ | LANECONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | Overall (seconds) | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2026 Build without Gracewood Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ 1 \text { TH, } 1 \text { RT } \\ 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{B}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/ A |
| 2026 Build with <br> Gracewood Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { LT-TH } \\ 1 \text { TH, } 1 \text { RT } \\ 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A |

3. Level of service for major-street left-turn movement.
4. Level of service for minor-street approach. Improvements by Developer shown in bold.

Capacity analysis of 2026 build with Gracewood Improvements and 2026 build without Gracewood Improvements indicates that the major-street left-turn movement and the minorstreet approach at the intersection of Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1 are expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Turn lanes were considered at this intersection according to the NCDOT Policy on Street and Driveway Access to NC Highways (Driveway Manual). Based on the Driveway Manual, an exclusive westbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length is warranted and recommended by the proposed development. Turn lane warrant charts can be found in Appendix H. Due to a low volume of left-turning movements into the proposed development, an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is not
warranted based on the criteria within the Driveway Manual. Although an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is not warranted, this improvement would not be uncommon along the major thoroughfare (Old US Highway 1) due to the high posted speed limit ( 55 mph ) and the traffic growth expected in the future. At this site driveway, the proposed development could construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane in place of the recommended exclusive westbound right-turn lane.

## 8. CONCLUSIONS

This Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted to determine the potential traffic impacts of the proposed development, located north of Old Highway US 1, west of New Hill-Olive Chapel Road in Apex, North Carolina. The proposed development is expected to be a residential development and be built out by 2026. Site access is proposed via two (2) full movement driveways along Old US Highway 1.

The study analyzes traffic conditions during the weekday AM and PM peak hours for the following scenarios:

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2026 No-Build Traffic Conditions without Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 No-Build Traffic Conditions with Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 Build Traffic Conditions without Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 Build Traffic Conditions with Gracewood Improvements


## Trip Generation

It is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 1,380 total site trips on the roadway network during a typical 24 -hour weekday period. Of the daily traffic volume, it is anticipated that 101 trips (26 entering and 75 exiting) will occur during the weekday AM peak hour and 136 trips ( 86 entering and 50 exiting) will occur during the weekday PM peak hour.

## Adjustments to Analysis Guidelines

Capacity analysis at all study intersections was completed according to NCDOT Congestion Management Guidelines. Refer to section 6.1 of this report for a detailed description of any adjustments to these guidelines made throughout the analysis.

## Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

All the study area intersections (including the proposed site driveways) are expected to operate at acceptable levels-of-service under existing and future year conditions with the
exception of the intersections listed below. A summary of the study area intersections that are expected to need improvements are as follows:

## Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road

 Under 2026 no-build and 2026 build conditions without Gracewood Improvements the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D or better during the weekday AM peak hour and an overall LOS F during the weekday PM peak hour. For the purposes of this study, future conditions were also analyzed with improvements committed to by the Gracewood Residential development. These improvements include installing a signal at the intersection and providing exclusive turn lanes on all approaches. Capacity analysis of 2026 no-build and 2026 build conditions with the Gracewood Improvements indicates that the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour.Signal timing modifications were considered at this intersection under 2026 build conditions with the Gracewood Improvements to mitigate an overall poor level of service experienced during the weekday PM peak hour. With this improvement, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour with delays better than 2026 no-build conditions during the weekday PM peak hour. The signal timing modifications are expected to improve delay to the better than 2026 no-build conditions during the weekday PM peak hour. While this study analyzes the signal with optimization, NCDOT periodically undertakes this at all signals to account for changes in traffic patterns.

2026 build conditions without Gracewood Improvements was analyzed with 50 single family homes built out to determine the impacts on the surrounding roadway network. With 50 single family homes, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS C during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour with delays equal to or better than 2026 no-build conditions without Gracewood Improvements.

Under 2026 build - without Gracewood Improvements conditions, the intersection was analyzed with exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along the major-street (Old US Highway 1) in order to mitigate poor levels-of-service experienced during the weekday PM peak hour. With these improvements, the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS D during the weekday AM peak hour and LOS E during the weekday PM peak hour under 2026 build conditions with delays better than 2026 no-build conditions during the weekday PM peak hour.

These improvements are not recommended to be constructed by the proposed development as they are already committed to by the Gracewood Residential development to be built out once completed. The Gracewood development has additional improvements at the subject intersection that will be constructed at time of their improvements. In order to not have continuous intersection improvements being undertaken at the subject intersection, it is recommended that these turn lanes be constructed once triggered by the Gracewood Residential development. The costs of these improvements are significant and beyond the impacts caused solely by the proposed development; therefore, a proportional fee in lieu is recommended for the Utley Farms development. An additional phased analysis scenario was provided to demonstrate the operations at the intersection with buildout of 50 units. Acceptable levels of service are expected under this scenario; therefore, it is recommended that the proportional fee in lieu for these improvements be assessed prior to the $51{ }^{\text {st }}$ single family home.

Per Section 13.19.2 of the Town's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), improvements to minimize delay are to be required for intersections operating at poor levels of service under future conditions when the traffic generated by the proposed development is at least $10 \%$ of the projected total weekday AM or PM peak hour traffic at the intersection. The proposed development is expected to only account for approximately $6 \%$ of the overall traffic at the intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the Gracewood Improvements. Without the Gracewood Improvements, the proposed development is expected to only account for approximately $6 \%$ of the overall traffic during the weekday AM peak hour and approximately $7 \%$ of overall traffic during the weekday PM peak hour. Additionally, the
proposed development is only expected to add approximately eight seconds to the overall delay during the weekday AM peak hour and approximately seven seconds to the overall delay during the weekday PM peak hour under 2026 build conditions with Gracewood Improvements.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric improvements have been identified and are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. See a more detailed description of the recommended improvements below. Refer to Figure 11 for an illustration of the recommended lane configuration for the proposed development.

## Background Improvements by Gracewood Residential Development

Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road

- Construct exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along Old US Highway 1 with a minimum of 250 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive southbound left-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 150 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.


## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Old US Highway 1 and New Hill-Olive Chapel Road / New Hill-Holleman Road
A proportional fee-in-lieu is recommended for these improvements based on an engineering estimate for their construction prior to the 51st unit.

- Construct exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along Old US Highway 1 with a minimum of 250 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.


## Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 1

- Construct the southbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Provide an exclusive westbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach.
- Although an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is not warranted, this improvement would not be uncommon along the major thoroughfare (Old US Highway 1) due to the high posted speed limit (55 mph) and the traffic growth expected in the future. At this site driveway, the proposed development could construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane in place of the recommended exclusive westbound right-turn lane.


## Old US Highway 1 and Site Drive 2

- Construct the southbound approach with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Provide an exclusive westbound right-turn lane with a minimum of 50 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper length.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach.
- Although an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane is not warranted, this improvement would not be uncommon along the major thoroughfare (Old US Highway 1) due to the high posted speed limit (55 mph) and the traffic growth expected in the future. At this site driveway, the proposed development could construct an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane in place of the recommended exclusive westbound right-turn lane.

*Note: Proportional fee-in-lieu by Developer

|  | Utley Farms <br> Apex, NC | Recommended Lane <br> Configurations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale Figure 11 |  |

## TECHNICAL APPENDIX

## APPENDIX A

## SCOPING DOCUMENTATION

February 23, 2022

Russell Dalton, PE<br>Town of Apex<br>73 Hunter Street<br>Apex, NC 27502<br>P: 919-429-3358<br>E: russell.dalton@apexnc.org<br>Subject: Memorandum of Understanding - Belterra Section II Apex, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Dalton:
The following is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the proposed scope of work and assumptions related to the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Belterra Section II development, to be located north of Old US Highway 1 and west of New Hill - Olive Chapel Road in Apex, North Carolina.

It is our understanding that the proposed development is expected be fully built out by 2026 and consist of a maximum amount of 140 single family homes. Access to the development is proposed via two (2) full movement driveways along Old US Highway 1. An internal connection to the existing phase 1 of the Belterra development, north of the site, is expected to provide site access to the proposed development. For the purposes of this study, this access will not be analyzed under future conditions as the traffic that is is expected to utilize this connection is negligible. This MOU contains information based on a scoping call with the Town of Apex (Town) on December 29, 2021 and with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) on December 28, 2021. A site location map and preliminary site plan has been attached for your reference.

## Study Area

Based on coordination with the Town and NCDOT, the study area is proposed to consist of the following existing intersection:

- Old US Highway 1 and New Hill - Olive Chapel Road / New Hill - Holleman Road


## Analysis Scenarios

All capacity analyses will be performed utilizing Synchro (Version 10.3). All study intersections will be analyzed during typical weekday AM and PM peak hours under the following proposed traffic scenarios:

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2026 No-Build Traffic Conditions with Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 No-Build Traffic Conditions without Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 Build Traffic Conditions with Gracewood Improvements
- 2026 Build Traffic Conditions without Gracewood Improvements


## Existing Traffic Volumes

Peak hour turning movement counts were collected at the study intersection in February 2022 during weekday AM (7:00-9:00 AM) and PM (4:00-6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools are in session, to determine 2022 existing peak hour traffic volumes.

## No-Build Traffic Volumes

Per coordination with Town and NCDOT Staff, no-build traffic volumes will be determined by projecting 2022 existing traffic volumes to the build-out year using a proposed $3 \%$ annual growth rate.

## Adjacent Developments

Based on coordination with the Town, the following adjacent developments are to be included in this study:

- Gracewood Residential - April 2021 by KHA
- Without Gracewood Improvements - this study will assume Gracewood consist of 270 single family homes.
- With Gracewood Improvements - this study will consider $85 \%$ of the Gracewood development as adjacent development traffic as $15 \%$ of the development is currently built-out.
- Olive Ridge - December 2018 by RKA
- Jordan Manors - May 2015 by KHA
- $20 \%$ of the Jordan Manors development will be considered as adjacent development traffic as $80 \%$ of the development is currently built out.
- Belterra (New Hill Assembly aka Jordan Vistas) - April 2018 by RKA

All other future developments will be accounted for with the proposed 3\% growth rate.

## Future Roadway Improvements

Through coordination with NCDOT and the Town, future roadway improvements associated with the Gracewood Residential development are to be included in this study under future conditions. For the purposes of this study, under future conditions without Gracewood Improvements, the Gracewood adjacent development is expected to consist of 270 single family homes. Analysis of future conditions with Gracewood Improvements will include $85 \%$ of the development's density as adjacent development traffic as $15 \%$ of the development is currently built-out.

## Trip Generation

Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition. Refer to Table 1, on the following page, for a detailed breakdown of the buildout site trip generation.

Table 1: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use <br> (ITE Code) | Intensity | Daily <br> Traffic <br> (vpd) | AM Peak Hour <br> Trips (vph) |  | PM Peak Hour <br> Trips (vph) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Exter | Enter |  |  |  |
| $(210)$ | 140 units | 1,380 | 26 | 75 | 86 | 50 |

It is estimated that the proposed site will generate approximately 1,380 total site trips on the roadway network during a typical 24 -hour weekday period. Of the daily traffic volume, it is anticipated that 101 trips ( 26 entering and 75 exiting) would occur during the weekday AM peak hour and 136 trips ( 86 entering and 50 exiting) would occur during the weekday PM peak hour.

## Trip Distribution

The primary site trips are distributed based on a combination of existing traffic patterns, population centers adjacent to the study area, and engineering judgment. A summary of the proposed regional trip distributions is as follows:

- $10 \%$ to/ from the north via New-Hill Olive Chapel Road
- $50 \%$ to/from the south via New-Hill Holleman Road
- $35 \%$ to/from the east via Old US Highway 1
- $5 \%$ to/from the west via Old US Highway 1

Refer to the attachments for a figure showing the anticipated site trip distributions for the site.

## Report

The Traffic Impact Analysis report will be prepared based on the Town and NCDOT guidelines. If you find this memorandum of understanding acceptable, please let me know so that we may include it in the TIA report. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Ramey Kemp \& Associates, Inc.


