All property owners within three hundred (300) feet of this rezoning have been notified per UDO Sec. 2.2.11 Public Notification.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

| Location: | $0,7208,7208 \mathrm{~B}$ Morris Acres Road |
| :--- | :--- |
| Applicant/Owner: | Kaplan Residential/Edith S. Morris |
| Agent: | Jason Barron, Morningstar Law Group |

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

| Acreage: | $17.4376 \pm$ acres |
| :--- | :--- |
| PINs: | $0732289587,0732382530, \& 0732382709$ |
| Current Zoning: | Rural Residential (RR) |
| Proposed Zoning: | Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ) |
| Current 2045 Land Use Map: | Medium Density Residential |
| Proposed 2045 Land Use Map: | High Density Residential |
| Town Limits: | 0732382709 is in the ETJ; 0732289587 \& 0732382530 are in Town limits |

Adjacent Zoning \& Land Uses:

|  | Zoning | Land Use |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| North: | Rural Residential (RR); Medium Density- <br> Conditional Use (MD-CU \#94CU01) | Single-family residential; Vacant |
| South: | Planned Unit Development-Conditional <br> Zoning (PUD-CZ \#15CZ22) | Morris Acres Road; Multi-family (Flats @ 540); <br> Single-family residential (Beaver Creek @ 540 <br> Townhomes) |
| East: | Medium Density-Conditional Use <br> (MD-CU \#94CU01); Conservation Buffer (CB) | Single-family residential <br> (Walden Creek); Vacant |
| West: | Rural Residential (RR) | Morris Acres Road; Vacant |

## Existing Conditions:

The subject properties are located on the north side of Morris Acres Road, just east of NC 540. There are several existing structures on the properties related to the historically rural residential setting of these properties.

## Neighborhood Meeting:

The applicant conducted a neighborhood meeting on January 24, 2019. The neighborhood meeting report is attached.

## 2045 LAND USE MAP:

The 2045 Land Use Map identifies the properties subject to this rezoning as Medium Density Residential. The rezoning to Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning, as proposed, is not consistent with the Medium Density Residential classification. Therefore, the applicant is also proposing a 2045 Land Use Map amendment to change the classification to High Density Residential.

This proposed Land Use Map amendment is generally consistent with the Advance Apex staff recommendation (not adopted) for Medium/High Density Residential and High Density Residential classifications in this area. The location is appropriate for such uses due to the proximity to NC 540 Hwy , the adjacent Flats at 540 multi-family
development, Beaver Creek @ 540 townhome development, and proximity to a future transit corridor. The recommended change in land use was not adopted with Advance Apex on February 5, 2019, but there was an understanding that three parcels (Morris Acres, Heelan, and Jenks/Wimberly) which remained unchanged from the 2030 Peak Plan), could be looked at in the future with a site-specific rezoning petition with conditions that could mitigate concerns.

Appropriate transitions from lesser to higher density residential can be achieved in a variety of ways, including stepping up density from lower to higher, transitioning with different housing types, or providing wider landscape buffers between multi-family to single-family homes. It is good practice to look at how an appropriate transition can be done during the rezoning stage as conditions can be added that go above UDO architectural, buffer, and/or RCA standards.

Morris Acres Road is included within Advance Apex's Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Context Area. Transit Oriented Development calls for a mix of land uses including residential, office, retail, civic, and commercial; Medium/High Density Residential to High Density Residential land use; and a transit stop within a quarter- to half-mile radius. TOD typically dictates transit-supportive densities, which is a minimum of seven (7) units per acre for a circulator bus service and a minimum 15 units per acre for fixed route bus service. The Morris Acres PUD proposes an overall density that supports future transit.

Without the proposed 2045 Land Use Map amendment, this site could be rezoned to MD-CZ or PUD-CZ and develop as single-family residential with a likely density of four (4) dwelling units per acre and with a $20^{\prime}$ perimeter buffer required. Townhomes could be a permitted use with a rezoning to PUD-CZ with a density up to seven ( 7 ) units per acre (122 units). Single-family detached and townhome residential development patterns typically require increased infrastructure costs with the need for an internal street network, making it more likely that the existing pasture would be developed either with this parcel or an adjacent parcel.

## PROPOSED ZONING CONDITIONS:

## Limitation of Uses:

The Rezoned Lands 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 and any additional limitations 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.

## Permitted Uses and Limitations:

1. Multi-family or apartment
2. Greenway
3. Recreation Facility, private
4. Park, active
5. Park, passive
6. Utility, minor

## Proposed Design Controls:

1. Maximum Density

The PUD text indicates a maximum residential density for the project of 17.0 dwelling units per acre and no more than 297 total units. Within the proposed 3 -acre Medium Density Transition Area (as depicted on the PUD Preliminary Layout Plan), density shall be limited to 4.0 dwelling units per acre and no more than 12 total units within this area.

## 2. Maximum Height of the Buildings and Number of Stories

Maximum height - Four (4) stories above grade, with a basement level $5^{\text {th }}$ story or 65'.
Buildings within the Medium Density Transition Area shall be no more than three (3) stories with a maximum height of $45^{\prime}$ and shall be townhome-style multi-family units (i.e. side-by-side residences, not flats).
3. Minimum Building Setbacks

- From Building to Building - 10'
- From Buffer/RCA - 10' for Buildings; $5^{\prime}$ for Parking Areas
- From Walden Woods Lots - $150^{\prime}$ from any lot within Walden Woods containing a dwelling unit
- Within the Medium Density Transition Area, no building shall be constructed closer than 275' from the nearest home on Flints Pond Circle.

4. Percentage of Built Upon Area

The UDO allows for a maximum 70\% of built upon area in a PUD project and the Morris Acres PUD will not exceed that amount.
5. Parking

The PUD indicates that parking will be provided per the standards in the UDO which are as follows:

- 1.5 spaces per 1-2 bedroom unit (a minimum of $50 \%$ du shall be one-bedroom units)
- 1.8 spaces per $3+$ bedroom unit (a maximum of $10 \%$ du shall be three-bedroom units)

6. Resource Conservation Area

The PUD is providing at least 29.9\% (5.09 acres) of the total area for Resource Conservation Area and landscape buffers. The minimum RCA required is 20\% (3.49 acres).

The PUD also sets aside 1.77 acres of passive open space in the northeast corner of the subject property in addition to the $29.9 \%$ RCA, which preserves additional land above the minimum required while providing additional separation of development from adjacent single-family residential to the east and vacant land to the north. In this area, no buildings or other structures shall be permitted, with the exception of passive recreational amenities.

## 7. Buffers

| Perimeter Buffers: | Required | Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Western property boundary | $10^{\prime}$ Type B | $30^{\prime}$ Type A |
| Eastern property boundary | $20^{\prime}$ Type B | $50^{\prime}$ Undisturbed |
| Eastern property boundary, abutting <br> Town of Apex property | $10^{\prime}$ Type A | $50^{\prime}$ Type A with 8-ft solid <br> privacy fence* |
| Adjacent to riparian buffers within <br> Medium Density Transition Area | N/A | $10^{\prime}$ evergreen planting strip |
| Southern property boundary | $30^{\prime}$ Type B | $30^{\prime}$ Type A |
| Northern property boundary | $20^{\prime}$ Type B | $20^{\prime}$ Type A |

*The Preliminary Layout Sheet in the PUD plan set indicates that the fence will be located further inside the subject property than the 50 ' buffer along a portion of the eastern property line.


## Architectural Standards:

1. Vinyl siding will not be used except for vinyl windows and limited decorative element use. Residential areas will utilize brick, stone, and Hardi-plank siding.
2. Siding materials will be varied in type and/or color on $30 \%$ of each façade on each building.
3. Windows that are not recessed shall be trimmed. Windows shall vary in size and/or type.
4. Recesses and projections shall be provided for at least $50 \%$ of each facade on each building. Building facades shall have horizontal relief achieved by the use of recesses and projections.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. The rear and side elevations of the units that can be seen from the right-of-way shall have trim around the windows.
8. Additionally, the following conditions shall apply to the building(s) located in the Medium Density Transition Area, as identified on the PUD Preliminary Sheet:
a. The roof of each unit shall be horizontally and/or vertically distinct from any adjacent unit so as to avoid the appearance of a single mass.
b. Front facing garage doors must have windows, decorative details, or carriage-style adornments.
c. Entrances for units with front-facing garage shall have a prominent covered porch/stoop area leading to the front door.
d. The front façade of any front-loaded garage shall not protrude farther than one 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.

Additionally, the following conditions shall also apply:

1. A maximum of 297 residential units shall be permitted upon the property.
2. Along the eastern boundary of the subject property, extending from Morris Acres Road to the southern edge of the riparian buffer around the existing farm pond, the following shall be installed and maintained:
a. A fifty-foot ( $50^{\prime}$ ) Type A vegetative buffer; and
b. An at least eight feet ( $8^{\prime}$ ) tall solid privacy fence. The final location of the fence within the $50^{\prime}$ Type A buffer will be determined at the time of site plan.
3. In the 3.00 acre Medium Density Residential Transition Area as depicted on the Preliminary Layout Plan, the following conditions shall apply:
a. The maximum height for buildings shall be three (3) stories up to a foot height of forty-five feet (45');
b. Only townhome style units (i.e., side-by-side rather than stacked multifamily) may be permitted; and
c. The maximum development density within this area shall be four (4) dwelling units per acre, and no more than 12 dwelling units in total.
4. In the area identified as "Passive Open Space" on the PUD Plan, no buildings or other structures shall be permitted, with the exception of passive recreational amenities.
5. A minimum of fifty percent ( $50 \%$ ) of the dwelling units shall be one-bedroom units, and a maximum of ten percent $(10 \%)$ of the dwelling units shall be three-bedroom units.
6. For a period of at least twenty (20) years from the date of the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, at least five percent (5\%) of the units developed on the site shall be preserved as affordable housing units at 60\% of Wake County's area median income.
7. All buildings constructed on the property shall provide solar conduit for the installation of rooftop solar panels.
8. A $6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ Public Art easement to the Town of Apex shall be provided along the Morris Acres Road frontage of the subject property. The precise location for this easement will be determined at the time of site plan review.

## Pedestrian Connectivity:

The project will provide a $10^{\prime}$ wide side path along the north side of Morris Acres Road, consistent with Bike Apex. An internal pedestrian connection to the preserved Passive Space in the northeast corner of the site is also proposed, as conceptually depicted on the Preliminary Layout Sheet. The pedestrian network will be evaluated during site plan review and shall be consistent with the UDO.

## Public Facilities:

The proposed PUD shall meet all Public Facilities requirements as set forth in UDO Section 2.3.4.F.1.f. Such facilities will 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.

All units within the project will be served by the Town of Apex for water and sanitary sewer. The utility design will be finalized at the time of Major Site Plan review and approval based upon available facilities adjacent to the site at that time. A conceptual utility plan is included in the PUD plan for reference. 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.

This PUD 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 conditions for the 1 year, 10 year, and 25 year 24 -hour storm events.
- This PUD shall convey as much stormwater runoff from the site development as practical, including required Stormwater Control Measures (SCM's), to the existing 48" RCP culvert located in the southeastern corner of the site along Morris Acres Road. The direct storm drainage connection to the existing 48" RCP culvert is subject to final approval by the Town of Apex, NCDOT or any other regulatory agency. In the event that this direct storm drainage connection is not approved, then this PUD shall meet and exceed existing stormwater management requirements for quality and quantity treatment provided in Section 6.1.7 of the UDO, such that post development peak runoff shall not exceed predevelopment peak runoff conditions for the 1 year, 10 year, 25 year, and 100 year 24 -hour storm events.


## APEX TRANSPORTATION PLAN/ACCESS and CIRCULATION:

The proposed PUD is consistent with the Apex Transportation Plan. The proposed PUD includes two (2) points of access onto Morris Acres Road, an existing 3-lane Thoroughfare on the Thoroughfare and Collector Street Plan. This project shall provide minimum frontage widening based on $1 / 2$ of a 3 -lane thoroughfare section with side path and public right-of-way dedication based on an eighty foot ( $80^{\prime}$ ) right-of-way along Morris Acres Road. The site will promote connectivity to undeveloped property with a cross access easement to the north.

Roadway improvements, subject to modification and final approval by the Town of Apex and NCDOT, are part of the site plan and construction plan approval process. A traffic study has been performed as part of this PUD rezoning consistent with the Town's standards for the same. Based upon the traffic impact analysis, the traffic from this development alone will not decrease the current Level of Service (LOS) for any intersection or approach as compared to the land remaining undeveloped and does not warrant off-site road improvements based on the UDO.

Wayfinding measures at the site shall be provided by the applicant in an effort to facilitate the movement of vehicles and pedestrians to and within the development.

Town of Apex staff has requested from NCDOT that the acceleration and deceleration lanes on US 64 for Morris Acres Road be extended to improve traffic flow on and off US 64 and reduce delays, as well as for improved wayfinding signs in the vicinity of Morris Acres Road and US 64.

## MARKET RATE MULTI-FAMILY AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING:

Market rate multi-family statistics in Apex were provided by the Triangle Apartment Association. Based on their most recent numbers:

- Average market rate rent in Apex is \$1,300 per month; up 5.2\% since 2018.
- Average household income of those living in the units is $\$ 122,000$; more than twice as much as the Wake County AMI for an individual and $44.7 \%$ above Wake County AMI for a family of four.
- Rental units are $48 \%$ full at delivery, meaning the buildings are half full the first day the buildings can be occupied.
- Vacancy rate in Apex is 6.2\%; a healthy vacancy rate is $7-8 \%$.
- Highest growth in apartment dwellers in Apex by age range is $55+$ at $35.6 \%$.
- Second highest growth in apartment dwellers by age range is 20-29 at $23.8 \%$.

This data points to the fact that there are not enough market rate apartments in Apex today. The lack of market rate housing only exacerbates the need for affordable housing as the market rate units are taken by those most able to pay rents above the fair market value of the units.

While the Town of Apex does not currently have an affordable housing policy in place, the proposed condition that $5 \%$ of the units be preserved as affordable housing at $60 \%$ of Wake County's Area Median Income (AMI) for 20 years marks the first time a market rate project proposes to provide affordable units. This type of inclusionary zoning by way of rezoning condition is allowed by state law and addresses the Peak Plan 2030 goal for "a variety of housing types available to a range of incomes" which was prioritized in the 2013 Town Counciladopted plan.

The following is recent Wake County data that frames the discussion regarding affordability:

| Wake County AMI | Individual | Family of four |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $100 \%$ | $\$ 59,100$ | $\$ 84,300$ |
| $80 \%$ (workforce) | $\$ 47,280$ | $\$ 67,440$ |
| $70 \%$ | $\$ 41,370$ | $\$ 59,010$ |
| $60 \%$ (affordable) | $\$ 35,460$ | $\$ 50,580$ |

To put these numbers in perspective, the following chart gives the average annual salaries for the Raleigh area:

| Job | Average Annual Salary |
| :--- | :---: |
| WCPSS school teacher $^{1}$ | $\$ 46,178^{2}$ |
| Police officer | $\$ 41,822^{2}$ |
| Entry level bookkeeper | $\$ 34,817^{2}$ |
| City planner | $\$ 45,758^{3}$ |
| Firefighter | $\$ 44,602^{3}$ |
| Administrative assistant | $\$ 39,662^{3}$ |
| Grocery store stock clerk | $\$ 31,855^{3}$ |
| Preschool teacher | $\$ 30,698^{3}$ |

For rents to be considered affordable for a particular household, the household income is divided by 40 to get the per month rental amount. ${ }^{4}$ For example, a WCPSS teacher making the average salary of $\$ 46,178$ could afford $\$ 1,154.45$ in rent by themselves.
${ }^{1}$ Average of elementary, middle, and high school teacher salaries
${ }^{2}$ Payscale.com
${ }^{3}$ Salary.com
${ }^{4}$ Realtor.com

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

The Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Advisory Commission recommended a fee-in-lieu at their May 29, 2019 meeting. If the rezoning is approved, the fee rate will be set based on the date of PUD approval and will be applied to the number of units proposed at the time of Major Site Plan approval.

## PLANNING STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Planning staff recommends approval of the 2045 Land Use Map amendment and Rezoning \#19CZ02 Morris Acres PUD with the conditions offered by the applicant.

## PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Board held a Public Hearing on August 12, 2019 and continued their vote to September 9, 2019 where they opened up public comment on new conditions; they recommended approval of the 2045 Land Use Map Amendment and Rezoning \#19CZO2 by a vote of 4-3. The Planning Board report to Town Council is attached.

## 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:


## 2045 Land Use Map Amendment:

With the conditions offered by the applicant in the PUD document, approval of the 2045 Land Use Map amendment from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential is reasonable. The proposed Land Use Map amendment is generally consistent with the Advance Apex staff recommendation (not previously adopted) for Medium/High Density Residential and High Density Residential classifications in this area. The location is appropriate for the proposed multi-family use and density due to the proximity of NC 540 Hwy , the adjacent Flats at 540 and Beaver Creek @ 540 Townhomes developments, and proximity to a future transit corridor. While staff's recommendation was not adopted with Advance Apex on February 5, 2019, there was an understanding by Council at the time that a LUM amendment could be reviewed for this property in conjunction with a specific rezoning request at a later date.

The associated rezoning includes a 3-acre Medium Density Transition Area on the eastern side of the site, south of the stream and closest to existing single-family residential development. Within this transition area, the density is restricted to four (4) units per acre, building height is limited to three (3) stories ( 45 feet), and the units are required to be constructed to look like side-by-side townhomes, similar to the townhomes located across Morris Acres Road and on the southeast side of the adjacent single-family neighborhood. This area, along with the additional buffer and screening measures, provides the transition in density and building height for this area previously envisioned by staff during Advance Apex.

Furthermore, the Morris Acres PUD provides nearly 10\% additional RCA above the required amount as well as additional passive open space, something that is not typically possible for lower density development to achieve as it spreads outward instead of upward. Without the proposed 2045 Land Use Map amendment, this site would likely develop as a single-family and/or townhome development which typically requires increased infrastructure costs with the need for an internal street network. This makes it more likely that the existing pasture would be developed either with this parcel or an adjacent parcel.

For these reasons, staff supports the proposed 2045 Land Use Map amendment provided it is done in conjunction with a rezoning offering these types of conditions.

## Rezoning \#19Cz02

The proposed rezoning is reasonable and in the public interest because it proposes appropriate land uses and provides an adequate transition in the height and density of the proposed multi-family use from the existing single-family residential development to the east. The provision of a Medium Density Transition Area, with limited densities and a townhome style product, provides the physical transition from the single-family detached neighborhood to the east and from the townhome and multi-family developments to the south. The PUD also sets aside nearly 10\% more Resource Conservation Area (RCA) than required by the UDO plus additional passive open space.

