## Memo

| To: | Mayor Currin and Board of Commissioners |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | Michael Elabarger, Senior Planner |
| Date: | September 5, 2023 |
| Re: | Hills at Harris Creek |
|  | Map Amendment Rezoning REZ-23-03 |
|  | Voluntary Annexation Petition ANX-22-04 |

## Background

## Rezoning (REZ-23-03)

The Town of Rolesville Planning Department received an initial Map Amendment (Rezoning) application in January of 2022 [MA 22-01] for approximatley 116 acres consisting of four (4) tracts of land located on the north side of Mitchell Mill Road, between Jonesville and Rolesville Roads. This application requested rezoning from Wake County's R-30 Zoning District to the Town's Land Development Ordinance (LDO) zoning district of Neighborhood Center.(NC) as a Conditional Zoning (CZ) District. This was reviewed several times over the course of 2022. In early 2023, the Applicant chose to significantly revise the scope of the application, and REZ-23-03 was submitted to usurp MA 22-01, and this requested a small NC District with the majority of the land area proposed for the Residential High Density (RH) District, both as Conditional Zoning (CZ) Districts. Project details include maximums of 270 total residential dwellings units (combined single-family detached and attached), with no more than 115 of them being detached units, and a nonresidential component in the NC-CZ District meeting the minimum requirements for that District.


Hills at Harris Creek Concept/Sketch Plan

## ANNEXATION PETITION (ANX-22-04

A Voluntary Annexation Petition has also been submitted and reviewed and is processing simultaneously with this rezoning request. As provided by G.S. 160A-31, the petition was investigated by the Town Clerk as to its sufficiency of meeting G. S. 160A-31 after the October 4, 2022 Town Board Meeting; see Attachment 14. On August 1, 2023, the Town Board of Commissioners scheduled a legislative hearing for the annexation petition (to be held September 5, 2023).

The Rezoning applicant has proposed a Concept/Sketch Plan (see Attachment 5, Exhibit 1) and a set of Conditions of Approval (see Attachment 9, Exhibit 5).

## Applicant Justification

The applicant provided this brief statement regarding the submittal (see Attachment 4 also).


#### Abstract

The proposed rezoning of the parcels described above is made in careful consideration of the Rolesville Comprehensive Plan 2017. The Future Land Use Map designates these parcels as Medium Density Residential, and we believe that a combination of the Mixed Use Neighborhood Center Conditional District and Residential High Density Conditional District would allow for the best variety of housing types to meet this objective while integrating seamlessly with the surrounding community. The proposed community includes a mix of housing types (single-family detached homes and townhomes) and is within the density levels recommended by the Comprehensive Plan.

Mixed-use neighborhoods such as the one proposed herein are routinely applauded for their connectivity and walkability and the multiple housing types appeal to various income levels while still maintaining the appeal and quality of the neighborhood. The proposed rezoning is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and reasonable and in the public interest. We request your support for the proposed zoning.


## Neighborhood Meetings

Under the header of MA 22-01, the Applicant conducted Neighborhood meetings on March 16, 2022 and January 10, 2023. With the new application REZ-23-03, the applicant held a meeting on May 23, 2023 - see Attachment 11. Per the Applicant, four (4) persons attended/signed-in at the most recent meeting.

## Comprehensive Plan

## Land Use

The 2017 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates the subject property, and the entire area south of Harris Creek to Mitchell Mill Road, as appropriate for MediumDensity Residential development. Per the Plan, this is defined as:

> Predominantly single family residential uses with portion of duplex, townhouse, or multifamily residential. These are lots or tracts at a density range of three to five (3-5) dwelling units per gross acre including preserved open space areas along with limited non-residential uses under planned unit development or form base code provisions.

## Community Transportation Plan

The Town of Rolesville's Community Transportation Plan (CTP, adopted 2021) includes recommendations for Thoroughfares, Collectors, and intersections.

## Thoroughfare Recommendations

- Mitchell Mills Road is planned to be a 4-lane, Raised Median-divided section with curb \& gutter, bike lanes, and sidewalks.


## Collector Recommendations

- At the far northern tip of the subject property, an east/west Collector roadway is identified. As demonstrated in the Concept/Sketch Plan (Attachment 5), the Applicant is proposing a more southern route for this roadway, moving it away from the environmental features (Harris Creek) further to the north, and bringing it closer to Mitchell Mill, where it can serve as a more near-by parallel roadway to the Arterial that Mitchell Mill will eventually function as. This more southern route aligns more so with a similar alignment approved with MA 22-06, 5109 Mitchell Mill Road, which when built will connect to Jonesville Road west of this subject property/project.


## Intersection Recommendations

- There are no intersection recommendations associated with the subject property.
- The closest intersection recommendations are located at Mitchell Mill and Rolesville Roads, for an intersection realignment.


## Greenway and Bike Plans

As per the 2022 Greenway and Bike Plans, proposed pedestrian routes are shown in the following locations:

- A ten foot ( $10^{\prime}$ ) greenway is shown on the northern end of the property, on the south side of the Harris Creek.
- A ten foot (10') side path is illustrated on the north side of Mitchell Mill Road.
- Bicycle lane within Mitchell Mill Road.


## Consistency

The applicant's rezoning request is consistent with the Town of Rolesville's Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons:

- The proposed mix of residential product types, with a commercial element, fits the Medium Density Residential land use description.
- The proposed vehicular circulation network will enhance or establish Thoroughfare and Collector connections, respectively, as recommended by the Town's Community Transportation Plan.
- The proposed Greenways will establish pedestrian connections as recommended by Rolesville's Greenway Plan.


## Traffic

## Traffic Impact Analysis

The consulting firm, Ramey Kemp Associates, performed the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for this project on behalf of the Town; the study analyzed a development of 155 Single Family Detached and 115 Single family Attached (townhome) housing units, and 12,000 square feet of Day Care center non-residential use. The Final Report dated June 2023 (sealed June 23, 2023) is included as Attachment 12 to this memo. Traffic conditions during weekday AM and PM peak hours were looked at in three scenarios: 2022 Existing conditions, 2027 No-build conditions, and 2027 Build conditions. See excerpted Table E-1 from the TIA report:

Table E-1: Site Trip Generation

| Land Use (ITE Code) | Intensity | Daily Traffic (vpd) | Weekday <br> AM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  | Weekday <br> PM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Home $(210)$ | 155 DU | 1,510 | 28 | 83 | 111 | 95 | 55 | 150 |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (220) | 115 DU | 812 | 14 | 45 | 59 | 44 | 26 | 70 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Day Care Center } \\ & (565) \end{aligned}$ | 12 KSF | 572 | 70 | 62 | 132 | 63 | 70 | 133 |
| Total Trips |  | 2,894 | 112 | 190 | 302 | 202 | 151 | 353 |
| Pass-By Trips: Day Care Center$(44 \%$ PM $)$ |  |  | - | - | - | -30 | -30 | -60 |
| Total Primary Trips |  |  | 112 | 190 | 302 | 172 | 121 | 293 |

Three (3) intersections were studied for capacity analysis and Level Of Service (LOS) impact of this development - US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road; US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-turn location; Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road.

TIA Summary - Intersection Improvements
Recommendations

| Required Frontage Improvements per Rolesville Community Transportation Plan (CTP) | - Widen one-half section of Mitchell Mill Road along the site frontage to this roadway's ultimate section (4-lane Median [raised] divided. |
| :---: | :---: |
| US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road | - Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to Full Buildout of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and Town. |
| Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road | - Construct a south-bound (Jonesville Rd) left-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper. <br> - It should be noted that this improvement was also identified by the 5109 Mitchell Mill Rd TIA. |
|  | - Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper. |
|  | - Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to Full Buildout of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and Town. |
| Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1 | - Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 1) as a right-in/right-out with one ingress lane and one egress lane. |
|  | - Provide stop control for the southbound approach (Site Access 1). |
|  | - Construct a concrete median on Mitchell Mill Road that restricts access to right-in/right-out. |
| Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2 | - Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 2) with one ingress lane and one egress lane. |
|  | - Provide stop control for the southbound approach (Site Access 2). |
|  | - Construct the westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper. |

## Development Review

The Technical Review Committee (TRC) reviewed two (2) versions of the Rezoning application (and three (3) reviews of MA 22-01 prior to that), with all comments pertinent to the consideration of the proposed districts and the general development plan being resolved. Note that this does not mean that all LDO subdivision and/or site development regulations have been demonstrated, as Attachment 5 is only a conceptual plan, and not an engineered and dimensioned layout.

## LDO Appendix A / 2.3.G. Review Standards with Staff Responses

The Land Development Ordinance (LDO) Handbook, Appendix A, includes the following standards that may be considered when reviewing a rezoning request; Staff responses follow each standard below.

1. Is the application consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable adopted Town plans;
Staff finds that the general project intent to develop a mix of single-family detached and attached dwelling unit, with a commercial use associated with the Attached units, is consistent with the Medium Density Residential land use, and the pedestrian and transportation improvements will fulfill the development of the Community Transportation Plan, Greenway Plan, and Bicycle Plan.
2. Is the application in conflict with any provision of the LDO or the Town Code of Ordinances;
Based on the level of detail provided, the application materials appear consistent with the LDO; the project will demonstrate full compliance with subdivision/land development requirements at later stage of development.
3. Does the application correct any errors in the existing zoning present at the time it was adopted;
The subject property is currently under land use control of Wake County and therefore is not consistent with the 2017 Rolesville Comprehensive Plan; the property is not within the Town of Rolesville Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (ETJ); per the circa 2014 Annexation Agreement with the City of Raleigh, this property, if sought to Voluntarily Annex, would annex into Rolesville.
4. Does the application allow uses that are compatible with existing and allowed uses on surrounding land;
Presently, the surrounding land uses are larger lot single family detached residential pursuant to Wake County's R-30 low density zoning. These existing land uses are inconsistent with the Rolesville Comprehensive Plan, which covers this region. The application therefore complies with the Rolesville Comprehensive Plan, but is significantly different from the existing or currently allowed (under Wake County R-30 zoning) development pattern.
5. Would the application ensure efficient development within the Town, including the capacity and safety of the street network, public facilities, and other similar considerations;
The application, with an envisioned density in the range of 2.3 dwelling units per acre ( 270 units/ 116 acres) is actually lower than the prescribed residential density range of 3 to 5 dwelling units per acre. The application is demonstrating compliance with planned Community Transportation Plan roadways, as well as pedestrian features. The identified amenities are demonstrating general compliance with LDO amenity requirements.
6. Would the application result in a logical and orderly development pattern; and Based on the concept/sketch plan, the proposed development indicates intentions to meet or exceed all subdivision requirements, including roadway and pedestrian improvements. All LDO subdivision requirements will be demonstrated on the subsequent Major Preliminary Subdivision Plat.
7. Would the application result in adverse impacts on water, air, noise, storm water management, wildlife, vegetation, wetlands, and the natural functioning of the environment.
Based on the concept/sketch plan and the requirement to comply with all LDO minimum requirements to develop the project, beyond the inherent and permitted impacts of land development, the impacts as described should not result.
8. If a conditional rezoning, the BOC may also consider if the conditional rezoning addresses the impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the development or use of the site, can reasonably be implemented and enforced for the subject
property, and if it will mitigate specific issues that would likely result if the subject property were zoned to accommodate all the uses and the minimum standards of the corresponding general zoning district.
While submitted as requesting Conditional Zoning (CZ) of the general NC and RH districts, the proposal includes nothing that could not be developed via a General District Rezoning to the NC and RH Districts.

## Overall Analysis

The project entails developing approximately 150 single family detached dwelling units with the RH Zoning District utilizing the LDO Section 3.1.3. standards of 7,500 SF minimum lots sizes with 75 ' of minimum lot width, and then developing up to 115 Single family Attached dwelling units (townhomes) across a portion of the RH District and then also within the NC District. The Applicant has shown the intention in the Concept/Sketch Plan (Attachment 5) and Exhibit 4 (Attachment 8) to subdivide Single family Attached (Townhome) lots both fronting on new/proposed public streets, but also utilizing private access easements for some units/buildings. The latter is the impetus for TA-23-05 and providing LDO regulations for the option to create Single family Attached lots that do not have lot frontage on public streets (right-of-ways), but rather private access easements. Staff generally supports the creation of such an option in the LDO, as it promotes more creative community development, it lessens the propensity of driveway entrances onto public streets, and it lessens the long-term maintenance responsibilities of new public streets by eliminating the need for public streets while still facilitating the development of fee simple (Townhome) lots. The NC District is rather small ( $\sim 13$ acres), making the minimum $15 \%$ of gross area for non-residential uses relatively small, but the inclusion of a neighborhood serving nonresidential use will be beneficial to the local community, and as demonstrated in the TIA trip calculations, can serve to reduce vehicle trips by containing some (of the non-residential caused trips) to stay within the project.

## Staff Recommendation

REZ-23-03 - Map Amendment Rezoning Application
Staff finds the proposed rezoning request REZ-23-03 is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and recommends Approval of it.

## ANX 22-04 - Voluntary Annexation Petition

Staff finds the petition for Voluntary Annexation (see Attachment 13) to be complete. The Town Clerk has provided a Certificate of Sufficiency dated October 26, 2022 (see Attachment 14).

## Consistency and Reasonableness

As noted above under the Comprehensive Plan section of this report, the rezoning request for the subject parcels is consistent with the Future Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential. The Concept Site Plan and proposed Conditions of Approval express general consistency with the Community Transportation Plan, Bicycle Plan, and Greenway Plan. Rezoning Map Amendment REZ-23-03 is thus consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable Plans and is therefore reasonable.

## Proposed Motions

1. Motion to (approve or deny) Rezoning Map Amendment request REZ-23-03 - Hills at Harris Creek.
2. (Following Approval) Motion to adopt a Plan Consistency Statement and Statement of Reasonableness for REZ-23-03.
3. Motion to (approve or deny) the Voluntary Annexation Petition received under G.S. 160A-31 for ANX 22-04 - Hills at Harris Creek.
Or
4. Motion to continue the legislative hearing for REZ-23-03 and ANX 22-04 to a future Town Board of Commissioners' meeting.

## Attachments

| 1 | Vicinity Map |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Zoning Map |
| 3 | Future Land Use Map |
| 4 | Map Amendment Application |
| 5 | Concept/Sketch Plan (dated June 2, 2023) |
| 6 | Zoning District boundary sketch |
| 7 | Zoning District Metes \& Bounds (Legal Descriptions) |
| 8 | Townhome Mews Sketch |
| 9 | Proposed Conditions of Approval |
| 10 | Duke Powerline Easement and Greenway Topic |
| 11 | Neighborhood Meeting Package - May 23, 2023 |
| 12 | Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) sealed dated 2023-06-23 |
| 13 | Voluntary Annexation Petition and Attachments |
| 14 | Voluntary Annexation Town Clerk Certificate of Sufficiency - signed October 5, 2022 |

## Vicinity Map

## PIN 1757750520, 1757758529, 1757761273, 1757778982

Address: 0,0,3645 Rock Farm, 5333 Mitchell Mill Road

Date: 2023.07.18

## Est. 1837 <br> eek_



Est. 1837
Case: ANX 22-04, REZ 23-03
Address: 0,0,3645 Rock Farm, 5333 Mitchell Mill Road PIN 1757750520, 1757758529, 1757761273, 1757778982
Date: 2023.07.18

## Future Land Use Map

## Legend

RolesFULU03-13-20 ROLU_CLASS
Low Density Residential
Medium Density Residential
High Density Residential
Town Center
Mixed Use
Neighborhood
Commercial
Business Park
Industrial
School
Preserved Open Space
Water Sewer Services

## ATTACHMENT 4 - APPLICATION

Case No
REZ-23-03

## Contact Information

Property Owner Alan Watkins
Address 3645 Rock Farm Road City/State/Zip Wake Forest, NC 27587

Phone 919-824-6088
Email coo: jason@ellisdevgroup.com

Developer Ellis Developments NC, LLC
Contact Name Jason Pfister, VP of Development
Address 6801 Falls of Neuse Road, Suite 108 City/State/Zip Raleigh NC 27615

Phone 919-824-6088 Emaillason@ellisdevgroup.com

## Property Information

Address 5333 Mitchell Mill Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587 \& O Mitchell Mill Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587
Wake County PINs) 175750520, 1757758529, 1757761273, 1757778982
Current Zoning District Wake R30
Total Acreage 115.94 acres Requested Zoning District $\frac{A G-C O Q R H=C D}{N C-C Z+\Omega H-C Z}$

## Owner Signature

I hereby certify that the information contained herein is true and completed. I understand that if any item is found to be otherwise after evidentiary hearing before the Town Board of Commissioners, that the action of the Board may be invalidated.
Signature


Date $3 / 2 / 2823$

## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF Wake
I, a Notary Public, do hereby certify that Alan Watkins
personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the dup.1xpection of the foregoing instrument. This the $\qquad$


2023


PO Box 250 / Rolesville, North Carolina 27571 / RolesvilleNC.gov / 919.554.6517

Est. 1837

Case No. $\qquad$
Date $\qquad$

## Map Amendment Application

## Contact Information

Property Owner Randy Watkins

| Address 145 Ode Liberty Drive | City/State/Zip Youngsville, NC 27596 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Phone 919-824-6088 | Email coo: jason@ellisdevgroup.com |