Nate Bouquin, PE, PTOE
Traffic Engineering Project Manager

Attachments: Site Location Map<br>Preliminary Site Plan<br>2022 Existing Peak Hour Traffic<br>Proposed Site Trip Distribution Figure




| $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{Y} \rightarrow$ | LEGEND |
| :--- | :--- |
| Unsignalized Intersection |  |
| Weekday AM / PM Peak |  |
| Hour Traffic |  |



|  | Belterra Section II <br> Apex, NC | 2022 Existing <br> Peak Hour Traffic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale |  |



## APPENDIX B

## TRAFFIC COUNTS



## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Apex(Old US Hwy 1 and New Hill) Site Code :
Start Date : 2/16/2022
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

|  | New Hill Holleman Road Southbound |  |  |  | Old US Hwy 1 Westbound |  |  |  | New Hill Holleman Road Northbound |  |  |  | Old US Hwy 1 Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 5 | 48 | 13 | 66 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 21 | 17 | 59 | 7 | 83 | 8 | 34 | 16 | 58 | 228 |
| 07:15 AM | 2 | 76 | 24 | 102 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 25 | 15 | 54 | 9 | 78 | 29 | 35 | 6 | 70 | 275 |
| 07:30 AM | 7 | 53 | 15 | 75 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 22 | 13 | 83 | 6 | 102 | 21 | 47 | 6 | 74 | 273 |
| 07:45 AM | 6 | 39 | 7 | 52 | 6 | 23 | 17 | 46 | 19 | 63 | 14 | 96 | 14 | 45 | 8 | 67 | 261 |
| Total | 20 | 216 | 59 | 295 | 19 | 53 | 42 | 114 | 64 | 259 | 36 | 359 | 72 | 161 | 36 | 269 | 1037 |
| 08:00 AM | 4 | 36 | 18 | 58 | 11 | 25 | 10 | 46 | 19 | 60 | 13 | 92 | 15 | 27 | 9 | 51 | 247 |
| 08:15 AM | 11 | 42 | 18 | 71 | 7 | 24 | 10 | 41 | 14 | 83 | 5 | 102 | 14 | 31 | 10 | 55 | 269 |
| 08:30 AM | 7 | 42 | 25 | 74 | 4 | 30 | 8 | 42 | 14 | 60 | 15 | 89 | 11 | 53 | 10 | 74 | 279 |
| Grand Total | 42 | 336 | 120 | 498 | 41 | 132 | 70 | 243 | 111 | 462 | 69 | 642 | 112 | 272 | 65 | 449 | 1832 |
| Apprch \% | 8.4 | 67.5 | 24.1 |  | 16.9 | 54.3 | 28.8 |  | 17.3 | 72 | 10.7 |  | 24.9 | 60.6 | 14.5 |  |  |
| Total \% | 2.3 | 18.3 | 6.6 | 27.2 | 2.2 | 7.2 | 3.8 | 13.3 | 6.1 | 25.2 | 3.8 | 35 | 6.1 | 14.8 | 3.5 | 24.5 |  |
| Cars + | 34 | 300 | 114 | 448 | 37 | 119 | 65 | 221 | 108 | 417 | 61 | 586 | 105 | 262 | 63 | 430 | 1685 |
| \% Cars + | 81 | 89.3 | 95 | 90 | 90.2 | 90.2 | 92.9 | 90.9 | 97.3 | 90.3 | 88.4 | 91.3 | 93.8 | 96.3 | 96.9 | 95.8 | 92 |
| Trucks | 8 | 36 | 6 | 50 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 22 | 3 | 45 | 8 | 56 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 19 | 147 |
| \% Trucks | 19 | 10.7 | 5 | 10 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 7.1 | 9.1 | 2.7 | 9.7 | 11.6 | 8.7 | 6.2 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 4.2 | 8 |



## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Apex(Old US Hwy 1 and New Hill)
Site Code :
Start Date : 2/16/2022
Page No :2

|  | New Hill Holleman Road Southbound |  |  |  | Old US Hwy 1 Westbound |  |  |  | New Hill Holleman Road Northbound |  |  |  | Old US Hwy 1 Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:15 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:15 AM | 2 | 76 | 24 | 102 | 7 | 10 | 8 | 25 | 15 | 54 | 9 | 78 | 29 | 35 | 6 | 70 | 275 |
| 07:30 AM | 7 | 53 | 15 | 75 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 22 | 13 | 83 | 6 | 102 | 21 | 47 | 6 | 74 | 273 |
| 07:45 AM | 6 | 39 | 7 | 52 | 6 | 23 | 17 | 46 | 19 | 63 | 14 | 96 | 14 | 45 | 8 | 67 | 261 |
| 08:00 AM | 4 | 36 | 18 | 58 | 11 | 25 | 10 | 46 | 19 | 60 | 13 | 92 | 15 | 27 | 9 | 51 | 247 |
| Total Volume | 19 | 204 | 64 | 287 | 27 | 71 | 41 | 139 | 66 | 260 | 42 | 368 | 79 | 154 | 29 | 262 | 1056 |
| \% App. Total | 6.6 | 71.1 | 22.3 |  | 19.4 | 51.1 | 29.5 |  | 17.9 | 70.7 | 11.4 |  | 30.2 | 58.8 | 11.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 679 | . 671 | . 667 | . 703 | . 614 | . 710 | . 603 | . 755 | . 868 | . 783 | 750 | . 902 | . 681 | . 819 | . 806 | . 885 | . 960 |




## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Apex(Old US Hwy 1 and New Hill) Site Code :
Start Date : 2/16/2022
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

|  | New Hill Holleman Road Southbound |  |  |  | Old US Hwy 1 Westbound |  |  |  | New Hill Holleman Road Northbound |  |  |  | Old US Hwy 1 Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 5 | 67 | 10 | 82 | 21 | 46 | 23 | 90 | 14 | 43 | 11 | 68 | 21 | 21 | 6 | 48 | 288 |
| 04:15 PM | 13 | 73 | 5 | 91 | 17 | 33 | 25 | 75 | 16 | 56 | 10 | 82 | 16 | 18 | 8 | 42 | 290 |
| 04:30 PM | 9 | 60 | 6 | 75 | 13 | 43 | 26 | 82 |  | 52 | 29 | 90 | 15 | 28 | 8 | 51 | 298 |
| 04:45 PM | 7 | 68 | 8 | 83 | 15 | 39 | 27 | 81 | 18 | 45 | 17 | 80 | 20 | 18 | 7 | 45 | 289 |
| Total | 34 | 268 | 29 | 331 | 66 | 161 | 101 | 328 | 57 | 196 | 67 | 320 | 72 | 85 | 29 | 186 | 1165 |
| 05:00 PM | 6 | 55 | 14 | 75 | 17 | 36 | 18 | 71 | 14 | 39 | 16 | 69 | 15 | 26 | 2 | 43 | 258 |
| 05:15 PM | 6 | 135 | 15 | 156 | 18 | 31 | 26 | 75 | 25 | 59 | 24 | 108 | 24 | 38 | 11 | 73 | 412 |
| 05:30 PM | 9 | 91 | 11 | 111 | 22 | 51 | 20 | 93 | 22 | 47 | 18 | 87 | 16 | 30 | 3 | 49 | 340 |
| 05:45 PM | 8 | 70 | 12 | 90 | 11 | 31 | 16 | 58 | 10 | 61 | 24 | 95 | 17 | 39 | 7 | 63 | 306 |
| Total | 29 | 351 | 52 | 432 | 68 | 149 | 80 | 297 | 71 | 206 | 82 | 359 | 72 | 133 | 23 | 228 | 1316 |
| Grand Total | 63 | 619 | 81 | 763 | 134 | 310 | 181 | 625 | 128 | 402 | 149 | 679 | 144 | 218 | 52 | 414 | 2481 |
| Apprch \% | 8.3 | 81.1 | 10.6 |  | 21.4 | 49.6 | 29 |  | 18.9 | 59.2 | 21.9 |  | 34.8 | 52.7 | 12.6 |  |  |
| Total \% | 2.5 | 24.9 | 3.3 | 30.8 | 5.4 | 12.5 | 7.3 | 25.2 | 5.2 | 16.2 | 6 | 27.4 | 5.8 | 8.8 | 2.1 | 16.7 |  |
| Cars + | 56 | 587 | 78 | 721 | 133 | 305 | 175 | 613 | 124 | 384 | 147 | 655 | 137 | 211 | 51 | 399 | 2388 |
| \% Cars + | 88.9 | 94.8 | 96.3 | 94.5 | 99.3 | 98.4 | 96.7 | 98.1 | 96.9 | 95.5 | 98.7 | 96.5 | 95.1 | 96.8 | 98.1 | 96.4 | 96.3 |
| Trucks | 7 | 32 | 3 | 42 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 18 | 2 | 24 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 15 | 93 |
| \% Trucks | 11.1 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 5.5 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 1.3 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 3.7 |



## TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

File Name : Apex(Old US Hwy 1 and New Hill)
Site Code :
Start Date : 2/16/2022
Page No : 2

|  | New Hill Holleman Road Southbound |  |  |  | Old US Hwy 1 Westbound |  |  |  | New Hill Holleman Road Northbound |  |  |  | Old US Hwy 1 Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour for 05:00 PM | Entire In | tersect | on Beg | $\text { ins at } 05$ | $00 \text { PM }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | 55 | 14 | 75 | 17 | 36 | 18 | 71 | 14 | 39 | 16 | 69 | 15 | 26 | 2 | 43 | 258 |
| 05:15 PM | 6 | 135 | 15 | 156 | 18 | 31 | 26 | 75 | 25 | 59 | 24 | 108 | 24 | 38 | 11 | 73 | 412 |
| 05:30 PM | 9 | 91 | 11 | 111 | 22 | 51 | 20 | 93 | 22 | 47 | 18 | 87 | 16 | 30 | 3 | 49 | 340 |
| 05:45 PM | 8 | 70 | 12 | 90 | 11 | 31 | 16 | 58 | 10 | 61 | 24 | 95 | 17 | 39 | 7 | 63 | 306 |
| Total Volume | 29 | 351 | 52 | 432 | 68 | 149 | 80 | 297 | 71 | 206 | 82 | 359 | 72 | 133 | 23 | 228 | 1316 |
| \% App. Total | 6.7 | 81.2 | 12 |  | 22.9 | 50.2 | 26.9 |  | 19.8 | 57.4 | 22.8 |  | 31.6 | 58.3 | 10.1 |  |  |
| PHF | 806 | . 650 | . 867 | . 692 | . 773 | . 730 | . 769 | .798 | 710 | . 844 | . 854 | . 831 | . 750 | . 853 | . 523 | .781 | 799 |



## APPENDIX C

## ADJACENT DEVELOPMENT <br> INFORMATION

## Traffic Impact Analysis New Hill Assembly Apex, NC
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## Kimley»)Horn

May 29, 2015
Mr. Colen Davidson
Milestone Developments, LLC.
140 Towerview Ct.
Cary, NC 27513
RE: Finkle and Haus Assemblage - Traffic Impact Analysis


5/29/2015

Dear Mr. Davidson:
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. has revised the Traffic Impact Analysis (originally dated February 27,2015 ) for the proposed residential development located on the west side of New Hill Olive Chapel Road in Apex, NC. The proposed development will consist of approximately 240 single-family homes split between 2 parcels (approximately 160 units in the northern parcel and 80 units in the southern parcel) and is expected to be completed (built-out) by the year 2018. The northern parcel is proposed to be accessed by two full-movement driveways on New Hill Olive Chapel Road, and the southern parcel is proposed to be access by two full-movement driveways on the Proposed Collector Road that will tie to New Hill Olive Chapel Road along the south end of the site. Figure 1 shows the site location, and Figure 2 shows the proposed site plan.