The development potential without the provisions of the Morris Acres PUD may indeed provide a less dense product, but that could serve as a loss to the future transit corridor in this area which demands increased densities to support its existence. Typical single-family or townhome development of the site would likely not preserve the same amount of open space and would permit development utilizing all available land. This PUD provides for a combination of multi-family development and open space while offering a transition in height and density from the existing single-family to the east.

While the Town of Apex does not currently have an affordable housing policy in place, the proposed condition that $5 \%$ of the units be preserved as affordable housing at $60 \%$ of Wake County's Area Median Income (AMI) for 20 years marks the first time a market rate project proposes to provide affordable units. This type of inclusionary zoning by way of rezoning condition is allowed by state law and addresses the Peak Plan 2030 goal for "a variety of housing types available to a range of incomes" which was prioritized in the 2013 Town Counciladopted plan. Providing $5 \%$ of the units at $60 \%$ AMI would serve the public interest by providing affordable housing for first responders, teachers, and other important workers in the community.

## 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-de-sac, 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 two percent (2\%) provided that:
(i) The PD Plan for PUD-CZ includes a non-residential component; or
(ii) The PD Plan for PUD-CZ has an overall density of 6 residential units per acre or more.
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 onsite 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 Planning Board shall find the Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (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.


May 24, 2019

Kevin Dean, PE
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
421 Fayetteville St, Suite 600
Raleigh, NC 27601

## Subject: $\quad$ Staff summary and comments for The Wayforth at Apex TIA and Addendum, 04/30/2019

Mr. Dean:
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 proposes to study access to the development at the following two intersections.

- Morris Acres Road and Reedybrook Crossing/North Site Driveway (unsignalized)
- Morris Acres Road and South Site Driveway (unsignalized)

The following intersections were also studied in the TIA:

- Jenks Road and Morris Acres Road (unsignalized)
- Morris Acres Road and Creekside Landing Drive (signalized)
- Morris Acres Road and US 64 Westbound (unsignalized)


## Trip Generation

The proposed Wayforth at Apex development is anticipated to consist of 300 apartments. The development is anticipated to generate approximately 26 new trips entering and 74 new trips exiting the site during the weekday A.M. peak hour and 77 new trips entering and 50 new trips exiting the site during the P.M. peak hour. The development is expected to add a total of 1,634 new weekday trips to the adjacent roadway network.

TOWN OF APEX

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

## Background traffic

Background traffic consists of 3\% annual background traffic growth compounded to build out year 2022. Additionally 10\% of site trips from the adjacent Beaver Creek Residential development ( 540 Townes) are included in the analysis, as the development was almost entirely built-out at the time this study was completed.

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

The distribution to and from the development are as follows:

- $25 \%$ from the east on US 64
- $25 \%$ from the east on Jenks Road
- $25 \%$ from the west on Jenks Road
- $25 \%$ from the south on Creekside Landing Drive
- $50 \%$ to the east on Jenks Road
- $25 \%$ to the west on US 64
- $15 \%$ to the south on Creekside Landing Drive
- $10 \%$ to the west on Jenks Road


## 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 5 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 2018 - Existing year 2018 traffic.
- No Build 2022 - Projected year (2022) with background growth, and approved development traffic from others.
- Build 2022 - Projected year (2022) with background traffic and site build-out traffic including recommended improvements where applicable.


## Morris Acres Road and Reedybrook Crossing/North Site Driveway (unsignalized)

| Table 1. A.M. / P.M. Unsignalized Peak Hour Levels of Service <br> Morris Acres Road and Reedybrook Crossing/North Site Driveway |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | No Build <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | Build 2022 |
| Overall | NA | NA | NA |
| Eastbound (Reedybrook Crossing) | $A / B^{2}$ | $A / B^{2}$ | $B / B^{2}$ |
| Westbound (North Site Driveway) | $N A$ | $N A$ | $B / B^{2}$ |
| Northbound (Morris Acres Road) | $A / A^{1}$ | $A / A^{1}$ | $A / A^{1}$ |
| Southbound (Morris Acres Road) | $N A$ | $N A$ | $A / A^{1}$ |

1. Level of service for major street left turn movements
2. Level of service for minor street stop controlled approaches

TIA recommendations:

- The TIA recommends construction of a full movement stop-controlled site driveway with one lane of ingress and one lane of egress that aligns with Reedybrook Crossing at Morris Acres Road.

Apex staff recommendations:

- Apex staff agree with the recommendation. All approaches at this intersection are projected to operate at LOS B or better with no operational issues in the build condition. Morris Acres Road already provides a left turn lane both directions at the proposed driveway since it was constructed as a three-lane road.


## Morris Acres Road and South Site Driveway (unsignalized)

| Table 2. A.M. / P.M. Unsignalized Peak Hour Levels of Service <br> Morris Acres Road and South Site Driveway |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | Build 2022 |
| Overall | NA |
| Westbound (South Site Driveway) | $A / B^{2}$ |
| Northbound (Morris Acres Road) | $N A$ |
| Southbound (Morris Acres Road) | $A / A^{1}$ |

1. Level of service for major street left turn movements
2. Level of service for minor street stop controlled approaches

TIA recommendations:

- The TIA recommends construction of a full movement stop-controlled site driveway with one lane of ingress and one lane of egress approximately 500 feet south of Reedybrook Crossing.

Apex staff recommendations:

- Apex staff agree with the recommendation. All approaches at this proposed intersection are projected to operate at LOS B or better with no operational issues in the build condition. Morris Acres Road already provides a left turn lane at the proposed driveway since it was constructed as a three-lane road.


## Jenks Road and Morris Acres Road (unsignalized)

| Table 3. A.M. / P.M. Unsignalized Peak Hour Levels of Service Jenks Road and Morris Acres Road |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No Build } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | Build 2022 |
| Overall | NA | NA | NA |
| Eastbound (Jenks Road) | $N A$ | NA | $N A$ |
| Westbound (Jenks Road) | A/ $A^{1}$ | A / $A^{1}$ | A / $A^{1}$ |
| Northbound (Morris Acres Road) | $B / C^{2}$ | $B / C^{2}$ | $B / C^{2}$ |

1. Level of service for major street left turn movements
2. Level of service for minor street stop controlled approaches

TIA recommendations:

- The TIA does not recommend any improvements at this intersection. All approaches are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better with or without the development.

Apex staff recommendations:

- Apex staff agree with the recommendation. Left turn lanes are already provided on both roadways and no additional turn lanes are recommended.


## Morris Acres Road and Creekside Landing Drive (Signalized)

| Table 4. A.M. / P.M. Signalized Peak Hour Levels of Service <br> Morris Acres Road and Creekside Landing Drive |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing <br> 2018 | No Build <br> 2022 | Build 2022 |
| Overall | A/A | A / A | A / A |
| Eastbound (Reedybrook Crossing) | $A / A$ | $A / A$ | $A / A$ |
| Northbound (Morris Acres Road) | $A / A$ | $A / A$ | $A / A$ |
| Southbound (Morris Acres Road) | $A / A$ | $A / B$ | $A / B$ |

TIA recommendations:

- The TIA does not recommend any improvements at this signalized intersection. All approaches are anticipated to operate at LOS B or better with or without the development.

Apex staff recommendations:

- Apex staff agree with the recommendation. There are already left turn lanes provided on both roadways and no additional turn lanes are recommended.

Morris Acres Road and US 64 Westbound (unsignalized)

| Table 5. A.M. / P.M. Unsignalized Peak Hour Levels of Service <br> Morris Acres Road and US 64 Westbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Existing <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | No Build <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | Build 2022 |
| Overall | NA | NA | NA |
| Westbound (US 64) | $N A$ | $N A$ | NA |
| Southbound (Morris Acres Road) | $D / D^{1}$ | $E / E^{1}$ | $E / E^{1}$ |

1. Level of service for minor street stop controlled approaches

TIA recommendations:

- The TIA does not recommend any improvements at this channelized intersection.

Apex staff recommendations:

- The right-out onto westbound US-64 is anticipated to operate at LOS E with average delays of over 45 seconds per vehicle and $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues of 5 vehicles in both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. Staff concurs with no roadway improvements being
required of this site approval according to the requirements of the UDO. However, the Town or NCDOT should consider future construction of an 800 -foot long acceleration lane with a 300 -foot taper on US 64 and lengthening of the right-turn deceleration lane. Town staff have already submitted these improvements to NCDOT for consideration of funding under one of their grant programs. The acceleration lane will eliminate the stop condition and the delays associated with the stop on Morris Acres Road while the longer deceleration lane will provide improved operations for the exit from US 64.

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. All recommendations are subject to review by Town Council prior to approval.

Sincerely,


Serge Grebenschikov
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 \#:
Fee Paid


Submittal Date:
Check \#


PETITION TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING DISTRICT MAP
Project Name: Morris Acres PUD
Addresses): $\quad 0,7208$, and 7208B Morris Acres Road
PINs) 0732-28-9587; 0732-38-2530; and 0732-38-2709
20.
$\qquad$ Proposed Zoning: PUD-CZ
16.95

Current Zoning: RR

## Medium Density Residential

High Density Residential
Requested 2030 LUM Designation:
See next page for LUM amendment
If any portion of the project is shown as mixed use (3 or more stripes on the 2030 Land Use Map) provide the following

Area classified as mixed use:
Area proposed as non-residential development:
Percent of mixed use area proposed as non-residential:

Acreage:
Acreage:
Percent:

Applicant Information
Name: Kaplan Residential
Address: 1111 Kane Concourse Ste 302
City: Bay Harbor Islands $\quad$ State: FL $\quad$ Zip: 33154

Phone: 305.901.2202 E-mail:

Owner Information

| Name: | Edith S Morris |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | 7208 Morris Acres Road |  |  |  |
| City: | Apex | State: | NC | Zip: |
| Phone: |  | E-mail: |  |  |

## Agent Information



Other contacts: Nil Ghosh - nghosh@morningstarlawgroup.com

Planned Unit Development Application
Application \#: 19 CZO2 Submittal Date:
2030 LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT (if applicable)
The applicant does hereby respectfully request the Town Council amend the 2030 Land Use Map. In support of this request, the following facts are shown:

The area sought to be amended on the 2030 Land Use Map is located at:
0, 7208, and 7208B Morris Acres Road

| Current 2030 Land Use Classification: | Medium Density Residential |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposed 2030 Land Use Classification: | High Density Residential |

What conditions justify the passage of the amendment to the 2030 Land Use Map? Discuss the existing use classifications of the subject area in addition to the adjacent land use classifications.
The Town of Apex currently is in the process of adopting an updated Land Use Plan with a 2045 horizon. The draft proposal for this new plan indicated that these parcels would be designated as High Density Residential. This draft already has been recommended for approval by the Town's Planning Board and is expected to be passed by Council in February. Consistent with the recommendations in the draft 2045 Land Use Plan, the applicant seeks to modify the future designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential.
$\qquad$ Submittal Date:


Provide a certified list of property owners subject to this application and all property owners within $300^{\prime}$ of the subject property and HOA Contacts.

|  | Owner's Name | PIN |  | Owner's Name | PIN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 540 TOWNES HOA, INC | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0732-37-1960 ; \\ & 0732-37-4927 ; \\ & 0732-37-5626 ; \\ & 0732-38-0119 ; \\ & 0732-38-1079 ; \\ & 0732-38-2217 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 32 | MADHVANI, VIRAT K MADHVANI, KAJAL V | 0732-37-3978 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | MAGNOLIA PROPERTY |  |
| 2 | ADDEN, NICOLE | 0732-39-8073 | 33 | MANAGEMENT LLC | 0732-37-4900 |
| 3 | ALPS LP | 0732-38-7152 | 34 | MCSWAIN, CHASE ALEXANDER | 0732-38-1102 |
|  | ANKNEY, CHRISTINA L ANKNEY, JOHN |  |  | MISTRY, DHANSUKH MISTRY, SHILA |  |
| 4 | ASTOR | 0732-38-8153 | 35 | D | 0732-38-1071 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0732-28-9587; |
|  |  | 0732-38-7570; |  |  | 0732-38-2530; |
| 5 | APEX TOWN OF | 0732-39-7559 | 36 | MORRIS, EDITH S | 0732-38-2709 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0732-29-5482; |
| 6 | BARK, GI CHAN | 0732-38-1244 | 37 | MORRIS, WILMA LEE | 0732-29-8556 |
|  |  |  |  | MULCAHY, JOHN M MULCAHY, |  |
| 7 | BEAVER CREEK CROSSING LLC | 0732-28-6392 | 38 | MICHELE A | 0732-39-6483 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0732-29-5017; |
| 8 | BECKER, GARY A BECKER, BARBARA J | 0732-38-9017 | 39 | NC DOT TRNPK AUTHORITY | 0732-28-4334 |
|  | BUTTERWORTH, JAMES D |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | BUTTERWORTH, BARBARA A | 0732-39-8254 | 40 | PARKER, DAVID PARKER, ROBYN | 0732-38-7613 |
|  | CAUTHEN, JOHNSON JR CAUTHEN, |  |  | PETERSON, DAVID R PETERSON, GAIL |  |
| 10 | DEBORAH | 0732-39-6202 | 41 | C | 0732-39-8344 |
|  |  |  |  | PULIJALA, DHEERAJ KUMAR |  |
| 11 | CHEN, WANLING | 0732-38-2191 | 42 | PULIJALA, CHAITANYA | 0732-38-3061 |
| 12 | CHING, LEUNG YIN | 0732-38-9347 | 43 | PYNE, CRAIG A GALIEN, KIMBERLY L | 0732-39-6402 |
|  |  |  |  | RAJARAM, NARAYAN K |  |
| 13 | CHO, EUNA K CHO, REX H | 0732-38-2024 | 44 | UTHAMARAJAN, ARTHI | 0732-38-1216 |
|  | CITISIDE AT BEAVER CREEK |  |  |  |  |
|  | CROSSING HOA INC |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | (Charleston Mngmt) | 0732-37-7766 | 45 | RAMSEY, FRANCES B | 0732-38-2147 |
|  | DIAZ, CYNTHIA I COLON CADENA, |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | ARGYL I RAMIREZ | 0732-38-0249 | 46 | SAFIAN, DAVID SAFIAN, MICHELLE | 0732-38-8289 |
|  | FALKANGER, JEFFREY J FALKANGER, |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | KERRY C | 0732-39-7014 | 47 | SARTORI, JEANETTE | 0732-28-9182 |
|  |  |  |  | SIMMONS, RYAN KENNETH |  |
| 17 | GAYLES, ANTHONY DARON | 0732-38-0268 | 48 | SIMMONS, KRYSTAL MARIE | 0732-38-7292 |
| 18 | GREEN ACRES OF APEX LLC | 0732-39-3853 | 49 | SINGH, ISHA | 0732-38-1092 |
|  | GROSSER, DONALD B JR GROSSER, |  |  | SMITH, DERMOT J SMITH, JENNIFER |  |
| 19 | CYNTHIAS | 0732-38-9588 | 50 | R | 0732-38-2164 |
| 20 | HARPER, PAUL MARK HARPER, RENAE KEY | 0732-39-6197 |  | ST AMANT, STEVEN | 0732-38-1272 |
|  | HOUSTON, MICHAEL J HOUSTON, KRISTIN A | 0732-38-0310 | 52 | STEVENS, GREGORY W STEVENS, YOKO FUSE | 0732-38-7923 |
| 22 | ISAACS, DANIEL J | 0732-48-0708 | 53 | V \& V PROPERTY GROUP LLC | 0732-37-3986 |
| 23 | KAPLAN, PETER KAPLAN, ERIN B | 0732-39-7472 | 54 | VACCA, STACY ELLEN | 0732-38-1121 |
|  | KOESTER, JOHN D KOESTER, |  |  | VOJTICEK, BRANDON M VOJTICEK, |  |
| 24 | JOHANNA P | 0732-38-9603 | 55 | LEIGH ANN | 0732-38-7723 |
| 25 | LAO, TERENCE LAO, CATHERINE | 0732-38-3044 | 56 | WARD, JUDITH F | 0732-48-0456 |



1, Nil Gosh property owners within $300^{\prime}$ of the subject property.


COUNTY OF Durham


Sworn and subscribed before me, Terri Lee Talley_, a Notary Public for the above State and County, on this the 294 h day of January , 20 19 .

SEAL


My Commission Expires: $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Submittal Date:

Provide a certified list of property owners subject to this application and all property owners within 300' of the subject property and HOA Contacts.


I, Nil Ghosh , certify that this is an accurate listing of all property owners and property owners within 300' of the subject property.


COUNTY OF WAKE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

sworn and subscribed before me, Jeffrey Phillips, a Notary Public for the above State and County, on this the $21^{\text {st }}$ day of June 2019

SEAL


Application \#:


Fee for Initial Submittal: No Charge

Submittal Date:


Fee for Name Change after Approval: \$500*

## Purpose

To provide a consistent and clearly stated procedure for the naming of subdivisions and/or developments and entrance roadways (in conjunction with Town of Apex Address Policy) so as to allow developers to define and associate the theme or aesthetics of their projects) while maintaining the Town's commitment to preserving the quality of life and safety for all residents of Apex proper and extraterritorial jurisdiction.

## Guidelines

$\checkmark$ The subdivision/development name shall not duplicate, resemble, or present confusion with an existing subdivision/development within Apex corporate limits or extraterritorial jurisdiction except for the extension of an existing subdivision/development of similar or same name that shares a continuous roadway.
$\checkmark$ The subdivision/development name shall not resemble an existing street name within Apex corporate limits or extraterritorial jurisdiction unless the roadway is a part of the subdivision/development or provides access to the main entrance.
$\checkmark$ The entrance roadway of a proposed subdivision/development shall contain the name of the subdivision/development where this name does not conflict with the Town of Apex Road Name Approval Application and Town of Apex Address Policy guidelines.
$\checkmark$ The name "Apex" shall be excluded from any new subdivision/development name.
$\checkmark$ Descriptive words that are commonly used by existing developments will be scrutinized more seriously in order to limit confusion and encourage distinctiveness. A list of commonly used descriptive words in Apex's jurisdiction is found below.
$\checkmark$ The proposed subdivision/development name must be requested, reviewed and approved during preliminary review by the Town.
$\checkmark$ A $\$ 500.00$ fee will be assessed to the developer if a subdivision/development name change is requested after official submittal of the project to the Town.*
*The imposed fee offsets the cost of administrative changes required to alleviate any confusion for the applicant, Planning staff, other Town departments, decision-making bodies, concerned utility companies and other interested parties. There is no charge for the initial name submittal.