Developer Ellis Developments NC, LLC
Contact Name Jason Pfister, VP of Development
Address 6801 Falls of Neuse Road, Suite 108 City/State/Zip Raleigh NC 27615
Phone 919-824-6088
Emaillason@ellisdevgroup.com

## Property Information

Address 5333 Mitchell Mill Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587 \& O Mitchell Mill Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587
Wake County PINes) 175750520, 1757758529, 1757761273, 1757778982
Current Zoning District Wake R30 Requested Zoning District NC-CD\&-RH-CD

Total Acreage 115.94 acres

## Owner Signature

I hereby certify that the information contained herein is true and completed. I understand that if any item is found to be otherwise after evidentiary hearing before the Town Board of Commissioners, that the action of the Board may be invalidated.
Signature $\qquad$ Date

## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF Wake

## I, a Notary Public, do hereby certify that Randy Watkins

 the


Town of Rolesville'Planhing
PO Box 250 / Rolesville, North Carolina 27571 / RolesvilleNC.gov / 919.554.6517

Case No. $\qquad$
Date $\qquad$
Map Amendment Application

## Contact Information

Property Owner Ellis Land Investment Company, LLC
Address 6801 Falls of Neuse Road, Suite $108 \quad$ City/State/Zip Raleigh NC 27615

Phone 919-824-6088
Email c/o: jason@ellisdevgroup.com

Developer Ellis Developments NC, LLC
Contact Name Jason Pfister, VP of Development
Address 6801 Falls of Neuse Road, Suite 108 City/State/Zip Raleigh NC 27615
Phone 919-824-6088 Emailjason@ellisdevgroup.com

## Property Information

Address 0 Mitchell Mill Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587
Wake County PIN(s) 175750520, 1757758529, 1757761273, 1757778982
Current Zoning District Wake R30

Total Acreage 115.94 acres
$\qquad$

Est 1837
Case No $\qquad$
Date $\qquad$ Map Amendment Application

## Contact Information

Property Owner Laura Watkins
Address 3544 Donlin Drive $\qquad$ City／State／Zip Wake Forest，NC 27587

Phone 919－824－6088 Email coo：jason＠ellisdevgroup．com

Developer Ellis Developments NC，LLC
Contact Name Jason Pfister，VP of Development
Address 6801 Falls of Reuse Road，Suite 108 City／State／Zip Raleigh NC 27615

Phone 919－824－6088 Emailjason＠ellisdevgroup．com

## Property Information

Address 3645 Rock Farm Road，Wake Forest，NC 27587
Wake County PINs）175750520，1757758529，1757761273， 1757778982
Current Zoning District Wake R30 Requested Zoning District $\frac{N C-C D \& R-C D}{N C-C 2+R H-C Z}$
Total Acreage 115.94 acres

## Owner Signature

I hereby certify that the information contained herein is true and completed．I understand that if any item is found to be otherwise after evidentiary hearing before the Town Board of Commissioners，that the action of the Signature may be invalidated An Date O1Mar2023 Signature may invalidated Date O1 Mar 2023
$\qquad$ Signature may be invalidated An Date O1Mar2023．

## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

## COUNTY OF Wake

I，a Notary Public，do hereby certify that Laura Watkins
personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged thawillelyeceytivn of the foregoing instrument．This
the
l st
My commission expires 1／8／2028 $\stackrel{\text { da }}{\text { ® }}$ se

$\qquad$

Est. 1837

Case No. $\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Map Amendment Application

## Contact Information

Property Owner Randall Watkins
Address 3544 Donlin Drive City/State/Zip Wake Forest, NC 27587
Phone 919-824-6088 Email c/o: jason@ellisdevgroup.cam

Developer Ellis Developments NC, LLC
Contact Name Jason Pfister, VP of Development
Address 6801 Falls of Neuse Road, Suite 108
City/State/Zip Raleigh NC 27615
Phone 919-824-6088 Emailjason@ellisdevgroup.com

## Property Information

Address 3645 Rock Farm Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587
Wake County PIN(s) 175750520, 1757758529, 1757761273, 1757778982
Current Zoning District Wake R30 Requested Zoning District NC-CD\&RHCD
Total Acreage 115.94 acres
$N C=C^{2}+R H-C^{2}$

## Owner Signature

I hereby certify that the information contained herein is true and completed. I understand that if any item is found to be otherwise after evidentiary hearing before the Town Board of Commissioners, that the action of the Board may be invalidated. Signature $\qquad$ Date $3 / 1 / 23$

## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF Wake
1, a Notary Public, do hereby certify that Randall Watkins
 the $\qquad$
 2023


My commission expires 1/8/2028 Signature



PO Box 250 / Rolesville, North Carolina 27571 / RolesvilleNC.gov / 919.554.6517

## Map Amendment Application

Est. 1837

## Metes and Bounds Description of Property

Will be completed upon completion of survey

## Map Amendment Application

## Rezoning Justification

See attached
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ ——_

## Map Amendment Application

## Property Owner Information

| Wake County PIN | Property Owner | Mailing Address | Zip Code |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1757758529 | Ellis Land Investment Company, LLC | B801 Falls of Nuuse Road, Sult 108, Reiligh, NC | 27615 |
| 1757761273 | Randall and Laura Watkins | 3544 Donlin Drive, Wake Forest, NC | 27587 |
| 1757750520 | Alan and Randy Watkins | 3609 Rock Fam Road, Wake Foress, NC | 27587 |
| 1757778982 | Alan and Randy Watkins | 3609 Rock Farm Road, Wake Forest, NC | 27587 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The proposed rezoning of the parcels described above is made in careful consideration of the Rolesville Comprehensive Plan 2017. The Future Land Use Map designates these parcels as Medium Density Residential, and we believe that a combination of the Mixed Use Neighborhood Center Conditional District and Residential High Density Conditional District would allow for the best variety of housing types to meet this objective while integrating seamlessly with the surrounding community. The proposed community includes a mix of housing types (single-family detached homes and townhomes) and is within the density levels recommended by the Comprehensive Plan.

Mixed-use neighborhoods such as the one proposed herein are routinely applauded for their connectivity and walkability and the multiple housing types appeal to various income levels while still maintaining the appeal and quality of the neighborhood. The proposed rezoning is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and reasonable and in the public interest. We request your support for the proposed zoning.



## EXHIBIT 3:

V2 - REZ-23-03
rcvd 6-2-23

## Metes and Bounds description of Parcel 1: NC-CZ

as shown on Exhibit 2: Zoning Diagram
Point of Beginning: Commencing at a point on the Future (post 35' Dedication)
Northern Right-Of-Way of Mitchell Mill Road:
THENCE, North $19^{\circ} 37^{\prime} 29^{\prime \prime}$ East, 153.43 feet to a point;
THENCE, North $18^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ East, 227.11 feet to a point;
THENCE, North $19^{\circ} 31$ '15" East, 230.80 feet to a point;
THENCE, North $83^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 35^{\prime \prime}$ West, 376.14 feet to a point;
THENCE, North $43^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ East, 539.17 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $43^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ West, 539.17 feet;
THENCE, South $16^{\circ} 32^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime}$ East, 42.44 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $27^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ East, 42.80 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $68^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ East, 54.77 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $77^{\circ} 04^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ East, 46.50 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $82^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ East, 43.34 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $63^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime}$ East, 53.99 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $78^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime}$ East, 55.03 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $73^{\circ} 28^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime}$ East, 39.46 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $75^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ East, 64.19 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $79^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime}$ East, 30.68 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $64^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime}$ East, 56.08 feet to a point;
THENCE, South $0^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ East, 955.98 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southerly, said curve has a radius of $13,079.66$ feet, to which a radial line bears North $14^{\circ} 33^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime}$ East;
THENCE, westerly along said curve through a central angle of $2^{\circ} 57^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ an arc distance of 675.93 feet to the point of beginning;

Containing 586,556.07 square feet / 13.47 acres, more or less.

## Hills at Mitchell Mill

## Metes and Bounds description of Parcel 2: RH-CZ

as shown on Exhibit 2: Zoning Diagram

Point of Beginning: Commencing at a point on the Future (post 35' Dedication) Northern Right-Of-Way of Mitchell Mill Road:
THENCE (1) North $0^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}$ West, 955.98 feet to a point;
THENCE (2) North $64^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime}$ West, 56.08 feet to a point;
THENCE (3) North $79^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime}$ West, 30.68 feet to a point;
THENCE (4) North $75^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ West, 64.19 feet to a point;
THENCE (5) North $73^{\circ} 28^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime}$ West, 39.46 feet to a point;
THENCE (6) North $78^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime}$ West, 55.03 feet to a point;
THENCE (7) North $63^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime}$ West, 53.99 feet to a point;
THENCE (8) North $82^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ West, 43.34 feet to a point;
THENCE (9) North $77^{\circ} 04^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ West, 46.50 feet to a point;
THENCE (10) North $68^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West, 54.77 feet to a point;
THENCE (11) North $27^{\circ} 36^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ West, 42.80 feet to a point;
THENCE (12) North $16^{\circ} 32^{\prime} 05^{\prime \prime}$ West, 42.44 feet to a point;
THENCE (13) North $43^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ East, 651.84 feet to a point;
THENCE (14) North $3^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ West, $2,963.58$ feet to a point;
THENCE (15) South $88^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 15^{\prime \prime}$ East, 0.54 feet to a point;
THENCE (16) North $75^{\circ} 53^{\prime} 40$ " East, 340.47 feet to a point;
THENCE (17) North $65^{\circ} 27^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime}$ East, 350.10 feet to a point;
THENCE (18) South $40^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ East, 133.25 feet to a point;
THENCE (19) South $80^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 11^{\prime \prime}$ East, 62.70 feet to a point;
THENCE (20) South $4^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 37{ }^{\prime \prime}$ East, 4,426.21 feet to a point;
THENCE (21) South $24^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 12$ " East, 83.90 feet to a point;
THENCE (22) South $0^{\circ} 25^{\prime} 29$ " East, 493.75 feet to a point;
THENCE (23) North $71^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 19^{\prime \prime}$ West, 3.27 feet to a point;
THENCE (24) North $74^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 58^{\prime \prime}$ West, 53.84 feet to a point;
THENCE (25) North $75^{\circ} 50$ '32" West, 260.45 feet to a point;
THENCE (26) North $75^{\circ} 16^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime}$ West, 150.67 feet to the beginning of a non-tangent curve concave southerly, said curve has a radius of $13,079.66$ feet, to which a radial line bears North $17^{\circ} 04^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime}$ East;
THENCE (27) westerly along said curve through a central angle of $2^{\circ} 31^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ an arc distance of 576.04 feet;

Containing 4,381,947.13 square feet / $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 6 0}$ acres, more or less.


## Exhibit FIVE

# Hills at Harris Creek (REZ-23-03) 

Neighborhood Center Conditional Zoning District (NC-CZ) and<br>Residential High Density Conditional (RH-CZ) Zoning District<br>Conditions of Approval

Conditions Applicable to the entire property:

1. The subject property shall be developed generally in accordance with the concept plan attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein as if fully set out. The approximately 13 -acre portion of the subject property, further described as Parcel 1 on the attached Exhibit 2 attached hereto, shall be zoned NC-CZ and the remaining 102-acre portion of the property, further described as Parcel 2 on Exhibit 2 attached hereto, shall be zoned RH-CZ. The improvements described herein may be developed in phases in accordance with a phasing plan approved by the Town of Rolesville.
2. Dwelling Units: The total number of dwellings on the subject property shall not exceed 270 dwelling units and no more than 115 of these dwelling units shall be permitted to be Dwellings, Single Family, Attached (Townhouse.)
3. No more than fifteen (15) gross acres of the RH-CZ zoned district shall be assigned to use for Dwellings, Single Family, Attached (Townhouse).
4. Affordable Housing: Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for a dwelling unit, the property owner shall donate Twenty Thousand Dollars and No Cents (\$20,000.00\} to Homes for Heroes or another non-profit organization with a substantially similar purpose statement.
5. Pollinator Plantings: At least three acres of the landscaping planted within the power line easement on the subject property shall utilize plant materials that are listed as Native Pollinator Plants on North Carolina Wildlife Federation ("NCWF") or other resources for native plants recommended by the NCWF. Where evergreen plantings or street trees are required by the Rolesville Land Development Ordinance as the same may be amended from time to time, pollinator plantings shall not be required. Nothing herein shall be construed to limit the plant materials permitted on individual residential lots.
6. Recreational Amenities: The following recreational amenities shall be provided generally as shown on the attached Exhibit 1 as a part of the development of the subject property and dedicated to the community's homeowner's association except for those areas offered to and accepted by the Town of Rolesville:
a. A swimming pool and cabana, including changing rooms and restrooms shall be constructed prior to the issuance of the 150th building permit for a dwelling unit;
b. At least one fenced playground shall be constructed prior to the issuance of the $150^{\text {th }}$ building permit for a dwelling unit;
c. At least one fenced dog park shall be constructed prior to the issuance of the $150^{\text {th }}$ building permit for a dwelling unit;
d. At least one (1) garden park shall be provided prior to the issuance of the $200^{\text {th }}$ building permit for a dwelling unit.
e. At least one (1) pickle ball court shall be provided prior to issuance of the 250th building permit for a dwelling unit; and
7. Transportation Improvements: The property owner shall install all required roadway and transportation improvements set forth in the Traffic Impact Analysis report associated with this project in order to address the transportation impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the development. All transportation improvements shall be installed in accordance with future phasing plans approved by the Town.
8. All homes shall include either crawl space foundations or stem wall foundation. Any stem wall foundations shall have an average of at least eighteen inches \{18") in height across the front facade of the home and shall have brick or stone veneer on all sides facing a public street.
9. The minimum gross building square footage shall be 2,000 square feet for Single Family Detached dwellings.
10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the $150^{\text {th }}$ dwelling unit, the property owner shall contribute Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars $(\$ 25,000.00)$ to the Town of Rolesville to be used by the Town of Rolesville to install a traffic light at the intersection of the US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road.

Conditions Applicable to Dwellings, Single Family, Attached (Townhouse) use only (In Both NC \& RH Districts):
11. The minimum gross building square footage for townomes shall be 1,500 square feet and include at least a two (2) car garage.
12. No Dwelling, Single Family, Attached (Townhouse) building shall exceed three (3) stories.

Conditions Applicable to the NC-CZ District only:
13. All uses permitted in the Neighborhood Center Conditional Zoning (NC-CZ) district shall be permitted except Dwellings, Multiple Family (ie apartments).

# ATTACHMENT 10 - DUKE Powerline/Greenway within Easement Topic 

| From: | Pait, Bruce E. |
| :---: | :---: |
| To: | Jason Pfister |
| Cc: | keith@strongrockgroup.com |
| Subject: | Duke Energy Q AND A Vinci WO 49291749 |
| Date: | Saturday, May 27, 2023 8:04:14 AM |
| Attachments: | image001.png |
|  | comment parks v1 rez-23-03 concept plan-markup.pdf |
|  | DE MYWORLD DEPICTION.pdf |
|  | 1 A UGET GDLF-STD-TRM-00004-5-2020.pdf |
|  | PICTURE - EQUIPMENT WORKING H 1.pdf |

Proposed improvements and development within or adjacent to Duke Energy's 180 foot wide transmission level power easement.

Line: OL294 Durham - Wake 500kV at Towers \# 100A to \# 104A

To: Jason Pfister (919-824-6088) VP - Development - Ellis Development Group | 6801 Falls of Neuse Rd, STE 108, Raleigh, NC 27615
Cc: Stephen Ellis - Ellis Development Group, Keith Spalding-Robbins - Strong Rock Group Dear Jason:
-1. Duke Energy highly discourages a parallel paved trail at this location. Duke Energy has plans to replace the large lattice towers and parallel trails at this location will be in the way of heavy equipment and could likely be damaged. See the "Equipment working" picture attached above.
-2. Duke Energy power easements are not compatible with dumping grounds and abandoned or junk vehicles. The junk car on the site should be removed as soon as possible by the property owners. These types of encroachments represent hazards to Duke Energy workers, property owners and the general public.
-3. Easement documents:
We have not performed a title search for the property and only a full title search to the beginning of the records would capture all encumbrances on the property. The attached easement was referenced in our maintenance records for the property's location. We are providing this as a courtesy but make no guarantees as to any easement rights on the property, including rights for corridors that are currently unoccupied. We strongly suggest that you engage a licensed attorney to complete a full title search on the property to confirm any rights that Duke Energy has on the property.

The maintenance records that I have seen include but may not be limited to the following easements: Book 2830 page 24, Book 2878 page 411 of the Wake County Registry.

I hope this information is beneficial to you and your team.