This report presents trip generation, distribution, traffic analyses, and recommendations for transportation improvements required to meet anticipated traffic demands in conjunction with the development. The three traffic conditions studied include the existing (2015) traffic condition, the projected (2018) background traffic condition, and the projected (2018) build-out traffic condition. Analyses were performed for the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The study area consists of the following intersections:

- New Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Hwy 1
- New Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Humie Olive Road
- New Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Proposed Site Access 1
- New Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Proposed Site Access 2
- New Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Proposed Collector Road (to connect with Site Access 3, 4)


## Background Traffic

AM and PM peak hour traffic counts were performed at the following intersections on January 22, 2015:

- New Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Hwy 1
- New Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Humie Olive Road

The existing AM and PM peak hour turning movement volumes are shown on Figures 3 and 4, respectively. A 3\% annual growth factor was applied to the existing volumes to account for ambient



FINKLE \& HAUS ASSEMBLAGE APEX, NC


FINKLE \& HAUS ASSEMBLAGE APEX, NC TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS


FINKLE \& HAUS ASSEMBLAGE APEX, NC TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

## Traffic Impact Analysis Olive Ridge Apex, North Carolina



# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS 

FOR

OLIVE RIDGE

LOCATED
IN
APEX, NORTH CAROLINA

Prepared For:
Rob Tessar
Weekley Homes, LLC
1901 N. Harrison Avenue, Suite 200
Cary, NC 27513

Prepared By:
Ramey Kemp \& Associates, Inc. 5808 Faringdon Place, Suite 100 Raleigh, NC 27609 License \#C-0910

December 2018

RKA Project No. 18357


Reviewed By: RS


| $\underline{\text { LEGEND }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Unsignalized Intersection |
| $\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{Y} \rightarrow$ | Weekday AM / PM Peak <br> Hour Site Trips |


| QRAMEY KEMP | Olive Ridge Residential Apex, NC | Site <br> Trip Assignment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| transportation enginems |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 9 |


|  | LEGEND |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\bigcirc$ | Unsignalized Intersection |
| 8 | Signalized Intersection |
| $\rightarrow$ | Existing Lane |
| $\rightarrow$ | Improvement by Developer |
| $\rightarrow$ | Improvements by Others |
| $\mathrm{X}^{\prime}$ | Storage (In Feet) |




| O-RAMEY KEMP | Olive Ridge Residential Apex, NC | Recommended Lane Configurations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 11 |

## APPENDIX D

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS OLD US HIGHWAY 1 <br> \&

NEW HILL-OLIVE CHAPEL ROAD / NEW HILL-HOLLEMAN ROAD

|  | $\psi$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | \& |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 29 | 154 | 79 | 41 | 71 | 27 | 42 | 260 | 66 | 64 | 204 | 19 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 29 | 154 | 79 | 41 | 71 | 27 | 42 | 260 | 66 | 64 | 204 | 19 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| 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 |  | 0.959 |  |  | 0.974 |  |  | 0.976 |  |  | 0.991 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.995 |  |  | 0.985 |  |  | 0.994 |  |  | 0.989 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1777 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 0 | 1807 | 0 | 0 | 1826 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.954 |  |  | 0.842 |  |  | 0.931 |  |  | 0.853 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1704 | 0 | 0 | 1528 | 0 | 0 | 1693 | 0 | 0 | 1575 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 32 | 171 | 88 | 46 | 79 | 30 | 47 | 289 | 73 | 71 | 227 | 21 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 409 | 0 | 0 | 319 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 12.4 | 12.4 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 84.3 | 84.3 |  | 84.9 | 84.9 |  | 19.6 | 19.6 |  | 20.2 | 20.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -0.7 |  |  | -0.1 |  |  | -0.4 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 16.2 |  |  | 16.2 |  |  | 20.1 |  |  | 20.1 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.35 |  |  | 0.35 |  |  | 0.43 |  |  | 0.43 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.49 |  |  | 0.29 |  |  | 0.56 |  |  | 0.47 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 14.8 |  |  | 12.3 |  |  | 14.2 |  |  | 12.9 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 14.8 |  |  | 12.3 |  |  | 14.2 |  |  | 12.9 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 14.8 |  |  | 12.3 |  |  | 14.2 |  |  | 12.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | + | $\checkmark$ | $\dagger$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 59 |  |  | 29 |  |  | 75 |  |  | 55 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 109 |  |  | 61 |  |  | 168 |  |  | 129 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1704 |  |  | 1528 |  |  | 734 |  |  | 682 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.17 |  |  | 0.10 |  |  | 0.56 |  |  | 0.47 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 46.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 13.8 |  |  | Intersection LOS: B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 50.9\% |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


|  | 4 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 23 | 133 | 72 | 80 | 149 | 68 | 82 | 206 | 71 | 52 | 351 | 29 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 23 | 133 | 72 | 80 | 149 | 68 | 82 | 206 | 71 | 52 | 351 | 29 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| 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 |  | 0.957 |  |  | 0.969 |  |  | 0.973 |  |  | 0.991 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.995 |  |  | 0.987 |  |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1774 | 0 | 0 | 1782 | 0 | 0 | 1793 | 0 | 0 | 1835 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.939 |  |  | 0.859 |  |  | 0.829 |  |  | 0.914 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1674 | 0 | 0 | 1550 | 0 | 0 | 1503 | 0 | 0 | 1687 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 26 | 148 | 80 | 89 | 166 | 76 | 91 | 229 | 79 | 58 | 390 | 32 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 254 | 0 | 0 | 331 | 0 | 0 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 480 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 11.8 | 11.8 |
| Total Split (s) | 90.0 | 90.0 | 90.0 | 90.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 78.3\% | 78.3\% | 78.3\% | 78.3\% | 21.7\% | 21.7\% | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 84.3 | 84.3 | 84.9 | 84.9 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 20.2 | 20.2 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -0.7 |  | -0.1 |  | -0.4 |  | 0.2 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min | Min | Min | None | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 15.1 |  | 15.1 |  | 20.1 |  | 20.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.33 |  | 0.33 |  | 0.44 |  | 0.44 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.46 |  | 0.64 |  | 0.60 |  | 0.64 |
| Control Delay |  | 14.6 |  | 19.1 |  | 15.1 |  | 15.9 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 14.6 |  | 19.1 |  | 15.1 |  | 15.9 |
| LOS |  | B |  | B |  | B |  | B |
| Approach Delay |  | 14.6 |  | 19.1 |  | 15.1 |  | 15.9 |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | B |  | B |  | B |


| $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 50 |  |  | 70 |  |  | 70 |  |  | 86 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 96 |  |  | 133 |  |  | \#170 |  |  | \#213 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { Internal Link Dist (ft) } & 1094 & 959 & 1204\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1674 |  |  | 1550 |  |  | 667 |  |  | 749 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.15 |  |  | 0.21 |  |  | 0.60 |  |  | 0.64 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 45.2Natural Cycle: 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 16.2 |  |  |  | sectio | OS: B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 75.4\% |  |  |  | Leve | Servic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two | ycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  | $4$ | 4 |  |  |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 67 | 217 | 160 | 46 | 95 | 37 | 71 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 41 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 67 | 217 | 160 | 46 | 95 | 37 | 71 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 41 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| 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 |  | 0.951 |  |  | 0.972 |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.988 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.987 |  |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.990 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1759 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 0 | 1811 | 0 | 0 | 1822 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.920 |  |  | 0.838 |  |  | 0.859 |  |  | 0.795 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1630 | 0 | 0 | 1517 | 0 | 0 | 1566 | 0 | 0 | 1463 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 74 | 241 | 178 | 51 | 106 | 41 | 79 | 364 | 82 | 103 | 371 | 46 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 493 | 0 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 0 | 525 | 0 | 0 | 520 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 12.4 | 12.4 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 84.3 | 84.3 |  | 84.9 | 84.9 |  | 19.6 | 19.6 |  | 20.2 | 20.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -0.7 |  |  | -0.1 |  |  | -0.4 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 20.6 |  |  | 20.6 |  |  | 20.2 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.40 |  |  | 0.40 |  |  | 0.40 |  |  | 0.40 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.75 |  |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.85 |  |  | 0.90 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 20.6 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  | 32.5 |  |  | 39.5 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 20.6 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  | 32.5 |  |  | 39.5 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 20.6 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  | 32.5 |  |  | 39.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | / |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 118 |  |  | 38 |  |  | 136 |  |  | 139 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 207 |  |  | 74 |  |  | \#349 |  |  | \#357 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1630 |  |  | 1517 |  |  | 620 |  |  | 579 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.30 |  |  | 0.13 |  |  | 0.85 |  |  | 0.90 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other <br> Cycle Length: 115  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 50.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 28.8 |  |  |  | ntersection LOS: C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 74.5\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Trafic Volume (vph) | 58 | 179 | 128 | 90 | 218 | 101 | 172 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 74 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 58 | 179 | 128 | 90 | 218 | 101 | 172 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 74 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| 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 |  | 0.953 |  |  | 0.967 |  |  | 0.981 |  |  | 0.984 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.992 |  |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.985 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1761 | 0 | 0 | 1781 | 0 | 0 | 1800 | 0 | 0 | 1822 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.884 |  |  | 0.833 |  |  | 0.584 |  |  | 0.869 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1569 | 0 | 0 | 1500 | 0 | 0 | 1067 | 0 | 0 | 1593 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 64 | 199 | 142 | 100 | 242 | 112 | 191 | 366 | 89 | 80 | 514 | 82 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 405 | 0 | 0 | 454 | 0 | 0 | 646 | 0 | 0 | 676 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 11.8 | 11.8 |
| Total Split (s) | 90.0 | 90.0 | 90.0 | 90.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 78.3\% | 78.3\% | 78.3\% | 78.3\% | 21.7\% | 21.7\% | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 84.3 | 84.3 | 84.9 | 84.9 | 19.6 | 19.6 | 20.2 | 20.2 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -0.7 |  | -0.1 |  | -0.4 |  | 0.2 |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min | Min | Min | None | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 19.9 |  | 19.9 |  | 20.2 |  | 20.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.40 |  | 0.40 |  | 0.40 |  | 0.40 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.65 |  | 0.76 |  | 1.51 |  | 1.06 |
| Control Delay |  | 17.5 |  | 22.2 |  | 261.0 |  | 73.0 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 17.5 |  | 22.2 |  | 261.0 |  | 73.0 |
| LOS |  | B |  | C |  | F |  | E |
| Approach Delay |  | 17.5 |  | 22.2 |  | 261.0 |  | 73.0 |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  | C |  | F |  | E |


| $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ | * | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 50th ( t ) | 91 |  |  | 109 |  |  | -274 |  |  | -226 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 162 |  |  | 195 |  |  | \#520 |  |  | \#477 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( f ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1569 |  |  | 1500 |  |  | 429 |  |  | 640 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.26 |  |  | 0.30 |  |  | 1.51 |  |  | 1.06 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 50.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 107.8 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 106.1\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT | + WBR | $\stackrel{4}{\text { NBL }}$ | ¢ NBT | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{ }$ | SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\uparrow$ | F' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 78 | 235 | 188 | 46 | 100 | 37 | 80 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 45 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 78 | 235 | 188 | 46 | 100 | 37 | 80 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 45 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 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 |  | 0.933 |  |  | 0.960 |  |  | 0.972 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1738 | 0 | 1770 | 1788 | 0 | 1770 | 1811 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1738 | 0 | 1770 | 1788 | 0 | 1770 | 1811 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 87 | 261 | 209 | 51 | 111 | 41 | 89 | 364 | 82 | 103 | 371 | 50 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 87 | 470 | 0 | 51 | 152 | 0 | 89 | 446 | 0 | 103 | 371 | 50 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA | pm+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 | 27.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% | 22.5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 | 20.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 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 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -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 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | 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 |
| Recall Mode | None | Min |  | None | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 12.4 | 28.9 |  | 10.7 | 27.2 |  | 12.5 | 28.9 |  | 13.1 | 29.5 | 47.1 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.13 | 0.31 |  | 0.11 | 0.29 |  | 0.13 | 0.31 |  | 0.14 | 0.31 | 0.50 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.37 | 0.88 |  | 0.25 | 0.29 |  | 0.38 | 0.81 |  | 0.42 | 0.64 | 0.06 |
| Control Delay | 45.6 | 54.7 |  | 45.3 | 32.7 |  | 45.6 | 46.4 |  | 45.4 | 37.0 | 15.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 45.6 | 54.7 |  | 45.3 | 32.7 |  | 45.6 | 46.4 |  | 45.4 | 37.0 | 15.5 |
| LOS | D | D |  | D | C |  | D | D |  | D | D | B |
| Approach Delay |  | 53.2 |  |  | 35.9 |  |  | 46.3 |  |  | 36.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |


| Lane Group | 4 EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | - WBT |  | NBL | $\uparrow$ <br> NBT | NBR | SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 52 | 292 |  | 30 | 78 |  | 53 | 268 |  | 61 | 208 | 17 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 102 | \#547 |  | 69 | 149 |  | 104 | \#495 |  | 116 | 342 | 40 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 426 | 532 |  | 426 | 547 |  | 426 | 554 |  | 426 | 583 | 963 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.88 |  | 0.12 | 0.28 |  | 0.21 | 0.81 |  | 0.24 | 0.64 | 0.05 |

Intersection Summary
Area Type:
Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 94.2
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.88
Intersection Signal Delay: 44.5
Intersection Capacity Utilization 73.9\%
Intersection LOS: D

Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT | + WBR | 4 | ¢ NBT | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{ }$ | SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 65 | 191 | 146 | 90 | 237 | 101 | 203 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 87 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 65 | 191 | 146 | 90 | 237 | 101 | 203 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 87 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 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 |  | 0.935 |  |  | 0.955 |  |  | 0.971 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1742 | 0 | 1770 | 1779 | 0 | 1770 | 1809 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1742 | 0 | 1770 | 1779 | 0 | 1770 | 1809 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 72 | 212 | 162 | 100 | 263 | 112 | 226 | 366 | 89 | 80 | 514 | 97 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 72 | 374 | 0 | 100 | 375 | 0 | 226 | 455 | 0 | 80 | 514 | 97 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA | pm+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 | 27.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% | 22.5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 | 20.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 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 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -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 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | 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 |
| Recall Mode | None | Min |  | None | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 12.0 | 27.1 |  | 13.5 | 28.5 |  | 19.4 | 38.3 |  | 12.4 | 28.1 | 45.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.25 |  | 0.12 | 0.26 |  | 0.18 | 0.35 |  | 0.11 | 0.26 | 0.42 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.37 | 0.86 |  | 0.45 | 0.80 |  | 0.71 | 0.71 |  | 0.39 | 1.06 | 0.15 |
| Control Delay | 51.4 | 59.7 |  | 51.7 | 52.0 |  | 55.8 | 40.5 |  | 51.5 | 98.4 | 21.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 51.4 | 59.7 |  | 51.7 | 52.0 |  | 55.8 | 40.5 |  | 51.5 | 98.4 | 21.4 |
| LOS | D | E |  | D | D |  | E | D |  | D | F | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 58.4 |  |  | 51.9 |  |  | 45.6 |  |  | 82.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |


| Lane Group | EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | - WBT |  | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR | SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 49 | 255 |  | 67 | 249 |  | 150 | 287 |  | 54 | $\sim 415$ | 43 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 96 | \#447 |  | 123 | \#413 |  | 247 | \#508 |  | 104 | \#663 | 80 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 361 | 453 |  | 361 | 486 |  | 361 | 640 |  | 361 | 484 | 808 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.20 | 0.83 |  | 0.28 | 0.77 |  | 0.63 | 0.71 |  | 0.22 | 1.06 | 0.12 |

Intersection Summary
Area Type:
Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 108.2
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.06
Intersection Signal Delay: $60.4 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.1\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  | $4$ | 4 |  |  |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 75 | 243 | 198 | 46 | 104 | 37 | 84 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 44 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 75 | 243 | 198 | 46 | 104 | 37 | 84 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 44 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| 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 |  | 0.948 |  |  | 0.973 |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.987 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.988 |  |  | 0.991 |  |  | 0.990 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1754 | 0 | 0 | 1791 | 0 | 0 | 1807 | 0 | 0 | 1820 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.921 |  |  | 0.829 |  |  | 0.805 |  |  | 0.766 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1626 | 0 | 0 | 1503 | 0 | 0 | 1468 | 0 | 0 | 1408 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 83 | 270 | 220 | 51 | 116 | 41 | 93 | 364 | 82 | 103 | 371 | 49 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 573 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 539 | 0 | 0 | 523 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 12.4 | 12.4 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 84.3 | 84.3 |  | 84.9 | 84.9 |  | 19.6 | 19.6 |  | 20.2 | 20.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -0.7 |  |  | -0.1 |  |  | -0.4 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 24.2 |  |  | 24.2 |  |  | 20.2 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.44 |  |  | 0.44 |  |  | 0.37 |  |  | 0.37 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.79 |  |  | 0.31 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 21.9 |  |  | 10.7 |  |  | 60.3 |  |  | 64.3 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 21.9 |  |  | 10.7 |  |  | 60.3 |  |  | 64.3 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 21.9 |  |  | 10.7 |  |  | 60.3 |  |  | 64.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 50th ( t ) | 148 |  |  | 40 |  |  | -169 |  |  | -168 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 251 |  |  | 75 |  |  | \#424 |  |  | \#417 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1626 |  |  | 1503 |  |  | 544 |  |  | 521 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.35 |  |  | 0.14 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 54.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 43.9 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.8\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  | $4$ | 4 |  | $V$ |  | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | * |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 63 | 197 | 153 | 90 | 248 | 101 | 215 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 83 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 63 | 197 | 153 | 90 | 248 | 101 | 215 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 83 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| 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 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.969 |  |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.982 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.992 |  |  | 0.990 |  |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1755 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 0 | 1800 | 0 | 0 | 1818 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.879 |  |  | 0.828 |  |  | 0.526 |  |  | 0.865 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1555 | 0 | 0 | 1495 | 0 | 0 | 963 | 0 | 0 | 1582 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 70 | 219 | 170 | 100 | 276 | 112 | 239 | 366 | 89 | 80 | 514 | 92 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 459 | 0 | 0 | 488 | 0 | 0 | 694 | 0 | 0 | 686 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 12.4 | 12.4 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 84.3 | 84.3 |  | 84.9 | 84.9 |  | 19.6 | 19.6 |  | 20.2 | 20.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -0.7 |  |  | -0.1 |  |  | -0.4 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 21.7 |  |  | 21.7 |  |  | 20.2 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.42 |  |  | 0.42 |  |  | 0.39 |  |  | 0.39 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.71 |  |  | 0.78 |  |  | 1.86 |  |  | 1.12 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 19.0 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 415.2 |  |  | 94.8 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 19.0 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 415.2 |  |  | 94.8 |  |
| LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 19.0 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 415.2 |  |  | 94.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |


| 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Queue Length 50th ( t ) | 109 |  |  | 121 |  |  | -334 |  |  | $\sim 249$ |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 190 |  |  | 214 |  |  | \#601 |  |  | \#514 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1555 |  |  | 1495 |  |  | 374 |  |  | 615 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.30 |  |  | 0.33 |  |  | 1.86 |  |  | 1.12 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 90 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 160.3 |  |  | Intersection LOS: F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 115.9\% |  |  | ICU Level of Service H |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT | + WBR | $\stackrel{4}{\text { NBL }}$ | ¢ NBT | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{ }$ | SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 86 | 261 | 226 | 46 | 109 | 37 | 93 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 48 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 86 | 261 | 226 | 46 | 109 | 37 | 93 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 48 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 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 |  | 0.930 |  |  | 0.962 |  |  | 0.972 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1732 | 0 | 1770 | 1792 | 0 | 1770 | 1811 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1732 | 0 | 1770 | 1792 | 0 | 1770 | 1811 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 96 | 290 | 251 | 51 | 121 | 41 | 103 | 364 | 82 | 103 | 371 | 53 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 96 | 541 | 0 | 51 | 162 | 0 | 103 | 446 | 0 | 103 | 371 | 53 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA | pm+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 | 27.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% | 22.5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 | 20.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 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 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -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 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | 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 |
| Recall Mode | None | Min |  | None | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 12.8 | 28.9 |  | 10.7 | 26.8 |  | 13.1 | 28.9 |  | 13.1 | 28.9 | 46.8 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.14 | 0.31 |  | 0.11 | 0.28 |  | 0.14 | 0.31 |  | 0.14 | 0.31 | 0.50 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 1.02 |  | 0.25 | 0.32 |  | 0.42 | 0.81 |  | 0.42 | 0.65 | 0.07 |
| Control Delay | 45.5 | 81.3 |  | 45.3 | 33.5 |  | 45.4 | 46.4 |  | 45.4 | 38.3 | 15.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 45.5 | 81.3 |  | 45.3 | 33.5 |  | 45.4 | 46.4 |  | 45.4 | 38.3 | 15.7 |
| LOS | D | F |  | D | C |  | D | D |  | D | D | B |
| Approach Delay |  | 75.9 |  |  | 36.3 |  |  | 46.2 |  |  | 37.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | - WBT |  | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR | SBL | $\downarrow$ SBT | ¢ SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 57 | ~393 |  | 30 | 84 |  | 61 | 268 |  | 61 | 210 | 18 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 110 | \#660 |  | 69 | 159 |  | 116 | \#495 |  | 116 | \#367 | 42 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 426 | 530 |  | 426 | 549 |  | 426 | 554 |  | 426 | 570 | 952 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.23 | 1.02 |  | 0.12 | 0.30 |  | 0.24 | 0.81 |  | 0.24 | 0.65 | 0.06 |

Intersection Summary
Area Type:
Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 94.2
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.02
Intersection Signal Delay: $52.5 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.6\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT | + WBR | 4 | ¢ NBT | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{ }$ | SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 70 | 209 | 171 | 90 | 267 | 101 | 246 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 96 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 70 | 209 | 171 | 90 | 267 | 101 | 246 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 96 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 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 |  | 0.932 |  |  | 0.959 |  |  | 0.971 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1736 | 0 | 1770 | 1786 | 0 | 1770 | 1809 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1736 | 0 | 1770 | 1786 | 0 | 1770 | 1809 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 78 | 232 | 190 | 100 | 297 | 112 | 273 | 366 | 89 | 80 | 514 | 107 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 78 | 422 | 0 | 100 | 409 | 0 | 273 | 455 | 0 | 80 | 514 | 107 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA | pm+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 |  | 27.0 | 33.0 | 27.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% |  | 22.5\% | 27.5\% | 22.5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 | 20.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 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 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -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 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | 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 |
| Recall Mode | None | Min |  | None | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 12.3 | 28.0 |  | 13.6 | 29.3 |  | 21.1 | 39.7 |  | 12.5 | 28.0 | 45.4 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.25 |  | 0.12 | 0.26 |  | 0.19 | 0.36 |  | 0.11 | 0.25 | 0.41 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 0.96 |  | 0.46 | 0.87 |  | 0.81 | 0.70 |  | 0.40 | 1.09 | 0.17 |
| Control Delay | 52.2 | 76.6 |  | 52.5 | 59.4 |  | 62.9 | 40.2 |  | 52.2 | 108.6 | 21.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 52.2 | 76.6 |  | 52.5 | 59.4 |  | 62.9 | 40.2 |  | 52.2 | 108.6 | 21.8 |
| LOS | D | E |  | D | E |  | E | D |  | D | F | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 72.8 |  |  | 58.0 |  |  | 48.7 |  |  | 88.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |


| Lane Group | $\Rightarrow$ <br> EBL | $\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow \\ & \text { EBT } \end{aligned}$ |  | WBL |  | $4$ <br> WBR | NBL | $9$ | $\begin{gathered} + \\ \text { NBR } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\downarrow$ SBT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 53 | 301 |  | 68 | 281 |  | 187 | 287 |  | 54 | $\sim 419$ | 48 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 101 | \#531 |  | 123 | \#477 |  | \#335 | \#508 |  | 104 | \#663 | 87 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 351 | 439 |  | 351 | 471 |  | 351 | 648 |  | 351 | 471 | 787 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.22 | 0.96 |  | 0.28 | 0.87 |  | 0.78 | 0.70 |  | 0.23 | 1.09 | 0.14 |

Intersection Summary
Area Type:
Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 110.8
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.09
Intersection Signal Delay: $67.2 \quad$ Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 81.9\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | ¢ EBL | $\rightarrow$ <br> EBT | EBR | WBL | $\bullet-$ WBT | 4 WBR | 4 | ¢ NBT | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{ }$ | SBL | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 70 | 226 | 173 | 46 | 98 | 37 | 76 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 42 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 70 | 226 | 173 | 46 | 98 | 37 | 76 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 42 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| 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 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.972 |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.988 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.993 |  |  | 0.987 |  |  | 0.992 |  |  | 0.990 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1757 | 0 | 0 | 1787 | 0 | 0 | 1809 | 0 | 0 | 1822 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.920 |  |  | 0.835 |  |  | 0.842 |  |  | 0.786 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1628 | 0 | 0 | 1512 | 0 | 0 | 1535 | 0 | 0 | 1447 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 78 | 251 | 192 | 51 | 109 | 41 | 84 | 364 | 82 | 103 | 371 | 47 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 521 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 521 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 12.4 | 12.4 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 90.0 | 90.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  | 25.0 | 25.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 78.3\% | 78.3\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  | 21.7\% | 21.7\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 84.3 | 84.3 |  | 84.9 | 84.9 |  | 19.6 | 19.6 |  | 20.2 | 20.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -0.7 |  |  | -0.1 |  |  | -0.4 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 21.7 |  |  | 21.7 |  |  | 20.2 |  |  | 20.2 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.42 |  |  | 0.42 |  |  | 0.39 |  |  | 0.39 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.77 |  |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.89 |  |  | 0.93 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 21.1 |  |  | 11.2 |  |  | 38.6 |  |  | 45.4 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 21.1 |  |  | 11.2 |  |  | 38.6 |  |  | 45.4 |  |
| LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 21.1 |  |  | 11.2 |  |  | 38.6 |  |  | 45.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |


| Lane Group | EBL | $\rightarrow$ |  | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ NBT | NBR |  | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 128 |  |  | 39 |  |  | 147 |  |  | 148 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | 222 |  |  | 74 |  |  | \#374 |  |  | \#378 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 1628 |  |  | 1512 |  |  | 595 |  |  | 561 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.13 |  |  | 0.89 |  |  | 0.93 |  |