## Existing Development Titles, Recurring

|  | Residential | Non-Residential |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 or more | Creek, Farm(s), Villages), | Center/Centre |
| 6 to 9 | Crossing(s), Park, Ridge, Wood(s) | Commons, Park |
| 3 to 5 | Acres, Estates, Glen(s), Green ${ }^{\circ}$, Hills | Crossing(s), Plaza, Station, Villages) |

excludes names with Green Level

Development Name Approval Application


## Proposed Subdivision/Development Information

Description of location: 0,7208, and 7208B Morris Acres Rd
Nearest intersecting roads: Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crsg
Wake County PIN(s): 0732-28-9587; 0732-38-2530; and 0732-38-2709
Township: White Oak

## Contact Information (as appropriate)

Contact person: Jason Barron
Phone number: 919-590-0371 Fax number: $\qquad$
Address: 421 Fayetteville Street | Ste 530, Raleigh, NC 27601
E-mail address: jbarron@morningstarlawgroup.com

Owner:
Phone number: $\qquad$ Fax number: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
E-mail address: $\qquad$

## Proposed Subdivision/Development Name

$1^{\text {st }}$ Choice: $\qquad$
$2^{\text {nd }}$ Choice (Optional): $\qquad$

Town of Apex Staff Approval:

Town of Apex Planning Department Staff
Date

## Street Name Approval Application

Application \#: $\qquad$ Submittal Date:

Wake County Approval Date: $\qquad$

## Guidelines:

- No names duplicating or sounding similar to existing road names
- Avoid difficult to pronounce names
- No individuals' names
- Avoid proper names of a business, e.g. Hannaford Drive
- Limit names to 14 characters in length
- No directionals, e.g. North, South, East, West
- No punctuation marks, e.g. periods, hyphens, apostrophes, etc.
- Avoid using double suffixes, e.g. Deer Path Lane
- All names must have an acceptable suffix, e.g. Street, Court, Lane, Path, etc.
- Use only suffixes which are Town of Apex approved
- Town of Apex has the right to deny any street name that is determined to be inappropriate


## momitiont

Description of location: 0,7208 , and 7208B Morris Acres Rd
Nearest intersecting roads: Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crsg
Wake County PIN(s): 0732-28-9587; 0732-38-2530; and 0732-38-2709
Township: White Oak


## Owner: Edith S Morris

Phone number: $\qquad$ Fax number: $\qquad$
Address: 0, 7208 and 7208B Morris Acres Road
E-mail address: $\qquad$

## Street Name Approval Application

Application \#: $\qquad$ Submittal Date:
\# of roads to be named: $\qquad$
Please submit twice as many road names as needed, with preferred names listed first. Proposed road names should be written exactly as one would want them to appear. Town of Apex Planning Department staff will send all approved street names to the Wake County GIS Department for county approval. Please allow several weeks for approval. Upon approval Wake County GIS - Street Addressing will inform you of the approved street names.

| Example: | $\underline{\text { Road Name }}$ | Suffix |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hunter | Street |  |

$\qquad$
11 $\qquad$
2 $\qquad$ 12 $\qquad$
3 $\qquad$ 13 $\qquad$
4 $\qquad$ 14 $\qquad$
5 $\qquad$ 15 $\qquad$
6 $\qquad$ 16 $\qquad$
7 $\qquad$ 17 $\qquad$
8 $\qquad$ 18 $\qquad$

9 $\qquad$ 19 $\qquad$
10 $\qquad$ 20 $\qquad$

## TOWN OF APEX STAFF APPROVAL

## Town of Apex Staff Approval

Date
WAKE COUNTY STAFF APPROVAL:
GIS certifies that names indicated by checkmark V are approved.
Please disregard all other names.

Comments:
$\square$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Date

## Application \#:

> (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.

Kaplan Residential 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:

CUSTOMER:

BY: $\qquad$
Authorized Agent

DATE: $\qquad$

TOWN OF APEX

BY: $\qquad$
Authorized Agent

DATE: $\qquad$

## Agent Authorization Form

Application \#:
Submittal Date: $\qquad$

## Edith S Morris

 is the owner of the property for which the attachedapplication is being submitted:
T Land Use Amendment
$\square$ Rezoning
$\square \quad$ Site PlanSubdivision
VarianceOther: $\qquad$

The property is located at: $\quad 0,7208$, and 7208B Morris Acres Rd
The agent for this project is:
Jason BarronI am the owner of the property and will be acting as my own agent
Agent Name:
Jason Barron

Address:
421 Fayetteville Street | Ste 530, Raleigh, NC 27601
Telephone Number:
919-590-0371
Fax Number:
E-Mail Address: $\qquad$
Signature (s) of Owner (s)

$\qquad$
$\longrightarrow$ Type or print name Date
$\qquad$
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.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Company Name | Kaplan Residential |
| Company Phone Number | 305.901 .2202 |
| Developer Representative Name | Jason Barron |
| Developer Representative Phone Number | $919-590-0371$ |
| Developer Representative Email | jbarron@morningstarlawgroup.com |


| $\quad$ New Residential Subdivision Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date of Application for Subdivision | $2 / 1 / 19$ |
| City, Town or Wake County Jurisdiction | Apex |
| Name of Subdivision |  |
| Address of Subdivision (if unknown enter nearest cross streets) | Morris Acres Rd at Reedybrook Crsg |
| REID(s) |  |
| PIN(s) | $0732-28-9587 ; 0732-38-2530 ;$ and 0732-38-2709 |

Please complete
each section and
return by email or
fax to all:

## WCPSS

Debra Adams
dbadams@wcpss.net
Judy Stafford
istafford1@wcpss.net

Fax: 919-431-7302

## WAKE

Mike Ping
Mike.ping@wakegov.com
Fax: 919-856-6389

| $\quad$ Projected Dates Information |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subdivision Completion Date | 2021 |
| Subdivision Projected First Occupancy Date | 2020 |


| Lot by Lot Development Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unit Type | Total \# of Units |  | .$\frac{0}{0}$ 需 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { 음 } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \infty \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { oㄴ } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \infty \\ & \text { m } \end{aligned}$ |  | Square Foot Range |  | Price Range |  | Anticipated Completion Units \& Dates |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Min | Max | Low | High | Year | \# Units | Year | \# Units | Year | \# Units |
| Single Family | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Townhomes | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condos | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apartments | 303 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2020 | 84 | 2021 | 219 |  |  |
| Other | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 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

1/11/19
Date
Dear Neighbor:
You are invited to a neighborhood meeting to review and discuss the development proposal at 0, 7208, 72088 Morris Acres Road $\quad$ (0732-28-9587; 0732-38-2530; and 0732-38-2709) Address(es) PIN(s)
in accordance with the Town of Apex Neighborhood Meeting procedures. The Neighborhood Meeting is intended as 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. 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 www.apexnc.org.

A Neighborhood Meeting is required because this project includes (check all that apply):
$\checkmark \quad$ Rezoning (including Planned Unit Development);Major Site Plan;Master Subdivision Plan (excludes minor or exempt subdivision); or $\square \quad$ Special Use Permit

The following is a description of the proposal (also see attached map(s) and/or plan sheet(s)): Rezoning to PUD is requested in order to allow the development of an approximately 300 unit multifamily development with multiple buildings, each up to 5 stories tall.
Estimated submittal date: $\quad \underline{2 / 1 / 19}$

## MEETING INFORMATION:

| Property Owner(s) name(s): | Edith S Morris |
| :---: | :---: |
| Applicant(s): | Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant |
| Contact information (email/phone): | jbarron@morningstarlawgroup.com / 919.590.0371 |
| Meeting Address: | 237 N Salem St. Apex, NC 27502 |
| Date of meeting*: | 1/24/19 |
| Time of meeting*: | 6:00pm |

## MEETING AGENDA TIMES:

| Welcome: | $\frac{6: 00-6: 05}{\text { Project Presentation: }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Question \& Answer: | $\frac{6: 06-6: 15}{6: 15-\text { on }}$ |

[^0]

Vicinty and Zoning Map


Disclaimer
iMaps 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.

## SITE DATA

| Acreage | $\approx 17$ acres |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposed Units | $290-320$ |



- Proposed Vehicular Connection(s)

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: 237 N Salem St. Apex, NC 27502

Date of meeting: $\qquad$ 1/24/19 Time of meeting: 6:00 PM
Property Owners) names): Edith S Morris
Applicant(s): Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant
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.


Use additional sheets, if necessary.

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: 237 N Salem St. Apex, NC 27502
Date of meeting: 1/24/19 Time of meeting: 6:00 PM
Property Owners) names): Edith S Morris
Applicants): Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant
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.


## 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: 237 N Salem St. Apex, NC 27502
Date of meeting: $1 / 24 / 19$ Time of meeting: 6:00 PM
Property Owner(s) name(s): Edith S Morris
Applicant(s): Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant
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.


## 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: 237 N Salem St. Apex, NC 27502
Date of meeting: $1 / 24 / 19$ Time of meeting: 6:00 PM
Property Owner(s) name(s): Edith S Morris
Applicant(s): Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant
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.

|  | name/organization | ADDRESS | PHoNE \# | емAIL | SEND PLANS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | KEYSTAL SIMMONS | 2503 FLINTS POND GIR |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ | Paul + Renaw Harper | OBI9 LOHDEN LOOOS DRIVE |  |  |  |
|  | ErwKaplan | 2524 waldenvosodsior |  |  |  |
|  | NANCM P PAT FARCLI | $505 \text { TRECCHNNEI } 20 .$ |  |  |  |
|  | Shavon Malley | 2817 Kentshive PL |  |  |  |
|  | Erika Chapman | 2808 Kentshive PI. |  |  |  |
|  | Pamalagreen | 2018 WALDEN GLTIER. |  |  |  |
|  | irena Rea | 2201 HENNIIEER ST |  |  |  |
|  | Gail Peterstan | 2522 Loilder wion |  |  |  |
| 10. | LINDA HEBERT | 2110 White Pond CT |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{11}$. | brandon vartlcek | 2511 WALDEN Wooos dr |  |  |  |
|  | - Aason Marrios | 7208 Maris Qowes Rd. |  |  |  |
| 13. | Edith Marris | 7208 Mervis lareo Rd. |  |  |  |
| 14. | michae / Dubraw | 2503 cranswick plat |  |  |  |

## 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: 237 N Salem St. Apex, NC 27502
Date of meeting: 1/24/19 Time of meeting: 6:00 PM
Property Owner(s) name(s): Edith S Morris
Applicant(s): Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant

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.


[^1]

CONCEPT IMAGERY


## MORRIS APEX

APEX, NORTH CAROLINA

## 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): Edith Morris

Applicant(s):
Contact information (email/phone):
Meeting Address:
Date of meeting: $\quad 1 / 24 / 19$

Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant
jbarron@morningstarlawgroup.com / 919-590-0371 237 N Salem St. Apex, NC

Please summarize the questions/comments and your response from the Neighborhood Meeting 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:

There was a concern raised about building height

## Applicant's Response:

The notice indicated building heights of up to 5 stories, but it was explained that the buildings generally are only 4 stories. Because of the topo in some areas, a 5th "basement" story is possible, which is why the max height was listed as 5 stories. In reality, the top of each building will appear to be only 4-stories high.

## Question/Concern \#2:

What type of road improvements will you all be doing and when?

> | Applicant's Response: |
| :--- |
| A TIA has been submitted which may recommend offsite road improvements, but for now, the only thing we |
| know for certain is that we will be required to widen Morris Acres Road to a 3-lane section for our entire frontage. |
| That improvement, plus any others committed to as a result of the TIA, will be required to be built before we can get a CO. |

Question/Concern \#3:
What can be done about existing flooding problems and how will SW be handled?

## Applicant's Response:

The design and engineering for stormwater controls are done at time of site plan. We will meet the Town's requirements for quantity and quality of runoff from the site. At this stage, we can look into the existing flooding issues you all experience. It may be possible for us to address some of that issue at the zoning stage, but we need to study it first.

## Question/Concern \#4:

What kind of buffers will you have?

Applicant's Response:
We will have a $25^{\prime}$ wide Type A buffer around the perimeter of the property. On the southeast side, there is a Town owned parcel which creates additional separation in that area. On the northeast side, we are committing to preserving that area as passive open space which will not be developed.

## 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):
Applicant(s):
Contact information (email/phone):
Meeting Address:
Date of meeting: $\quad 1 / 24 / 19$

Edith Morris
Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant
jbarron@morningstarlawgroup.com / 919-590-0371
237 N Salem St. Apex, NC
Time of meeting: 6:00PM

Please summarize the questions/comments and your response from the Neighborhood Meeting 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:
Why is this a quasi-judicial case? What exceptions to the UDO are you seeking?

```
    Applicant's Response:
    Our rezoning is not quasi-judicial; it is a legislative approval. We are not seeking any exception to the UDO
    at this time. The site plan, which will come after rezoning, is a quasi-judicial approval, but not due to any
    exception or variance we are seeking. In Apex, all Major Site Plans are quasi-judicial, even if not variance or exception is sought.
    Question/Concern #2:
Can you put a fence along the perimeter?
```

| Applicant's Response: |
| :--- |
| We are open to doing that, but some people have expressed that they do not want a fence. Depending on |
| where the fence proponents are, we may be able to put a fence along a portion of the perimeter and keep it off |
| of the areas where people do not want a fence. We will look into adding this. |

Question/Concern \#3:
How will this project affect our property values?

Applicant's Response:
We have not had an appraiser study that, but there are very few projects which negatively affect property value.
Our expectation is that this project would not hurt your property values.

## Question/Concern \#4:

Do any of these examples on the concept imagery handout apply to this project?

[^2]
## 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): | dith Morris |
| :---: | :---: |
| Applicant(s): | Jason Barron - Attorney for Applicant |
| Contact information (email/phone): | jbarron@morningstarlawgroup.com / 919-590-0371 |
| Meeting Address: | 237 N Salem St. Apex, NC |
| Date of meeting: 1/24/19 | Time of meeting: 6:00PM |

Please summarize the questions/comments and your response from the Neighborhood Meeting 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:
What will the time line be for construction?

Applicant's Response:
From today, we would anticipate about 2 years before breaking ground. The project will most likely be developed in a single phase which may take about 18 to 24 months to complete.

## Question/Concern \#2:

Is there enough parking?

> | Applicant's Response: |
| :--- |
| Based on this developer's experience and what we are seeing in the market, we believe that Apex's standard |
| parking ratio for multi-family will provide adequate parking for this use. Moreover, it is important that we put |
| enough parking on this site because there is no opportunity for shared parking with any adjacent development. |

Question/Concern \#3:
Will there be sidewalks?

Applicant's Response:
Yes. We are requird to build sidewalk along our Morris Acres Road frontage and there will be sidewalks internal to the site.

## Question/Concern \#4:

## Applicant's Response:

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## 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, Nil Ghosh do hereby declare as follows: Print Name

1. I have conducted a Neighborhood Meeting for the proposed Rezoning, Major Site Plan, 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 Planning Department, all property owners within 300 feet of the subject property and any neighborhood association that represents citizens in the area via first class mail a minimum of 10 days in advance of the Neighborhood Meeting.
3. The meeting was conducted at 237 N Salem St, Apex, NC 27502 (location/address) on 1/24/19 (date) from 6:00PM (start time) to 8:00PM (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.


STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
county of WAke Durham
Sworn and subscribed before me, $\qquad$ a Notary Public for the above State and County, on this the $\qquad$ day of January


# Morris Acres PUD PD PLAN APEX, NORTH CAROLINA 

Submitted: February 2019
Revised: February 28, 2019
Revised: May 10, 2019
Revised: June 7, 2019
Revised: June 27, 2019
Revised: July 31, 2019
Revised: August 6, 2019
Revised: August 23, 2019

PREPARED BY:
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## Section 2: Vicinity Map



The Morris Acres PUD is located in the Town of Apex, east of I-540, south of Jenks Road, and north of US-64. The properties are located on the north side of Morris Acres Road. To the north are large tracts of agricultural land with frontage on Jenks Road. Directly south is Morris Acres Road, and across Morris Acres Road is the 540 Townes Townhome community. East of the project site is the large Walden Creek single-family neighborhood built in the late 90 's and early 2000's. Morris Acres Road and I-540 are directly west of the project.

## Section 3: Project Data

## A. Name of Project: <br> Morris Acres PUD

B. Property Owners:

Edith S. Morris
Prepared By:
Jason Barron, Partner
Morningstar Law Group
421 Fayetteville St | Ste 530
Raleigh, NC 27601
C. Current Zoning Designation:

Rural Residential (RR)
D. Proposed Zoning Designation:

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

Medium Density Residential (<6 units/acre)

## F. Proposed 2045 Land Use Map Designation:

High Density Residential
G. Proposed Use

Up to 297 dwelling units and associated open space, recreational amenities and infrastructure.
H. Size of Project

| Wake County Tax Identification Number | Acreage |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0732-28-9587 ; 0732-38-2530 ;$ and 0732- | 17.44 |
| $38-2709$ | acres |

## Section 4: Purpose Statement

The Morris Acres PUD development will be a multi-building apartment community with buildings that are up to four (4) stories or less entirely above grade (i.e., where basement units are feasible, some sides of buildings may be up to five (5) stories). The maximum building height shall be sixty-five feet (65') measured to the top of any pitched roof. Given the proximity of the subject property to the existing residences in Walden Woods (located to the east of the site), there shall be a minimum building setback of one hundred fifty feet (150') from any lot within Walden Woods containing a dwelling unit, and not structures on the property can be located any closer than two hundred seventy five feet (275') from the nearest home that is located on Flints Pond Circle. Additionally, in the medium density residential transition area as shown on the PUD Preliminary Layout Plan (the "Medium Density Transition Area"), the maximum height of buildings shall be three (3) stories up to a foot height of forty-five feet (45'), a maximum of four (4) dwelling units per acre shall be permitted, and only townhome style multifamily units (i.e., side-by-side residences rather than stacked apartments) shall be permitted Further, a Type A buffer shall be established along the eastern boundary of the subject property from Morris Acres Road to the southern edge of the riparian buffer around the existing farm pond on the subject property, a 10' wide evergreen planting strip shall be provided adjacent to riparian areas in the southeastern portion of the site, and a solid privacy fence at least eight feet (8') in height shall be installed within the Medium Density Residential Transition Area to provide beneficial screening from the proposed use to the adjacent community. Additionally, the northeastern corner of the subject property, north and east of the existing creek and pond, is to be preserved as permanent passive open space. Lastly, at least five percent (5\%) of the units shall be affordable housing units at sixty percent (60\%) of Wake County AMI for a period of at least twenty (20) years, and all of the buildings shall be prewired for solar.