Sincerely,

## Brace 919-219-9567

## Bruce E Pait <br> © DUKE <br> ENERGY.

Sr. Asset Protection Program Manager Transmission Department<br>Carolinas East \& Carolinas West - Zone 7<br>4690 Simms Creek Road | MC: US 1N T\&D OPS | Raleigh, NC 27616<br>Work: 919.431.4831 | Cell: 919.219.9567<br>Bruce.Pait@duke-energy.com

For more information about Transmission Asset Protection: Trees \& Rights of Way @ Duke-Energy.com
Hills at Harris Creek
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## Notification of Neighborhood Meeting for Pending Annexation/ Rezoning



You have received this notice because you own property within 500 feet of a property for which an application to rezone or subdivide property has been filed. This notice is to inform you of an upcoming information meeting on this proposed annexation and rezoning.

## Dear Property Owner:

Please be advised that a formal application has been submitted to amend the zoning classification for four properties (Wake County Property Identification Numbers 1757750520, 1757758529, 1757761273, and 1757778982) located at 5326 Mitchell Mill Road. The project consists of approximately 115.94 acres which is currently zoned R-30: Residential under the jurisdiction of Wake County. These applications are being presented by Ellis Developments Group on behalf of the property owners.

Ellis Developments Group has applied to rezone the parcels to a combination of NC-CZ (Neighborhood Center Conditional Zoning) and RH-CZ (Residential High Density Conditional Zoning) under the Town of Rolesville's Land Development Ordinance to allow for the construction of a mixed-use residential development featuring a mix of detached homes and townhomes, along with commercial outparcels along Mitchell Mill Road. We believe the proposed rezoning at this location is consistent with the Town of Rolesville Future Land Use Map which calls for Medium Density Residential in this area. In compliance with the requirements of the Town of Rolesville's Land Development Ordinance Code, this Neighborhood Meeting will be held to provide you with an opportunity to review a conceptual plan for the project and to give you an opportunity to ask any questions you may have about the project.

The Neighborhood Meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 23, 2023 from 7:00-8:00 p.m. at the Rolesville Community Center located at 514 Southtown Circle, Rolesville, NC 27571. Should you have questions prior to the meeting, please feel free to contact me via telephone at 919-824-6088 or email at jason@ellisdevgroup.com.


Community Meeting Sign-In Sheet

| Project: | Hills at Harris Creek | Meeting Date: | May 23, 2023 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Applicant: | Ellis Developments Group | Location: | Rolesville Community Center |




Who are We?
Where are We?
Headquarters in Raleigh with an office in Charlotte
Projects throughout the Carolinas
What is our Role?
Develop and deliver high-quality residential development projects
that meet demand for growth
members to develop projects that enhance communities Develop and Development Company
deliver high quality residential development projects that enhance
communities and meet demand for growth

About Us

Proposed Rezoning
PROPOSED CHANGES






- Consistent with Comprehensive Plan
Future Land Use Map designates these
parcels at Medium Density Residential (3-5 units/acre)
- Consistent with residential character of adjacent
properties
Comprehensive Plan 2017




Amenities

Amenities
POLLINATOR/WILDFLOWER GARDEN

Amenities

急
PICKLEBALL COURT




## Hills at Harris Creek Neighborhood Meeting Report

Ellis Developments Group (EDG) hosted an informational meeting for the proposed project on May 23, 2023 at the Rolesville Community Center. Five neighboring residents attended the meeting (attendance sheet attached). During the meeting, EDG presented an overview of the proposed project and provided the attendees with an opportunity to ask questions and express any concerns about the project. More specifically, the following topics were discussed in detail:

- Process and timeline
- Overview of the rezoning process and upcoming hearings, as well as overall anticipated construction timeline.
- Overview of project
- Unit mix, overall goal for neighborhood look and feel
- 116 acres; 115 THs; 152 SF homes
- Density: 2.3 units/acre
- Described amenities green space design/walkability of community
- Commercial: tentative plans for childcare center
- Comparison to prior version of site plan and need for second neighborhood meeting
- Reduced units from 318 homes to 267 homes
- Minimum lot size increased from 5000 sf to 7500 sf
- Improved open space with pollinator garden, bike paths and dog park
- Greenway trail integrated into wetland areas
- Reduced intensity of commercial parcel
- Traffic
- EDG responsible for all traffic improvements called for in the TIA
- Widen Mitchell Mill Road for entire frontage of site
- Left turn lanes into development from Mitchell Mill
- Right in, right out at each entrance with tapered lane to help residents of Manly Farm Road
- Measures to control traffic including traffic calming boulevard entrance


## RAMEY KEMP ASSOCIATES

## TOGETHER WE ARE LIMITLESS
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# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS <br> HILLS AT HARRIS CREEK ROLESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## 1. Development Overview

A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) was conducted for the proposed Hills at Harris Creek development in accordance with the Town of Rolesville (Town) Land Development Ordinance (LDO) and North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) capacity analysis guidelines. The proposed development is to be located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, North Carolina. This TIA is an update to the approved TIA that was sealed on May 19, 2022. This updated study reflects changes to the proposed land use types and densities and a change to the site access at the westernmost driveway from full-movement to right-in/right-out. No other scope changes were made from the previous TIA.

The proposed development is anticipated to be completed in 2027 and is expected to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a $12,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. day care center. Site access is proposed via one (1) full-movement and one (1) right-in/right-out (RIRO) driveway connection along Mitchell Mill Road.

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

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2027 No-Build Traffic Conditions
- 2027 Build Traffic Conditions


## 2. Existing Traffic Conditions

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

- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location
- Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

Existing peak hour traffic volumes were determined based on traffic counts conducted at the study intersection listed above, in November of 2021 during typical weekday AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools were in session for in-person learning.

Previously collected counts from the year 2021 were projected to the 2022 existing analysis year using a compounded annual growth rate of $2 \%$. Weekday AM and PM traffic volumes were balanced between study intersections, where appropriate.

## 3. Site Trip Generation

The proposed development is assumed to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a 12,000 sq. ft. day care center. Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11 th Edition. Table E-1 provides a summary of the trip generation potential for the site.

Table E-1: Site Trip Generation

| Land Use (ITE Code) | Intensity | Daily Traffic (vpd) | Weekday AM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Home (210) | 155 DU | 1,510 | 28 | 83 | 111 | 95 | 55 | 150 |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (220) | 115 DU | 812 | 14 | 45 | 59 | 44 | 26 | 70 |
| Day Care Center (565) | 12 KSF | 572 | 70 | 62 | 132 | 63 | 70 | 133 |
| Total Trips |  | 2,894 | 112 | 190 | 302 | 202 | 151 | 353 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pass-By Trips: Day Care Center } \\ (44 \% \text { PM) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | - | - | - | -30 | -30 | -60 |
| Total Primary Trips |  |  | 112 | 190 | 302 | 172 | 121 | 293 |

## 4. Future Traffic Conditions

Through coordination with NCDOT and the Town, it was determined that an annual growth rate of $2 \%$ would be used to generate 2027 projected weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. The following adjacent developments were identified to be considered under future conditions:

- Cobblestone Crossing Mixed-Use
- Young Street PUD
- Wheeler Tract
- Louisbury Road Assemblage
- Kalas / Watkins Family Property


## 5. Capacity Analysis Summary

The analysis considered weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic for 2022 existing, 2027 no-build, and 2027 build conditions. Refer to Section 7 of the TIA for the capacity analysis summary performed at each study intersection.

## 6. Recommendations

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

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Required Frontage Improvements per Rolesville Community Transportation Plan

- Widen one-half section of Mitchell Mill Road along the site frontage to this roadway's ultimate section (4-lane median divided).


## US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road

- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

- Construct a southbound (Jonesville Road) left-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- It should be noted that this improvement was also identified by the 5109 Mitchell Mill Road TIA.
- Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1

- Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 1) as a right-in/right-out with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach (Site Access 1).
- Construct a concrete median on Mitchell Mill Road that restricts access to right-in/right-out.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

- Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 2) with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach (Site Access 2).
- Construct an eastbound (Mitchell Mill Road) left-turn lane with at least 150 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.

**Refer to Section 9 of the report for more information
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# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS HILLS AT HARRIS CREEK ROLESVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA 

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The contents of this report present the findings of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) conducted for the proposed Hills at Harris Creek development in Rolesville, North Carolina. The proposed development, anticipated to be completed in 2027, is located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, North Carolina. The purpose of this study is to determine the potential impacts to the surrounding transportation system created by traffic generated by the proposed development, as well as recommend improvements to mitigate the impacts.

This TIA is an update to the approved TIA that was sealed on May 19, 2022. This updated study reflects changes to the proposed land use types and densities and a change to the site access at the westernmost driveway from full-movement to right-in/right-out. No other scope changes were made from the previous TIA.

The proposed development is expected to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a $12,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. day care center.

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

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2027 No-Build Traffic Conditions
- 2027 Build Traffic Conditions


### 1.1. Site Location and Study Area

The proposed development is located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, North Carolina. Refer to Figure 1 for the site location map. The study area for the TIA was determined through coordination with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and the Town of Rolesville (Town) and consists of the following existing intersections:

- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location
- Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

Refer to Appendix A for the approved scoping documentation.

### 1.2. Proposed Land Use and Site Access

The site is to be located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane. The proposed development, anticipated to be completed in 2027, is assumed to consist of the following uses:

- 155 single-family homes
- 115 townhomes
- 12,000 sq. ft. day care center

Site access is proposed via one (1) full-movement and one (1) right-in/right-out (RIRO) driveway connection along Mitchell Mill Road. Refer to Figure 2 for a copy of the preliminary site plan.

### 1.3. Adjacent Land Uses

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

### 1.4. Existing Roadways

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

Table 1: Existing Roadway Inventory

| Road Name | Route <br> Number | Typical <br> Cross- <br> Section | Speed Limit | Maintained <br> By | 2019 AADT <br> (vpd) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 401 Bypass |  | 4-lane <br> divided | 55 mph | NCDOT | 17,500 |
| Jonesville Road | SR 2226 | 2-lane <br> undivided | $35 \mathrm{mph} /$ <br> 45 mph | NCDOT | $2,210^{*}$ |
| Mitchell Mill <br> Road | SR 2224 | 2-lane <br> undivided | 45 mph | NCDOT | 4,000 |
| Peebles Road | SR 2929 | 2-lane <br> undivided | 45 mph | NCDOT | $1,700^{*}$ |

*ADT based on 2022 existing traffic volumes and assuming the weekday PM peak hour volume is $10 \%$ of the average daily traffic.


EXHIBIT ONE: CONCEPT PLAN (SKETCH PLAN)




## 2. 2022 EXISTING PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

### 2.1. 2022 Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Existing peak hour traffic volumes were determined based on previously collected traffic counts conducted at the study intersections listed below, in November of 2021 during typical weekday AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools were in session for in-person learning:

- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location
- Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

Previously collected counts from the year 2021 were projected to the 2022 existing analysis year using a compounded annual growth rate of $2 \%$. Weekday AM and PM traffic volumes were balanced between study intersections, where appropriate. Refer to Figure 4 for 2022 existing weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. A copy of the count data is located in Appendix B of this report.

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

The 2022 existing weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes were analyzed to determine the current levels of service at the study intersections under existing roadway conditions. The results of the analysis are presented in Section 7 of this report.


## 3. 2027 NO-BUILD PEAK HOUR CONDITIONS

In order to account for the growth of traffic and subsequent traffic conditions at a future year, no-build traffic projections are needed. No-build traffic is the component of traffic due to the growth of the community and surrounding area that is anticipated to occur regardless of whether the proposed development is constructed. No-build traffic is comprised of existing traffic growth within the study area and additional traffic created as a result of adjacent approved developments.

### 3.1. Ambient Traffic Growth

Through coordination with NCDOT and the Town, it was determined that an annual growth rate of $2 \%$ would be used to generate 2027 projected weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 5 for 2027 projected peak hour traffic.

### 3.2. Adjacent Development Traffic

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

- Cobblestone Crossing Mixed-Use
- Young Street PUD
- Wheeler Tract
- Louisbury Road Assemblage
- Kalas / Watkins Family Property

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

Table 2: Adjacent Development Information

| Development <br> Name | Location | Build- <br> Out Year | Land Use / <br> Intensity | TIA <br> Performed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cobblestone <br> Crossing Mixed- <br> Use | Northwest quadrant <br> of the intersection of <br> Main Street and <br> Young Street | 2023 | 180 multi-family homes <br> 18,200 sq. ft. municipal <br> flex space <br> 50,000 sq. ft. general <br> retail | March 2021 <br> by RKA |
| Young Street <br> PUD | Along both sides of <br> US 401 Bypass west <br> of Young Street | 2025 | 96 single-family homes <br> 325 single-family homes <br> 122,800 sq. ft. general <br> retail | June 2019 <br> by Kimley <br> Horn |
| Wheeler Tract | Northeast quadrant <br> of the intersection of <br> Rolesville Road and <br> Mitchell Mill Road | 2026 | 233 single-family homes <br> 125 multi-family homes | June 2019 <br> by RKA |
| Louisbury Road |  |  |  |  |
| Assemblage | West of Louisbury <br> Road and south of <br> Stells Road | 2025 | 152 single-family homes | May 2020 <br> by RKA |
| Kalas / Watkins | Along the west side <br> of Rolesville Road, <br> north of Mitchell Mill <br> Road | 2025 | 439 single-family homes <br> 96 multi-family homes | August 2019 <br> by Stantec |

Adjacent development trips are shown in Figure 6. Adjacent development information can be found in Appendix C.

### 3.3. Future Roadway Improvements

Based on coordination with the NCDOT and the Town, it was determined there were no future roadway improvements to consider under future conditions with this study. It should be noted that per the Rolesville Community Transportation Plan (dated May 2022), the ultimate cross-section of Jonesville Road is identified as a 2-lane roadway with a center two-way-left-turn-lane (TWLTL) and Mitchell Mill Road is identified as a 4-lane median-divided roadway.

### 3.4. 2027 No-Build Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

The 2027 no-build traffic volumes were determined by projecting the 2022 existing peak hour traffic to the year 2027 and adding the adjacent development trips. Refer to Figure 7 for an illustration of the 2027 no-build peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections.

### 3.5. Analysis of $\mathbf{2 0 2 7}$ No-Build Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

The 2027 no-build AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections were analyzed with existing geometric roadway conditions and traffic control. The analysis results are presented in Section 7 of this report.




## 4. SITE TRIP GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION

### 4.1. Trip Generation

The proposed development is assumed to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a 12,000 sq. ft. day care center. Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition. Table 3 provides a summary of the trip generation potential for the site.

Table 3: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use (ITE Code) | Intensity | Daily Traffic (vpd) | Weekday AM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Home (210) | 155 DU | 1,510 | 28 | 83 | 111 | 95 | 55 | 150 |
| Single-Family Attached Housing (220) | 115 DU | 812 | 14 | 45 | 59 | 44 | 26 | 70 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Day Care Center } \\ & (565) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 12 KSF | 572 | 70 | 62 | 132 | 63 | 70 | 133 |
| Total Trips |  | 2,894 | 112 | 190 | 302 | 202 | 151 | 353 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pass-By Trips: Day Care Center } \\ (44 \% \text { PM) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | - | - | - | -30 | -30 | -60 |
| Total Primary Trips |  |  | 112 | 190 | 302 | 172 | 121 | 293 |

It is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 2,894 total site trips on the roadway network during a typical 24-hour weekday period. Of the daily traffic volume, it is anticipated that 302 trips (112 entering and 190 exiting) will occur during the weekday AM peak hour and 353 trips (202 entering and 151 exiting) will occur during the weekday PM peak hour.

Pass-by trips were also taken into consideration in this study. Pass-by trips are made by the traffic already using the adjacent roadway, entering the site as an intermediate stop on their way to another destination. Pass-by trips are expected to account for approximately 60 trips (30 entering and 30 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour. It should be noted that the
pass-by trips were balanced, as it is likely that these trips would enter and exit in the same hour.

The total primary site trips are the calculated site trips after the reduction for pass-by trips. There are anticipated to be approximately 302 primary site trips ( 112 entering and 190 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 293 primary site trips (172 entering and 121 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour.

### 4.2. Site Trip Distribution and Assignment

Trip distribution percentages used in assigning site traffic for this development were estimated based on a combination of existing traffic patterns, population centers adjacent to the study area, and engineering judgment.

It is estimated that site trips will be regionally distributed as follows:

- $30 \%$ to/from the west via US 401 Bypass
- $15 \%$ to/from the east via US 401 Bypass
- $10 \%$ to/from the south via Peebles Road
- $35 \%$ to/from the west via Mitchell Mill Road
- $10 \%$ to/from the east via Mitchell Mill Road

The residential site trip distribution is shown in Figure 8a and the day care center site trip distribution is shown in Figure 8b. Refer to Figures 9a and $9 b$ for the residential site trip assignment and day care center site trip assignment, respectively.

The pass-by site trips were distributed based on existing traffic patterns with consideration given to the proposed driveway access and site layout. Refer to Figure 10 for the pass-by site trip distribution. Pass-by site trips are shown in Figure 11.

The total site trips were determined by adding the primary site trips and the pass-by site trips. Refer to Figure 12 for the total peak hour site trips at the study intersections.








## 5. 2027 BUILD TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

### 5.1. 2027 Build Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

To estimate traffic conditions with the site fully built-out, the total site trips were added to the 2027 no-build traffic volumes to determine the 2027 build traffic volumes. Refer to Figure 13 for an illustration of the 2027 build peak hour traffic volumes with the proposed site fully developed.