Intersection Summary
Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 115
Actuated Cycle Length: 52
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.93
Intersection Signal Delay: $32.4 \quad$ Intersection LOS: C
Intersection Capacity Utilization 75.5\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT |  | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR |  | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 60 | 185 | 137 | 90 | 229 | 101 | 187 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 77 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 60 | 185 | 137 | 90 | 229 | 101 | 187 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 77 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| 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 |  | 0.952 |  |  | 0.968 |  |  | 0.982 |  |  | 0.983 |  |
| Flt Protected |  | 0.992 |  |  | 0.989 |  |  | 0.985 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1759 | 0 | 0 | 1783 | 0 | 0 | 1802 | 0 | 0 | 1820 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.802 |  |  | 0.711 |  |  | 0.589 |  |  | 0.859 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1422 | 0 | 0 | 1282 | 0 | 0 | 1077 | 0 | 0 | 1573 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 67 | 206 | 152 | 100 | 254 | 112 | 208 | 366 | 89 | 80 | 514 | 86 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 425 | 0 | 0 | 466 | 0 | 0 | 663 | 0 | 0 | 680 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 12.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 17.7 | 17.7 |  | 17.1 | 17.1 |  | 12.4 | 12.4 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 45.0 | 45.0 |  | 70.0 | 70.0 |  | 70.0 | 70.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 39.1\% | 39.1\% |  | 39.1\% | 39.1\% |  | 60.9\% | 60.9\% |  | 60.9\% | 60.9\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 39.3 | 39.3 |  | 39.9 | 39.9 |  | 64.6 | 64.6 |  | 65.2 | 65.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.7 | 4.7 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) |  | -0.7 |  |  | -0.1 |  |  | -0.4 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | Min | Min |  | Min | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 40.0 |  |  | 40.0 |  |  | 65.0 |  |  | 65.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.35 |  |  | 0.35 |  |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.57 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio |  | 0.86 |  |  | 1.05 |  |  | 1.09 |  |  | 0.76 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 53.5 |  |  | 92.9 |  |  | 89.7 |  |  | 26.3 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 53.5 |  |  | 92.9 |  |  | 89.7 |  |  | 26.3 |  |
| LOS |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 53.5 |  |  | 92.9 |  |  | 89.7 |  |  | 26.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |


| Lane Group | EBL | $\rightarrow$ |  | WBL | - WBT |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ NBT | NBR |  | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) |  | 291 |  |  | $\sim 375$ |  |  | $\sim 553$ |  |  | 366 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) |  | \#473 |  |  | \#580 |  |  | \#880 |  |  | 534 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) |  | 494 |  |  | 445 |  |  | 608 |  |  | 889 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio |  | 0.86 |  |  | 1.05 |  |  | 1.09 |  |  | 0.76 |  |

Intersection Summary
Area Type: Other

Cycle Length: 115
Actuated Cycle Length: 115
Natural Cycle: 80
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.09
Intersection Signal Delay: 64.2
Intersection Capacity Utilization 111.0\%
Intersection LOS: E

Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT | 4 WBR | 4 NBL | 4 NBT | NBR |  | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{*}$ | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 75 | 243 | 198 | 46 | 104 | 37 | 84 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 44 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 75 | 243 | 198 | 46 | 104 | 37 | 84 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 44 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 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 |  | 0.933 |  |  | 0.961 |  |  | 0.979 |  |  | 0.987 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.991 |  |  | 0.990 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1738 | 0 | 1770 | 1790 | 0 | 0 | 1807 | 0 | 0 | 1820 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.796 |  |  | 0.754 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1738 | 0 | 1770 | 1790 | 0 | 0 | 1452 | 0 | 0 | 1386 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 83 | 270 | 220 | 51 | 116 | 41 | 93 | 364 | 82 | 103 | 371 | 49 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 83 | 490 | 0 | 51 | 157 | 0 | 0 | 539 | 0 | 0 | 523 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 17.7 |  | 14.0 | 17.1 |  | 12.4 | 12.4 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 43.0 |  | 15.0 | 43.0 |  | 57.0 | 57.0 |  | 57.0 | 57.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 13.0\% | 37.4\% |  | 13.0\% | 37.4\% |  | 49.6\% | 49.6\% |  | 49.6\% | 49.6\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 8.0 | 37.3 |  | 8.0 | 37.9 |  | 51.6 | 51.6 |  | 52.2 | 52.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.0 | 4.7 |  | 5.0 | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 1.0 |  | 2.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 | -0.7 |  | -2.0 | -0.1 |  |  | -0.4 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 6.0 |  | 3.0 | 6.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | Min |  | None | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.8 | 31.9 |  | 10.6 | 31.7 |  |  | 40.8 |  |  | 40.8 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.11 | 0.34 |  | 0.11 | 0.34 |  |  | 0.43 |  |  | 0.43 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.41 | 0.84 |  | 0.26 | 0.26 |  |  | 0.86 |  |  | 0.87 |  |
| Control Delay | 54.6 | 46.2 |  | 51.1 | 28.2 |  |  | 41.3 |  |  | 43.5 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 54.6 | 46.2 |  | 51.1 | 28.2 |  |  | 41.3 |  |  | 43.5 |  |


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | - WBT | $4$ <br> WBR | 4 | $\uparrow$ NBT | NBR |  | $\downarrow$ SBT | ¢ SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | D | D |  | D | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 47.4 |  |  | 33.8 |  |  | 41.3 |  |  | 43.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 56 | 310 |  | 33 | 78 |  |  | 330 |  |  | 323 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 113 | \#521 |  | 77 | 140 |  |  | \#539 |  |  | \#535 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 210 | 785 |  | 210 | 808 |  |  | 864 |  |  | 825 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.40 | 0.62 |  | 0.24 | 0.19 |  |  | 0.62 |  |  | 0.63 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 115
Actuated Cycle Length: 94.5
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.87
Intersection Signal Delay: 43.0
Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 78.8\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow \underset{\text { EBT }}{\rightarrow}$ |  | WBL | ↔- WBT | 4 <br> WBR | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR |  | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 63 | 197 | 153 | 90 | 248 | 101 | 215 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 83 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 63 | 197 | 153 | 90 | 248 | 101 | 215 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 83 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 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 |  | 0.934 |  |  | 0.957 |  |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.982 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.983 |  |  | 0.994 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1740 | 0 | 1770 | 1783 | 0 | 0 | 1800 | 0 | 0 | 1818 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |  | 0.569 |  |  | 0.856 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1740 | 0 | 1770 | 1783 | 0 | 0 | 1042 | 0 | 0 | 1566 | 0 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 70 | 219 | 170 | 100 | 276 | 112 | 239 | 366 | 89 | 80 | 514 | 92 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 70 | 389 | 0 | 100 | 388 | 0 | 0 | 694 | 0 | 0 | 686 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 4 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 12.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 17.7 |  | 14.0 | 17.1 |  | 12.4 | 12.4 |  | 11.8 | 11.8 |  |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 28.0 |  | 15.0 | 28.0 |  | 72.0 | 72.0 |  | 72.0 | 72.0 |  |
| Total Split (\%) | 13.0\% | 24.3\% |  | 13.0\% | 24.3\% |  | 62.6\% | 62.6\% |  | 62.6\% | 62.6\% |  |
| Maximum Green (s) | 8.0 | 22.3 |  | 8.0 | 22.9 |  | 66.6 | 66.6 |  | 67.2 | 67.2 |  |
| Yellow Time (s) | 5.0 | 4.7 |  | 5.0 | 4.1 |  | 4.1 | 4.1 |  | 3.8 | 3.8 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 2.0 | 1.0 |  | 2.0 | 1.0 |  | 1.3 | 1.3 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -2.0 | -0.7 |  | -2.0 | -0.1 |  |  | -0.4 |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |  | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes |  | Yes | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 6.0 |  | 3.0 | 6.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Minimum Gap (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |
| Time Before Reduce (s) | 0.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 15.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Time To Reduce (s) | 0.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Recall Mode | None | Min |  | None | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 9.8 | 23.0 |  | 9.9 | 25.9 |  |  | 67.0 |  |  | 67.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.09 | 0.20 |  | 0.09 | 0.23 |  |  | 0.58 |  |  | 0.58 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.47 | 1.12 |  | 0.66 | 0.97 |  |  | 1.14 |  |  | 0.75 |  |
| Control Delay | 60.7 | 126.5 |  | 72.0 | 83.2 |  |  | 107.8 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 60.7 | 126.5 |  | 72.0 | 83.2 |  |  | 107.8 |  |  | 24.4 |  |


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | - WBT | 4 <br> WBR | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR |  | $\downarrow$ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOS | E | F |  | E | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 116.5 |  |  | 80.9 |  |  | 107.8 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 50 | $\sim 332$ |  | 73 | ~323 |  |  | $\sim 602$ |  |  | 357 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 98 | \#524 |  | \#148 | \#515 |  |  | \#831 |  |  | 520 |  |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 153 | 348 |  | 153 | 401 |  |  | 607 |  |  | 913 |  |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.46 | 1.12 |  | 0.65 | 0.97 |  |  | 1.14 |  |  | 0.75 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 115
Actuated Cycle Length: 114.9
Natural Cycle: 150
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.14
Intersection Signal Delay: 79.3
Intersection LOS: E
Intersection Capacity Utilization 109.7\% ICU Level of Service H
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT | + WBR | $\stackrel{4}{\text { NBL }}$ | ¢ ${ }_{\text {NBT }}$ | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{ }$ | SBL | $\dagger$ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 86 | 261 | 226 | 46 | 109 | 37 | 93 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 48 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 86 | 261 | 226 | 46 | 109 | 37 | 93 | 328 | 74 | 93 | 334 | 48 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 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 |  | 0.930 |  |  | 0.962 |  |  | 0.972 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1732 | 0 | 1770 | 1792 | 0 | 1770 | 1811 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1732 | 0 | 1770 | 1792 | 0 | 1770 | 1811 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 96 | 290 | 251 | 51 | 121 | 41 | 103 | 364 | 82 | 103 | 371 | 53 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 96 | 541 | 0 | 51 | 162 | 0 | 103 | 446 | 0 | 103 | 371 | 53 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA | pm+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 38.0 |  | 15.0 | 38.0 |  | 26.0 | 50.0 |  | 17.0 | 41.0 | 15.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 12.5\% | 31.7\% |  | 12.5\% | 31.7\% |  | 21.7\% | 41.7\% |  | 14.2\% | 34.2\% | 12.5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 8.0 | 31.0 |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  | 19.0 | 43.0 |  | 10.0 | 34.0 | 8.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 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 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -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 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | 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 |
| Recall Mode | None | Min |  | None | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 10.2 | 34.9 |  | 10.1 | 30.1 |  | 13.8 | 32.8 |  | 11.6 | 30.6 | 46.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.10 | 0.34 |  | 0.10 | 0.30 |  | 0.14 | 0.32 |  | 0.11 | 0.30 | 0.46 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.54 | 0.91 |  | 0.29 | 0.30 |  | 0.43 | 0.76 |  | 0.51 | 0.66 | 0.07 |
| Control Delay | 61.7 | 58.0 |  | 53.7 | 32.6 |  | 50.6 | 41.5 |  | 57.6 | 39.3 | 19.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 61.7 | 58.0 |  | 53.7 | 32.6 |  | 50.6 | 41.5 |  | 57.6 | 39.3 | 19.1 |
| LOS | E | E |  | D | C |  | D | D |  | E | D | B |
| Approach Delay |  | 58.5 |  |  | 37.6 |  |  | 43.2 |  |  | 40.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |


| Lane Group | 4 EBL | $\rightarrow$ |  | WBL | - WBT |  | 4 NBL | $\uparrow$ NBT | NBR | ¢ SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 65 | $\sim 402$ |  | 34 | 86 |  | 67 | 284 |  | 69 | 227 | 21 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#149 | \#706 |  | 80 | 163 |  | 128 | 401 |  | 138 | 352 | 49 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 184 | 595 |  | 184 | 615 |  | 386 | 848 |  | 221 | 704 | 725 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.52 | 0.91 |  | 0.28 | 0.26 |  | 0.27 | 0.53 |  | 0.47 | 0.53 | 0.07 |