This concept is consistent with the Town's stated PUD goal 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 open space areas.
- Provide appropriate buffering and screening from the proposed use to the existing residential areas.
- Offer multifamily style living near interstate I-540 in an area where there are not many options for the same.
- 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 significant open space and walkable trails to promote pedestrian activity, while appropriately buffering adjacent residential areas

All site-specific standards and conditions of this PUD Plan shall be consistent with all Conditional Zoning (CZ) District standards set forth in the UDO Section 2.3.3, Conditional Zoning Districts and UDO Section 2.3.4.F.1, Planned Unit Development (PUD-CZ) District. The proposed PUD will provide a development density that is consistent with principles found throughout the recently updated Advance Apex 2045. Through various policies, the Peak Plan 2030 works to ensure that there are appropriate transitions between uses. The proposed PUD Plan does just that, by transitioning from l-540 on the west to the single-family Walden Creek community east of the site. Thus, the plan is consistent with several policies contained within the Peak Plan 2030.

## Section 5: Permitted Uses

The development will only include residential and supporting uses. Specifically, the permitted uses include:

- Multi-family or apartment
- Greenway
- Recreation Facility, private
- Park, active
- Park, passive
- Utility, minor

Additionally, the following conditions shall also apply:
A. A maximum of 297 residential units shall be permitted upon the property.
B. Along the eastern boundary of the subject property, extending from Morris Acres Road to the southern edge of the riparian buffer around the existing farm pond, the following shall be installed and maintained:
a. A fifty-foot (50') Type A vegetative buffer; and
b. An at least eight feet (8') tall solid privacy fence. The final location of the fence within the 50' Type A buffer will be determined at the time of site plan.
C. In the 3.00 acre Medium Density Residential Transition Area as depicted on the Preliminary Layout Plan, the following conditions shall apply:
a. The maximum height for buildings shall be three (3) stories, up to a foot height of forty-five feet (45');
b. Only townhome style units (i.e., side-by-side rather than stacked multifamily) may be permitted; and
c. The maximum development density within this area shall be four (4) dwelling units per acre, and no more than 12 dwelling units in total.
D. In the area identified as "Passive Open Space" on the PUD Plan, no buildings or other structures shall be permitted, with the exception of passive recreational amenities.
E. A minimum of fifty percent ( $50 \%$ ) of the dwelling units shall be one-bedroom units,
and a maximum of ten percent (10\%) of the dwelling units shall be three-bedroom units.
F. For a period of at least twenty (20) years from the date of the issuance of the certificate of occupancy, at least five percent (5\%) of the units developed on the site shall be preserved as affordable housing units at sixty percent (60\%) of Wake County's area median income.
G. All buildings constructed on the property shall provide solar conduit for the installation of rooftop solar panels.

## Section 6: Proposed Design Controls

## A. Maximum Non-Residential Densities (SF per non-residential

 use) This PUD does not provide for any non-residential land uses (see Section 5, Permitted Uses).
## B. Residential Densities and Design Controls

Density - The overall gross density shall not exceed 17.0 units per acre. The gross density within the Medium Density Transition Area shall not exceed 4.0 units per acre.
Design Controls - Dimensional standards below shall apply to all residential uses, and at a minimum, will comply with the following:

| Maximum Density: | 17.0 Units/Acre <br> (includes RCA and rights-of-way) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Maximum Number of Units: |  |
| 297 |  |
| Maximum Built-Upon Area: | $70 \%$ |
| Minimum Lot Size: | n/a |
| Minimum Lot Width: | n/a |
| Maximum Building Height: | Four (4) stories |
| above grade, with a basement level (5 $5^{\text {th }}$ story) |  |

## C. Buffers

Perimeter Buffers

North boundary:
South boundary (Morris Acres Road):
West boundary (along 0732-29-5017):
East boundary
Where Abutting Town of Apex Property: 50-foot Type A with $\geq 8$-ft solid privacy fence
Adjacent to riparian buffers within Medium Density Transition Area: 10' wide evergreen planting strip 50-foot undisturbed
Otherwise:

20-foot Type A
30-foot Type A
30-foot Type A

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 Buffers

As depicted on the PD Plan, a 30' Type A Buffer shall be established along Morris Acres Road.

## 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 Site Plan submittal. The following conditions shall apply:
A. Vinyl siding will not be used except for vinyl windows and limited decorative element use. Residential areas will utilize brick, stone, and Hardi-plank siding.
B. Siding materials will be varied in type and/or color on $30 \%$ of each façade on each building.
C. Windows that are not recessed shall be trimmed. Windows shall vary in size and/or type.
D. Recesses and projections shall be provided for at least $50 \%$ of each facade on each building. Building facades shall have horizontal relief achieved by the use of recesses and projections.
E. 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.
F. 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.
G. The rear and side elevations of the units that can be seen from the right-ofway shall have trim around the windows.
H. Additionally, the following conditions shall apply to the building(s) located in the Medium Density Transition Area, as identified on the PUD Preliminary Sheet:

1. The roof of each unit shall be horizontally and/or vertically distinct from any adjacent unit so as to avoid the appearance of a single mass.
2. Front facing garage doors must have windows, decorative details, or carriage-style adornments.
3. Entrances for units with front-facing garages shall have a prominent covered porch/stoop area leading to the front door.
4. The front façade of any front-loaded garage shall not protrude farther than one 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-ofway from which the dwelling unit is addressed.

## Section 8: Parking and Loading

Parking for the development shall be per Town of Apex UDO.

## Section 9: Signage

All signage for this PUD shall comply with 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 Beaver Creek drainage basin, which is within the Cape Fear River Basin.

## 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.

The Site is located on the east side of the 540 corridor and therefore is required to preserve a minimum of $30 \%$ Resource Conservation Area (RCA). Designated RCA areas will be consistent with the items listed in Section 8.1.2(B) of the Town's UDO. Preserved streams, wetlands, and associated riparian buffers provide the primary RCA's throughout the site. Additional RCA area provided include stormwater management areas, perimeter buffers, and greenway trails within the walkable community.

## C. Any historic structures present

As confirmed by the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office and Capital Area Preservation, Inc. there are no historic structures present within the project boundary.

## Section 11: Stormwater Management

A. This PUD 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 conditions for the 1 year, 10 year, and 25 year 24 -hour storm events.
B. This PUD shall convey as much stormwater runoff from the site development as practical, including required Stormwater Control Measures (SCM'), to the existing 48" RCP culvert located in the southeastern corner of the site along Morris Acres Road. The direct storm drainage connection to the existing 48" RCP culvert is subject to final approval by the Town of Apex, NCDOT or any other regulatory agency. In the event that this direct storm drainage connection is not approved, then this PUD shall meet and exceed existing stormwater management requirements for quality and quantity treatment provided in Section 6.1.7 of the UDO, such that post development peak runoff shall not exceed pre-development peak runoff conditions for the 1 year, 10 year, 25 year, and 100 year 24-hour storm events


## Section 12: Parks and Recreation

The Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Resources Advisory Commission recommended a fee-in-lieu for the project at the May 29, 2019 meeting.

## 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 a 3 -lane thoroughfare section with side path and public right-of-way dedication based on an eighty foot ( $80^{\prime}$ ) right-of-way along Morris Acres Road. 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 and along street frontage.

Please refer to the concept plan of the PUD plan for proposed access points, stub streets and planned vehicular connectivity. All access and circulation is conceptual and will be finalized at the time of Major Site Plan review and approval.

- Transportation Improvements

5. Roadway improvements are subject to modification and final approval by the Town of Apex and NCDOT as part of the site plan and construction plan approval process. A traffic study has been performed as part of this PUD rezoning consistent with the Town's standards for the same. Based upon the traffic study, no offsite improvements are recommended for this development.

- Wayfinding Improvements

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

- Water and Sanitary Sewer

All lots within the project will be served by the Town of Apex for water and sanitary sewer. The utility design will be finalized at the time of Major Site Plan review and approval based upon available facilities adjacent to the site at that time. A conceptual utility plan is included in the PUD plan for reference.

- 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 may be completed in up to three (3) phases, with construction anticipated to begin in 2020. Project phasing will be planned to ensure the points of access are
provided in accordance with the UDO.

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

The proposed land use is consistent with the 2045 Land Use Map, if the Land Use Map Amendment is approved.

## 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.

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

Major Site Plans for any development to be made pursuant to this amendment to the Official Zoning District Map shall comply with the adopted Comprehensive Transportation Plan in effect at the time of the Major Site Plan approval as provided for in the Unified Development Ordinance. Further, development of the Property shall be consistent with the Town's adopted Bicycle Plan.

## Section 18: Public Art

The applicant shall provide a $6^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ Public Art easement to the Town of Apex along the Morris Acres Road frontage of the subject property. The precise location for this easement will be determined at the time of site plan review.
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## Executive Summary

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. has performed a Traffic Impact A nalysis for The Wayforth at A pex, a proposed apartment project located on the east side of Morris A cres Road between J enks Road and Walden Creek Drive in A pex, North Carolina. The property is currently occupied by a few single-family homes and as currently envisioned will consist of approximately 300 apartments. The development is proposed to be accessed via three driveways on Morris Acres Road, and build-out of the project is anticipated in the year 2022.

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 traffic conditions studied include the existing (2018) traffic condition as well as the projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions.

As shown in Table ES-1, the proposed development has the potential to generate 1,634 new trips during a typical weekday with 100 new trips during the AM peak hour and 127 new trips during the PM peak hour.

| Table ES-1ПE Traffic Generation (Vehicles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Land Use | Intensity |  | Daily |  | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
| Code |  |  |  | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out |
| 221 | Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) | 300 | d.u. | 817 | 817 | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |

Capacity analyses were performed using Synchro V ersion 9.2 software. Table ES-2 summarizes the operation of the study intersections for the AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions.

| Table ES-2Level-of-S ervice Summary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| $J$ enks R oad at M orris A cres R oad (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(11.3) \\ & \text { WBL }^{-A}(7.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(14.6) \\ \text { WBL }^{-} \mathrm{A}(8.1) \end{gathered}$ |
| Background (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & N B^{-}-B(11.8) \\ & W^{-1} L^{-}(7.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N B^{-} C^{C(16.6)} \\ & W^{-} A(8.2) \end{aligned}$ |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(11.9) \\ & \text { WBL }^{-A}(7.9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{C}^{(17.6)} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}^{-} \mathrm{A}(8.3) \end{aligned}$ |


| Table ES-2 (cont.) Level-of-S ervice Summary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| Morris Acres R oad at R eedybrook Crossing/C entral Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{A}(9.4) \\ \mathrm{NBL}^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(7.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \mathrm{NBL}^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Background (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{A}(9.5) \\ & \text { NBL }^{-1} \mathrm{~B}(7.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB }^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.4) \\ & \text { NBL }^{-A}(7.7) \end{aligned}$ |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \mathrm{WB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \mathrm{NBL} \\ & \mathrm{SBL}^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.4) \\ & \mathrm{SBL}^{-1.6)} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | EB ${ }^{-}$B (12.6) WB ${ }^{-1}$ B (12.5) NBL - A (7.7) SBL $^{-1}$ A (8.0) |
| Morris A cres R oad at Creekside L anding Drive (Signalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | A (4.6) | A (6.7) |
| Background (2022) T raffic | A (4.7) | A (7.1) |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | A (5.0) | A (7.8) |
| US 64 Westbound at M orris A cres R oad (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | SB ${ }^{-1}$ (27.9) | SB ${ }^{-}$D (28.8) |
| Background (2022) Traffic | SB - E (41.8) | SB - E (43.6) |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | SB ${ }^{-E}$ (49.4) | SB ${ }^{-E}$ (48.8) |
| Morris Acres R oad at North Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline W B B^{-} A(9.8) \\ & S B L^{-} A(7.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline W B^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.6) \\ & S B L^{-} \mathrm{A}(8.0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Morris A cres R oad at South Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { WB }^{-} A(9.7) \\ & \text { SBL }^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(7.6) \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline W B^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.8) \\ & S B L^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(8.0) \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ |

With the exception of southbound Morris A cres Road at US 64 Westbound, analyses indicate that all of the study intersections are expected to operate at an acceptable LOS at project build-out with only minor increases in delays and queues associated with the addition of site traffic. The intersection of US 64 Westbound at Morris Acres road is expected to operate with moderate delays on Morris Acres Road in the year 2022 with or without the proposed project in place.

No roadway improvements are recommended to be performed to accommodate projected site traffic volumes.

The build-out roadway laneage is shown on Figure ES-1.
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### 1.0 Introduction

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. has performed a Traffic Impact A nalysis for The Wayforth at A pex, a proposed apartment project located on the east side of Morris A cres Road between J enks Road and Walden Creek Drive in A pex, North Carolina. The property is currently occupied by a few single-family homes and as currently envisioned will consist of approximately 300 apartments. The development is proposed to be accessed via three driveways on Morris Acres Road, and build-out of the project is anticipated in the year 2022.

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 traffic conditions studied include the existing (2018) traffic condition as well as the projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions.

Town of A pex and North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) transportation staff provided background data and were consulted regarding the elements to be covered in this analysis. The approved Memorandum of Understanding is included in the Appendix of this report.
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### 2.0 Inventory

### 2.1 Study Area

The study area for this development in includes the following intersections:
é Jenks Road at Morris A cres Road
é Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crossing/Central Site Driveway
é Morris Acres Road at Creekside L anding Drive
é Morris Acres Road at US 64 Westbound
é Morris Acres Road at North Site Driveway
é Morris Acres Road at South Site Driveway

Figure 1 shows the site location. The preliminary site plan is shown on Figure 2.

### 2.2 Existing Conditions

The Wayforth at Apex development is proposed to be located generally east of Morris Acres Road between Jenks Road and Walden Creek Drive in A pex, North Carolina. Roadways in the study area include US 64, Jenks Road, Creekside Landing Drive, and Morris Acres Road (formerly Green Level Church Road). The existing roadway laneage is shown in Figure 3.

US 64 is a 4-lane divided highway with a posted speed limit of 55 mph near Morris A cres Road. On US 64 Westbound, the reported 2017 average daily traffic (ADT) volume was approximately 31,000 vehicles per day (vpd) west of Morris Acres Road. US 64 is designated as a freeway on the Town of A pex Thoroughfare and Collector Street Plan.

Jenks Road is a 2-lane undivided roadway with a posted speed limit of 45 mph in the vicinity of Morris A cres Road. The estimated 2018 ADT volume is approximately 6,000 vpd west of Morris Acres Road. Jenks Road is designated to be a 3-lane thoroughfare section per the Town of A pex Thoroughfare and Collector Street Plan.

Creekside Landing Drive is a 2-Iane undivided roadway with a posted speed limit of 25 mph . The estimated 2018 ADT volume is approximately 3,500 vpd. Morris Acres Road is designated to be a minor collector on the Town of A pex Thoroughfare and Collector Street Plan.

Morris Acres Road (formerly Green Level Church Road) is a 3-lane undivided roadway in the vicinity of the site with a posted speed limit of 45 mph . The estimated 2018 ADT volume is approximately $3,000 \mathrm{vpd}$ at Jenks Road. Morris Acres Road has already been widened to the designated 3-lane thoroughfare per the T own of A pex Thoroughfare and Collector Street Plan.
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PROPOSED SITE PLAN

FIGURE 2
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### 3.0 Traffic Generation

The traffic generation potential of the proposed development was determined using the traffic generation rates published in Trip Generation (Institute of Transportation Engineers, Tenth Edition, 2017). As currently envisioned the development will consist of approximately 300 apartments. Table 3.0 summarizes the estimated traffic generation for the proposed development.

| Table 3.0חE Traffic Generation (Vehicles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Code | Land Use | Intensity |  | Daily |  | AM Peak Hour |  | PM Peak Hour |  |
|  |  |  |  | In | Out | In | Out | In | Out |
| 221 | Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) | 300 | d.u. | 817 | 817 | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |

Table 3.0 shows the proposed development has the potential to generate 1,634 new trips during a typical weekday with 100 new trips during the AM peak hour and 127 new trips during the PM peak hour.

Detailed trip generation calculations are included in the A ppendix of this report.
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### 4.0 Site Traffic Distribution

The projected site-generated trips were assigned to the surrounding roadway network. The directional distribution and assignment for this development were based on a review of surrounding land uses and traffic patterns in the study area. As the intersection of Morris Acres Road at US 64 Westbound is limited to right-in/right-out access, separate inbound and outbound distributions were developed for the site in conjunction with Town of A pex staff to account for anticipated travel paths.

The inbound site traffic distribution used for the site was:
é $25 \%$ from the east on US 64
é $25 \%$ from the east on J enks Road
é $25 \%$ from the west on J enks Road
é $25 \%$ from the south on Creekside Landing Drive

The outbound site traffic distribution used for the site was:
é $50 \%$ to the east on J enks Road
é $25 \%$ to the west on US 64
é $15 \%$ to the south on Creekside Landing Drive
é $10 \%$ to the west on Jenks Road

The site traffic distribution and percent assignment for site are shown on Figure 4.
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### 5.0 Projected Traffic Volumes

### 5.1 Existing Traffic

AM peak hour (7:00 to 9:00 AM) and PM peak hour (4:00 to 6:00 PM) turning movement counts were performed at the following intersections:
¿ Jenks Road at Morris A cres Road
¿ Morris Acres Road at Creekside L anding Drive
i Morris A cres Road at US 64 Westbound

October 23, 2018
October 23, 2018
October 23, 2018

The existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes are shown on Figures 5 and 6, and the traffic count data are included in the Appendix. No turning movement counts were performed at the intersection of Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crossing. However, as the development is approximately $90 \%$ occupied (discussed below), existing volumes onto/off of Reedybrook Crossing were assumed to be equal to $90 \%$ of the site traffic volume on those movements as indicated in the TIA for that project.

### 5.2 Historic Growth Traffic

Historic growth traffic is the increase in traffic due to usage increases and non-specific growth throughout the area. An annual growth rate of $3 \%$ was applied to the existing volumes up to the year 2022. Background growth calculations are detailed on intersection spreadsheets in the A ppendix of this report.

### 5.3 Approved Development Traffic

A pproved development traffic is generated by approved but not yet constructed projects in the vicinity of the proposed project. Based on discussions with the Town of Apex, the Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential (540 Townes) project was the only development identified for inclusion in the analysis as background traffic.

Per the Beaver Creek Residential Development TIA (Stantec, August 2015), the project proposes the construction of approximately 300 apartments and 50 townhomes along Morris Acres Road (Green Level Church Road) north of US 64 with a build-out year of 2020. As the development was almost entirely built-out when traffic counts were performed, only $10 \%$ of site trips from this development were included at off-site intersections as background traffic.