### 5.2. Analysis of 2027 Build Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

Study intersections were analyzed with the 2027 build traffic volumes using the same methodology previously discussed for existing and no-build traffic conditions. Intersections were analyzed with improvements necessary to accommodate future traffic volumes. The results of the capacity analysis for each intersection are presented in Section 7 of this report.


|  | Hills at Harris Creek <br> Rolesville, NC | 2027 Build <br> Peak Hour Traffic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 13 |

## 6. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Study intersections were analyzed using the methodology outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), 6th Edition published by the Transportation Research Board. Capacity and level of service are the design criteria for this traffic study. A computer software package, Synchro (Version 11), was used to complete the analyses for most of the study area intersections. Please note that the unsignalized capacity analysis does not provide an overall level of service for an intersection; only delay for an approach with a conflicting movement.

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

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

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

### 6.1. Adjustments to Analysis Guidelines

Capacity analysis at all study intersections was completed according to Town LDO and NCDOT Congestions Management Guidelines.

## 7. CAPACITY ANALYSIS

### 7.1. US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road

The existing unsignalized intersection of US 401 Bypass Road and Jonesville Road was analyzed under 2022 existing, 2027 no-build, and 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 5. Refer to Table 5 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix D for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 5: Analysis Summary of US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | Overall (seconds) | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2022 Existing | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & --{ }^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\mathrm{E}^{1}$ <br> $\mathrm{C}^{2}$ | N/A |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB** } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{E}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{B}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
| 2027 No-Build | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB* } \\ \text { NB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & \mathrm{D}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{E}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{EB}^{* *} \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \text { RT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline F^{1} \\ & -- \\ & F^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{E}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{B}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-- \\ & \mathrm{D}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-- \\ & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~F}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB** } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \mathrm{LT} \\ 2 \mathrm{TH}, 1 \mathrm{RT} \\ 1 \mathrm{RT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline F^{1} \\ & -- \\ & F^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{E}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{B}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A |

*Synchro analyzed the WB left-turns as SB through movements due to the nature of the superstreet and synchro limitations.
**Synchro analyzed the EB left-turns as NB through movements due to the nature of the superstreet and synchro limitations.

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

Capacity analysis of 2022 existing traffic conditions indicates that the major-street left-turn movements and minor-street approaches are expected to operate at LOS D or better with the exception of the eastbound left-turn movement during the weekday AM peak hour (LOS F),
the westbound left-turn movement during the weekday PM peak hour (LOS E), and the southbound minor-street approach during the weekday AM peak hour (LOS E).

Under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions, the major-street left-turn movements are expected to operate at LOS E/F during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the westbound left-turn movement during the weekday AM peak hour (LOS D) under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions. The minor-street approaches are expected to operate at LOS E/F during the weekday AM and PM peak hours with the exception of the northbound approach during the weekday AM peak hour (LOS B/C) and the southbound approach during the weekday PM peak hour (LOS B) under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions. It should be noted that the proposed development is expected to account for approximately $5 \%$ of the total traffic at this intersection during both the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The proposed development is expected to account for approximately $36 \%$ and $28 \%$ of the overall northbound approach traffic at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Due to the poor levels-of-service expected at this intersection, a traffic signal was considered under 2027 build traffic conditions to achieve acceptable levels of service. Weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes were utilized in evaluating the potential need for signalization based on the guidelines contained within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and within the Guidelines for Signalization of Intersections with Two or Three Approaches Final Report, published by ITRE. Based on a review of signal warrants at this intersection, the peak hour warrant (warrant 3) from the MUTCD is expected to be met for both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2027 no-build and build traffic conditions. It is not expected that this intersection would satisfy the MUTCD 8-hour (warrant 1) or 4-hour (warrant 2) warrants, which NCDOT favors for installation of a traffic signal. These longer period warrants are not typically met for residential areas due to the distinct peak traffic periods for these types of development. Based on a review of ITRE $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue length calculations, the northbound right-turn movement demand is expected to exceed capacity during the weekday PM peak hour under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic
conditions. Refer to Appendix J for a copy of the MUTCD warrants and the ITRE 95 th percentile queue length calculations.

Based on the Town's LDO, improvements must be identified to maintain no-build levels-ofservice under build traffic conditions or to limit the degradation to less than a five percent increase in total delay on any approach for those operating at failing levels-of-service under no-build traffic conditions. Therefore, additional turn-lanes were considered for the northbound right-turn and westbound left-turn movements at this intersection to achieve acceptable operation per the Town's LDO. However, additional turn-lanes are not a realistic or practical improvement at an unsignalized intersection operating with superstreet configurations.

Based on the Town's LDO, it is recommended that this intersection be monitored for signalization and a full signal warrant analysis be conducted prior to the full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by the Town and NCDOT. With signalization, it is expected that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels-of-service during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

### 7.2. US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

The existing unsignalized intersection of US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location was analyzed under 2022 existing, 2027 no-build, and 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 6. Refer to Table 6 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix E for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 6: Analysis Summary of US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2022 Existing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB* } \\ & \text { WB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \mathrm{UT} \\ & 2 \mathrm{TH} \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{C}^{1}$ | N/A | B1 -- | N/A |
| 2027 No-Build | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB* } \\ & \text { WB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \mathrm{UT} \\ & 2 \mathrm{TH} \end{aligned}$ | E1 | N/A | B1 | N/A |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB* } \\ & \text { WB } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \mathrm{UT} \\ & 2 \mathrm{TH} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{F^{1}}$ | N/A | B1 -- | N/A |

*Synchro analyzed the EB u-turn as a NB left-turn movement due to the nature of the superstreet and synchro limitations.

1. Level of service for major-street u-turn movement.

Capacity analysis of 2022 existing and 2027 no-build traffic conditions indicates that the major-street u-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 nobuild conditions (LOS E).

Under 2027 build traffic conditions, the major-street u-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS F during the weekday AM peak hour and at LOS B during the weekday PM peak hour. It should be noted that the proposed development is expected to account for approximately $3 \%$ of the total traffic at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The proposed development is expected to account for approximately $36 \%$ and $33 \%$ of the overall northbound approach traffic at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Due to the poor levels-of-service expected at this intersection, a traffic signal was considered under 2027 build traffic conditions to achieve acceptable levels of service. Weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes were utilized in evaluating the potential need for signalization based on the guidelines contained within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and within the Guidelines for Signalization of Intersections with Two or Three Approaches Final Report, published by ITRE. Based on a review of signal warrants at this intersection, the peak hour warrant (warrant 3) from the MUTCD is expected to be met for the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions. It is not expected that this intersection would satisfy the MUTCD 8-hour (warrant 1) or 4-hour (warrant 2) warrants, which NCDOT favors for installation of a traffic signal. These longer period warrants are not typically met for residential areas due to the distinct peak traffic periods for these types of development. Based on a review of ITRE 95 th percentile queue length calculations, the eastbound u-turn movement demand is expected to exceed capacity during the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 no-build and 2027 build traffic conditions. Refer to Appendix J for a copy of the MUTCD warrants and the ITRE 95th percentile queue length calculations.

Based on the Town's LDO, improvements must be identified to maintain no-build levels-ofservice under build traffic conditions or to limit the degradation to less than a five percent increase in total delay on any approach for those operating at failing levels-of-service under no-build traffic conditions. Therefore, additional turn-lanes were considered for the eastbound u-turn movement at this intersection to achieve acceptable operation per the Town's LDO. However, additional turn-lanes are not a realistic or practical improvement at an unsignalized intersection operating with superstreet configurations.

Based on the Town's LDO, it is recommended that this intersection be monitored for signalization and a full signal warrant analysis be conducted prior to the full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by the Town and NCDOT. With signalization, it is expected that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels-of-service during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

### 7.3. Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

The existing unsignalized intersection of Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road was analyzed under 2022 existing, 2027 no-build, and 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 7. Refer to Table 7 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix F for the Synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 7: Analysis Summary of Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2022 Existing | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { NB } \\ \text { SB } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 1 LT-TH-RT 1 LT-TH-RT 1 LT-TH-RT 1 LT-TH-RT | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~A}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~A}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~A}^{1} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B } \\ (11) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2027 No-Build | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C } \\ (19) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (142) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{E}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (53) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2027 Build Improved | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EB } \\ & \text { WB } \\ & \text { NB } \\ & \text { SB } \end{aligned}$ | 1 LT-TH-RT <br> 1 LT-TH, 1 RT <br> 1 LT-TH-RT <br> $1 \mathrm{LT}, 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} F \\ (103) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{D}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{C}^{1} \\ & \mathrm{~B}^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { F } \\ (61) \end{gathered}$ |

Improvements by the developer are shown in bold.

1. Level of service for all-way stop controlled approach.

Capacity analysis of 2022 existing and 2027 no-build traffic conditions indicates that the intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 no-build traffic conditions (LOSF). Under 2027 build traffic conditions, this intersection is expected to operate at an overall LOS F during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. It should be noted that the
proposed development is expected to account for approximately $19 \%$ and $20 \%$ of the total traffic at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The proposed development is expected to account for approximately $13 \%$ and $11 \%$ of the overall eastbound approach traffic and $21 \%$ and $23 \%$ of the overall westbound approach at this intersection during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

Turn lanes were considered at this intersection in order to mitigate the proportional impact that the proposed site traffic is expected to have at this intersection and to improve overall operations. An exclusive left-turn lane on the southbound approach (Jonesville Road) and right-turn lane on the westbound approach (Mitchell Mill Road) are recommended by the developer. It should be noted that an exclusive southbound left-turn lane was also identified in the 5109 Mitchell Mill Road TIA. With these improvements, the intersection is expected to continue operating at an overall LOS F during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

It should be noted that the overall intersection delay is expected to increase during the weekday PM peak hour as a result of the recommended improvements to the southbound and westbound approaches. This increase in delay is attributable to minor increases in delays for all approaches caused by adding additional lanes to an all-way stop-controlled intersection. No feasible improvements other than signalization would be expected to decrease delays further at this intersection.

Due to the poor levels-of-service expected at this intersection, a traffic signal was considered under 2027 build traffic conditions to achieve acceptable levels-of-service. The peak hour warrant (warrant 3) from the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) was considered. Based on a review of the peak hour signal warrant at this intersection, the intersection is expected to meet the peak hour warrant for the weekday AM peak hour under 2027 no-build traffic conditions and both the weekday AM and PM peak hours under 2027 build traffic conditions. It is not expected that this intersection would satisfy the MUTCD 8hour (warrant 1) or 4-hour (warrant 2) warrants, which NCDOT favors for installation of a traffic signal. These longer period warrants are not typically met for residential areas due to
the distinct peak traffic periods for these types of development. Refer to Appendix J for a copy of the MUTCD warrants.

Based on the Town's LDO, it is recommended that this intersection be monitored for signalization and a full signal warrant analysis be conducted prior to the full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by the Town and NCDOT. With signalization, it is expected that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels-of-service during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

### 7.4. Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1

The proposed intersection of Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1 was analyzed under 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 8. Refer to Table 8 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix G for the synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 8: Analysis Summary of Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | Overall (seconds) | Approach | Overall (seconds) |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{gathered} \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \mathrm{TH} \\ 1 \mathrm{TH}-\mathrm{RT} \\ \mathbf{1 ~ R T} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & -- \\ & \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{aligned}$ | N/A | -- | N/A |

Improvements to lane configurations by the developer are shown in bold.

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

Capacity analysis of 2027 build traffic conditions indicates that the minor-street approach is expected to operate at LOS C or better during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Based on the estimated low volume of right-turn movements into the proposed development at this intersection, an exclusive right-turn lane is not recommended.

### 7.5. Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

The proposed intersection of Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2 was analyzed under 2027 build traffic conditions with the lane configurations and traffic control shown in Table 9. Refer to Table 9 for a summary of the analysis results. Refer to Appendix H for the synchro capacity analysis reports.

Table 9: Analysis Summary of Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

| ANALYSIS SCENARIO | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{O} \\ & \mathbf{A} \\ & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | LANE CONFIGURATIONS | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ | Approach | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Overall } \\ & \text { (seconds) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2027 Build | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EB } \\ \text { WB } \\ \text { SB } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 \text { LT, } 1 \text { TH } \\ 1 \text { TH, } 1 \text { RT } \\ 1 \text { LT-RT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{A}^{1} \\ -- \\ \mathrm{C}^{2} \end{gathered}$ | N/A | A - $-{ }^{2}$ | N/A |

Improvements to lane configurations by the developer are shown in bold.

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

Capacity analysis of 2027 build traffic conditions indicates that the major-street left-turn movement is expected to operate at LOS A during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The minor-street approach is expected to operate at LOS C during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Right and left-turn lanes were considered based on the NCDOT Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways. The policy states that turn lanes should be considered on roads that carry at least 4,000 vehicles per day. Mitchell Mill Road is expected to carry more than 4,000 vehicles per day. Based on previous coordination with NCDOT, an eastbound left turn lane and a westbound right turn lane is recommended to be constructed by the developer on Mitchell Mill Road at Site Access 2. Refer to Appendix I for a copy of the turn lane warrants.

## 8. CONCLUSIONS

This Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted to determine the potential traffic impacts of the proposed Hills at Harris Creek development located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, North Carolina. The development is expected to consist of 155 single-family homes, 115 townhomes, and a $12,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. day care center and to be built-out in 2027. Site access is proposed via one (1) full-movement and one (1) right-in/right-out driveway connection along Mitchell Mill Road.

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

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2027 No-Build Traffic Conditions
- 2027 Build Traffic Conditions


## Trip Generation

It is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 302 primary trips (112 entering and 190 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 293 primary trips (172 entering and 121 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour.

## Rolesville Community Transportation Plan

Per the Rolesville Community Transportation Plan (CTP), the ultimate cross-section of Mitchell Mill Road is identified as a 4-lane median-divided roadway. It is recommended that the proposed development widen one-half section of Mitchell Mill Road along the site frontage in accordance with the Town's CTP.

## Adjustments to Analysis Guidelines

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

## Intersection Capacity Analysis Summary

All the study area intersections (including the proposed site driveways) are expected to operate at acceptable levels-of-service under existing and future year conditions with the exception of those identified in Section 7 of this report.

## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric improvements have been identified and are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. See a more detailed description of the recommended improvements below. Refer to Figure 14 for an illustration of the recommended lane configurations for the proposed development.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Required Frontage Improvements per Rolesville Community Transportation Plan

- Widen one-half section of Mitchell Mill Road along the site frontage to this roadway's ultimate section (4-lane median divided).


## US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road

- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Jonesville Road / Peebles Road

- Construct a southbound (Jonesville Road) left-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- It should be noted that this improvement was also identified by the 5109 Mitchell Mill Road TIA.
- Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- Conduct a full signal warrant analysis prior to full build-out of the proposed development and install a traffic signal if warranted and approved by NCDOT and the Town.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 1

- Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 1) as a right-in/right-out with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach (Site Access 1).
- Construct a concrete median on Mitchell Mill Road that restricts access to right-in/right-out.


## Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

- Construct the southbound approach (Site Access 2) with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop-control for the southbound approach (Site Access 2).
- Construct an eastbound (Mitchell Mill Road) left-turn lane with at least 150 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.
- Construct a westbound (Mitchell Mill Road) right-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.

**Refer to Section 9 of the report for more information



## APPENDIX A

## SCOPING DOCUMENTATION

## Andrew Eagle

| From: | Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, May 23, 2023 12:17 PM |
| To: | Andrew Eagle; Nolfo, Matthew J |
| Cc: | Jessica McClure; Daniel Reisfeld; Elabarger, Michael S; Gruber, Meredith; Jason Pfister; |
|  | Lineberger, Nicholas C; Darnell, Trevor S |
| Subject: | RE: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek |

Andrew,
We would prefer to see an updated TIA with the new volumes and the RIRO.
Thanks,

## Jeremy Warren, P.E.

Assistant Division Maintenance Engineer
Division 5
North Carolina Department of Transportation
jlwarren@ncdot.gov
4009 District Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607


Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the
North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Andrew Eagle [AEagle@rameykemp.com](mailto:AEagle@rameykemp.com)
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2023 9:34 AM
To: Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov); Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Jessica McClure [jmcclure@rameykemp.com](mailto:jmcclure@rameykemp.com); Daniel Reisfeld [dreisfeld@rameykemp.com](mailto:dreisfeld@rameykemp.com); Elabarger, Michael S
[michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov](mailto:michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov); Gruber, Meredith [meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov](mailto:meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov); Jason Pfister [jason@ellisdevgroup.com](mailto:jason@ellisdevgroup.com)
Subject: RE: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Report suspicious emails with the Report Message button located on your Outlook menu bar on the Home tab.

Jeremy/Matt,

It's my understanding NCDOT prefers Access A to be RIRO. We can update the TIA to match this configuration. Also, the developer now plans the commercial area to be 12,000 square feet of Day Care instead of 14,000 square feet of retail. This results in 30 more entering trips and 20 more exiting trips during the AM peak hour when compared to the original TIA. During the PM peak hour the Day Care scenario results in 11 fewer entering trips and 4 more exiting trips.