Intersection Summary
Area Type:
Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 101.4
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.91
Intersection Signal Delay: $47.0 \quad$ Intersection LOS: D
Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.6\% ICU Level of Service D
Analysis Period (min) 15
~ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


| Lane Group | - EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | $\leftarrow$ WBT | 4 WBR | 4 | ¢ NBT | $\underset{\text { NBR }}{ }$ | SBL | ¢ SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\dagger$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 70 | 209 | 171 | 90 | 267 | 101 | 246 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 96 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 70 | 209 | 171 | 90 | 267 | 101 | 246 | 329 | 80 | 72 | 463 | 96 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 250 |  | 0 | 250 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 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 |  | 0.932 |  |  | 0.959 |  |  | 0.971 |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1770 | 1736 | 0 | 1770 | 1786 | 0 | 1770 | 1809 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1770 | 1736 | 0 | 1770 | 1786 | 0 | 1770 | 1809 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Right Turn on Red |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance ( ft ) |  | 1174 |  |  | 1039 |  |  | 1284 |  |  | 1091 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.5 |  |
| 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) | 78 | 232 | 190 | 100 | 297 | 112 | 273 | 366 | 89 | 80 | 514 | 107 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 78 | 422 | 0 | 100 | 409 | 0 | 273 | 455 | 0 | 80 | 514 | 107 |
| Turn Type | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA | pm+ov |
| Protected Phases | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 14.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 |  | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 21.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 |  | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 15.0 | 38.0 |  | 15.0 | 38.0 |  | 26.0 | 50.0 |  | 17.0 | 41.0 | 15.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 12.5\% | 31.7\% |  | 12.5\% | 31.7\% |  | 21.7\% | 41.7\% |  | 14.2\% | 34.2\% | 12.5\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 8.0 | 31.0 |  | 8.0 | 31.0 |  | 19.0 | 43.0 |  | 10.0 | 34.0 | 8.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 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 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | -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 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag |  | Lead | Lag | Lead |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | 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 |
| Recall Mode | None | Min |  | None | Min |  | None | None |  | None | None | None |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 9.8 | 31.6 |  | 9.9 | 31.8 |  | 20.6 | 47.3 |  | 11.2 | 34.8 | 49.6 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.08 | 0.27 |  | 0.08 | 0.27 |  | 0.18 | 0.40 |  | 0.10 | 0.30 | 0.42 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.53 | 0.90 |  | 0.67 | 0.85 |  | 0.88 | 0.62 |  | 0.47 | 0.93 | 0.16 |
| Control Delay | 66.1 | 65.0 |  | 74.9 | 57.7 |  | 76.2 | 34.1 |  | 60.8 | 64.9 | 22.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 66.1 | 65.0 |  | 74.9 | 57.7 |  | 76.2 | 34.1 |  | 60.8 | 64.9 | 22.0 |
| LOS | E | E |  | E | E |  | E | C |  | E | E | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 65.2 |  |  | 61.1 |  |  | 49.9 |  |  | 57.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |


| Lane Group | ¢ EBL | $\rightarrow$ | EBR | WBL | - WBT |  | 4 | 4 NBT | NBR | SBL | t SBT | $\stackrel{\downarrow}{\text { SBR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 59 | 314 |  | 77 | 298 |  | 208 | 292 |  | 59 | 385 | 50 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 112 | \#495 |  | \#157 | \#462 |  | \#363 | 411 |  | 112 | \#591 | 89 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1094 |  |  | 959 |  |  | 1204 |  |  | 1011 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 151 | 491 |  | 151 | 505 |  | 318 | 732 |  | 182 | 574 | 674 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.52 | 0.86 |  | 0.66 | 0.81 |  | 0.86 | 0.62 |  | 0.44 | 0.90 | 0.16 |

Intersection Summary
Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 120
Actuated Cycle Length: 117
Natural Cycle: 90
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.93
Intersection Signal Delay: 57.7
Intersection Capacity Utilization 81.9\%
Analysis Period (min) 15
\# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.
Splits and Phases: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1


## APPENDIX E

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS OLD US HIGHWAY 1 <br> \& <br> SITE DRIVE 1

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{4}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{T}$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 478 | 219 | 13 | 38 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 478 | 219 | 13 | 38 | 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 | - | - | - | 50 | 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 | 531 | 243 | 14 | 42 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  | Minor2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 257 | 0 | - | 0 | 782 | 243 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 243 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 539 | - |
| 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 | 1308 | - | - | - | 363 | 796 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 797 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 585 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1308 | - | - | - | 362 | 796 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 362 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 794 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0 | 15.7 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | $C$ |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1308 | - | - | -382 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | -0.122 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | 0 | - | -15.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |
| C | 0.4 |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 388 | 503 | 43 | 25 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 388 | 503 | 43 | 25 | 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 | - | - | - | 50 | 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 | 431 | 559 | 48 | 28 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 607 | 0 | - | 0 | 998 | 559 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 559 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 439 | - |
| 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 | 971 | - | - | - | 270 | 529 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 572 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 650 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 971 | - | - | - | 269 | 529 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 269 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 569 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 650 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0 | 19 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 971 | - | - | - | 289 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.005 | - | - | - | 0.111 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0 | - | - | 19 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - | 0.4 |



| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 277 | 0 | - | 0 | 865 | 263 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 263 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 602 | - |
| 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 | 1286 | - | - | - | 324 | 776 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 781 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 547 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1286 | - | - | - | 322 | 776 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 322 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 777 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 547 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0 | 17.2 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | $C$ |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1286 | - | - | -341 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | -0.137 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | 0 | - | -17.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - |
| CO |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |
|  | 0.5 |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | P | $\mathbf{P}$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 425 | 566 | 43 | 25 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 425 | 566 | 43 | 25 | 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 | - | - | - | 50 | 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 | 472 | 629 | 48 | 28 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 677 | 0 | - | 0 | 1109 | 629 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 629 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 480 | - |
| 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 | 915 | - | - | - | 232 | 482 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 531 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 622 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 915 | - | - | - | 231 | 482 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 231 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 528 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0 | 21.6 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 915 | - | - | -249 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.005 | - | - | -0.129 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9 | 0 | - | -21.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |
| C | 0.4 |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX F

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS OLD US HIGHWAY 1 <br> \& <br> SITE DRIVE 2

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{-}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{T}$ | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 444 | 207 | 12 | 34 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 444 | 207 | 12 | 34 | 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 | - | - | - | 50 | 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 | 493 | 230 | 13 | 38 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |  | Minor2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 243 | 0 | - | 0 | 731 | 230 |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 230 | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 501 | - |  |  |  |
| 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 | 1323 | - | - | - | 389 | 809 |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 808 | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 609 | - |  |  |  |
| Platoon locked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1323 | - | - | - | 387 | 809 |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 387 | - |  |  |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 805 | - |  |  |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0 | 14.8 |
| HCM LOS |  | $B$ |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1323 | - | - | -409 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | -0.103 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.7 | 0 | - | -14.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |
| B | 0.3 |  |  |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 501 | 225 | 12 | 34 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 501 | 225 | 12 | 34 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Fr | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized |  | None | - | None |  | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 50 | 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 | 557 | 250 | 13 | 38 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 263 | 0 | - | 0 | 815 | 250 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 250 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 565 | - |
| 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 | 1301 | - | - | - | 347 | 789 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 792 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 569 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1301 | - | - | - | 346 | 789 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 346 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 789 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 569 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0 | 16 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | $C$ |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1301 | - | - | -368 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.003 | - | - | -0.115 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 7.8 | 0 | - | -16 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - |
| Co |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - |
| C | 0.4 |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 4 | 402 | 527 | 39 | 23 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 4 | 402 | 527 | 39 | 23 | 4 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Fr | ree | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized |  | None | - | None |  | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | 50 | 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 | 447 | 586 | 43 | 26 | 4 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 629 | 0 | - | 0 | 1041 | 586 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 586 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 455 | - |
| 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 | 953 | - | - | - | 255 | 510 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 556 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 639 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 953 | - | - | - | 253 | 510 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 253 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 553 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 639 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0.1 | 0 | 19.8 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 953 | - | - | - | 273 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.005 | - | - | -0.11 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.8 | 0 | - | -19.8 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | - | - | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0 | - | - | - | 0.4 |

## APPENDIX G

## SIMTRAFFIC QUEUING REPORTS

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 111 | 110 | 332 | 233 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 50 | 47 | 126 | 84 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 97 | 88 | 255 | 146 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1134 | 1004 | 1249 | 1051 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Network Summary
Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 132 | 149 | 614 | 377 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 54 | 81 | 193 | 154 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 96 | 127 | 432 | 295 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1134 | 1004 | 1249 | 1051 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Network Summary
Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 306 | 221 | 1224 | 767 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 135 | 75 | 505 | 406 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 229 | 165 | 1130 | 797 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1134 | 1004 | 1249 | 1051 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Network Summary
Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 399 | 381 | 1312 | 1103 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 127 | 185 | 1266 | 633 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 247 | 330 | 1282 | 1301 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1134 | 1004 | 1249 | 1051 |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  |  | 100 | 39 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Network Summary
Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement |  | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| M | SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Directions Served | L | TR | L | TR | L | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 350 | 1129 | 113 | 190 | 200 | 482 | 250 | 283 | 65 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 172 | 518 | 35 | 72 | 92 | 226 | 58 | 156 | 19 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 427 | 1013 | 83 | 144 | 185 | 410 | 130 | 261 | 53 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1114 |  | 997 |  | 1242 |  | 1040 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 |  | 250 |  | 100 |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 47 |  |  | 4 | 37 | 0 | 11 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 37 |  |  | 17 | 30 | 0 | 15 |  |

## Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 100

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| DB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |  |
| Directions Served | L | TR | L | TR | L | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 350 | 834 | 350 | 428 | 200 | 433 | 250 | 1074 | 250 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 110 | 295 | 84 | 244 | 144 | 253 | 141 | 611 | 101 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 319 | 619 | 181 | 373 | 233 | 411 | 311 | 1246 | 271 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1114 |  | 997 |  | 1242 |  | 1040 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (ven) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 |  | 250 |  | 100 |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 25 |  | 12 | 21 | 40 |  | 55 | 0 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 17 |  | 11 | 89 | 81 |  | 89 | 0 |

## Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 286

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 408 | 91 | 1301 | 928 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 164 | 52 | 894 | 401 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 302 | 91 | 1545 | 737 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1106 | 1004 | 1249 | 1051 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  | 43 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 23 | 41 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 8 | 32 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 935 | 953 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 22 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 31 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1153 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
|  |  |
| Network Summary |  |

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 349 | 517 | 1283 | 1103 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 156 | 207 | 1263 | 673 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 279 | 361 | 1273 | 1207 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1106 | 1004 | 1249 | 1051 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  | 100 | 23 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | :---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 17 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 21 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 953 |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 24 | 22 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 12 | 32 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1076 | 1153 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | TR | L | TR | L | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 350 | 853 | 114 | 191 | 200 | 393 | 249 | 517 | 51 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 192 | 481 | 33 | 71 | 88 | 238 | 68 | 187 | 19 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 435 | 761 | 80 | 133 | 197 | 370 | 148 | 373 | 49 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1086 |  | 997 |  | 1242 |  | 1040 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 |  | 250 |  | 100 |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 60 |  |  | 0 | 41 | 1 | 15 |  |

Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 53 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 17 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 37 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 972 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

## Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 50 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 24 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 46 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1068 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Network Summary |  |

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | TR | L | TR | L | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 350 | 487 | 349 | 442 | 200 | 637 | 250 | 1103 | 250 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 79 | 237 | 61 | 212 | 167 | 275 | 112 | 791 | 145 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 213 | 418 | 168 | 355 | 232 | 471 | 273 | 1348 | 331 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1086 |  | 997 |  | 1242 |  | 1040 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 |  | 250 |  | 100 |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 14 |  | 7 | 35 | 41 |  | 64 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 10 |  | 6 | 146 | 101 |  | 108 |  |

Intersection: 2: OId US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 26 | 36 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 10 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 12 | 27 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 996 | 972 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 73 | 50 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 9 | 17 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 41 | 41 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1064 | 1068 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 371

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 510 | 334 | 476 | 530 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 302 | 152 | 186 | 228 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 450 | 289 | 324 | 456 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1106 | 1004 | 1249 | 1051 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 22 | 17 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 8 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 8 | 21 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 935 | 953 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 51 | 47 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 14 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 17 | 37 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1076 | 1153 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 823 | 1038 | 1301 | 713 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 440 | 975 | 1265 | 356 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 735 | 1169 | 1279 | 602 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1106 | 1004 | 1249 | 1051 |
| Upstream BIk Time (\%) |  | 77 | 97 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 | 0 |  |

Storage Bay Dist (ft)
Storage BIk Time (\%)
Queuing Penalty (veh)
Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 42 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 9 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 26 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 953 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 53 | 42 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 8 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 18 | 28 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1076 | 1153 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 0

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| Directions Served | TR | L | TR | LTR | LTR |  |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 350 | 619 | 73 | 148 | 1004 | 1108 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 101 | 329 | 29 | 61 | 319 | 514 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 295 | 554 | 64 | 122 | 706 | 1083 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1105 |  | 1003 | 1242 | 1045 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 |  | 250 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 33 |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 25 |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 51 | 40 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 17 | 34 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 935 | 952 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 22 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 31 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1153 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Network Summary |  |