Background traffic volumes consisting of existing, historic growth, and approved development traffic, are shown on Figures 5 and 6 for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.
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### 5.4 Site Traffic

The projected site traffic was generated and assigned to the adjacent roadway network according to the distribution discussed previously in Section 4.0. The site traffic volumes for the AM and PM peak hours are shown in Figures 7 and 8, respectively.

### 5.5 Build-Out Traffic

To obtain the projected (2022) build-out traffic volumes, the projected site traffic were added to the projected (2022) background traffic. Traffic volume calculations are detailed in intersection spreadsheets in the A ppendix of this report. Figures 7 and 8 show the projected (2022) AM and PM peak hour build-out traffic volumes, respectively.
 RELIANCE ON THIS DOCUMENT WITHOUT WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION AND ADAPTATION BY KIVLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC. SHALL BE WITHOUT LIABILITY TO KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC
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PROJECTED (2022) BUILD-OUT
PM EAK HOUR
TRAFFIC VOLUMES
FIGURE 8

### 6.0 Capacity Analysis

Capacity analyses (see A ppendix) were performed for the A M and PM peak hours for the existing traffic condition and the projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions using Synchro Version 9.2 software to determine the operating characteristics of the adjacent road network and the impacts of the proposed project.

Capacity is defined as the maximum number of vehicles that can pass over a particular road segment or through a particular intersection within a set time duration. Capacity is combined with Level-of-Service (LOS) to describe the operating characteristics of a road segment or intersection. LOS is a qualitative measure that describes operational conditions and motorist perceptions within a traffic stream. The Highway Capacity Manual defines six levels of service, LOS A through LOS F, with A representing the shortest average delays and F representing the longest average delays. LOS D is the typically accepted standard for signalized intersections in urbanized areas. For signalized intersections, LOS is defined for the overall intersection operation.

For unsignalized intersections, only the movements that must yield right-of-way experience control delay. Therefore, LOS criteria for the overall intersection is not reported by Synchro V ersion 9.2 or computable using methodology published in the Highway Capacity Manual. It is typical for stop sign controlled side streets and driveways intersecting major streets to experience long delays during peak hours, while the majority of the traffic moving through the intersection on the major street experiences little or no delay. Table 6.0-A lists the LOS control delay thresholds published in the Highway Capacity Manual for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

| Table 6.0-ALevel-of-Service Control Delay Thresholds |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level-ofService | Signalized Intersections Control Delay Per Vehicle [sec/veh] | Unsignalized Intersections Average Control Delay [sec/veh] |
| A | H10 | H10 |
| B | $>10^{-} 20$ | $>10^{-15}$ |
| C | $>20^{-35}$ | $>15^{-25}$ |
| D | $>35^{-55}$ | $>25^{-35}$ |
| E | $>55^{-80}$ | $>35^{-5} 5$ |
| F | > 80 | > 50 |

Existing peak hour factors (PHF) were used at all existing intersections for all conditions except at new intersections, where a PHF of 0.90 was used. The existing signal plan provided by NCDOT was referenced to obtain signal timings, which were not adjusted as part of this analysis, and right-turns on red were allowed where currently allowed.

## Kimley»Horn

Capacity analyses were performed for the existing (2018) traffic condition and the projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions for the following intersections:
é Jenks Road at Morris A cres Road
é Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crossing/Central Site Driveway
é Morris Acres Road at Creekside Landing Drive
é Morris Acres Road at US 64 Westbound
é Morris Acres Road at North Site Driveway
é Morris Acres Road at South Site Driveway
Table 6.0-B summarizes the LOS and delay (seconds per vehicle) for all of the study intersections for the existing (2018) traffic condition and the projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions. All capacity analyses are included in the A ppendix and are briefly summarized in the following sub-sections.

| Table 6.0-B <br> Level-of-S ervice Summary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| J enks R oad at M orris Acres R oad (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NB}^{-1} \mathrm{~B}(11.3) \\ & \text { WBL }^{-A}(7.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(14.6) \\ \text { WBL }^{-} \mathrm{A}(8.1) \end{gathered}$ |
| Background (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(11.8) \\ & \mathrm{WBL}^{-A}(7.9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N^{-1} C^{-}(16.6) \\ & W B L^{-} A(8.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(11.9) \\ & W^{\prime} \mathrm{ABL}^{-A}(7.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline N B^{-} C^{C(17.6)} \\ & W B L^{-} A(8.3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Morris Acres R oad at R eedybrook Crossing/C entral Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | $\begin{gathered} E^{-1} \text { A (9.4) } \\ N^{\prime} L^{-1} \text { A (7.3) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \text { NBL }^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Background (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{A}(9.5) \\ & \mathrm{NBL}^{-1} \mathrm{~B}(7.3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.4) \\ & \mathrm{NBL}^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(7.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EB }^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \text { WB }^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \text { NBL }^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.4) \\ & \text { SBL }^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(7.6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { EB }^{-}-\mathrm{B}(12.6) \\ & \text { WB }^{-1} \mathrm{~B}(12.5) \\ & \mathrm{NBL}^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.7) \\ & \mathrm{SBL}^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(8.0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Morris A cres R oad at Creekside L anding Drive (Signalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | A (4.6) | A (6.7) |
| Background (2022) Traffic | A (4.7) | A (7.1) |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | A (5.0) | A (7.8) |
| US 64 Westbound at M orris A cres R oad (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | SB ${ }^{-} \mathrm{D}$ (27.9) | SB ${ }^{-}$D (28.8) |
| Background (2022) Traffic | SB - E (41.8) | SB ${ }^{-E}$ (43.6) |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | SB ${ }^{-E}$ (49.4) | SB ${ }^{-E}$ (48.8) |


| Table 6.0-B (cont.) Level-of-S ervice Summary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| Morris Acres R oad at North Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB }^{-} \mathrm{A}(9.8) \\ & \text { SBL }^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{WB}^{-1} \mathrm{~B}(10.6) \\ & \mathrm{CBI}{ }^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(80) \end{aligned}$ |
| M orris A cres R oad at South Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { WB }^{-} \text {A (9.7) } \\ & \text { SBL }^{-} \text {A (7.6) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline W B^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.8) \\ & S B L^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(8.0) \end{aligned}$ |

### 6.1 J enks Road at Morris Acres Road

A nalyses indicate that the unsignalized intersection of J enks Road at Morris A cres R oad currently operates with short delays on the minor street approach (Morris Acres Road) in both the AM and PM peak hours. The intersection is expected to continue to operate with short delays and queues in the year 2022 with or without the proposed project in place, and no roadway improvements are recommended to accommodate projected site traffic.

Table 6.1 summarizes the operation of the intersection of Jenks Road at Morris A cres Road for the existing (2018) and projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions.

| Table 6.1Level-of-ServiceJ enks Road at Morris Acres Road (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(11.3) \\ & \text { WBL }^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.8) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(14.6) \\ & W^{-1} \mathrm{~A}^{-} \mathrm{A}(8.1) \end{aligned}$ |
| Background (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(11.8) \\ & \text { WBL }^{-1}(7.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline N B^{-} C^{-16.6)} \\ & W^{-1} L^{-}(8.2) \end{aligned}$ |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(11.9) \\ & W B L^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{NB}^{-} \mathrm{C}^{(17.6)} \\ & \mathrm{WBL}^{-} \mathrm{A}(8.3) \end{aligned}$ |

### 6.2 Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook C rossing/Central Site Driveway

A nalyses indicates that the intersection of Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crossing currently operates with short delays on the minor street approach (Reedybrook Crossing) in both the AM and PM peak hours, and the intersection is expected to continue to operate with short delays in the background traffic condition.

The Wayforth at A pex proposes to construct a site driveway aligning with Reedybrook Crossing, providing one ingress lane and one egress lane. A nalyses indicate that at project build-out both minor street approaches (Reedybrook Crossing and the Central Site Driveway) are expected to operate with short delays and queues. No roadway improvements are recommended to be performed as part of this development

Table 6.2 summarizes the operation of the intersection of Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crossing/Central Site Driveway for the existing (2018) and projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions.

| Table 6.2 <br> Level-of-S ervice <br> k Crossing/Central Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB }^{-1} \text { A (9.4) } \\ & \text { NBL }^{-1} \text { A }(7.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \mathrm{NBI} \mathrm{~B}^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.6) \end{aligned}$ |
| Background (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{EB}^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(9.5) \\ & \text { NBL }^{-1}(7.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB }^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.4) \\ & \text { NBL }^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.7) \end{aligned}$ |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \hline E^{-}-\mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \text { WB }^{-} \mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \mathrm{NBL}^{-} \mathrm{A}(7.4) \\ & \mathrm{SBL}^{-1} \mathrm{~A}(7.6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{EB}^{-} \mathrm{B}(12.6)$ WB $\mathrm{NBL}^{-} \mathrm{B}(12.5)$ SBL $^{-} \mathrm{A}(8.7)$ |

### 6.3 Morris Acres Road at Creekside Landing Drive

A nalyses indicate that the signalized intersection of Morris Acres Road at Creekside Landing Drive currently operates at LOS A in both the AM and PM peak hours. The intersection is expected to continue to operate at LOS A in the year 2022 with or without the proposed project in place, and no queuing issues are expected at this intersection. No roadway improvements are recommended to be performed at this intersection to accommodate projected site traffic volumes.

Table 6.3 summarizes the operation of the intersection of Morris Acres Road at Creekside Landing Drive for the existing (2018) and projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions.

| Table 6.3 <br> Level-of-S ervice |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Morris Acres Road at Creekside Landing Drive (Signalized) |  |  |

### 6.4 Morris Acres Road at US 64 Westbound

A nalyses indicate that the unsignalized intersection of Morris Acres Road at US 64 Westbound currently operates with moderate delays on the minor street approach (Morris Acres Road) in both the AM and PM peak hours. The intersection is expected to continue to operate with moderate delays on the minor street approach in the year 2022 with or without the proposed project in place. As only slight increases in queues and delays are expected at this intersection with the addition of site traffic, no roadway improvements are recommended to be performed at this intersection.

Table 6.4 summarizes the operation of the intersection of Morris Acres Road at US 64 Westbound for the existing (2018) and projected (2022) background and build-out traffic conditions.

| Table 6.4Level-of-S erviceMorris Acres Road at US 64 Westbound (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | SB ${ }^{-}$D (27.9) | SB ${ }^{-}$D (28.8) |
| Background (2022) Traffic | SB ${ }^{-E}$ (41.8) | SB ${ }^{-E}$ (43.6) |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | SB - E (49.4) | SB ${ }^{-E}$ (48.8) |

## Kimley»Horn

### 6.5 Morris Acres Road at North Site Driveway

A full-movement site driveway is proposed to be constructed on Morris Acres Road approximately 750 feet north of Reedybrook Crossing. A nalyses indicate that the intersection is expected to operate with short delays and queues on the minor street approach (North Site Driveway) at project build-out. No roadway improvements are recommended to be performed as part of this development

Table 6.5 summarizes the operation of the intersection of Morris Acres Road at North Site Driveway for the projected (2022) build-out traffic condition.

| Table 6.5Level-of-S erviceMorris Acres Road at North Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB }^{-} \text {A (9.8) } \\ & \text { SBL }^{-} \text {A (7.7) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & W^{W-1} B^{-1}(10.6) \\ & S B{ }^{-} A(8.0) \end{aligned}$ |

## Kimley»Horn

### 6.6 Morris Acres Road at South Site Driveway

A full-movement site driveway is proposed to be constructed on Morris Acres Road approximately 500 feet south of Reedybrook Crossing. A nalyses indicate that the intersection is expected to operate with short delays and queues on the minor street approach (South Site Driveway) at project build-out. No roadway improvements are recommended to be performed as part of this development

Table 6.6 summarizes the operation of the intersection of Morris Acres Road at South Site Driveway for the projected (2022) build-out traffic condition.

| Table 6.6 <br> Level-of-S ervice |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Morris Acres Road at South Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour | PM Peak Hour |
|  | LOS (Delay) | LOS (Delay) |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | WB $^{-}$A (9.7) | WB $^{-}$B (10.8) |
|  | SBL $^{-}$A (7.6) | SBL $^{-}$A (8.0) |

## Kimley»)Horn

### 7.0 Recommendations

With the exception of southbound Morris A cres Road at US 64 Westbound, analyses indicate that all of the study intersections are expected to operate at an acceptable LOS at project build-out with only minor increases in delays and queues associated with the addition of site traffic. The intersection of US 64 Westbound at Morris Acres road is expected to operate with moderate delays on Morris Acres Road in the year 2022 with or without the proposed project in place.

No roadway improvements are recommended to be performed to accommodate projected site traffic volumes.

The build-out roadway laneage is shown on Figure 9.
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## Appendix

## Appendix A:

Assumptions Memorandum

## Preliminary Assumptions <br> The W ayforth at A pex A partments - Traffic Impact A nalysis A pex, North Carolina

KHA will perform analyses for The Wayforth at Apex development, a proposed apartments project located on the east side of Morris Acres Road (formerly Green Level Church Road) between Jenks R oad and Creekside Landing in A pex, North Carolina. The following assumptions will be used in the analysis of the site:

The study area will consist of the following intersections:
é Jenks Road at Morris A cres Road
é Morris Acres Road at Creekside Landing Drive
é US 64 at Morris Acres Road
é Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crossing/Central Site Driveway
é Morris A cres Road at North Site Driveway
é Morris Acres Road at South Site Driveway
The study scenarios will consist of:
i Existing (2018)
¿ Background (2022)
i Build-out(2022)
Based on discussions with the Town of Apex and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), the 540 Townes development located on the west side of Morris Acres Road (which is partially built-out and occupied) was identified for inclusion in this analysis as background traffic. Traffic for this development will be obtained from the Beaver Creek Residential Development TIA (Stantec, J uly 2015).

In addition to the approved development traffic, an annual growth rate of $3 \%$ will also be applied to the existing traffic volumes up to the year 2022.

Separate entering and existing directional distributions will be used for the site based on a review of surrounding land uses and the existing roadway network. The following overall distribution will be used for entering traffic:
i $25 \%$ from the east on US 64
i $25 \%$ from the east on J enks R oad
i 25\% from the west on Jenks Road
i 25\% from the south on Creekside Landing Drive
The following overall distribution will be used for entering traffic:
i 50\% to the east on Jenks Road
i $25 \%$ to the west on US 64
i $15 \%$ to the south on Creekside L anding Drive
i $10 \%$ to the west on Jenks Road
The property is currently occupied by a few single-family homes, and as currently envisioned the development will consist of approximately 305 apartments. Trips will be generated using ITE Trip Generation $10^{\text {th }}$ E dition rates. See attached trip generation table.

| The Wayforth at Apex <br> Table 1 - Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Intensity |  | Daily |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 221 Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) | 305 | d.u. | 1,662 | 831 | 831 | 102 | 27 | 75 | 129 | 79 | 50 |



## Appendix B: <br> Trip Generation

| The Wayforth at Apex <br> Table 1 - Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Intensity |  | Daily |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total | In | Out |
| 221 Multifamily Housing (Mid-R ise) | 300 | d.u. | 1,634 | 817 | 817 | 100 | 26 | 74 | 127 | 77 | 50 |

Appendix C:
Traffic Count Data

Morris Acres Road/ and I enks Road AM and PM Peak Hour Traffic Count
Count Performed: Tuesday, October 23, 2018

| Start Time | 0 |  |  | enks Road |  |  | Morris Acres Road |  |  | enks Road |  |  | Intersection Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 7:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 53 | 9 | 120 |
| 7:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 38 | 9 | 109 |
| 7:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 37 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 54 | 9 | 139 |
| 7:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 55 | 3 | 143 |
| 8:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 54 | 9 | 128 |
| 8:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 46 | 13 | 113 |
| 8:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 45 | 11 | 119 |
| 8:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 28 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 53 | 12 | 129 |


| $16: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 39 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 47 | 24 | 173 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 47 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 39 | 24 | 176 |
| $16: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 45 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 38 | 14 | 170 |
| $16: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 59 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 41 | 21 | 184 |
| $17: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 65 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 47 | 23 | 201 |
| $17: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 52 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 45 | 31 | 207 |
| $17: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 67 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 63 | 28 | 227 |
| $17: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 66 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 61 | 17 | 225 |


| Peak Hour |  | SBL | SBT | SBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $7: 00-8: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 104 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 200 | 30 | 511 |  |
| $7: 15-8: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 112 | 0 | 116 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 201 | 30 | 519 |  |
| $7: 30-8: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 113 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 209 | 34 | 523 |  |
| $7: 45-8: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 103 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 200 | 36 | 503 |  |
| $8: 00-9: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 100 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 198 | 45 | 489 |  |


| Peak Hour | SBL | SBT | SBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 00-17: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 190 | 0 | 157 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 165 | 83 | 703 |
| $16: 15-17: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 216 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 165 | 82 | 731 |
| $16: 30-17: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 221 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 171 | 89 | 762 |
| $16: 45-17: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 243 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 196 | 103 | 819 |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 250 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 216 | 99 | 860 |


| Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | Volume |
| 7:30-8:30 | 110 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 34 | 16 | 113 | 0 | 523 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 175 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 99 | 57 | 250 | 0 | 860 |


| Peak-Hour Factor by Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | PHF |
| 7:30-8:30 | 0.743 | - | 0.788 | - | - | - | - | 0.950 | 0.654 | 0.667 | 0.764 | - | 0.914 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 0.931 | - | 0.788 | - | - | - | 0.250 | 0.857 | 0.798 | 0.838 | 0.933 | - | 0.947 |


| Peak-Hour Factor by Approach |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NB | SB | E B | WB | PHF |  |  |
| $7: 30-8: 30$ | 0.76 | - | 0.96 | 0.83 | 0.91 |  |  |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 0.93 | - | 0.87 | 0.93 | 0.95 |  |  |


| Heavy Vehicle Percentage by Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | \%HV |
| 7:30-8:30 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 17:00-18:00 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |


| Heavy Vehicle Percentage by Approach |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NB | SB | E B | WB | $\%$ HV |
| $7: 30-8: 30$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