Does NCDOT want the TIA updated to reflect the Day Care trip generation as well as the RIRO?

## Andrew Eagle, PE, PTOE

## Senior Traffic Engineering Project Manager

D 7042206847 |C 7044670325

TOGETHER WE ARE LIMITLESS

## From: Andrew Eagle

Sent: Monday, May 8, 2023 2:59 PM
To: Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov); Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Jessica McClure [JMCClure@rameykemp.com](mailto:JMCClure@rameykemp.com); Daniel Reisfeld [dreisfeld@rameykemp.com](mailto:dreisfeld@rameykemp.com); Elabarger, Michael S [michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov](mailto:michael.elabarger@rolesville.nc.gov); Gruber, Meredith [meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov](mailto:meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov); Jason Pfister [jason@ellisdevgroup.com](mailto:jason@ellisdevgroup.com)
Subject: RE: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek

The link below can be used to download the TIA, site plan, and Synchro files. Please review and let me know if you have any questions/comments. Thank you!
$\square$ 20498-0005 - Hills at Harris Creek - 05-08-2023

Andrew Eagle, PE, PTOE Senior Traffic Engineering Project Manager D 7042206847 |C 7044670325

TOGETHER WE ARE LIMITLESS

From: Warren, Jeremy L [jlwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:jlwarren@ncdot.gov)
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 8:53 AM
To: Andrew Eagle [AEagle@rameykemp.com](mailto:AEagle@rameykemp.com); Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Jessica McClure [JMCClure@rameykemp.com](mailto:JMCClure@rameykemp.com); Daniel Reisfeld [dreisfeld@rameykemp.com](mailto:dreisfeld@rameykemp.com)
Subject: RE: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek

The study area should be the same so an updated TIA with an explanation should suffice.

## Jeremy Warren, P.E.

Assistant Division Maintenance Engineer
Division 5
North Carolina Department of Transportation
jlwarren@ncdot.gov
4009 District Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607

From: Andrew Eagle [AEagle@rameykemp.com](mailto:AEagle@rameykemp.com)
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 8:37 AM
To: Warren, Jeremy L[ilwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:ilwarren@ncdot.gov); Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Jessica McClure [imcclure@rameykemp.com](mailto:imcclure@rameykemp.com); Daniel Reisfeld [dreisfeld@rameykemp.com](mailto:dreisfeld@rameykemp.com)
Subject: [External] RE: Hills at Harris Creek

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to Report Spam.

Jeremy,
NCDOT approved the Hills at Harris Creek TIA in June of last year. The site plan has been changed, resulting in less density and fewer trips. The Town of Rolesville wants the TIA updated to match the latest site plan. Do you want an updated MOU, or can we revise the TIA and submit it via email with an explanation of the changes?
...and a heads up due to the similar names, this is a different project from Harris Creek Farm. NCDOT recently approved the MOU for that one on April 3.

Thanks,

Andrew Eagle, PE, PTOE
Senior Traffic Engineering Project Manager
D 7042206847 |C 7044670325

## RAMEY KEMP ASSOCIATES

- TOGETHER WE ARE LIMITLESS

From: Warren, Jeremy L[ilwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:ilwarren@ncdot.gov)
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2022 1:47 PM
To: Tucker Fulle [tfulle@rameykemp.com](mailto:tfulle@rameykemp.com)
Cc: Nolfo, Matthew J [mjnolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:mjnolfo@ncdot.gov); Brennan, Sean P [spbrennan@ncdot.gov](mailto:spbrennan@ncdot.gov)
Subject: FW: Hills at Harris Creek
Please see congestions comments.
Jeremy Warren, P.E.
District Engineer
Division 5, District 1
North Carolina Department of Transportation
9197333213 office
ilwarren@ncdot.gov
4009 District Drive
Raleigh, NC 27607

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the
North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Walker, Braden M [bmwalker1@ncdot.gov](mailto:bmwalker1@ncdot.gov)
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2022 9:32 AM
To: Warren, Jeremy L[ilwarren@ncdot.gov](mailto:ilwarren@ncdot.gov)
Cc: Lacy, Kevin [jklacy1@ncdot.gov](mailto:jklacy1@ncdot.gov); Brennan, Sean P [spbrennan@ncdot.gov](mailto:spbrennan@ncdot.gov); Grant, John H [ihgrant@ncdot.gov](mailto:ihgrant@ncdot.gov);
Keilson, David P [dpkeilson@ncdot.gov](mailto:dpkeilson@ncdot.gov); Ishak, Doumit Y [dishak@ncdot.gov](mailto:dishak@ncdot.gov); Bunting, Clarence B [cbunting@ncdot.gov](mailto:cbunting@ncdot.gov); Jones, Brandon H [bhjones@ncdot.gov](mailto:bhjones@ncdot.gov); Parrott, Tracy N [tnparrott@ncdot.gov](mailto:tnparrott@ncdot.gov); Holmes, Benjamin W [bwholmes@ncdot.gov](mailto:bwholmes@ncdot.gov); Mcneal, Douglas R [dmcneal@ncdot.gov](mailto:dmcneal@ncdot.gov); Nolfo, Matthew J [minolfo@ncdot.gov](mailto:minolfo@ncdot.gov)
Subject: Hills at Harris Creek

Attached is a PDF copy of our final review letter for Hills at Harris Creek. This letter is only being distributed electronically and should be considered as the official documentation. If you have any questions, please contact me or Clarence Bunting.

Thank you,

## Braden M. Walker, PE.

Congestion Management Project Design Engineer
Traffic Management Unit
North Carolina Department of Transportation
9198145078 office
bmwalker1@ncdot.gov

750 N. Greenfield Parkway
Garner, NC 27529

## Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the

North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Email correspondence to and from this sender is subject to the N.C. Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

Meredith Gruber, PLA, AICP
Town of Rolesville - Planning Director
PO Box 250
502 Southtown Circle
Rolesville, NC 27571
meredith.gruber@rolesville.nc.gov
[Sent via Email]
Reference: Hills at Harris Creek
Rolesville, North Carolina

Subject: Memorandum of Understanding for TIA Report

Dear Ms. Gruber:

The following is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the proposed scope of work and assumptions related to the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed Hills at Harris Creek development in Rolesville, North Carolina. The proposed development is to be located north of Mitchell Mill Road, west of Manly Farm Road, and east of Gro Peg Lane in Rolesville, NC. The development is expected to consist of 211 single-family homes, 109 townhomes, and 3.626 acres of commercial development. This MOU reflects the assumptions outlined during the initial coordination between Ramey Kemp Associates (RKA), the Town of Rolesville (Town), and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). Refer to the attached site location map. Site access to the proposed development is expected to be provided via two (2) full-movement driveway connections along Mitchell Mill Road. Refer to the attachments for a copy of the preliminary site plan.

The proposed development, anticipated to be completed in 2027, is expected to consist of 211 singlefamily homes, 109 townhomes, and 3.626 acres of commercial development. It should be noted that the commercial development land use(s) and intensity are not known at this time. Therefore, 7,000 square feet (sq. ft.) of general retail space per acre of land [approximately $25,400 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.] was assumed for the commercial development in this study. The proposed development is assumed to consist of the following land uses:

- 211 single-family homes
- 109 townhomes
- $25,400 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. of general retail


## Study Area

Based on a coordination with NCDOT and Town staff, the study area is proposed to consist of the following intersections:

- Mitchell Mill Road \& Jonesville Road / Peebles Road (unsignalized)
- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road (unsignalized)
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location (unsignalized)
- Mitchell Mill Road and Site Driveways (2)


## Existing Traffic Volumes

Existing peak hour traffic volumes will be determined based on previously collected traffic counts at the study intersections below, in November 2021 during typical weekday AM (7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) and PM (4:00 PM - 6:00 PM) peak periods, while schools were in session for in-person learning:

- Mitchell Mill Road \& Jonesville Road / Peebles Road
- US 401 Bypass and Jonesville Road
- US 401 Bypass and Eastern U-Turn Location

These previously collected counts will be projected to the year 2022 using a compounded annual growth rate of $2 \%$. Refer to the attachments for an illustration of 2022 existing peak hour traffic volumes.

## Background Traffic Volumes

Based on coordination with NCDOT and the Town, background traffic volumes will be determined by projecting 2022 existing traffic volumes to the year 2027 using a $2 \%$ annual growth rate. Additionally, it was determined that the following adjacent developments are to be included in this study:

- Cobblestone Crossing Mixed-Use
- Young Street PUD
- Wheeler Tract
- Louisbury Road Assemblage
- Kalas / Watkins Family Property


## Future Roadway Improvements

Based on coordination with the Town and NCDOT, it was determined that there are no future roadway improvements within the study area to consider under future traffic conditions.

## Trip Generation

Average weekday daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips for the proposed development were estimated using methodology contained within the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Refer to

Table 1, on the following page, for a summary of the proposed site trip generation for full buildout of the proposed development.

Table 1: Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use (ITE Code) | Intensity | Daily <br> Traffic (vpd) | Weekday AM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  | Weekday PM Peak Hour Trips (vph) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Enter | Exit | Total | Enter | Exit | Total |
| Single-Family Home (210) | 211 DU | 2,010 | 38 | 109 | 147 | 126 | 74 | 200 |
| Multi-Family Home (Low-Rise) (220) | 109 DU | 770 | 14 | 43 | 57 | 42 | 25 | 67 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Retail (<40 KSF) } \\ (822) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 25.4* KSF | 1,300 | 32 | 21 | 53 | 75 | 76 | 151 |
| Total Trips |  | 4,080 | 84 | 173 | 257 | 243 | 175 | 418 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Internal Capture } \\ (2 \% \text { AM, } 1 \% \text { PM })^{* *} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | -2 | -3 | -5 | -5 | -3 | -8 |
| Total External Trips |  |  | 82 | 170 | 252 | 238 | 172 | 410 |
| Pass-By Trips: Shopping Center (34\% PM) |  |  | - | - | - | -25 | -25 | -50 |
| Total Primary Trips |  |  | 82 | 170 | 252 | 213 | 147 | 360 |

*Since the commercial development is unknown at this time, $7,000 \mathrm{SF}$ of general retail space per acre of land [3.626 acres in total] was assumed for this land use.
**Utilizing methodology contained in the NCHRP Report 684.
It is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 4,080 site trips on the roadway network during a typical 24 -hour weekday period. Of the daily traffic volume, it is anticipated that 257 trips (84 entering and 173 exiting) will occur during the weekday AM peak hour and 418 trips ( 243 entering and 175 exiting) will occur during the weekday PM peak hour.

Internal capture of trips between the retail and residential land uses was considered in this study. Internal capture is the consideration for trips that will be made within the site between different land uses, so the vehicle technically never leaves the internal site but can still be considered as a trip to that specific land use. Based on NCHRP Report 684 methodology, weekday AM and PM peak hour internal capture rates of $2 \%$ and $1 \%$, respectively, were applied to the trips generated from the development. The internal capture reductions are expected to account for approximately 5 trips (2 entering and 3 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour and 8 trips ( 5 entering and 3 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour. Refer to the attached NCHRP internal capture reports for reference.

Pass-by trips will also be taken into consideration in this study. Pass-by trips are made by the traffic already using the adjacent roadway, entering the site as an intermediate stop on their way to another destination. Pass-by percentages are applied to site trips after adjustments for internal capture. Passby trips are expected to account for approximately 50 trips ( 25 entering and 25 exiting) during the
weekday PM peak hour. It should be noted that the pass-by trips were balanced, as it is likely that these trips would enter and exit in the same hour.
The total primary trips are the calculated site trips after the reduction for internal capture and pass-by trips. Primary site traffic is expected to generate approximately 252 trips ( 82 entering and 170 exiting) during the weekday AM peak hour, and 360 trips ( 213 entering and 147 exiting) during the weekday PM peak hour.

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

Site trips are distributed based on the locations of existing traffic patterns, population centers adjacent to the study area, and engineering judgment. A summary of the overall distributions is below.

## Residential

- $30 \%$ to/from the west via US 401 Bypass
- $15 \%$ to/from the east via US 401 Bypass
- $10 \%$ to/from the south via Peebles Road
- $35 \%$ to/from the west via Mitchell Mill Road
- $10 \%$ to/from the east via Mitchell Mill Road


## Commercial

- $25 \%$ to/from the west via US 401 Bypass
- $15 \%$ to/from the east via US 401 Bypass
- $10 \%$ to/from the south via Peebles Road
- $40 \%$ to/from the west via Mitchell Mill Road
- $10 \%$ to/from the east via Mitchell Mill Road

Refer to the attached site trip distribution figures.

## Analysis Scenarios

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

- 2022 Existing Traffic Conditions
- 2027 No-Build Traffic Conditions
- 2027 Build Traffic Conditions


## Report

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

Sincerely,
Ramey Kemp Associates,


Michael Karpkinski, P.E.
Traffic Engineering Project Manager
Attachments: Site Location Map
Site Plan
2022 Existing Traffic Volumes Figure
NCHRP 684 Internal Capture Reports
Proposed Site Trip Distribution Figures



| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | Hills at Harris Creek | Organization: | Ramey Kemp \& Associates |  |
| Project Location: | Rolesville, NC | TF |  |  |
| Scenario Description: | AM Street Peak Hour | Performed By: | Date: | $3 / 18 / 2022$ |
| Analysis Year: | 20xx Build | Checked By: |  |  |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |  |


| Table 1-A: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail | 822 | 25,400 | sq.ft. |  | 32 | 21 |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | 210,220 | 211,109 | units |  | 52 | 152 |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 84 | 173 |


| Table 2-A: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Entering Trips |  |  | Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized |
| Office | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Retail | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Restaurant | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Residential | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hotel | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |


| Table 3-A: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Destination (To) |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |  |  |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Table 4-A: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |  |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Residential | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 5-A: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-A: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 282 | 92 | 190 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 2\% | 3\% | 2\% | Retail | 6\% | 4\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | N/A | N/A |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{5}$ | 251 | 81 | 170 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | 2\% | 1\% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.
${ }^{3}$ Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE Trip Generation Manual).
${ }^{4}$ Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-A vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be made to Tables 5-A, 9-A ( $O$ and $D$ ). Enter transit, non-motorized percentages that will result with proposed mixed-use project complete.
${ }^{5}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A.
${ }^{6}$ Person-Trips
*ndicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A\&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Hills at Harris Creek |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Period: | AM Street Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 7-A: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Table 7-A (D): Entering Trips |  |  | Table 7-A (0): Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.10 | 32 | 35 | 1.10 | 21 | 23 |
| Restaurant | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.10 | 52 | 57 | 1.10 | 152 | 167 |
| Hotel | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 8-A (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 7 |  | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 3 | 2 | 33 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 8-A (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |
| Office |  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Residential | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |


| Table 9-A (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Destination Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 2 | 33 | 35 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1 | 56 | 57 | 51 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 9-A (0): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1 | 22 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 2 | 165 | 167 | 150 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

${ }^{1}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-A

## ${ }^{2}$ Person-Trips

${ }^{3}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

| NCHRP 684 Internal Trip Capture Estimation Tool |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Project Name: | Hills at Harris Creek | Organization: | Ramey Kemp \& Associates |  |
| Project Location: | Rolesville, NC | Performed By: | TF |  |
| Scenario Description: | AM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |  |
| Analysis Year: | 20xx Build |  | Checked By: |  |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour | Date: |  |  |


| Table 1-P: Base Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates (Single-Use Site Estimate) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Development Data (For Information Only) |  |  | Estimated Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | ITE LUCs ${ }^{1}$ | Quantity | Units | Total | Entering | Exiting |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail | 822 | 25,400 | sq.ft. |  | 75 | 76 |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | 210,220 | 211,109 | units |  | 168 | 99 |
| Hotel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 0 | 243 | 175 |


| Table 2-P: Mode Split and Vehicle Occupancy Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Entering Trips |  |  | Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized | Veh. Occ. ${ }^{4}$ | \% Transit | \% Non-Motorized |
| Office | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Retail | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Restaurant | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Residential | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| Hotel | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{2}$ | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% | 1.10 | 0\% | 0\% |


| Table 3-P: Average Land Use Interchange Distances (Feet Walking Distance) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |
| Office |  | 4000 | 4000 |  | 4000 | Hotel |  |
| Retail |  |  |  |  | 4000 |  |  |
| Restaurant |  |  |  |  | 4000 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment |  |  |  |  | 4000 |  |  |
| Residential |  | 4000 | 4000 |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel |  |  |  | 4000 |  |  |  |


| Table 4-P: Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) |  | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential |  |  |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel |  |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Residential | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |


| Table 5-P: Computations Summary |  |  |  | Table 6-P: Internal Trip Capture Percentages by Land Use |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Entering | Exiting | Land Use | Entering Trips | Exiting Trips |
| All Person-Trips | 461 | 268 | 193 | Office | N/A | N/A |
| Internal Capture Percentage | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% | Retail | 1\% | 2\% |
|  |  |  |  | Restaurant | N/A | N/A |
| External Vehicle-Trips ${ }^{5}$ | 414 | 241 | 173 | Cinema/Entertainment | N/A | N/A |
| External Transit-Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Residential | 1\% | 1\% |
| External Non-Motorized Trips ${ }^{6}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Hotel | N/A | N/A |