[^0]Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | EB | B4 | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | TR | T | L | TR | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 350 | 1213 | 458 | 350 | 937 | 1294 | 834 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 162 | 689 | 29 | 210 | 516 | 1261 | 283 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 410 | 1379 | 147 | 435 | 867 | 1279 | 533 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1105 | 436 |  | 1003 | 1242 | 1045 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  | 20 | 0 |  |  | 96 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 80 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 |  |  | 250 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 59 |  | 2 | 62 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 38 |  | 7 | 56 |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 53 | 17 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 18 | 20 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 935 | 952 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 24 | 22 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 1 | 15 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 8 | 32 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1076 | 1153 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

## Network Summary

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 182

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | TR | L | TR | L | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 350 | 963 | 113 | 130 | 200 | 356 | 250 | 437 | 250 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 223 | 563 | 38 | 57 | 73 | 212 | 83 | 224 | 26 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 464 | 849 | 87 | 108 | 157 | 328 | 174 | 384 | 104 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1086 |  | 997 |  | 1242 |  | 1040 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 |  | 250 |  | 100 |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage BIk Time (\%) |  | 68 |  |  | 1 | 36 | 3 | 21 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 59 |  |  | 4 | 34 | 11 | 30 |  |

Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | SB |
| :--- | ---: |
| Directions Served | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 39 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 17 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 34 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 972 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |

Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 70 | 49 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 4 | 24 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 31 | 48 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1064 | 1068 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 139

Intersection: 1: New-Hill Holleman Road/New-Hill Olive Chapel Road \& Old US Highway 1

| Movement | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | NB | SB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | TR | L | TR | L | TR | L | T | R |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 350 | 472 | 349 | 456 | 200 | 444 | 250 | 948 | 250 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 84 | 228 | 75 | 228 | 175 | 269 | 88 | 486 | 131 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 217 | 376 | 212 | 368 | 228 | 383 | 232 | 844 | 302 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 1086 |  | 997 |  | 1242 |  | 1040 |  |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 250 |  | 250 |  | 100 |  | 150 |  | 150 |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 9 |  | 10 | 46 | 31 |  | 55 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 6 |  | 10 | 191 | 76 |  | 92 |  |

Intersection: 2: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 1

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 26 | 36 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 2 | 9 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 13 | 24 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 996 | 972 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: Old US Highway 1 \& Site Drive 2

| Movement | EB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LT | LR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 53 | 47 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 4 | 17 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 23 | 41 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1064 | 1068 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Network Summary |  |  |

Network wide Queuing Penalty: 374

## APPENDIX H

## TURN LANE WARRANT CHARTS




## Planning Board Report to Town Council

Rezoning Case: 22 cz09 Utiey Farms PuD
Plenting Boaid Neetil: Datc octoser 10, 20p2

## Report Requirements:

Per NCGS §160D-604(b), all proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance or zoning map shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review and comment. If no written report is received from the Planning Board within 30 days of referral of the amendment to the Planning Board, the Town Council may act on the amendment without the Planning Board report. The Town Council is not bound by the recommendations, if any, of the Planning Board.

Per NCGS §160D-604(d), the Planning Board shall advise and comment on whether the proposed action is consistent with all applicable officially adopted plans, and provide a written recommendation to the Town Council that addresses plan consistency and other matters as deemed appropriate by the Planning Board, but a comment by the Planning Board that a proposed amendment is inconsistent with the officially adopted plans shall not preclude consideration or approval of the proposed amendment by the Town Council.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Acreage:
$\pm 56.59$ acres
PIN(s): $\quad 0710714843 \& 0710736732$

Current Zoning: Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W) \& Wake County Residential-80W (R-80W)
Proposed Zoning: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)

2045 Land Use Map: Low Density Residential \& Low Density Residential/Office Employment

Town Limits: Currently in Wake County jurisdiction; to be annexed with rezoning

## Applicable Officially Adopted Plans:

The Board must state whether the project is consistent or inconsistent with the following officially adopted plans, if applicable. Applicable plans have a check mark next to them.

$\square$
Inconsistent

Reason: $\qquad$
$\checkmark$ Apex Transportation Plan
$\square$ Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent
Reason: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\square$ Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Greenways Plan
$\square$ Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent Reason: $\qquad$

## Legislative Considerations:

The applicant shall propose site-specific standards and conditions that take into account the following considerations, which are considerations that are relevant to the legislative determination of whether or not the proposed conditional zoning district rezoning request is in the public interest. These considerations do not exclude the legislative consideration of any other factor that is relevant to the public interest.

1. Consistency with 2045 Land Use Plan. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's appropriateness for its proposed location and consistency with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the 2045 Land Use Plan.
$\square$ ConsistentInconsistent
Reason:
$\qquad$
2. Compatibility. The proposed Conditional Zoning ( $C Z$ ) District use's appropriateness for its proposed location and compatibility with the character of surrounding land uses.
$\square$ Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent Reason: $\qquad$
3. Zoning district supplemental standards. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's compliance with Sec. 4.4 Supplemental Standards, if applicable.
$\square$ Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent Reason: $\qquad$
4. Design minimizes adverse impact. The design of the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's minimization of adverse effects, including visual impact of the proposed use on adjacent lands; and avoidance of significant adverse impacts on surrounding lands regarding trash, traffic, service delivery, parking and loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration and not create a nuisance.
$\qquad$
$\checkmark$ Consistent
Inconsistent
Reason:
5. Design minimizes environmental impact. The proposed Conditional Zoning District use's minimization of environmental impacts and protection from significant deterioration of water and air resources, wildlife habitat, scenic resources, and other natural resources.
$\qquad$
Reason:

Planning Board report To Town Councll
Rezoning Case: 22CZ09 Utley Farms PUD
Phmin: Boaro Meeting Datce October 10, 2022

6. Impact on public facilities. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's avoidance of having adverse impacts on public facilities and services, including roads, potable water and wastewater facilities, parks, schools, police, fire and EMS facilities.


Inconsistent
Reason: $\qquad$
7. Health, safety, and welfare. The proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use's effect on the health, safety, or welfare of the residents of the Town or its ETJ.

- Consistent
Inconsistent
Reason: $\qquad$

8. Detrimental to adjacent properties. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use is substantially detrimental to adjacent properties.
$\square$ Consistent
Inconsistent

Reason: $\qquad$
9. Not constitute nuisance or hazard. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use constitutes a nuisance or hazard due to traffic impact or noise, or because of the number of persons who will be using the Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use.
$\square$ Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent Reason: $\qquad$
10. Other relevant standards of this Ordinance. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use complies with all standards imposed on it by all other applicable provisions of this Ordinance for use, layout, and general development characteristics.

Reason: $\qquad$

# PLANNING BOARD REPORT TO TOWN COUNCIL 

Rezoning Case: 22Cz09 Utiey Farms PuD


## Planning Board Recommendation:

Motion:
To recommend approval as presented.

Introduced by Planning Board member: Ryan Akers
Seconded by Planning Board member: Tina ShermanApproval: the project is consistent with all applicable officially adopted plans and the applicable legislative considerations listed above.
$\square$ Approval with conditions: the project is not consistent with all applicable officially adopted plans and/or the applicable legislative considerations as noted above, so the following conditions are recommended to be included in the project in order to make it fully consistent:

As presented.

Denial: the project is not consistent with all applicable officially adopted plans and/or the applicable legislative considerations as noted above.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { With } 7 \text { Planning Board Member(s) voting "aye" } \\
& \text { With } 0 \text { Planning Board Member(s) voting "no" }
\end{aligned}
$$

Reasons for dissenting votes:

This report reflects the recommendation of the Planning Board, this the 10 th


Reginald Skinner, Planning Board Chair

Dianne Khin
Digitally signed by Dianne Khin Date: 2022.10.10 17:52:11 $-04^{\prime} 00^{\prime}$

Dianne Khin, Director of Planning and Community Development

TOWN OF APEX
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
POST OFFICE BOX 250
APEX, NORTH CAROLINA 27502
PHONE 919-249-3426
CONDITIONAL ZONING \#22CZO9
Utley Farms PUD

Pursuant to the provisions of North Carolina General Statutes $\S 160 \mathrm{D}-602$ and to the Town of Apex Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Section 2.2.11, notice is hereby given of public hearings before the Planning Board of the Town of Apex. The purpose of these hearings is to consider the following:

Applicant: Thurm Bowen, KB Homes, Inc. Carolinas Division
Authorized Agents: Jeff Roach, Peak Engineering \& Design
Property Addresses: 3720 Old US 1 Highway and 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road
Acreage: $\pm 56.59$ acres
Property Identification Numbers (PINs): 0710714834 and 0710736732
Current 2045 Land Use Map Designation: Low Density Residential and Low Density/Office Employment
Existing Zoning of Properties: Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W) and Wake County Residential-80W (R-80W)
Proposed Zoning of Properties: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)

Public Hearing Location: Apex Town Hall
Council Chamber, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
73 Hunter Street, Apex, North Carolina

## Planning Board Public Hearing Date and Time: October 10, 2022 4:30 PM

You may attend the meeting in person or view the meeting through the Town's YouTube livestream at: https://www.youtube.com/c/townofapexgov.

If you are unable to attend, you may provide a written statement by email to public.hearing@apexnc.org, or submit it to the clerk of the Planning Board, Jeri Pederson (73 Hunter Street or USPS mail - P.O. Box 250, Apex, NC 27502), at least two business days prior to the Planning Board vote. You must provide your name and address for the record. The written statements will be delivered to the Planning Board prior to their vote. Please include the Public Hearing name in the subject line.

## A separate notice of the Town Council public hearing on this project will be mailed and posted in order to comply with State public notice requirements.



Property owners, tenants, and neighborhood associations within 300 feet of the proposed conditional zoning have been sent this notice via first class mail. All interested parties may submit comments with respect to the application by the means specified above. In addition to the above map, the location of the property may be viewed online at https://maps.raleighnc.gov/imaps. The 2045 Land Use Map may be viewed online at www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/478. You may call 919-249-3426, Department of Planning and Community Development, with questions or for further information. To view the petition and related documents online: https://www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/39388.

## NOTIFICACIÓN PÚBLICA DE AUDIENCIAS PÚBLICAS

ORDENAMIENTO TERRITORIAL CONDICIONAL \#22CZ09
Utley Farms PUD (Desarrollo de Unidad Planificada)

De conformidad con las disposiciones de los Estatutos Generales de Carolina del Norte §160D-602 y con la Sección 2.2.11 de la Ordenanza de Desarrollo Unificado (UDO) del ayuntamiento de Apex, por la presente se notifican las audiencias públicas ante la Junta de Planificación de Apex. El propósito de estas audiencias es considerar lo siguiente:

Solicitante: Thurm Bowen, KB Homes, Inc. Carolinas Division
Agente autorizado: Jeff Roach, Peak Engineering \& Design
Dirección de las propiedades: 3720 Old US 1 Highway and 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road
Superficie: $\pm 56.59$ acres
Números de identificación de las propiedades: 0710714834 and 0710736732
Designación actual en el Mapa de Uso Territorial para 2045: Low Density Residential and Low Density/Office
Employment
Ordenamiento territorial existente de las propiedades: Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W) and Wake County Residential-80W (R-80W)
Ordenamiento territorial propuesto para las propiedades: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)
Lugar de la audiencia pública: Ayuntamiento de Apex
Cámara del Consejo, 2ㅇ piso
73 Hunter Street, Apex, Carolina del Norte

Fecha y hora de la audiencia pública de la Junta de Planificación: 10 de octubre de 2022 4:30 P.M.
Puede asistir a la reunión de manera presencial o seguir la transmisión en directo por YouTube a través del siguiente enlace: https://www.youtube.com/c/townofapexgov.

Si no puede asistir, puede enviar una declaración escrita por correo electrónico a public.hearing@apexnc.org, o presentarla a la secretaría de la Junta de Planificación, Jeri Pederson ( 73 Hunter Street o por correo USPS a P.O. Box 250, Apex, NC 27502), al menos dos días hábiles antes de la votación de la Junta de Planificación. Debe proporcionar su nombre y dirección para que conste en el registro. Las declaraciones escritas se entregarán a la Junta de Planificación antes de la votación. No olvide incluir el nombre de la audiencia pública en el asunto.

De conformidad con los requisitos estatales de notificaciones públicas, se enviará por correo y se publicará por separado una notificación de la audiencia pública del Consejo Municipal sobre este proyecto.