Morris Acres Road and Creekside Landing Drive/ AM and PM Peak Hour Traffic Count Count Performed: Tuesday, October 23, 2018

| Start Time | Morris Acres Road Southbound |  |  | 0 |  |  | Morris Acres Road Northbound |  |  | Creekside Landing Drive <br> Eastbound |  |  | Intersection Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 7:00 | 0 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 25 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 83 |
| 7:15 | 0 | 25 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 26 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 28 | 101 |
| 7:30 | 0 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 27 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 21 | 106 |
| 7:45 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 28 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 23 | 103 |
| 8:00 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 32 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 100 |
| 8:15 | 0 | 31 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 95 |
| 8:30 | 0 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 26 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 94 |
| 8:45 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 24 | 101 |


| $16: 00$ | 0 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 27 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 35 | 168 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 15$ | 0 | 26 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 42 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 42 | 191 |
| $16: 30$ | 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 59 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 44 | 186 |
| $16: 45$ | 0 | 17 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 44 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 43 | 184 |
| $17: 00$ | 0 | 19 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 55 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 50 | 197 |
| $17: 15$ | 0 | 29 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 59 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 43 | 217 |
| $17: 30$ | 0 | 20 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 47 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 39 | 183 |
| $17: 45$ | 0 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 74 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 46 | 227 |


| Peak Hour |  | SBL | SBT | SBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBL | EBT | EBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $7: 00-8: 00$ | 0 | 101 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 106 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 92 | 393 |
| $7: 15-8: 15$ | 0 | 102 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 113 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 95 | 410 |
| $7: 30-8: 30$ | 0 | 108 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 105 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 98 | 404 |
| $7: 45-8: 45$ | 0 | 82 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 104 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 104 | 392 |
| $8: 00-9: 00$ | 0 | 83 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 97 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 105 | 390 |


| Peak Hour | SBL | SBT | SBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 00-17: 00$ | 0 | 76 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 172 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 164 | 729 |
| $16: 15-17: 15$ | 0 | 76 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 200 | 0 | 82 | 0 | 179 | 758 |
| $16: 30-17: 30$ | 0 | 79 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 217 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 180 | 784 |
| $16: 45-17: 45$ | 0 | 85 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 205 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 175 | 781 |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 0 | 83 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 235 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 178 | 824 |


| Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | Volume |  |
| $7: 15-8: 15$ | 55 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 15 | 30 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 410 |  |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 144 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 88 | 96 | 0 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 824 |  |


| Peak-Hour Factor by Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | PHF |
| 7:15-8:15 | 0.724 | 0.883 | - | - | 0.638 | 0.469 | 0.500 | - | 0.848 | - | - | - | 0.967 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 0.923 | 0.794 | - | - | 0.716 | 0.846 | 0.613 | - | 0.890 | - | - | - | 0.907 |


| Peak-Hour Factor by Approach |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NB | SB | EB | WB | PHF |  |
| $7: 15-8: 15$ | 0.88 | 0.68 | 0.82 | - | 0.97 |  |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 0.84 | 0.78 | 0.90 | - | 0.91 |  |


| Heavy Vehicle Percentage by Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | \%HV |
| 7:15-8:15 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 17:00 - 18:00 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |


| Heavy Vehicle Percentage by Approach |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NB | SB | EB | WB | $\% H V$ |
| $7: 15-8: 15$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

/Morris Acres Road and /US 64 AM and PM Peak Hour Traffic Count Count Performed: Tuesday, October 23, 2018

| Start Time | Morris Acres Road |  |  | US 64 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | Intersection Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right | Left | Thru | Right |  |
| 7:00 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 300 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 350 |
| 7:15 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 320 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 388 |
| 7:30 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 399 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 471 |
| 7:45 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 450 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 519 |
| 8:00 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 428 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 486 |
| 8:15 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 416 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 476 |
| 8:30 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 370 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 433 |
| 8:45 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 372 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 437 |


| $16: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 394 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 482 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 417 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 513 |
| $16: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 415 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 532 |
| $16: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 416 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 522 |
| $17: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 456 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 564 |
| $17: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 459 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 559 |
| $17: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 450 | 74 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 558 |
| $17: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 418 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 536 |


| Peak Hour |  | SBL | SBT | SBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $7: 00-8: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 114 | 0 | 1,469 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,728 |  |
| $7: 15-8: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 1,597 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,864 |  |
| $7: 30-8: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 1,693 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,952 |  |
| $7: 45-8: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 1,664 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,914 |  |
| $8: 00-9: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 1,586 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,832 |  |


| Peak Hour | SBL | SBT | SBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $16: 00-17: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 1,642 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,049 |
| $16: 15-17: 15$ | 0 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 1,704 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,131 |
| $16: 30-17: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 1,746 | 305 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,177 |
| $16: 45-17: 45$ | 0 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 1,781 | 299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,203 |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 1,783 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,217 |


| Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | Volume |
| $7: 30-8: 30$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,693 | 140 | 1,952 |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,783 | 308 | 2,217 |


| Peak-Hour Factor by Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | PHF |
| 7:30-8:30 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.850 | - | - | - | - | 0.941 | 0.814 | 0.940 |
| 17:00 - 18:00 | - | - | - | - | - | 0.926 | - | - | - | - | 0.971 | 0.885 | 0.983 |


| Peak-Hour Factor by Approach |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NB | SB | EB | WB | PHF |  |
| $7: 30-8: 30$ | - | 0.85 | - | 0.93 | 0.94 |  |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | - | 0.93 | - | 0.98 | 0.98 |  |


| Heavy Vehicle Percentage by Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | \%HV |
| 7:30-8:30 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 17:00-18:00 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |


| Heavy Vehicle Percentage by Approach |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | NB | SB | EB | WB | $\% H V$ |
| $7: 30-8: 30$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| $17: 00-18: 00$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
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## BEAVER CREEK RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FINAL TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The proposed Beaver Creek Residential Development is located between US 64 and Green Level Church Road, just east of NC 540, in Apex, NC, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Proposed Site Location


The proposed 27.5 acre site is planned to have up to 300 apartments and 50 townhomes. The proposed site is anticipated to be built-out by the year 2020. A conceptual sketch illustrating the development property and the access locations used in this study is shown on the site plan in Figure 2.

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the proposed development in terms of projected traffic conditions, evaluate the ability of the adjacent roadways to accommodate the additional traffic volumes, and to recommend transportation improvements needed to mitigate congestion that may result from the additional site traffic. This report presents trip generation, trip distribution, traffic analyses, and recommendations for transportation improvements needed to meet anticipated traffic demands. This report examines the following scenarios for both the AM and PM peak hours:

- 2015 Existing
- 2020 No-Build
- 2020 Build

Figure 2: Site Plan


## BEAVER CREEK RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FINAL TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

### 4.0 TRAFFIC GENERATION

The proposed Beaver Creek Residential Development will consist of up to 300 Apartments and 50 Condominiums. Table 2 below shows the number of anticipated trips entering and exiting the site during a typical week day and during the AM and PM peak hours.

Table 2: ITE Trip Generation Table

| ITE Trip Generation Beaver Creek Residential Development ITE Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | ITE Site Code | Size |  | Daily | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Total | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit |
| Apartment | 220 | 300 | units | 1942 | 151 | 30 | 121 | 183 | 119 | 64 |
| Residential Condominium/Townhouse | 230 | 50 | units | 352 | 30 | 5 | 25 | 34 | 23 | 11 |
| Total New Trips |  |  |  | 2293 | 181 | 35 | 146 | 217 | 142 | 75 |

### 4.1 SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION

In order to accurately determine the effect of the proposed development on the surrounding roadway network, an estimate of the expected distribution of traffic entering and exiting the site is needed. The following percentages were used in both the AM and PM peak hours.

- $5 \%$ to/from the west on US 64
- $20 \%$ to/from the east on US 64
- $25 \%$ to/from the north on W. Williams Street
- $15 \%$ to/from the south on W. Williams Street
- $10 \%$ to/from the north on Kelly Road
- $10 \%$ to/from the south on Kelly Road
- $15 \%$ to/from the north on NC 540

These percentages were developed using a combination of input from the Town of Apex, existing traffic volume counts, historic AADTs provided by NCDOT, and engineering judgment. Figure 8 shows the distributions described above as well as the turning movement percentages at each intersection.

Figure 8: Site Trip Distribution


## Stantec

Figure 9: Future (2020) AM Build Out Traffic Volumes


Stantec

Figure 10: Future (2020) PM Build Out Traffic Volumes
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Figure 11: Recommended Geometry
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## Appendix E: <br> Intersection Spreadsheets

INTERSECTION ANALY SIS SHEET


|  | AM In | AM Out | PM In | PM Out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net New Trips: | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |
| Annual Growth Rate: | 3.0\% | Existing Y ear: Buildout $Y$ ear: |  | 2018 |
| Growth Factor: | 0.125509 |  |  | 2022 |


|  | Jenks Road <br> Eastbound |  |  | Jenks Road Westbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 0 | 209 | 34 | 16 | 113 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 209 | 34 | 16 | 113 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 26 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C ommitted Projects <br> Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T otal Committed T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 235 | 38 | 18 | 127 | 0 | 126 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent A ssignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T otal Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 0 | 235 | 44 | 25 | 127 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Impact (Approach) |  | 2.1\% |  | 4.6\% |  |  | 20.2\% |  |  | - |  |  |

Overall Percent Impact
8.8\%

| PM PEAK HOUR PM PHF $=0.95$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Jenks Road <br> Eastbound |  | Jenks Road Westbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Southbound |  |  |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic C ount | 0 | 216 | 99 | 57 | 250 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 216 | 99 | 57 | 250 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 31 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C ommitted Projects <br> Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T otal Committed Traffic | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 243 | 112 | 66 | 281 | 0 | 198 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 19 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 0 | 243 | 131 | 86 | 281 | 0 | 203 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Impact (A pproach) |  | 5.1\% |  |  | 5.4\% |  |  | 10.0\% |  |  | - |  |

INTERSECTION ANALY SIS SHEET

| Project: | The Wayforth at Apex |
| :---: | :---: |
| L ocation: | Apex, NC |
| Ct. Date | Balance with J enks at M orris Acres |
| N/S Street: | Morris Acres Road |
| EN Street: | Reedybrook Crossing/C entral Site Driveway |


| Net New Trips: | AM In | AM Out | PM In | PM Out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |
| A nnual Growth R ate: | 3.0\% | Existing Y ear: Buildout Y ear: |  | 2018 |
| Growth Factor: | 0.125509 |  |  | 2022 |


|  | Reedybrook Crossing Eastbound |  |  | Central Site Driveway Westbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic C ount | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 26 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 26 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.126 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.126 | 0.000 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| C ommitted Projects <br> Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| T otal C ommitted Traffic | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 29 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 6 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 30\% | 30\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 35\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| T otal Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 29 | 0 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 6 | 149 | 8 | 8 | 56 | 6 |
| Percent Impact (A pproach) |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 9.8\% |  |  | 18.7\% |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\hline \text { Overall Percent Impact } 22.1 \% \\
\text { PM PEAK HOUR }
\end{array}
$$

| PM PEAK HOUR <br> PM PHF $=0.90$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reedybrook Crossing Eastbound |  |  | Central Site Driveway Westbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Southbound |  |  |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic C ount | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 24 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 24 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.126 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.126 | 0.000 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Committed Projects | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| T otal Committed Traffic | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 15 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 253 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 27 |
| Project T raffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 30\% | 30\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 23 | 4 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 35\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| T otal Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 23 | 7 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 15 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 262 | 23 | 23 | 156 | 27 |
| Percent Impact (A pproach) |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 10.4\% |  |  | 14.6\% |  |

INTERSECTION ANALY SIS SHEET

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project: | The Wayforth at A pex |
| Location: | Apex, NC |
| Ct. Date | $10 / 23 / 2018$ |
| N/S Street: | Morris A cres R oad |
| ENW Street: | Creekside Landing Drive |
|  |  |


|  | AM In | AM Out | PM In | PM Out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net New Trips: | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |
| A nnual Growth Rate: Growth Factor: | 3.0\% | Existing Y ear: Buildout $Y$ ear: |  | 2018 |
|  | 0.125509 |  |  | 2022 |


|  | Creekside Landing Drive Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 30 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 15 |
| Count Balancing | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 30 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 15 |
| Growth Factor ( 0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 4 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 |
| Committed Projects <br> Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| T otal C ommitted Tr raffic | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 2022 Background T raffic | 34 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 17 |
| Project Traffic Percent A ssignment Inbound | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Assignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 15\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 10 |
| T otal Project Traffic | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 10 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 41 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 27 |
| Percent Impact (Approach) | 4.7\% |  |  | - |  |  | 3.6\% |  |  | 17.7\% |  |  |

Overall Percent Impact $8.4 \%$ PM PEAK HOUR

| PM PEAK HOUR <br> PM PHF $=0.91$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Creekside Landing Drive Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Southbound |  |  |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 96 | 0 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 88 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 96 | 0 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 235 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 88 |
| Growth Factor ( 0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 12 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 |
| C ommitted Projects <br> Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential <br> T otal C ommitted Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 108 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 266 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 99 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent Assignment Inbound <br> Inbound Project Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Assignment Outbound Outbound Project T raffic | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 15\% |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | O | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 |
| Total Project Traffic <br> 2022 Buildout Total Percent Impact (A pproach) | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 |
|  | 127 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 285 | 0 | 0 | 108 | 106 |
|  |  | 5.8\% |  |  | - |  |  | 4.2\% |  |  | 9.4\% |  |

INTERSECTION ANALY SIS SHEET

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project: |  |
|  | The Wayforth at Apex |
| Location: | Apex, NC |
| Ct. Date | $10 / 232018$ |
| N/S Street: | Morris Acres Road |
| EN Street: | US 64 WB |
|  |  |


|  | AM In | AM Out | PM In | PM Out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net New Trips: | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |
| A nnual Growth R ate: | 3.0\% | Existing $Y$ ear: Buildout $Y$ ear: |  | 2018 |
| Growth Factor: | 0.125509 |  |  | 2022 |


|  | US 64 WB <br> Eastbound |  |  | US 64 WB Westbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic C ount | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1693 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1693 | 140 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| C ommitted Projects <br> Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| T otal Committed Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1905 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% |
| Outbound Project T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Total Project T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1905 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| Percent Impact (A pproach) |  | - |  |  | 0.3\% |  |  | - |  |  | 12.2\% |  |

Overall Percent Impact $1.2 \%$

| PM PEAK HOUR PM PHF $=0.98$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | US 64 WB <br> Eastbound |  |  | US 64 WB Westbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Southbound |  |  |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1783 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1783 | 308 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| C ommitted Projects Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| T otal C ommitted Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2007 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| Project Traffic Percent A ssignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% |
| Outbound Project T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Total Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2007 | 369 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| Percent Impact (A pproach) |  | - |  |  | 0.8\% |  |  | - |  |  | 8.3\% |  |

INTERSECTION ANALY SIS SHEET

| Project: | The Wayforth at A pex |
| :---: | :---: |
| L ocation: | Apex, NC |
| Ct. Date | Balance with J enks at M orris Acres |
| N/S Street: | M orris Acres R oad |
| EN Street: | North Site Driveway |


|  | AM In | AM Out | PM In | PM Out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net New Trips: | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |
| A nnual Growth R ate: Growth Factor: | 3.0\% | Existing Y ear:Buildout Y ear: |  | 2018 |
|  | 0.125509 |  |  | 2022 |


|  | North Site Driveway Eastbound |  |  | North Site Driveway Westbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic C ount | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| C ommitted Projects Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| T otal C ommitted T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 |
| Project Traffic Percent A ssignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 15\% | 35\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 45\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 207 | 1 | 4 | 66 | 0 |
| Percent Impact (A pproach) |  | - |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 16.4\% |  |  | 18.6\% |  |

Overall Percent Impact $\quad 21.2 \%$

| PM PEAK HOUR <br> PM PHF $=0.90$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | North Site Driveway Eastbound |  |  | North Site Driveway Westbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Northbound |  |  | Morris A cres Road Southbound |  |  |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 0 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 |
| C ommitted Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| T otal C ommitted Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 0 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 15\% | 35\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 27 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 45\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 23 | 4 | 12 | 27 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 293 | 4 | 12 | 207 | 0 |
| Percent Impact (Approach) |  | - |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 9.1\% |  |  | 17.8\% |  |

INTERSECTION ANALY SIS SHEET

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project: | The Wayforth at A pex |
| Location: | Apex, NC |
| Ct. Date | Balance with J enks at M orris Acres |
| N/S Street: | Morris Acres R oad |
| EN S Street: | South Site Driveway |
|  |  |


|  | AM In | AM Out | PM In | PM Out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net New Trips: | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |
| A nnual Growth R ate: | 3.0\% | Existing Y ear:Buildout Y ear: |  | 2018 |
| Growth Factor: | 0.125509 |  |  | 2022 |


|  |  |  |  |  | PEAK H $\mathrm{PHF}=$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { h Site Drive } \\ & \text { E astbound } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Site Drive Westbound |  |  | ris Acres R orthbound |  |  | is A cres R outhbound |  |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Committed Projects Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| T otal C ommitted Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 |
| Project Traffic Percent A ssignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 35\% | 15\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 30\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |
| T otal Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 22 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 156 | 4 | 1 | 105 | 0 |
| Percent Impact (A pproach) |  | - |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 8.1\% |  |  | 21.8\% |  |

Overall Percent Impact 17.9\%

| PM PEAK HOUR PM PHF $=0.90$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | South Site Driveway Eastbound |  |  | South Site Driveway Westbound |  |  | Morris Acres R oad Northbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Southbound |  |  |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic C ount | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 0 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Committed Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| T otal C ommitted T raffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 0 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 35\% | 15\% | 5\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent A ssignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 10\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 30\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Total Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 11 | 4 | 15 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout T otal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 305 | 11 | 4 | 179 | 0 |
| Percent Impact (Approach) |  | - |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 12.0\% |  |  | 10.4\% |  |

Appendix F:
Synchro Output:
Existing (2018)





## Intersection Summary

Area Type:
Other
Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 16.6\%
ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15




K:IRAL_TPTO\_Traffic1013249000 Morris Acres ResidentiallT4 - Analysis|SynchrolExistingAM.syn
Kimley-Horn

| 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| 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 0.03 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 32.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.19 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 4.6 |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 24.2\% |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description: 05-2280 |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Morris Acres Road \& Creekside Landing Drive


|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | 个个 | 「 |  | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 0 | 0 | 1693 | 140 | 0 | 119 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 0 | 0 | 1693 | 140 | 0 | 119 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 0 |  |  | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 55 | 55 |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 890 | 661 |  | 383 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 11.0 | 8.2 |  | 5.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 0 | 1801 | 149 | 0 | 127 |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type：Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 60．8\％ICU Level of Service B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 1 |  | \% | 4 | \% | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 216 | 99 | 57 | 250 | 175 | 63 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 216 | 99 | 57 | 250 | 175 | 63 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) |  | 0 | 200 |  | 200 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) |  |  | 100 |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1785 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1785 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 45 |  |  | 45 | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 645 |  |  | 534 | 1006 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 9.8 |  |  | 8.1 | 15.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 331 | 0 | 60 | 263 | 184 | 66 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 40.4\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  | 1 | 4 | a | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 216 | 99 | 57 | 250 | 175 | 63 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 216 | 99 | 57 | 250 | 175 | 63 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | 200 | - | 200 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 227 | 104 | 60 | 263 | 184 | 66 |



|  | $\rangle$ | 7 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | \% | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 14 | 14 | 20 | 225 | 132 | 24 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 14 | 14 | 20 | 225 | 132 | 24 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 | 100 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  | 100 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1694 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1824 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.976 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1694 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1824 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 45 | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 294 |  |  | 470 | 758 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.0 |  |  | 7.1 | 11.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%)Lane Group Flow (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type:
Other
Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 25.1\%
ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15