${ }^{1}$ Land Use Codes (LUCs) from Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.
${ }^{2}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator.
${ }^{3}$ Enter trips assuming no transit or non-motorized trips (as assumed in ITE Trip Generation Manual).
${ }^{4}$ Enter vehicle occupancy assumed in Table 1-P vehicle trips. If vehicle occupancy changes for proposed mixed-use project, manual adjustments must be made
${ }^{5}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P.
${ }^{6}$ Person-Trips
*Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.
Estimation Tool Developed by the Texas A\&M Transportation Institute - Version 2013.1

| Project Name: | Hills at Harris Creek |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analysis Period: | PM Street Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 7-P: Conversion of Vehicle-Trip Ends to Person-Trip Ends |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Table 7-P (D): Entering Trips |  |  | Table 7-P (0): Exiting Trips |  |  |
|  | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* | Veh. Occ. | Vehicle-Trips | Person-Trips* |
| Office | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1.10 | 75 | 83 | 1.10 | 76 | 84 |
| Restaurant | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1.10 | 168 | 185 | 1.10 | 99 | 109 |
| Hotel | 1.10 | 0 | 0 | 1.10 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 8-P (O): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Origin) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 2 |  | 24 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 |  | 3 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 8-P (D): Internal Person-Trip Origin-Destination Matrix (Computed at Destination) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin (From) | Destination (To) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office | Retail | Restaurant | Cinema/Entertainment | Residential | Hotel |
| Office |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Retail | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 42 |  | 0 | 30 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 |
| Residential | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |


| Table 9-P (D): Internal and External Trips Summary (Entering Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Destination Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 1 | 82 | 83 | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 2 | 183 | 185 | 166 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Table 9-P (0): Internal and External Trips Summary (Exiting Trips) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Origin Land Use | Person-Trip Estimates |  |  | External Trips by Mode* |  |  |
|  | Internal | External | Total | Vehicles ${ }^{1}$ | Transit ${ }^{2}$ | Non-Motorized ${ }^{2}$ |
| Office | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Retail | 2 | 82 | 84 | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Restaurant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cinema/Entertainment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential | 1 | 108 | 109 | 98 | 0 | 0 |
| Hotel | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Other Land Uses ${ }^{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[^0]


## APPENDIX B

## TRAFFIC COUNTS



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Jonesville)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Jonesville Road Southbound |  |  |  | US 401 <br> Westbound |  |  |  | Jonesville Road Northbound |  |  |  | US 401 <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 63 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 24 | 380 | 21 | 425 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 18 | 182 | 3 | 203 | 714 |
| 07:15 AM | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 39 | 362 | 24 | 425 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 11 | 125 | 7 | 143 | 647 |
| 07:30 AM | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 80 | 318 | 23 | 421 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 24 | 136 | 15 | 175 | 695 |
| 07:45 AM | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 38 | 249 | 16 | 303 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 135 | 10 | 170 | 563 |
| Total | 221 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 181 | 1309 | 84 | 1574 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 78 | 578 | 35 | 691 | 2619 |
| 08:00 AM | 61 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 26 | 236 | 13 | 275 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 30 | 120 | 10 | 160 | 519 |
| 08:15 AM | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 12 | 233 | 9 | 254 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 13 | 94 | 9 | 116 | 422 |
| 08:30 AM | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 10 | 213 | 5 | 228 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 91 | 3 | 100 | 361 |
| 08:45 AM | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 9 | 145 | 5 | 159 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 11 | 85 | 2 | 98 | 295 |
| Total | 149 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 57 | 827 | 32 | 916 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 60 | 390 | 24 | 474 | 1597 |
| Grand Total | 370 | 0 | 0 | 370 | 238 | 2136 | 116 | 2490 | 191 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 138 | 968 | 59 | 1165 | 4216 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 9.6 | 85.8 | 4.7 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 11.8 | 83.1 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Total \% | 8.8 | 0 | 0 | 8.8 | 5.6 | 50.7 | 2.8 | 59.1 | 4.5 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 23 | 1.4 | 27.6 |  |
| Cars + | 366 | 0 | 0 | 366 | 233 | 2094 | 114 | 2441 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 135 | 916 | 57 | 1108 | 4103 |
| \% Cars + | 98.9 | 0 | 0 | 98.9 | 97.9 | 98 | 98.3 | 98 | 98.4 | 0 | 0 | 98.4 | 97.8 | 94.6 | 96.6 | 95.1 | 97.3 |
| Trucks | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 42 | 2 | 49 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 52 | 2 | 57 | 113 |
| \% Trucks | 1.1 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 2 | 1.7 | 2 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 2.7 |



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Jonesville)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 2

|  | Jonesville Road Southbound |  |  |  | US 401 <br> Westbound |  |  |  | Jonesville Road Northbound |  |  |  | US 401 <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 63 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 24 | 380 | 21 | 425 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 18 | 182 | 3 | 203 | 714 |
| 07:15 AM | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 39 | 362 | 24 | 425 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 11 | 125 | 7 | 143 | 647 |
| 07:30 AM | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 80 | 318 | 23 | 421 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 24 | 136 | 15 | 175 | 695 |
| 07:45 AM | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 38 | 249 | 16 | 303 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 135 | 10 | 170 | 563 |
| Total Volume | 221 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 181 | 1309 | 84 | 1574 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 78 | 578 | 35 | 691 | 2619 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 11.5 | 83.2 | 5.3 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 11.3 | 83.6 | 5.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 850 | . 000 | . 000 | . 850 | . 566 | . 861 | . 875 | . 926 | . 693 | . 000 | . 000 | . 693 | . 780 | . 794 | . 583 | . 851 | . 917 |




TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Jonesville)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 1

|  | Jonesville Road Southbound |  |  |  | US 401 <br> Westbound |  |  |  | Jonesville Road Northbound |  |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 47 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 13 | 124 | 6 | 143 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 37 | 217 | 22 | 276 | 487 |
| 04:15 PM | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 13 | 119 | 6 | 138 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 15 | 231 | 20 | 266 | 464 |
| 04:30 PM | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 19 | 118 | 12 | 149 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 12 | 291 | 28 | 331 | 542 |
| 04:45 PM | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 137 | 6 | 165 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 303 | 30 | 341 | 553 |
| Total | 126 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 67 | 498 | 30 | 595 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 72 | 1042 | 100 | 1214 | 2046 |
| 05:00 PM | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 143 | 7 | 160 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 322 | 30 | 375 | 595 |
| 05:15 PM | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 22 | 146 | 11 | 179 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 15 | 257 | 26 | 298 | 543 |
| 05:30 PM | 39 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 20 | 145 | 3 | 168 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 23 | 262 | 14 | 299 | 540 |
| 05:45 PM | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 10 | 112 | 9 | 131 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 227 | 21 | 259 | 436 |
| Total | 130 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 62 | 546 | 30 | 638 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 72 | 1068 | 91 | 1231 | 2114 |
| Grand Total | 256 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 129 | 1044 | 60 | 1233 | 226 | 0 | 0 | 226 | 144 | 2110 | 191 | 2445 | 4160 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 10.5 | 84.7 | 4.9 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 5.9 | 86.3 | 7.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 6.2 | 0 | 0 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 25.1 | 1.4 | 29.6 | 5.4 | 0 | 0 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 50.7 | 4.6 | 58.8 |  |
| Cars + | 252 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 127 | 1020 | 60 | 1207 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 223 | 142 | 2051 | 191 | 2384 | 4066 |
| \% Cars + | 98.4 | 0 | 0 | 98.4 | 98.4 | 97.7 | 100 | 97.9 | 98.7 | 0 | 0 | 98.7 | 98.6 | 97.2 | 100 | 97.5 | 97.7 |
| Trucks | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 59 | 0 | 61 | 94 |
| \% Trucks | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 0 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 0 | 2.5 | 2.3 |



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Jonesville)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 2

|  | Jonesville Road Southbound |  |  |  | US 401 <br> Westbound |  |  |  | Jonesville Road Northbound |  |  |  | US 401 <br> Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 19 | 118 | 12 | 149 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 12 | 291 | 28 | 331 | 542 |
| 04:45 PM | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 137 | 6 | 165 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 303 | 30 | 341 | 553 |
| 05:00 PM | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 143 | 7 | 160 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 322 | 30 | 375 | 595 |
| 05:15 PM | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 22 | 146 | 11 | 179 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 15 | 257 | 26 | 298 | 543 |
| Total Volume | 112 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 73 | 544 | 36 | 653 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 58 | 1173 | 114 | 1345 | 2233 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 11.2 | 83.3 | 5.5 |  | 100 | 0 | 0 |  | 4.3 | 87.2 | 8.5 |  |  |
| PHF | . 757 | . 000 | . 000 | . 757 | . 830 | . 932 | . 750 | . 912 | . 854 | . 000 | . 000 | . 854 | . 630 | . 911 | . 950 | . 897 | . 938 |




TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Eastern U Turn)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

|  | US 401 Westbound |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 421 | 0 | 421 | 198 | 12 | 210 | 631 |
| 07:15 AM | 410 | 0 | 410 | 136 | 24 | 160 | 570 |
| 07:30 AM | 392 | 0 | 392 | 149 | 36 | 185 | 577 |
| 07:45 AM | 279 | 0 | 279 | 137 | 17 | 154 | 433 |
| Total | 1502 | 0 | 1502 | 620 | 89 | 709 | 2211 |
| 08:00 AM | 253 | 0 | 253 | 130 | 20 | 150 | 403 |
| 08:15 AM | 243 | 0 | 243 | 98 | 13 | 111 | 354 |
| 08:30 AM | 223 | 0 | 223 | 94 | 7 | 101 | 324 |
| 08:45 AM | 147 | 0 | 147 | 85 | 9 | 94 | 241 |
| Total | 866 | 0 | 866 | 407 | 49 | 456 | 1322 |
| Grand Total | 2368 | 0 | 2368 | 1027 | 138 | 1165 | 3533 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 |  | 88.2 | 11.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 67 | 0 | 67 | 29.1 | 3.9 | 33 |  |
| Cars + | 2318 | 0 | 2318 | 973 | 136 | 1109 | 3427 |
| \% Cars + | 97.9 | 0 | 97.9 | 94.7 | 98.6 | 95.2 | 97 |
| Trucks | 50 | 0 | 50 | 54 | 2 | 56 | 106 |
| \% Trucks | 2.1 | 0 | 2.1 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 4.8 | 3 |



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Eastern U Turn)AM Peak
Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 2

|  | US 401 <br> Westbound |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 421 | 0 | 421 | 198 | 12 | 210 | 631 |
| 07:15 AM | 410 | 0 | 410 | 136 | 24 | 160 | 570 |
| 07:30 AM | 392 | 0 | 392 | 149 | 36 | 185 | 577 |
| 07:45 AM | 279 | 0 | 279 | 137 | 17 | 154 | 433 |
| Total Volume | 1502 | 0 | 1502 | 620 | 89 | 709 | 2211 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 |  | 87.4 | 12.6 |  |  |
| PHF | . 892 | . 000 | . 892 | . 783 | . 618 | . 844 | . 876 |




TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Eastern U Turn)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

|  | US 401 Westbound |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 130 | 0 | 130 | 240 | 12 | 252 | 382 |
| 04:15 PM | 128 | 0 | 128 | 237 | 15 | 252 | 380 |
| 04:30 PM | 129 | 0 | 129 | 311 | 19 | 330 | 459 |
| 04:45 PM | 149 | 0 | 149 | 317 | 19 | 336 | 485 |
| Total | 536 | 0 | 536 | 1105 | 65 | 1170 | 1706 |
| 05:00 PM | 149 | 0 | 149 | 342 | 8 | 350 | 499 |
| 05:15 PM | 160 | 0 | 160 | 284 | 19 | 303 | 463 |
| 05:30 PM | 161 | 0 | 161 | 273 | 22 | 295 | 456 |
| 05:45 PM | 120 | 0 | 120 | 235 | 12 | 247 | 367 |
| Total | 590 | 0 | 590 | 1134 | 61 | 1195 | 1785 |
| Grand Total | 1126 | 0 | 1126 | 2239 | 126 | 2365 | 3491 |
| Apprch \% | 100 | 0 |  | 94.7 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Total \% | 32.3 | 0 | 32.3 | 64.1 | 3.6 | 67.7 |  |
| Cars + | 1101 | 0 | 1101 | 2175 | 125 | 2300 | 3401 |
| \% Cars + | 97.8 | 0 | 97.8 | 97.1 | 99.2 | 97.3 | 97.4 |
| Trucks | 25 | 0 | 25 | 64 | 1 | 65 | 90 |
| \% Trucks | 2.2 | 0 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 2.6 |



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(US 401 and Eastern U Turn)PM Peak
Site Code :
Start Date : 11/9/2021
Page No : 2

|  | US 401 <br> Westbound |  |  | US 401 Eastbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Thru | UTrn | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | 129 | 0 | 129 | 311 | 19 | 330 | 459 |
| 04:45 PM | 149 | 0 | 149 | 317 | 19 | 336 | 485 |
| 05:00 PM | 149 | 0 | 149 | 342 | 8 | 350 | 499 |
| 05:15 PM | 160 | 0 | 160 | 284 | 19 | 303 | 463 |
| Total Volume | 587 | 0 | 587 | 1254 | 65 | 1319 | 1906 |
| \% App. Total | 100 | 0 |  | 95.1 | 4.9 |  |  |
| PHF | . 917 | . 000 | . 917 | . 917 | . 855 | . 942 | . 955 |




TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(Jonesville and Mitchell Mill)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/30/2021
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

|  | Peebles Road Southbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Westbound |  |  |  | Peebles Road Northbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 07:00 AM | 4 | 17 | 13 | 34 | 8 | 73 | 5 | 86 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 74 | 1 | 75 | 215 |
| 07:15 AM | 4 | 36 | 7 | 47 | 8 | 101 | 2 | 111 | 3 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 33 | 221 |
| 07:30 AM | 6 | 34 | 5 | 45 | 16 | 87 | 3 | 106 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 35 | 210 |
| 07:45 AM | 2 | 43 | 6 | 51 | 8 | 49 | 1 | 58 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 24 | 4 | 29 | 155 |
| Total | 16 | 130 | 31 | 177 | 40 | 310 | 11 | 361 | 11 | 76 | 4 | 91 | 2 | 163 | 7 | 172 | 801 |
| 08:00 AM | 7 | 31 | 12 | 50 | 4 | 53 | 1 | 58 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 28 | 3 | 31 | 150 |
| 08:15 AM | 12 | 17 | 3 | 32 | 1 | 37 | 1 | 39 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 24 | 1 | 26 | 105 |
| 08:30 AM | 6 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 49 | 2 | 54 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 92 |
| 08:45 AM | 1 | 13 | 3 | 17 | 4 | 32 | 1 | 37 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 18 | 2 | 21 | 80 |
| Total | 26 | 65 | 20 | 111 | 12 | 171 | 5 | 188 | 4 | 22 | 5 | 31 | 2 | 89 | 6 | 97 | 427 |
| Grand Total | 42 | 195 | 51 | 288 | 52 | 481 | 16 | 549 | 15 | 98 | 9 | 122 | 4 | 252 | 13 | 269 | 1228 |
| Apprch \% | 14.6 | 67.7 | 17.7 |  | 9.5 | 87.6 | 2.9 |  | 12.3 | 80.3 | 7.4 |  | 1.5 | 93.7 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Total \% | 3.4 | 15.9 | 4.2 | 23.5 | 4.2 | 39.2 | 1.3 | 44.7 | 1.2 | 8 | 0.7 | 9.9 | 0.3 | 20.5 | 1.1 | 21.9 |  |
| Cars + | 42 | 195 | 50 | 287 | 52 | 479 | 16 | 547 | 15 | 98 | 9 | 122 | 4 | 249 | 13 | 266 | 1222 |
| \% Cars + | 100 | 100 | 98 | 99.7 | 100 | 99.6 | 100 | 99.6 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 98.8 | 100 | 98.9 | 99.5 |
| Trucks | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| \% Trucks | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.3 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 1.1 | 0.5 |



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(Jonesville and Mitchell Mill)AM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/30/2021
Page No : 2

|  | Peebles Road Southbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Westbound |  |  |  | Peebles Road Northbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 07:00 AM to 08:45 AM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:00 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00 AM | 4 | 17 | 13 | 34 | 8 | 73 | 5 | 86 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 20 | 0 | 74 | 1 | 75 | 215 |
| 07:15 AM | 4 | 36 | 7 | 47 | 8 | 101 | 2 | 111 | 3 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 33 | 221 |
| 07:30 AM | 6 | 34 | 5 | 45 | 16 | 87 | 3 | 106 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 35 | 210 |
| 07:45 AM | 2 | 43 | 6 | 51 | 8 | 49 | 1 | 58 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 24 | 4 | 29 | 155 |
| Total Volume | 16 | 130 | 31 | 177 | 40 | 310 | 11 | 361 | 11 | 76 | 4 | 91 | 2 | 163 | 7 | 172 | 801 |
| \% App. Total | 9 | 73.4 | 17.5 |  | 11.1 | 85.9 | 3 |  | 12.1 | 83.5 | 4.4 |  | 1.2 | 94.8 | 4.1 |  |  |
| PHF | . 667 | . 756 | . 596 | . 868 | . 625 | . 767 | . 550 | . 813 | . 458 | . 731 | . 333 | . 758 | . 500 | . 551 | . 438 | . 573 | . 906 |




TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(Jonesville and Mitchell Mill)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/30/2021
Page No : 1

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

|  | Peebles Road Southbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Westbound |  |  |  | Peebles Road Northbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| 04:00 PM | 7 | 11 | 13 | 31 | 6 | 25 | 1 | 32 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 16 | 2 | 44 | 6 | 52 | 131 |
| 04:15 PM | 6 | 11 | 4 | 21 | 2 | 27 | 2 | 31 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 21 | 1 | 62 | 4 | 67 | 140 |
| 04:30 PM | 3 | 13 | 3 | 19 | 4 | 30 | 2 | 36 | 0 | 27 | 1 | 28 | 3 | 64 | 3 | 70 | 153 |
| 04:45 PM | 2 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 71 | 3 | 77 | 154 |
| Total | 18 | 43 | 25 | 86 | 16 | 119 | 5 | 140 | 5 | 76 | 5 | 86 | 9 | 241 | 16 | 266 | 578 |
| 05:00 PM | 1 | 15 | 6 | 22 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 36 | 3 | 19 | 2 | 24 | 1 | 78 | 5 | 84 | 166 |
| 05:15 PM | 3 | 15 | 6 | 24 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 27 | 3 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 4 | 89 | 7 | 100 | 181 |
| 05:30 PM | 5 | 11 | 9 | 25 | 8 | 36 | 0 | 44 | 1 | 27 | 2 | 30 | 5 | 62 | 3 | 70 | 169 |
| 05:45 PM | 1 | 7 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 21 | 1 | 24 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 17 | 4 | 55 | 6 | 65 | 118 |
| Total | 10 | 48 | 25 | 83 | 19 | 111 | 1 | 131 | 9 | 85 | 7 | 101 | 14 | 284 | 21 | 319 | 634 |
| Grand Total | 28 | 91 | 50 | 169 | 35 | 230 | 6 | 271 | 14 | 161 | 12 | 187 | 23 | 525 | 37 | 585 | 1212 |
| Apprch \% | 16.6 | 53.8 | 29.6 |  | 12.9 | 84.9 | 2.2 |  | 7.5 | 86.1 | 6.4 |  | 3.9 | 89.7 | 6.3 |  |  |
| Total \% | 2.3 | 7.5 | 4.1 | 13.9 | 2.9 | 19 | 0.5 | 22.4 | 1.2 | 13.3 | 1 | 15.4 | 1.9 | 43.3 | 3.1 | 48.3 |  |
| Cars + | 28 | 91 | 50 | 169 | 35 | 229 | 6 | 270 | 14 | 161 | 12 | 187 | 23 | 524 | 37 | 584 | 1210 |
| \% Cars + | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99.6 | 100 | 99.6 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99.8 | 100 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| \% Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |



TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION
File Name : Rolesville(Jonesville and Mitchell Mill)PM Peak Site Code :
Start Date : 11/30/2021
Page No : 2

|  | Peebles Road Southbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Westbound |  |  |  | Peebles Road Northbound |  |  |  | Mitchell Mill Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start Time | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Right | Thru | Left | App. Total | Int. Total |
| Peak Hour Analysis From 04:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1 Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:45 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:45 PM | 2 | 8 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 37 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 18 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 71 | 3 | 77 | 154 |
| 05:00 PM | 1 | 15 | 6 | 22 | 5 | 31 | 0 | 36 | 3 | 19 | 2 | 24 | 1 | 78 | 5 | 84 | 166 |
| 05:15 PM | 3 | 15 | 6 | 24 | 4 | 23 | 0 | 27 | 3 | 26 | 1 | 30 | 4 | 89 | 7 | 100 | 181 |
| 05:30 PM | 5 | 11 | 9 | 25 | 8 | 36 | 0 | 44 | 1 | 27 | 2 | 30 | 5 | 62 | 3 | 70 | 169 |
| Total Volume | 11 | 49 | 26 | 86 | 21 | 127 | 0 | 148 | 10 | 90 | 5 | 105 | 13 | 300 | 18 | 331 | 670 |
| \% App. Total | 12.8 | 57 | 30.2 |  | 14.2 | 85.8 | 0 |  | 9.5 | 85.7 | 4.8 |  | 3.9 | 90.6 | 5.4 |  |  |
| PHF | . 550 | . 817 | . 722 | . 860 | . 656 | . 858 | . 000 | . 841 | . 833 | . 833 | . 625 | . 875 | . 650 | . 843 | . 643 | . 828 | . 925 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Peak Hour Data <br> Peak Hour Begins at 04:45 PM <br> Cars + <br> Trucks |  |
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## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric improvements have been identified and are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. See a more detailed description of the recommended improvements below. Refer to Figure 14 for an illustration of the recommended lane configuration for the proposed development.

## Improvements by STIP U-6241

STIP U-6241 is expected to realign Burlington Mills Road and install a traffic signal at the relocated intersection on Main Street. STIP U-6241 is also expected to provide improvements to the pedestrian and bike facilities along Main Street and add a concrete median island along Main Street west of Rogers Road. These improvements associated with STIP U-6241 will alter the existing lane configurations at the study intersections along Main Street.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

## Main Street and Site Drive 1

- Construct the southbound approach with one ingress and two egress lanes.
- Provide stop control for the southbound approach.
- Install an eastbound left-turn lane with at least 125 feet of storage and appropriate decel and taper.


## Young Street and Site Drive 2

- Construct the eastbound approach with one ingress and egress lane.
- Provide stop control for the eastbound approach.



# Revised Traffic Impact Analysis for Young Street PUD 

Rolesville, North Carolina

Prepared for:<br>Ashton Woods<br>Raleigh, North Carolina

Prepared by:
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
NC License \#F-0102
421 Fayetteville Street, Suite 600
Raleigh, NC 27601
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## Kimley»)Horn

| YOUNG STREET PUD |
| :---: |
| ROLESVILLE, NC |
| TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS |

SITE LOCATION

| $\nabla し$ <br> ヨ】ก૭｜」 |  <br> －SヨWก70＾ગ｜－JVY <br>  （GZOZ）0ヨıつヨroyd | SISATVNV，$\perp$ OVdNI O｜$-\exists \forall \forall ป \perp$ כN ‘ $\exists 771 / \wedge S \exists 704$ and $\perp \exists \exists y \perp S$ 9NกO人 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| $\begin{gathered} 91 \\ \exists y \cap 9 \mid \sqsupset \end{gathered}$ |  <br> －SヨWกา0＾ગIJJVタ」 <br>  （GZOZ）Oヨ1Jヨ「Oyd |  כN ‘ $\exists 77 / \wedge$ S $\exists 704$ and $\perp \exists \exists y \perp S$ 9NNO人 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



## Kimley»Horn

### 7.0 Recommendations

## Residential Build-out

The following improvements are recommended to be performed to accommodate projected site traffic volumes at build-out of the residential portion of the development:

## US 401 Bypass:

- Coordinate the traffic signals at the intersections of US 401 at Young Street and the Superstreet U-turns


## Young Street at Quarry Road/North Site Driveway:

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Construct a southbound right-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Restripe the existing westbound left-turn lane on Quarry Road to a shared left/through lane
- Provide an exclusive left-turn lane with 275 feet of storage and appropriate tapers and a shared through/right lane on the North Site Driveway
- Install a traffic signal when warranted


## Young Street at Central Site Driveway:

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Construct a southbound right-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Provide exclusive left and right-turn lanes on the Central Site Driveway with 125 feet of storage and appropriate tapers for the left-turn lane


## Young Street at Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway:

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane on Young Street with 50 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Provide one egress lane on the South Site Driveway


## Rolesville Road at Mitchell Mill Road:

- Install a traffic signal when warranted

Analyses indicate that with the recommended improvements in place, all of the study intersections except for Young Street at Century Farm Road and Young Street at Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway are expected to operate at an acceptable LOS at build-out of the residential-only phase of the development.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at Century Farm Road is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Century Farm Road) in the AM peak hour at project build-out. However, 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. SimTraffic traffic simulations indicate that no queuing issues are expected at this intersection.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at the Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Rolesville High School Driveway) in the AM peak hour and school PM peak hour with or without the proposed project in place in the study year 2025. SimTraffic traffic simulations also indicate the possibility of long queues on the westbound left-turn movement at this intersection in the AM peak hour and school PM peak hour. However, 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. This intersection is not expected to meet 4-hour or 8-hour MUTCD traffic signal warrants.

## Commercial Build-out

The following additional improvements are recommended to be performed in addition to those recommended above for the residential phase to accommodate projected site traffic volumes when the retail portion of the site is developed:

## US 401 Bypass Eastbound at Young Street:

- Extend the storage of the existing eastbound right-turn lane on US 401 Bypass by approximately 175 feet to provide 400 feet of storage and appropriate tapers


## Young Street at Quarry Road/North Site Driveway:

- Construct a northbound right-turn lane on Young Street with 100 feet of storage and appropriate tapers
- Modify the traffic signal to accommodate the additional laneage

Analyses indicate that with the recommended improvements in place, all of the study intersections except for Young Street at Century Farm Road, Young Street at the Central Site Driveway, and Young Street at Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway are expected to operate at acceptable LOS at commercial build-out of the development.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at Century Farm Road is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Century Farm Road) in the AM peak hour at project build-out. 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. SimTraffic
traffic simulations indicate that short queues are likely on the minor street approach in the AM peak hour at commercial build-out.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at the Central Site Driveway is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Central Site Driveway) in the AM peak hour in the commercial build-out traffic condition. 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. SimTraffic traffic simulations indicate the possibility of long queues on the eastbound leftturn movement at this intersection in the AM peak hour in the commercial build-out condition.

Analyses indicate that the intersection of Young Street at the Rolesville High School Driveway/South Site Driveway is expected to operate with long delays on the minor street approach (Rolesville High School Driveway) in the AM peak hour and school PM peak hour with or without the proposed project in place in the study year 2025. SimTraffic traffic simulations also indicate the possibility of long queues on the westbound left-turn movement at this intersection in the AM peak hour and school PM peak hour. However, 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. This intersection is not expected to meet 4 -hour or 8-hour MUTCD traffic signal warrants.

As shown in the analysis, the impact of site traffic associated with the commercial build-out of this proposed PUD is generally consistent with the currently-approved PUD for the site. The proposed PUD is expected to generate no more than 50 additional peak hour trips in each of the studied peak hours compared to the approved PUD, and delays at commercial build-out of both plans are generally consistent at each of the study intersections.

The recommended laneage for the development is shown on Figure 17.
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## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS

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

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Rolesville Road and Mitchell Mill Road

- Monitor intersection for signalization.


## Rolesville Road and Site Drive 1

- Provide site access via a full movement intersection with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop control for westbound Site Drive 1 approach.
- Provide a designated southbound left-turn lane with at least 100 feet of storage and appropriate deceleration and taper.

Mitchell Mill Road and Site Drive 2

- Provide site access via a full movement intersection with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Provide stop control for southbound Site Drive 2 approach.
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| Moving forward. <br> RAMEY KEMP ASSOCIATES | Louisbury Road Assemblage Raleigh, NC | Site Location Map |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 1 |

## LEGEND
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$\mathrm{X} / \mathrm{Y} \rightarrow$ Weekday AM / PM Peak Hour Site Trips


| Moving forward. | Louisbury Road Assemblage <br> Raleigh, NC | Site Trip Assignment |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| RAMEY KEMP ASSOCIATES |  |  |  |$\quad$| Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 7 |
| :--- | :--- |

## 12. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, specific geometric improvements have been identified and are recommended to accommodate future traffic conditions. See a more detailed description of the recommended improvements below. Refer to Figure 9 for an illustration of the recommended lane configuration for the proposed development.

## Recommended Improvements by Developer

Mitchell Mill Road and Louisbury Road

- Monitor for signalization after site is constructed.


## US 401 and Louisbury Road

- Per NCDOT, extend northbound left turn lane to $175^{\prime}$ of storage.
- Monitor for signalization after site is constructed.


## Louisbury Road and Site Drive 1

- Provide site access via full movement intersection with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Per NCDOT, provide northbound left turn lane with $100^{\prime}$ of storage.
- Provide stop control for eastbound approach.

Louisbury Road and Site Drive 2

- Provide site access via full movement intersection with one (1) ingress lane and one (1) egress lane.
- Provide stop control for eastbound approach.


*Based on NCDOT Review


| Moving forward. | Louisbury Road Assemblage <br> Raleigh, NC | Recommended <br> Lane Configurations |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Scale: Not to Scale | Figure 9 |
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the transportation impacts of the proposed Kalas / Watkins Family Property development located on the west side of Rolesville Road just north of Mitchell Mill Road in Rolesville, NC. The project location is shown below in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Site Location
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Figure 6: Site Trip Assignment
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### 5.42025 BUILD WITH IMPROVEMENTS

Geometric improvements such as the installation of turn-lanes are recommended and therefore analyzed in this scenario. These items are listed below as well as in the recommendations section.

## Rolesville Road at Site Driveway A

- Construct Driveway A as a full-movement access point onto Rolesville Road with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Driveway A.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.


## Rolesville Road at Site Driveway B / Wheeler Tract Driveway

- Construct Driveway B as a full-movement access point onto Rolesville Road with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with 50 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.


## Rolesville Road at Site Driveway C

- Construct Driveway $C$ as a full-movement access point onto Rolesville Road with one ingress lane and one egress lane.
- Construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Driveway C.
- Construct an exclusive northbound left-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.
- Construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane with 100 feet of full-width storage and appropriate taper on Rolesville Road.

Accordingly, all study area intersections and approaches operate at acceptable levels of service with the following exceptions:

- The east and westbound approaches to the intersection of Rolesville Road at Rolesville High School Driveway / Young Street PUD Southern Driveway operates at LOS F in the AM peak hour. This causes high overall delays at the intersection. Furthermore, the eastbound approach operates at LOS F and westbound approach operates at LOS E in the PM peak hour.
- The east and westbound approaches at the intersection of Rolesville Road at Site Driveway B / Wheeler Tract Driveway operate at LOS E in the AM peak hour.

The east and westbound approaches to the intersection of Rolesville Road at Rolesville High School Driveway / Young Street PUD Southern Driveway performs unacceptably across analysis scenarios. These delays can be
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attributed to both the Young Street PUD and High School traffic on the side street approaches. The Kalas / Watkins development is projected to only add through volumes to the intersection and are anticipated to have a minimal impact on overall delays at this intersection.

Delays on the eastbound approach of Site Driveway B at Rolesville Road can be attributed to high thru volumes on Rolesville Road during the AM peak hour. Traffic volumes using this approach are anticipated to be minor (i.e. 15 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 10 vehicles in the PM peak hour) and side street delays should dissipate after High School Traffic passes through the network. Table 8 lists the results of the capacity analysis under the 2025 buildimproved traffic conditions. The recommended improvements are illustrated in figure 14.