Mapa de las inmediaciones:


Los propietarios, inquilinos y asociaciones de vecinos en un radio de 300 pies del Ordenamiento Territorial Condicional propuesto han recibido esta notificación por correo postal de primera clase. Todas las partes interesadas pueden presentar comentarios sobre la solicitud a través de los medios especificados anteriormente. La ubicación de la propiedad también puede verse aquí: https://maps.raleighnc.gov/imaps. Puede ver el Mapa de Uso Territorial para 2045 aquí: www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/478. Si tiene preguntas o desea obtener más información, puede comunicarse con el Departamento de Planificación y Desarrollo Comunitario al 919-249-3426. Puede ver la solicitud y otros documentos relacionados aquí: https://www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/39388.



# AFFIDAVIT CERTIFYING <br> Public Notification - Written (Mailed) Notice 

Section 2.2.11
Town of Apex Unified Development Ordinance

| Project Name: | Conditional Zoning \#22CZ09 <br> Utley Farms PUD |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Location: | 3720 Old US 1 Highway and 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road |
| Applicant or Authorized Agent: | Therm Bowen, KB Homes, Inc. Carolinas Division |

This is to certify that I, as Director of Planning and Community Development, mailed or caused to have mailed by first class postage for the above mentioned project on September 26, 2022, a notice containing the time and place, location, nature and scope of the application, where additional information may be obtained, and the opportunity for interested parties to be heard, to the property owners and tenants within 300 ' of the land subject to notification. I further certify that I relied on information from the Wake County Tax Assessor and the Town of Apex Master Address Repository provided to me by Town of Apex GIS Staff as to accuracy of the list and accuracy of mailing addresses of property owners and tenants within 300 ' of the land subject to notification.


STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF WAKE

Sworn and subscribed before me,

State and County, this the



My Commission Expires: 6, 6,2027

TOWN OF APEX
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION
POST OFFICE BOX 250
APEX, NORTH CAROLINA 27502
PHONE 919-249-3426

Pursuant to the provisions of North Carolina General Statutes §160D-602 and to the Town of Apex Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Section 2.2.11, notice is hereby given of public hearings before the Town Council of the Town of Apex. The purpose of these hearings is to consider the following:

Applicant: Thurm Bowen, KB Homes, Inc. Carolinas Division
Authorized Agents: Jeff Roach, Peak Engineering \& Design
Property Addresses: 3720 Old US 1 Highway and 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road
Acreage: $\pm 56.59$ acres
Property Identification Numbers (PINs): 0710714834 and 0710736732
Current 2045 Land Use Map Designation: Low Density Residential and Low Density/Office Employment
Existing Zoning of Properties: Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W) and Wake County Residential-80W (R-80W)
Proposed Zoning of Properties: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)

Public Hearing Location: Apex Town Hall
Council Chamber, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
73 Hunter Street, Apex, North Carolina

# Comments received prior to the Planning Board public hearing will not be provided to the Town Council. Separate comments for the Town Council public hearing must be provided by the deadline specified below. 

## Town Council Public Hearing Date and Time: October 25, 2022 6:00 PM

You may attend the meeting in person or view the meeting through the Town's YouTube livestream at: https://www.youtube.com/c/townofapexgov.

If you are unable to attend, you may provide a written statement by email to public.hearing@apexnc.org, or submit it to the Office of the Town Clerk ( 73 Hunter Street or USPS mail - P.O. Box 250, Apex, NC 27502), at least two business days prior to the Town Council vote. You must provide your name and address for the record. The written statements will be delivered to the Town Council members prior to their vote. Please include the Public Hearing name in the subject line.

## Vicinity Map:



Property owners, tenants, and neighborhood associations within 300 feet of the proposed conditional zoning have been sent this notice via first class mail. All interested parties may submit comments with respect to the application by the means specified above. In addition to the above map, the location of the property may be viewed online at https://maps.raleighnc.gov/imaps. The 2045 Land Use Map may be viewed online at www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/478. You may call 919-249-3426, Department of Planning and Community Development, with questions or for further information. To view the petition and related documents online: https://www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/39388.
pUBLIC Notification OF PUBLIC HEARINGS CONDITIONAL ZONING \#22CZO9
 hearings stis to considider the following.
Applicant: Thurm Bowen, KB Homes, Inc. Carolinas Divisio
Authorized Agents: 保f Roact, Peak Engineering \& Design
Property Addresses: 3720 old US 1 Highway and 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road
Acreage: 156.59 acres
Property Identification Numbers (PINs): 0710714834 and 0710736732
Current 2045 Land Use Map Designation: Low Density Residential and Low Density/Office Employment Existing Zoning of Properties: Wake County Residential-40W ( $R$-4OW) and Wake County Residential-8ow ( $R$--sow) Proposed Zoning of Properties: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-(Z)
Public Hearing Location: Apex Town Hall
Council Chambe
${ }_{73}$ Hunter Street, Apeex, North Carolina
Comments received prior to the Planning Board public hearing will not be provided to the Town Council
Separate comments for the Town Council public hearing must be provided by the deadine specified below. Town Council Public Hearing Date and Time: October 25, 2022 6:00 PM You may attend the meeting in person or view the meeting through the Town's You Tube inestream at. hetps///www.youtube com/c/townofapexpov.
If you are unable to attend, you may provide a witten statement by emair to publichearing@ apexnc.org, or submit
it to the office of the Town Clerk (73 Hunter Street or USPS mail -P.O. Box 250, Apex, NC 27502), at least two busines days prior to the Town Council vote. You must provide your name and address for the record. The written statements will be delivered to the Town Council members prior to their vote. Please include the Public Hearing name in th
subject line. Vicinity Map:
 Property owners, tenants, and deceghbochood assocations wathin 300 feet of the proposed cond dional zoning have been sent thy
notice wo first dass mal. All hiterested parties myy submit comments with respect to the appliction by the means specified abowe



Diamene F. Khin, ALCP
Director of Planning
Director of Planning and Community Development

ORDENAMIENTO TERRITORIAL CONDICIONAL \#22CZ09
Utley Farms PUD (Desarrollo de Unidad Planificada)

De conformidad con las disposiciones de los Estatutos Generales de Carolina del Norte §160D-602 y con la Sección 2.2.11 de la Ordenanza de Desarrollo Unificado (UDO) del ayuntamiento de Apex, por la presente se notifican las audiencias públicas ante el Consejo Municipal del Ayuntamiento de Apex. El propósito de estas audiencias es considerar lo siguiente:

Solicitante: Thurm Bowen, KB Homes, Inc. Carolinas Division
Agente autorizado: Jeff Roach, Peak Engineering \& Design
Dirección de las propiedades: 3720 Old US 1 Highway and 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road
Superficie: $\pm 56.59$ acres
Números de identificación de las propiedades: 0710714834 and 0710736732
Designación actual en el Mapa de Uso Territorial para 2045: Low Density Residential and Low Density/Office Employment
Ordenamiento territorial existente de las propiedades: Wake County Residential-40W (R-40W) and Wake County Residential-80W (R-80W)
Ordenamiento territorial propuesto para las propiedades: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)
Lugar de la audiencia pública: Ayuntamiento de Apex
Cámara del Consejo, 2o piso
73 Hunter Street, Apex, Carolina del Norte

Los comentarios recibidos antes de la audiencia pública de la Junta de Planificación no se proporcionarán al Consejo Municipal. Los comentarios para la audiencia pública del Consejo Municipal deben presentarse por separado en el plazo especificado a continuación.

## Fecha y hora de la audiencia pública del Consejo Municipal: 25 de octubre de 2022 6:00 P.M.

Puede asistir a la reunión de manera presencial o seguir la transmisión en directo por YouTube a través del siguiente enlace: https://www.youtube.com/c/townofapexgov.

Si no puede asistir, puede enviar una declaración escrita por correo electrónico a public.hearing@apexnc.org, o presentarla a la oficina del Secretario Municipal (73 Hunter Street o por correo USPS a P.O. Box 250, Apex, NC 27502), al menos dos días hábiles antes de la votación del Consejo Municipal. Debe proporcionar su nombre y dirección para que conste en el registro. Las declaraciones escritas se entregarán al Consejo Municipal antes de la votación. No olvide incluir el nombre de la audiencia pública en el asunto.

Mapa de las inmediaciones:


Los propietarios, inquilinos y asociaciones de vecinos en un radio de 300 pies del Ordenamiento Territorial Condicional propuesto han recibido esta notificación por correo postal de primera clase. Todas las partes interesadas pueden presentar comentarios sobre la solicitud a través de los medios especificados anteriormente. La ubicación de la propiedad también puede verse aquí: https://maps.raleighnc.gov/imaps. Puede ver el Mapa de Uso Territorial para 2045 aquí: www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/478. Si tiene preguntas o desea obtener más información, puede comunicarse con el Departamento de Planificación y Desarrollo Comunitario al 919-249-3426. Puede ver la solicitud y otros documentos relacionados aquí: https://www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/39388.



# AFFIDAVIT CERTIFYING <br> Public Notification - Written (Mailed) Notice 

Section 2.2.11
Town of Apex Unified Development Ordinance

Project Name:<br>Project Location:<br>Conditional Zoning \#22CZ09<br>Utley Farms PUD<br>3720 Old US 1 Highway and 0 New Hill Olive Chapel Road<br>Applicant or Authorized Agent:<br>Thurm Bowen, KB Homes, Inc. Carolinas Division

This is to certify that I , as Director of Planning and Community Development, mailed or caused to have mailed by first class postage for the above mentioned project on October 3, 2022, a notice containing the time and place, location, nature and scope of the application, where additional information may be obtained, and the opportunity for interested parties to be heard, to the property owners and tenants within 300' of the land subject to notification. I further certify that I relied on information from the Wake County Tax Assessor and the Town of Apex Master Address Repository provided to me by Town of Apex GIS Staff as to accuracy of the list and accuracy of mailing addresses of property owners and tenants within 300' of the "land subject to notification.


Director of Planning and Community Development

## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

Sworn and subscribed before me,

## Joshua Killian

 , a Notary Public for the aboveState and County, this the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ ,202 2.



## Student Assignment

5625 Dillard Drive
Email: studentassignment@wcpss.net
June 24, 2022
Dianne Khin, AICP
Director, Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Apex
Dianne.Khin@apexnc.org
Dear Dianne,
The Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) Office of School Assignment received information about a proposed rezoning/development within the Town of Apex planning area. We are providing this letter to share information about WCPSS's capacity related to the proposal. The following information about the proposed rezoning/development was provided through the Wake County Residential Development Notification database:

- Date of application: May 1,2022
- Name of development: 22CZo9 Utley Farms PUD
- Address of rezoning: 3720 Old US 1 Hwy \& o New Hill Olive Chapel Rd (PINs 0710704834 \& 0710736732
- Total number of proposed residential units: 122
- Type(s) of residential units proposed: Single-family detached

Based on the information received at the time of application, the Office of School Assignment is providing the following assessment of possible impacts to the Wake County Public School System:Schools at all grade levels within the current assignment area for the proposed rezoning/development are anticipated to have sufficient capacity for future students.
$\boxtimes$ Schools at the following grade levels within the current assignment area for the proposed rezoning/development are anticipated to have insufficient capacity for future students; transportation to schools outside of the current assignment area should be anticipated:

$$
\begin{array}{llllll}
\boxtimes & \text { Elementary } & \boxtimes & \text { Middle } & \boxtimes & \text { High }
\end{array}
$$

The following mitigation of capacity concerns due to school construction or expansion is anticipated:Not applicable - existing school capacity is anticipated to be sufficient.School expansion or construction within the next five years is not anticipated to address concerns.
$\boxtimes$ School expansion or construction within the next five years may address concerns at these grade levels:
$\begin{array}{llllll}\boxtimes & \text { Elementary } & \boxtimes & \text { Middle } & \boxtimes & \text { High }\end{array}$
Thank you for sharing this information with the Town of Apex Planning Board and Town Council as they consider the proposed rezoning/development.

Sincerely,
Susan W. Pullium

Lauren Staudenmaier
Planner II, Town of Apex
PO Box 250
Apex, NC 27502

## Lauren,

CAP has been working with the developer (KB Homes) and their team for most of 2022 developing a plan to save the Utley-Horton Farmhouse and two contributing outbuildings. A large lot for the house and two outbuildings has been designated for preservation purposes. I have attached the most recent sketch plan that was presented to CAP that satisfies the preservation goals of the property. The developer's intention is to donate the property to CAP, where it will be rehabilitated and protected with a rehabilitation agreement and preservation easement to protect the property in perpetuity.

Sincerely,


Gary G. Roth
President/CEO



[^0]:    Network wide Queuing Penalty: 25