K:IRAL_TPTO\_Trafficl013249000 Morris Acres ResidentiallT4 - Analysis|SynchrolExistingPM.syn
Kimley-Horn

| 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| 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 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.11 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 39.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 6.7 |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 36.3\% |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description: 05-2280 |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Morris Acres Road \& Creekside Landing Drive



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Major2 Minor2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All |  | - | 0 | - | 910 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy |  | - | - | - | 6.94 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy |  | - | - | - | 3.32 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver |  | - | - | 0 | 277 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver |  | - | - | - | 277 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s |  | 0 |  | . 8 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  | D |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | WBT | WBR |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 77 |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | D |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 2.3 |  |  |

Appendix G:
Synchro Output:
Background (2022)

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | 7 |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | \% | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 235 | 38 | 18 | 127 | 126 | 48 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 235 | 38 | 18 | 127 | 126 | 48 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (t) |  | 0 | 200 |  | 200 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) |  |  | 100 |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1827 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1827 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 45 |  |  | 45 | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (tt) | 645 |  |  | 534 | 1006 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 9.8 |  |  | 8.1 | 15.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 300 | 0 | 20 | 140 | 138 | 53 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 28.6\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 4 | 7 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 29 | 29 | 6 | 141 | 51 | 6 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 29 | 29 | 6 | 141 | 51 | 6 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (t) | 0 | 0 | 100 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  | 100 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1694 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1835 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.976 |  | 0.950 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1694 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1835 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 45 | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (tt) | 294 |  |  | 470 | 758 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.0 |  |  | 7.1 | 11.5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Shared Lane Traffic (\%) } & & \\ \text { Lane Group Flow (vph) } & 64 & 0 & 7 & 157 & 64 & 0\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type:
Other
Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 17.5\%
ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |




K:IRAL_TPTO\_Trafficl013249000 Morris Acres ResidentiallT4 - Analysis\SynchrolBackgroundAM.syn
Kimley-Horn

| 4 |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| 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 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.08 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 32.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 4.7 |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 34.2\% |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description: 05-2280 |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Morris Acres Road \& Creekside Landing Drive


|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | 个个 | 「 |  | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 0 | 0 | 1905 | 159 | 0 | 137 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 0 | 0 | 1905 | 159 | 0 | 137 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length（ft） | 0 |  |  | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Taper Length（ft） | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| Link Speed（mph） |  | 55 | 55 |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance（ft） |  | 890 | 661 |  | 383 |  |
| Travel Time（s） |  | 11.0 | 8.2 |  | 5.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Shared Lane Traffic（\％） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 0 | 0 | 2027 | 169 | 0 | 146 |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type：Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 67．8\％ICU Level of Service C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor |  | Major2 | Minor2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All |  | - | 0 | - | 1013 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy |  | - | - | - | 6.94 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy |  | - | - | - | 3.32 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver |  | - | - | 0 | 237 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver |  | - | - | - | 237 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s |  | 0 |  | . 8 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  | E |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | WBT | WBR |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 37 |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - |  |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | E |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 3.6 |  |  |


|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\uparrow$ | \% | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 243 | 112 | 66 | 281 | 198 | 72 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 243 | 112 | 66 | 281 | 198 | 72 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (tt) |  | 0 | 200 |  | 200 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) |  |  | 100 |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1783 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1783 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 45 |  |  | 45 | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 645 |  |  | 534 | 1006 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 9.8 |  |  | 8.1 | 15.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 374 | 0 | 69 | 296 | 208 | 76 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |





## Intersection Summary

```
Area Type:
Other
```

Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 26.1\%
ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15




K:IRAL_TPTO\_Trafficl013249000 Morris Acres ResidentiallT4 - Analysis\Synchro\BackgroundPM.syn
Kimley-Horn

| $\rangle$ |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| 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 0.13 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.13 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 39.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.37 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 7.1 |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 38.6\% |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description: 05-2280 |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Morris Acres Road \& Creekside Landing Drive


|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | 个4 | F |  | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 2007 | 350 | 0 | 144 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 2007 | 350 | 0 | 144 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  |  | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Taper Length (tt) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 | 55 |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 890 | 661 |  | 383 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.0 | 8.2 |  | 5.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 2048 | 357 | 0 | 147 |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 71.1\% ICU Level of Service C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor |  | Major2 | Minor2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All |  | - | 0 | - | 1024 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy |  | - | - | - | 6.94 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy |  | - | - | - | 3.32 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver |  | - | - | 0 | 233 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver |  | - | - | - | 233 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s |  | 0 |  | . 6 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  | E |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | WBT | WBR |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 33 |  |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 3.6 |  |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | E |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 3.8 |  |  |

Appendix H:
Synchro Output: Build-out (2022)


| Intersection Summary |
| :--- |
| Area Type: Other |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $34.8 \%$ |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |




2: Morris Acres R oad \& Reedybrook C rossing/Central Site Driveway

|  | $\Rightarrow$ | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  | \% | $\hat{F}$ |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 29 | 4 | 29 | 19 | 4 | 26 | 6 | 149 | 8 | 8 | 56 | 6 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 29 | 4 | 29 | 19 | 4 | 26 | 6 | 149 | 8 | 8 | 56 | 6 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length(f) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length(f) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 0 | 1694 | 0 | 1770 | 1848 | 0 | 1770 | 1835 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.977 |  |  | 0.981 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 0 | 1694 | 0 | 1770 | 1848 | 0 | 1770 | 1835 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 294 |  |  | 267 |  |  | 470 |  |  | 758 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  | 7.3 |  |  | 7.1 |  |  | 11.5 |  |
| 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 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 7 | 175 | 0 | 9 | 69 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: Other |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 20.0\% | ICU Level of Service A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |





K:VAL_TPTO\_Trafficl013249000 Moris Acres ResidentiallT4- Analysis\SynchrolBuildAMsyn
Kirley-Hom

|  | $\gamma$ |  | 4 | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reducedv/c Ratio | 0.04 | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.10 |  |

## Intersection Surmary

## Area Type: <br> Other

```
Cycle Length: }11
```

Actuated Cycle Length: 32.4
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximumv/c Ratio: 0.21
Intersection Signal Delay: $5.0 \quad$ Intersection LOS: A

Intersection Capacity Utilization 34.2\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Description: 05-2280
Splits and Phases: 3: Moris Acres Road \& Creekside Landing Drive


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | 4 | , | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | 44 | F |  | F |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 1905 | 166 | 0 | 156 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 1905 | 166 | 0 | 156 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  |  | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Taper Length(ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 | 55 |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 890 | 661 |  | 383 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.0 | 8.2 |  | 5.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow(vph) | 0 | 0 | 2027 | 177 | 0 | 166 |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |


| Intersection Summary |
| :--- |
| Area Type: Other |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $69.0 \%$ |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |




|  | 7 | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 4 | 11 | 207 | 4 | 4 | 66 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 4 | 11 | 207 | 4 | 4 | 66 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length(ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1655 | 0 | 1859 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Flt Pemitted | 0.988 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1655 | 0 | 1859 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 317 |  | 758 |  |  | 1006 |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.6 |  | 11.5 |  |  | 15.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow(vph) | 16 | 0 | 234 | 0 | 4 | 73 |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |


| Intersection Summary |
| :--- |
| Area Type: Other |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $21.1 \%$ |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |




|  | $\checkmark$ | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 7 | 7 | 156 | 4 | 4 | 105 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 7 | 7 | 156 | 4 | 4 | 105 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (f) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow(prot) | 1694 | 0 | 1857 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| FltPemitted | 0.976 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1694 | 0 | 1857 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 369 |  | 1004 |  |  | 470 |
| Travel Time (s) | 10.1 |  | 15.2 |  |  | 7.1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow(vph) | 16 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 4 | 117 |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |


| Intersection Surmary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: Other |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 18.5\% | ICU Level of Service A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |



| MajorMinor | Minor1 | Major1 |  |  | Major2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting FlowAll | 302 | 176 | 0 | 0 | 178 | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 176 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 126 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdwy | 6.42 | 6.22 | - | - | 4.12 | - |  |
| Critical Hdyy Stg 1 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Critical Howy Stg 2 | 5.42 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.518 | 3.318 | - | - | 2.218 | - |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 690 | 867 | - | - | 1398 | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 855 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 900 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 688 | 867 | - | - | 1398 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer | 713 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Stage 1 | 855 | - | - |  | - | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 897 | - | - | - | - | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| HCMControl Delay, s | 9.7 |  | 0 |  | 0.3 |  |  |
| HCMLOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mwn |  | NBT | NBRV | BLn1 | SBL | SBT |  |
| Capacity (vehh) |  | - | - | 782 | 1398 | - |  |
| HCMLane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.02 | 0.003 | - |  |
| HCMControl Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.7 | 7.6 | - |  |
| HCMLane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | - |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |  |


| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 243 | 131 | 86 | 281 | 203 | 97 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 243 | 131 | 86 | 281 | 203 | 97 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) |  | 0 | 200 |  | 200 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) |  |  | 100 |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1775 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Flt Pemitted |  |  | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1775 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1770 | 1583 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 45 |  |  | 45 | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 645 |  |  | 534 | 1006 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 9.8 |  |  | 8.1 | 15.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow(vph) | 394 | 0 | 91 | 296 | 214 | 102 |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: Other |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 46.8\% |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |




|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | * | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | * |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{}$ |  | \% | 个 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 4 | 15 | 12 | 4 | 18 | 22 | 262 | 23 | 23 | 156 | 27 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 4 | 15 | 12 | 4 | 18 | 22 | 262 | 23 | 23 | 156 | 27 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (f) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow(prot) | 0 | 1712 | 0 | 0 | 1697 | 0 | 1770 | 1840 | 0 | 1770 | 1822 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.978 |  |  | 0.983 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow(perm) | 0 | 1712 | 0 | 0 | 1697 | 0 | 1770 | 1840 | 0 | 1770 | 1822 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 294 |  |  | 267 |  |  | 470 |  |  | 758 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  | 7.3 |  |  | 7.1 |  |  | 11.5 |  |
| 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 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow(vph) | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 24 | 317 | 0 | 26 | 203 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: Other |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 29.1\% | ICU Level of Service A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |




|  | $\psi$ |  | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 127 | 201 | 164 | 285 | 108 | 106 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 127 | 201 | 164 | 285 | 108 | 106 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | 2\% |  |  | -5\% | 5\% |  |
| Storage Length (ft) | 100 | 0 | 100 |  |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 |
| Taper Length(ft) | 55 |  | 100 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1752 | 1567 | 1814 | 1909 | 1694 | 0 |
| Fit Permitted | 0.950 |  | 0.432 |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1752 | 1567 | 825 | 1909 | 1694 | 0 |
| Right Tum on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow(RTOR) |  | 221 |  |  | 78 |  |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  |  | 45 | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 396 |  |  | 548 | 1004 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 10.8 |  |  | 8.3 | 15.2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow(vph) | 140 | 221 | 180 | 313 | 235 | 0 |
| Tum Type | Prot | pm+ov | pm+pt | NA | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  | 8 | 6 |  |  |  |
| Detector Phase | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 |  |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MinimumInitial (s) | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |  |
| MinimumSplit(s) | 22.7 | 12.2 | 12.2 | 24.0 | 23.1 |  |
| Total Split(s) | 25.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 90.0 | 75.0 |  |
| Total Split(\%) | 21.7\% | 13.0\% | 13.0\% | 78.3\% | 65.2\% |  |
| YellowTime(s) | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 4.1 |  |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Lost Time Adjust(s) | 0.3 | -0.2 | -0.2 | -1.0 | -0.1 |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |  |
| Lead/Lag |  | Lead | Lead |  | Lag |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | Min | Min |  |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 7.9 | 17.8 | 25.8 | 27.2 | 12.6 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.19 | 0.44 | 0.63 | 0.67 | 0.31 |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.41 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.41 |  |
| Control Delay | 20.1 | 2.2 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 11.6 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 20.1 | 2.2 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 11.6 |  |
| LOS | C | A | A | A | B |  |
| Approach Delay | 9.1 |  |  | 5.1 | 11.6 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  | A | B |  |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 30 | 0 | 16 | 30 | 28 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 73 | 23 | 40 | 68 | 83 |  |
| Intemal Link Dist(ft) | 316 |  |  | 468 | 924 |  |
| Tum Bay Length(ft) | 100 |  | 100 |  |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 884 | 885 | 771 | 1909 | 1694 |  |

K:VAL_TPTO\_Traffic1013249000 Moris Acres ResidentiallT4- Analysis\SynchrolBuildPMsyn
Kirley-Hom

| 4 |  | 4 |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Starvation Cap Reductn 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Spillback Cap Reductn 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Cap Reductn 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reduced v/c Ratio 0.16 | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.16 | 0.14 |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 115 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 40.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Natural Cycle: 60 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximumv/c Ratio: 0.41 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 7.8 |  |  |  | sectio | OS: A |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 40.8\% |  |  |  | Level | Service A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description: 05-2280 |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 3: Momis Acres Road \& Creekside Landing Drive


|  |  |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | 个4 | F |  | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 2007 | 369 | 0 | 157 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 2007 | 369 | 0 | 157 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  |  | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Satd. Flow(prot) | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| FltPemitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 3539 | 1583 | 0 | 1611 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 55 | 55 |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 890 | 661 |  | 383 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 11.0 | 8.2 |  | 5.8 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Shared Lane Traffic (\%) } & 0 & \\ \text { Lane Group Flow(vph) } & 0 & 0 & 2048 & 377 & 0 & 160\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |


| Intersection Surmary Other |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 71.9\% ICU Level of Service C <br> Analysis Period (min) 15  |  |



| Major/Minor | Major2 Minor2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All |  | - | 0 | 1024 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - |
| Critical Howy |  | - | - | 6.94 |
| Critical Hdyy Stg 1 |  | - | - |  |
| Critical Hdyy Stg 2 |  | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy |  | - | - | 3.32 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver |  | - | - | 233 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Manewer |  | - | - | 233 |
| Mov Cap-2 Manewer |  | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 |  | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach |  | WB |  |  |
| HCMControl Delay, s |  | 0 |  |  |
| HCMLOS |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major M ${ }^{\text {mint }}$ | WBT | WBR |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - |  | 33 |  |
| HCMLane V/C Ratio | - | - |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - |  |  |
| HCMLane LOS | - |  | E |  |
| HCM 95th \%dile Q(veh) | - |  | 4.4 |  |


|  | $\checkmark$ | 4 |  |  | - | $\frac{1}{7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ** |  | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1 /}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 4 | 8 | 293 | 4 | 12 | 207 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 4 | 8 | 293 | 4 | 12 | 207 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length(ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1664 | 0 | 1859 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.985 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1664 | 0 | 1859 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 317 |  | 758 |  |  | 1006 |
| Travel Time (s) | 8.6 |  | 11.5 |  |  | 15.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow(vph) | 13 | 0 | 330 | 0 | 13 | 230 |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |


| Intersection Summary |
| :--- |
| Area Type: Other |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization $25.7 \%$ |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, sNeh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | - |  | 1 | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, vehh | 4 | 8 | 293 | 4 | 12 | 207 |
| Future Vol, vehh | 4 | 8 | 293 | 4 | 12 | 207 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - None | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 100 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, $\%$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Munt Flow | 4 | 9 | 326 | 4 | 13 | 230 |



|  | 7 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 4 | 5 | 305 | 11 | 4 | 179 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 4 | 5 | 305 | 11 | 4 | 179 |
| Ideal Flow(vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length(f) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length(f) | 25 |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1678 | 0 | 1853 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| FltPemitted | 0.980 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow(perm) | 1678 | 0 | 1853 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 369 |  | 1004 |  |  | 470 |
| Travel Time (s) | 10.1 |  | 15.2 |  |  | 7.1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow(vph) | 10 | 0 | 351 | 0 | 4 | 199 |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |


| Intersection Summary |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Area Type: Other |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 26.7\% | ICU Level of Service A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |




## Appendix I:

Signal Plans


## MIEMIORANDUM

To: Mr. Sean Brennan, P.E., NCDOT
Mr.
From: Kevin Dean, P.E.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Date: April 30, 2019


Subject: The Wayforth at Apex - Traffic Analysis Addendum - Revised Site Access

Kimley-Horn has performed an addendum to the original Wayforth at Apex TIA (Kimley-Horn, January 2019) to determine the impacts of a revision to the site access. The original TIA for the development analyzed the site assuming three full-movement access driveways along Morris Acres Road. However, a revised development plan indicates that only two full-movement driveways will be provided, with one driveway aligning with Reedybrook Crossing and another approximately 515 feet to the south. The revised development plan is shown on the attached Figure 1.

As this change in access will not have impacts on any off-site intersections, it was confirmed with the Town of Apex that this addendum should only include analysis for the site driveway intersections along Morris Acres Road. It should be noted that as the previously-analyzed "North Site Driveway" is no longer proposed, the "Central Site Driveway" described in the previous analysis has been renamed to "North Site Driveway" for this addendum analysis.

This report presents trip generation, distribution, traffic analyses, and recommendations for transportation improvements required to meet anticipated traffic demands at the proposed site driveways.

## Background Volume Development

AM and PM peak hour background traffic volumes were obtained from the original TIA and were not modified as part of this analysis.

## Trip Generation

Trip generation data was obtained from the original TIA and was not modified as part of this analysis.

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

No changes were made to the overall distribution of site traffic assumed in the original TIA. However, to account for this revised access scenario, site traffic assignment percentages were modified for this addendum. The revised site traffic assignment is shown on the attached Figure 2.
The attached Figures 3 and 4 show the AM and PM peak hour site traffic and total build-out volumes at the study intersections, and volume development is detailed on the attached intersection spreadsheets.

## Kimley»>Horn

## Capacity Analysis

Consistent with the original TIA, capacity analyses were performed using Synchro Version 9.2 software. Synchro intersection level-of-service (LOS) reports are attached. The LOS for the study intersections are summarized in Table 1.

| Table 2 <br> Level-of-Service Summary |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition | AM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) | PM Peak Hour LOS (Delay) |
| Morris Acres Road at Reedybrook Crossing/North Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Existing (2018) Traffic | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{EB}-\mathrm{A}(9.4) \\ \mathrm{NBL}-\mathrm{A}(7.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{EB}-\mathrm{B}(10.2) \\ & \mathrm{NBL}-\mathrm{A}(7.6) \end{aligned}$ |
| Background (2022) Traffic | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{EB}-\mathrm{A}(9.5) \\ \mathrm{NBL}-\mathrm{B}(7.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{EB}-\mathrm{B}(10.4) \\ & \mathrm{NBL}-\mathrm{A}(7.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB - B (10.2) } \\ & \text { WB - B (10.3) } \\ & \text { NBL - A (7.4) } \\ & \text { SBL - A (7.6) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB - B (12.8) } \\ & \text { WB - B (12.6) } \\ & \text { NBL - A (7.7) } \\ & \text { SBL - A (8.0) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Morris Acres Road at South Site Driveway (Unsignalized) |  |  |
| Build-out (2022) Traffic | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB - A (9.7) } \\ & \text { SBL - A (7.6) } \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WB - B (10.8) } \\ & \mathrm{SBL}-\mathrm{A}(8.0) \\ & \hline \hline \end{aligned}$ |

Analysis indicates that the site driveway intersections are expected to operate at an acceptable level-of-service at project build-out, and no queueing issues are expected at these intersections.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings of this addendum analysis, and consistent with the original TIA, no roadway improvements are recommended to be performed to accommodate projected site traffic volumes.

The build-out roadway laneage is shown on Figure 5.
Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at (919) 678-4185 or kevin.dean@kimley-horn.com.
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FIGURE 5

## INTERSECTION ANALYSIS SHEET

| Project: <br> Location: <br> Scenario: <br> Ct. Date <br> N/S Street: <br> E/W Street: | The Wayforth at Apex |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Apex, NC |
|  | Addendum - 2 Site Driveways |
|  | Balance with Jenks at Morris Acres |
|  | Morris Acres Road |
|  | Reedybrook Crossing/North Site Driveway |

Net New Trips: |  | AM In | AM Out | PM In |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PM Out |  |  |  |
| 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |

| Location: | Apex, NC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Scenario: | Addendum - 2 Site Driveways |


|  | N/S Street: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Morris Acres Road |
|  | E/W Street: |
|  | Reedybrook Crossing/North Site Driveway |


|  | AM In | AM Out | PM In | PM Out |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net New Trips: | 26 | 74 | 77 | 50 |
| Annual Growth Rate: | 3.0\% | Existing Year: Buildout Year: |  | 2018 |
| Growth Factor: | 0.125509 |  |  | 2022 |


| Description | AM PHF $=0.90$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reedybrook Crossing Eastbound |  |  | North Site Driveway Westbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road <br> Northbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Southbound |  |  |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 26 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 26 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 5 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.126 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.126 | 0.000 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Committed Projects <br> Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total Committed Traffic | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 29 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 6 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 30\% | 35\% | 15\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 0 |
| Percent Assignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 40\% | 0\% | 20\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout Total | 29 | 0 | 29 | 19 | 0 | 29 | 6 | 156 | 8 | 9 | 55 | 6 |
| Percent Impact (Approach) |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 13.5\% |  |  | 18.7\% |  |

PM PEAK HOUR
PM PHF = 0.90

| Description | Reedybrook Crossing Eastbound |  |  | North Site Driveway Westbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road <br> Northbound |  |  | Morris Acres Road Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 24 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 24 |
| Growth Factor (0.03 per year) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.126 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.126 | 0.000 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Committed Projects <br> Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Total Committed Traffic | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 15 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 253 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 27 |
| Project Traffic <br> Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 30\% | 35\% | 15\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 27 | 12 | 0 |
| Percent Assignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% | 40\% | 0\% | 20\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 10 | 23 | 27 | 12 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout Total | 15 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 20 | 22 | 263 | 23 | 27 | 161 | 27 |
| Percent Impact (Approach) |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 10.7\% |  |  | 18.2\% |  |

INTERSECTION ANALYSIS SHEET

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project: | The Wayforth at Apex |
| Location: | Apex, NC |
| Ct. Date | Balance with Jenks at Morris Acres |
| N/S Street: | Morris Acres Road |
| E/W Street: | South Site Driveway |
|  |  |


|  | AM In | AM Out | PM In |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PM Out |  |  |  |
| Net New Trips: | 26 | 74 | 77 | |  | 50 |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  |  |  |  | PEAK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Site Driv Eastboun |  |  | Site Dri Westboun |  |  | is Acres orthboun |  |  | is Acres outhboun |  |
| Description | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right | Left | Through | Right |
| 2018 Traffic Count | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Balancing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 |
| 2018 Existing Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 |
| Growth Factor ( 0.03 per year) | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
| 2022 Background Growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Committed Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beaver Creek Phase 4 Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Total Committed Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 2022 Background Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 |
| Project Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Assignment Inbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 30\% | 20\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Inbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Assignment Outbound | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 20\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 25\% | 0\% |
| Outbound Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Total Project Traffic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 19 | 0 |
| 2022 Buildout Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 155 | 5 | 4 | 102 | 0 |
| Percent Impact (Approach) |  | - |  |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 8.1\% |  |  | 21.8\% |  |

Overall Percent Impact 21.3\%


2: Morris Acres Road \& Reedybrook Crossing/North Site Driveway

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | $\geqslant$ | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | P | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | \$ |  | * | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  | * | ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 29 | , | 29 | 19 | 4 | 29 | 6 | 156 | 8 | 9 | 55 |  |
| Future Volume (vph) | 29 | 4 | 29 | 19 | 4 | 29 | 6 | 156 | 8 | 9 | 55 |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (t) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 100 |  |  |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 0 | 1690 | 0 | 1770 | 1850 | 0 | 1770 | 1835 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.977 |  |  | 0.982 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1703 | 0 | 0 | 1690 | 0 | 1770 | 1850 | 0 | 1770 | 1835 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 294 |  |  | 267 |  |  | 470 |  |  | 758 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  | 7.3 |  |  | 7.1 |  |  | 11.5 |  |
| 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 |
| Shared Lane Trafic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 7 | 182 | 0 | 10 | 68 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |

## Intersection Summary

| Area Type: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 20.6\% | ICU Level of Service A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 29 | 4 | 29 | 19 | 4 | 29 | 6 | 156 | 8 | 9 | 55 | 6 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 29 | 4 | 29 | 19 | 4 | 29 | 6 | 156 | 8 | 9 | 55 | 6 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | - | 100 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 32 | 4 | 32 | 21 | 4 | 32 | 7 | 173 | 9 | 10 | 61 | 7 |



|  | 7 | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 4 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 11 | 15 | 155 | 5 | 4 | 102 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 11 | 15 | 155 | 5 | 4 | 102 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1681 | 0 | 1853 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.980 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1681 | 0 | 1853 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 369 |  | 1004 |  |  | 470 |
| Travel Time (s) | 10.1 |  | 15.2 |  |  | 7.1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 29 | 0 | 178 | 0 | 4 | 113 |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 18.5\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | 1 |  | F |  | i | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 11 | 15 | 155 | 5 | 4 | 102 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 11 | 15 | 155 | 5 | 4 | 102 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 100 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 12 | 17 | 172 | 6 | 4 | 113 |



2: Morris Acres Road \& Reedybrook Crossing/North Site Driveway

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  | 7 | 7 | $\downarrow$ | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | * |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\uparrow}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 15 | 4 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 20 | 22 | 263 | 23 | 27 | 161 | 27 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 15 | 4 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 20 | 22 | 263 | 23 | 27 | 161 | 27 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 | 100 |  | 0 |
| Storage Lanes | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1712 | 0 | 0 | 1696 | 0 | 1770 | 1840 | 0 | 1770 | 1822 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  | 0.978 |  |  | 0.983 |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1712 | 0 | 0 | 1696 | 0 | 1770 | 1840 | 0 | 1770 | 1822 | 0 |
| Link Speed (mph) |  | 25 |  |  | 25 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 294 |  |  | 267 |  |  | 470 |  |  | 758 |  |
| Travel Time (s) |  | 8.0 |  |  | 7.3 |  |  | 7.1 |  |  | 11.5 |  |
| 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 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 24 | 318 | 0 | 30 | 209 | 0 |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |

## Intersection Summary

## Area Type: Other

Control Type: Unsignalized
Intersection Capacity Utilization 31.9\%
ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 4 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 20 | 22 | 263 | 23 | 27 | 161 | 27 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 4 | 15 | 13 | 4 | 20 | 22 | 263 | 23 | 27 | 161 | 27 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | - | 100 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 17 | 4 | 17 | 14 | 4 | 22 | 24 | 292 | 26 | 30 | 179 | 30 |



|  | 7 | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 个 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 7 | 10 | 301 | 15 | 12 | 177 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 7 | 10 | 301 | 15 | 12 | 177 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 100 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1681 | 0 | 1850 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.979 |  |  |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1681 | 0 | 1850 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 25 |  | 45 |  |  | 45 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 369 |  | 1004 |  |  | 470 |
| Travel Time (s) | 10.1 |  | 15.2 |  |  | 7.1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 19 | 0 | 351 | 0 | 13 | 197 |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 26.8\% |  |  |  |  | Level of | rvice A |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | 1 |  | 1 |  | i | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 10 | 301 | 15 | 12 | 177 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 10 | 301 | 15 | 12 | 177 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | 100 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 8 | 11 | 334 | 17 | 13 | 197 |




Planning Board Recommendation:
Torecommend approval of the 2045
Motion: and lase Map amendment and rezoning

Introduced by Planning Board member: Reginald Skinner
Seconded by Planning Board member:


Approval: the project is consistent with all applicable officially adopted plans and the applicable legislative considerations listed above.

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:
Conditions as offerred by the applicant and presented by staff.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Denial: the project is not consistent with all applicable officially adopted plans.


Reasons for dissenting votes:

1. Beth Godfrey-relying on Medium Density on 2030 Land
2. Use Nap. Sherman and Mark steele - a) relying on

Medium Density on 2030 Land use map and E) want
more a ffordable housing pronged.
This report reflects the recommendation of the Planning Board, this the th day of September 2019.

Attest:


Margo Bills, Planning Board Chair
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## Planning Board report to Town Council

Rezoning \#19CZ02 Morris Acres PUD
September 9, 2019 Planning Board Meeting

## Report Requirements:

Per NCGS 160A-387, all proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance or zoning map shall have a written report provided from the Planning Board to the Town Council within 30 days of referral of the amendment to the Planning Board, or the Town Council may proceed in its consideration of the amendment without the Planning Board report. Furthermore, in no case is the Town Council bound by the recommendations, if any, of the Planning Board.

Per NCGS 160A-383, the Planning Board shall advise and comment on whether the proposed zoning amendment 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: }\pm17.4376\mathrm{ acres
PINs:
Current Zoning:
Proposed Zoning:
2045 Land Use Map:
Proposed 2045 Land Use Map:
Town Limits:
0732289587, 0732382530,0732382709
Rural Residential (RR)
Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)
Medium Density Residential
High Density Residential
0732382709 is in the ETJ; PINs 0732289587 \& 0732382530 are in Town limits
```


## 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.

(A) Apex Transportation Plan

C Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent Reason: $\qquad$

凹. Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and Greenways Plan
$\boxtimes$ 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 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. Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent Reason: Leith amendment to 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.
$\square$ Consistent 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.
区 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.
Consistent
$\square$ Inconsistent
Reason: $\qquad$
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.
区. Consistent
$\square$ Inconsistent
Reason: $\qquad$

## PLANNING BOARD REPORT TO TOWN COUNCIL

Rezoning \#19CZ02 Morris Acres PUD
September 9, 2019 Planning Board Meeting
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.
$\square$ Consistent $\square$ 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.
$\geq$ Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent Reason: $\qquad$
8. Detrimental to adjacent properties. Whether the proposed Conditional Zoning (CZ) District use is substantially detrimental to adjacent properties.
Consistent
$\square$ 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.
区 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.
区 Consistent $\square$ Inconsistent Reason: $\qquad$

TOWN OF APEX

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

2045 LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT \＆ CONDITIONAL ZONING \＃19CZO Morris Acres PUD

Pursuant to the provicions of North Carolina General Statutes Section 1600.364 and to the Town of Apex Unified Developnent Town of Apee．The purpose of heere tex hing is it oc consider the following．

Applicant：Kaplan Residential
Authorized Agent．Jason Barron，Morringstar Law Group
Property Addresses：
Acreage：$\pm 17.4376$
Acreage：$\pm 17.4376$
Property Identifcation Numbers（PINs）： $0732289587,0732382530, \& 0732382709$ Existing 20055 Land Use Map Designnation：Medium Density Residentia
Proposed 2045 Land Use Map Designation：High Density Residential
Existing zoning of Property：Rural Residential（RR）
Proposed Zoning of Property：Planned Unit Development－conditional Zoning（PUD－CZ）
Public Hearing Location：Apex Town Hall
73 Hunter Street，Apex，North Carolina
73 Hunter street，apex，No
Council Chambers，
$2 c^{*}$
Floor
Planning Board Public Hearing Date and Time：July s， 2019 4：30 P．M．
Hearing Date and Time：July 16,2019 7：00 P．M．




## PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

## 2045 LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT \& CONDITIONAL ZONING \#19CZO2 <br> Morris Acres PUD

Pursuant to the provisions of North Carolina General Statutes Section 160A-364 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 and Town Council of the Town of Apex. The purpose of these hearings is to consider the following:

Applicant: Kaplan Residential
Authorized Agent: Jason Barron, Morningstar Law Group
Property Addresses: 0, 7208, \& 7208B Morris Acres Road
Acreage: $\pm 17.4376$
Property Identification Numbers (PINs): 0732289587, 0732382530, \& 0732382709
Existing 2045 Land Use Map Designation: Medium Density Residential
Proposed 2045 Land Use Map Designation: High Density Residential
Existing Zoning of Property: Rural Residential (RR)
Proposed Zoning of Property: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)
Public Hearing Location: Apex Town Hall
73 Hunter Street, Apex, North Carolina
Council Chambers, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
Planning Board Public Hearing Date and Time: July 8, 2019 4:30 P.M.
Town Council Public Hearing Date and Time: July 16, 2019 7:00 P.M.

## Vicinity Map:



Property owners within 300 feet of the proposed conditional zoning have been sent this notice via first class mail. All interested parties may appear at the public hearing and be heard with respect to the application. Maps showing the location for the above site(s) to be considered in addition to a copy of the 2045 Land Use Map can be inspected at the Apex Town Hall or call 919-249-3426, Department of Planning and Community Development for further information. To view the petition and related documents on-line: https://www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/26285.


Pursuant to the provisions of North Carolina General Statutes Section 160A-364 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 and Town Council of the Town of Apex. The purpose of these hearings is to consider the following:

Applicant: Kaplan Residential
Authorized Agent: Jason Barron, Morningstar Law Group
Property Addresses: 0, 7208, \& 7208B Morris Acres Road
Acreage: $\pm 17.4376$
Property Identification Numbers (PINs): 0732289587, 0732382530, \& 0732382709
Existing 2045 Land Use Map Designation: Medium Density Residential
Proposed 2045 Land Use Map Designation: High Density Residential
Existing Zoning of Property: Rural Residential (RR)
Proposed Zoning of Property: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)
Public Hearing Location: Apex Town Hall
73 Hunter Street, Apex, North Carolina Council Chambers, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
Planning Board Public Hearing Date and Time: July-8, 2019 August 12, 2019 4:30 P.M.
Town Council Public Hearing Date and Time: July 16, 2019 August 20, 2019 7:00 P.M.

## Vicinity Map:



Property owners within 300 feet of the proposed conditional zoning have been sent this notice via first class mail. All interested parties may appear at the public hearing and be heard with respect to the application. Maps showing the location for the above site(s) to be considered in addition to a copy of the 2045 Land Use Map can be inspected at the Apex Town Hall or call 919-249-3426, Department of Planning and Community Development for further information. To view the petition and related documents on-line: https://www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/26285.


Pursuant to the provisions of North Carolina General Statutes Section 160A-364 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 and Town Council of the Town of Apex. The purpose of these hearings is to consider the following:

Applicant: Kaplan Residential
Authorized Agent: Jason Barron, Morningstar Law Group
Property Addresses: 0, 7208, \& 7208B Morris Acres Road
Acreage: $\pm 17.4376$
Property Identification Numbers (PINs): 0732289587, 0732382530, \& 0732382709
Existing 2045 Land Use Map Designation: Medium Density Residential
Proposed 2045 Land Use Map Designation: High Density Residential
Existing Zoning of Property: Rural Residential (RR)
Proposed Zoning of Property: Planned Unit Development-Conditional Zoning (PUD-CZ)
Public Hearing Location: Apex Town Hall
73 Hunter Street, Apex, North Carolina
Council Chambers, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Floor
Planning Board Public Hearing Date and Time: July-8, 2019 August 12, 2019 4:30 P.M.
Town Council Public Hearing Date and Time: July 16, 2019 August 20, 2019 September 17, 2019 7:00 P.M.

## Vicinity Map:



Property owners within 300 feet of the proposed conditional zoning have been sent this notice via first class mail. All interested parties may appear at the public hearing and be heard with respect to the application. Maps showing the location for the above site(s) to be considered in addition to a copy of the 2045 Land Use Map can be inspected at the Apex Town Hall or call 919-249-3426, Department of Planning and Community Development for further information. To view the petition and related documents on-line: https://www.apexnc.org/DocumentCenter/View/26285.



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

Section 2.2.11
Town of Apex Unified Development Ordinance

Project Name:
Rezoning 19CZO2

Project Location:
0, 7208, \& 7208B Morris Acres Road
Applicant or Authorized Agent:
Firm:
Jason Barron
Morningstar Law Group

This is to certify that $I$, as Planning Director, mailed or caused to have mailed by first class postage for the above mentioned project June 21, 2019, 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 within $300^{\prime}$ of the land subject to notification. I further certify that I relied on information provided to me by the above-mentioned person as to accuracy and mailing addresses of property owners within $300^{\prime}$ of the land subject to notification.


## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE
Sworn and subscribed before me, PayaleeJ. Smith , a Notary Public for the above State and County, this the 21 day of June, 2019.




[^0]:    *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 Department at 919-249-3426. You may also find information about the Apex Planning Department and on-going planning efforts at http://www.apexnc.org/180/Planning.

[^1]:    Use additional sheets, if necessary.

[^2]:    Applicant's Response:
    All of these are examples of what this developer has built elsewhere, but not all will apply to this site. Some will. We are required to include sample elevations with our rezoning submittal, so you will see some of these again as part of our submittal.

[^3]:    RELANCE ON THIS DOCUMENT WITHOUT WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION AND ADAPTATION BY KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC. SHALL BE WITHOUT LAABILITY TO KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INO.