Figure 14: Recommended Improvements


## APPENDIX D

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS US 401 BYPASS <br> \& <br> JONESVILLE ROAD

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 中4 | 「 |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 590 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 86 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 590 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 0 | 86 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | Yield | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | 125 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - |  | 16983 | - | - | 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 | 0 | 656 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 0 | 96 | 0 |



| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 12 | 17.5 |
| HCM LOS |  | B | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 668 | - | -384 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.226 | - | -0.249 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 12 | - | -17.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.9 | - | - |



| Major/Minor | Major1 | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 485 | - | 970 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 970 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | - | 6.54 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.54 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 3.32 | - | 4.02 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 528 | 0 | 252 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 330 | 0 |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | 528 | - | 252 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 252 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 330 | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, $s$ | 0 | 14.9 | 29.2 |
| HCM LOS |  | $B$ | D |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 528 | - | -252 |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.316 | - | -0.419 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 14.9 | - | -29.2 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - | - | D |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 1.3 | - | - | 2 |



| Major/Minor | Major1 | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Minor2 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | 485 | - | 970 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 970 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.94 | - | 6.54 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.54 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 3.32 | - | 4.02 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 528 | 0 | 252 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 330 | 0 |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - | - | - | 528 | - | 252 | - |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 252 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 18.4 | 32.5 |
| HCM LOS |  | $C$ | $D$ |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 528 | - | -252 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.497 | - | -0.494 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 18.4 | - | -32.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 2.7 | - | - |
| D | 2.5 |  |  |

RKA Synchro 11 Report

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | T゙ |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1220 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1220 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | Yield | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | 125 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - |  | 16983 | - | - | 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 | 0 | 1356 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 41 | 0 |



| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 19 | 38.4 |
| HCM LOS | C | E |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 395 | - | -148 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.352 | - | -0.278 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 19 | - | -38.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 1.6 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 6.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 44 | T゙ |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1835 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 41 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 1835 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 41 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | Yield | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | 125 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - |  | 16983 | - | - | 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 | 0 | 2039 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 46 | 0 |



| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, $s$ | 0 | 45.5 | 186.4 |
| HCM LOS |  | E | F |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 234 | - | -56 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.655 | - | -0.813 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 45.5 | - | -186.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | E | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 4.1 | - | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh 17．9 | 17.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement E | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个4 | 「 |  |  |  |  |  | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 0 | 1835 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 67 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 0 | 1835 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 0 | 67 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | － | － | Yield | － | － | None | － |  | None | ． |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | － | － | 125 | － | － | － | － | － | 0 | － | － | － |  |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |  |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 2039 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 | 0 | 74 | 0 |  |


| Major／Minor | Major1 |  |  | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | － | 0 | 0 | － |  | 1020 | － | 2039 | － |  |
| Stage 1 | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 0 | － |  |
| Stage 2 | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 2039 | － |  |
| Critical Hdwy | － | － | － | － | － | 6.94 | － | 6.54 | － |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 5.54 | － |  |
| Follow－up Hdwy | － | － | － | － | － | 3.32 | － | 4.02 | － |  |
| Pot Cap－1 Maneuver | 0 | － | － | 0 | 0 | 234 | 0 | $\sim 56$ | 0 |  |
| Stage 1 | 0 | － | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | － | 0 |  |
| Stage 2 | 0 | － | － | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 99 | 0 |  |
| Platoon blocked，\％ |  | － | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap－1 Maneuver | － | － | － | － | － | 234 | － | $\sim 56$ | － |  |
| Mov Cap－2 Maneuver | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | $\sim 56$ | － |  |
| Stage 1 | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | － |  |
| Stage 2 | － | － | － | － | － | － | － | 99 | － |  |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay，s | 0 | 82.4 | $\$ 353$ |
| HCM LOS |  | $F$ | $F$ |


| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／h） | 234 | - | -56 |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 0.912 | - | -1.329 |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | 82.4 | - | $-\$ 353$ |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | - | - |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | 7.7 | - | - |
| F | 6.6 |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |

$\sim:$ Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ ：Delay exceeds $300 \mathrm{~s} \quad+$ ：Computation Not Defined $\quad$＊：All major volume in platoon



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 20.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | 44 | 「 |  | 4 |  |  |  | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1796 | 204 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1796 | 204 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Stap | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 150 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1996 | 227 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 276 |



| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 293.8 | 143.8 |
| HCM LOS |  | F | F |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 43 | - | -242 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.034 | - | -1.139 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 293.8 | - | -143.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 4.2 | - | -12.5 |

[^1]| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 23.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | 个4 | 「 |  | ＋ |  |  |  | 「 |
| Trafic Vol，veh／h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1853 | 204 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 |  | 248 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1853 | 204 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | － | － | None | － | － | None | － | － | None |  |  | None |
| Storage Length | － | － | － | － | － | 150 | － | － | － | － | － | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | \＃ | 1 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Grade，\％ | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － | － | 0 | － |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2059 | 227 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 276 |



| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay，s | 0 | $\$ 348.5$ | 165.2 |
| HCM LOS |  | $F$ | $F$ |


| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／／） | 39 | - | -231 |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 1.14 | - | -1.193 |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | $\$ 348.5$ | - | -165.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | - | - |
| HCM $95 t h$ \％tile Q（veh） | 4.4 | - | -13.3 |
| Notes |  |  |  |

$\sim:$ Volume exceeds capacity $\quad \$$ ：Delay exceeds $300 \mathrm{~s} \quad+$ ：Computation Not Defined $\quad$＊：All major volume in platoon







| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 220 | - | -525 |  |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.646 | - | -0.267 |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 47.1 | - | -14.3 |  |
| HCM Lane LOS | E | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 3.9 | - | - | 1.1 |

RKA Synchro 11 Report

## APPENDIX E

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS US 401 BYPASS <br> \&

EASTERN U-TURN LOCATION

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | 个4 | T |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1532 | 91 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1532 | 91 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1702 | 101 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Major2 | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | - | 851 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | 851 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 6.84 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | 5.84 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 3.52 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | 299 | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | 379 | 0 |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 299 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | 299 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | 379 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Approach | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 23.1 |
| HCM LOS |  | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 299 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.338 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 23.1 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 1.4 | - |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | M | T |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1994 | 100 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1994 | 100 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2216 | 111 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Major2 | Minor1 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | - | 1108 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 6.84 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | -52 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 0 | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | 0 |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 204 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | 204 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| Approach | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 41.9 |
| HCM LOS | E |  |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 204 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.545 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 41.9 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | E | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 2.9 | - |



| MajorMinor | Major2 | Minor1 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | -1117 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | 0 |
| Stage 2 | - | - | -1117 |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | -3.54 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | 201 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - |  |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | 0 |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 201 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |
|  |  |  | 275 |


| Approach | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 81.9 |
| HCM LOS |  | F |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 201 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.868 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 81.9 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 6.6 | - |


| RKA | Synchro 11 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Page 2 |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | 个4 | T |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 66 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 66 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 667 | 73 | 0 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | M | 1 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 892 | 73 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 892 | 73 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 991 | 81 | 0 |


| Major/Minor | Major2 | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | - | 496 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | - | - | 496 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 6.84 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | 5.84 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 3.52 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | 503 | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| $\quad$ Stage 2 | 0 | - | 577 | 0 |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 503 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | 503 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | 577 | - |
|  | WB |  | NB |  |
| Approach | 0 | 13.5 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s |  |  |  |  |

HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 503 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.161 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 13.5 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.6 | - |



|  | Major2 | Minor1 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| MajorMinor | - | - | 510 | - |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | - | 0 | - |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | 510 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | 6.84 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | 5.84 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | 3.52 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 0 | - | 493 | 0 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - | 568 | 0 |
| Stage 2 |  | - |  |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - | 493 | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 493 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | 568 | - |


| Approach | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 14.7 |
| HCM LOS |  | B |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBLn1 | WBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 493 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.246 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 14.7 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 1 | - |


| RKA | Synchro 11 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Page 2 |  |

## APPENDIX F

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS MITCHELL MILL ROAD <br> \&

JONESVILLE ROAD / PEEBLES ROAD

| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.7 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 166 | 4 | 11 | 316 | 41 | 4 | 78 | 11 | 32 | 133 | 16 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 166 | 4 | 11 | 316 | 41 | 4 | 78 | 11 | 32 | 133 | 16 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 8 | 184 | 4 | 12 | 351 | 46 | 4 | 87 | 12 | 36 | 148 | 18 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.8 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 11.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $84 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 93 | 177 | 368 | 181 |
| LT Vol | 4 | 7 | 11 | 32 |
| Through Vol | 78 | 166 | 316 | 133 |
| RT Vol | 11 | 4 | 41 | 16 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 103 | 197 | 409 | 201 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.168 | 0.297 | 0.577 | 0.318 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.85 | 5.433 | 5.079 | 5.696 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 612 | 661 | 711 | 629 |
| Service Time | 3.904 | 3.477 | 3.114 | 3.743 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.168 | 0.298 | 0.575 | 0.32 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.1 | 10.8 | 14.9 | 11.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | B | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.6 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 1.4 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 50.6 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 240 | 4 | 12 | 569 | 45 | 4 | 86 | 12 | 35 | 147 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 240 | 4 | 12 | 569 | 45 | 4 | 86 | 12 | 35 | 147 | 18 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 267 | 4 | 13 | 632 | 50 | 4 | 96 | 13 | 39 | 163 | 20 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.2 |  |  | 82.4 |  |  | 12.5 |  |  | 15 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $84 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $73 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $12 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 102 | 252 | 626 | 200 |
| LT Vol | 4 | 8 | 12 | 35 |
| Through Vol | 86 | 240 | 569 | 147 |
| RT Vol | 12 | 4 | 45 | 18 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 113 | 280 | 696 | 222 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.223 | 0.481 | 1.081 | 0.417 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.412 | 6.42 | 5.595 | 7.067 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 487 | 566 | 647 | 513 |
| Service Time | 5.412 | 4.42 | 3.663 | 5.067 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.232 | 0.495 | 1.076 | 0.433 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.5 | 15.2 | 82.4 | 15 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | F | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.8 | 2.6 | 19.6 | 2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 142.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 279 | 4 | 31 | 635 | 131 | 4 | 86 | 23 | 86 | 147 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 279 | 4 | 31 | 635 | 131 | 4 | 86 | 23 | 86 | 147 | 18 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 310 | 4 | 34 | 706 | 146 | 4 | 96 | 26 | 96 | 163 | 20 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 20.4 |  |  | 242.9 |  |  | 14.7 |  |  | 20.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $76 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $20 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 113 | 291 | 797 | 251 |
| LT Vol | 4 | 8 | 31 | 86 |
| Through Vol | 86 | 279 | 635 | 147 |
| RT Vol | 23 | 4 | 131 | 18 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 126 | 323 | 886 | 279 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.26 | 0.59 | 1.481 | 0.545 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.674 | 7.367 | 6.021 | 8.087 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 417 | 495 | 602 | 449 |
| Service Time | 6.674 | 5.367 | 4.101 | 6.087 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.302 | 0.653 | 1.472 | 0.621 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.7 | 20.4 | 242.9 | 20.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | F | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1 | 3.8 | 43.1 | 3.2 |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 103.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 个 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 279 | 4 | 31 | 635 | 131 | 4 | 86 | 23 | 86 | 147 | 18 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 279 | 4 | 31 | 635 | 131 | 4 | 86 | 23 | 86 | 147 | 18 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 310 | 4 | 34 | 706 | 146 | 4 | 96 | 26 | 96 | 163 | 20 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.8 |  |  | 172.6 |  |  | 15.5 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $76 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $20 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 113 | 291 | 666 | 131 | 86 | 165 |
| LT Vol | 4 | 8 | 31 | 0 | 86 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 86 | 279 | 635 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| RT Vol | 23 | 4 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 18 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 126 | 323 | 740 | 146 | 96 | 183 |
| Geometry Grp | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.283 | 0.645 | 1.385 | 0.243 | 0.218 | 0.39 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.975 | 7.746 | 6.739 | 6 | 8.989 | 8.391 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 403 | 469 | 540 | 595 | 402 | 433 |
| Service Time | 6.975 | 5.746 | 4.513 | 3.774 | 6.689 | 6.091 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.313 | 0.689 | 1.37 | 0.245 | 0.239 | 0.423 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.5 | 23.8 | 204.5 | 10.7 | 14.2 | 16.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | C | F | B | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.1 | 4.5 | 33.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.8 |

PKA $\quad$ Synchro 11 Report

| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10.8 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 18 | 306 | 13 | 4 | 130 | 21 | 5 | 92 | 10 | 27 | 50 | 11 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 18 | 306 | 13 | 4 | 130 | 21 | 5 | 92 | 10 | 27 | 50 | 11 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 340 | 14 | 4 | 144 | 23 | 6 | 102 | 11 | 30 | 56 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.2 |  |  | 9.5 |  |  | 9.6 |  |  | 9.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $86 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 107 | 337 | 155 | 88 |
| LT Vol | 5 | 18 | 4 | 27 |
| Through Vol | 92 | 306 | 130 | 50 |
| RT Vol | 10 | 13 | 21 | 11 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 119 | 374 | 172 | 98 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.175 | 0.489 | 0.233 | 0.146 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.312 | 4.702 | 4.878 | 5.379 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 668 | 760 | 728 | 659 |
| Service Time | 3.407 | 2.766 | 2.957 | 3.477 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.178 | 0.492 | 0.236 | 0.149 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.6 | 12.2 | 9.5 | 9.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.6 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 436 | 14 | 4 | 339 | 23 | 6 | 102 | 11 | 30 | 55 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 436 | 14 | 4 | 339 | 23 | 6 | 102 | 11 | 30 | 55 | 12 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 484 | 16 | 4 | 377 | 26 | 7 | 113 | 12 | 33 | 61 | 13 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 24.7 |  |  | 17.3 |  |  | 11.8 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $86 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $9 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 119 | 470 | 366 | 97 |
| LT Vol | 6 | 20 | 4 | 30 |
| Through Vol | 102 | 436 | 339 | 55 |
| RT Vol | 11 | 14 | 23 | 12 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 132 | 522 | 407 | 108 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.245 | 0.777 | 0.621 | 0.203 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.682 | 5.357 | 5.493 | 6.79 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 541 | 668 | 651 | 531 |
| Service Time | 4.682 | 3.437 | 3.578 | 4.796 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.244 | 0.781 | 0.625 | 0.203 |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.8 | 24.7 | 17.3 | 11.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1 | 7.4 | 4.3 | 0.8 |

3: Peebles Road/Jonesville Road \& Mitchell Mill Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh Intersection LOS | 53.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Trafic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 496 | 14 | 12 | 382 | 77 | 6 | 102 | 28 | 108 | 55 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 496 | 14 | 12 | 382 | 77 | 6 | 102 | 28 | 108 | 55 | 12 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 551 | 16 | 13 | 424 | 86 | 7 | 113 | 31 | 120 | 61 | 13 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 79.1 |  |  | 48.3 |  |  | 15.1 |  |  | 16.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $75 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $21 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 136 | 530 | 471 | 175 |
| LT Vol | 6 | 20 | 12 | 108 |
| Through Vol | 102 | 496 | 382 | 55 |
| RT Vol | 28 | 14 | 77 | 12 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 151 | 589 | 523 | 194 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.329 | 1.056 | 0.928 | 0.422 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.141 | 6.455 | 6.582 | 8.1 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 444 | 565 | 555 | 447 |
| Service Time | 6.141 | 4.503 | 4.582 | 6.1 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.34 | 1.042 | 0.942 | 0.434 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.1 | 79.1 | 48.3 | 16.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | F | E | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.4 | 16.9 | 11.6 | 2.1 |

3: Peebles Road/Jonesville Road \& Mitchell Mill Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 60.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「' |  | \& |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 496 | 14 | 12 | 382 | 77 | 6 | 102 | 28 | 108 | 55 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 496 | 14 | 12 | 382 | 77 | 6 | 102 | 28 | 108 | 55 | 12 |
| 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 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 551 | 16 | 13 | 424 | 86 | 7 | 113 | 31 | 120 | 61 | 13 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 112.5 |  |  | 32.4 |  |  | 16.3 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 | SBLn2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $75 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $82 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $21 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 136 | 530 | 394 | 77 | 108 | 67 |
| LT Vol | 6 | 20 | 12 | 0 | 108 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 102 | 496 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| RT Vol | 28 | 14 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 12 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 151 | 589 | 438 | 86 | 120 | 74 |
| Geometry Grp | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.345 | 1.149 | 0.835 | 0.146 | 0.286 | 0.165 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.785 | 7.023 | 7.215 | 6.48 | 9.089 | 8.439 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 413 | 524 | 503 | 557 | 398 | 428 |
| Service Time | 6.785 | 5.023 | 4.915 | 4.18 | 6.789 | 6.139 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.366 | 1.124 | 0.871 | 0.154 | 0.302 | 0.173 |
| HCM Control Delay | 16.3 | 112.5 | 36.7 | 10.3 | 15.4 | 12.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | F | E | B | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.5 | 20.4 | 8.4 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.6 |

## APPENDIX G

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS MITCHELL MILL ROAD <br> \&

SITE ACCESS 1

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 个 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 388 | 765 | 4 | 0 | 32 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 388 | 765 | 4 | 0 | 32 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 431 | 850 | 4 | 0 | 36 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 852 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | -3.318 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 359 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | 359 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 16.1 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt EBT WBT WBR SBLn1

| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | - | 359 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | - | 0.099 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | - | 16.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | - | C |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | - | 0.3 |

RKA $\quad$ Synchro 11 Report

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Intersection }}{\text { Int Delay, s/veh }} 0.2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 632 | 451 | 4 | 0 | 20 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 632 | 451 | 4 | 0 | 20 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Frosid | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 0 | 702 | 501 | 4 | 0 | 22 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 503 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | - | - | - | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | - | - | -3.318 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | 569 |
| Stage 1 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Stage 2 | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | 569 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 11.6 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | B |

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt EBT WBT WBR SBLn1

| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | -0.039 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | 11.6 |  |  |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | - |
| B | - | - | - |
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## APPENDIX H

## CAPACITY ANALYSIS CALCULATIONS MITCHELL MILL ROAD <br> \&

SITE ACCESS 2

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | M |  |
| Trafic Vol, veh/h | 101 | 287 | 626 | 11 | 19 | 139 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 101 | 287 | 626 | 11 | 19 | 139 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 150 | - | - | 100 | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, | , \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 112 | 319 | 696 | 12 | 21 | 154 |
| Major/Minor M | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor2 |  |
| Conflicting Flow All | 708 | 0 |  | 0 | 1239 | 696 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 696 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 543 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 |  |  |  | - | 5.42 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - |  | 3.518 | 3.318 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 891 | - | - | - | 194 | 442 |
| Stage 1 |  | - | - | - | 495 |  |
| Stage 2 | - |  |  | - |  | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 891 | - | - | - |  | 442 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver |  | - | - | - | 170 |  |
| Stage 1 |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| Stage 2 |  |  | - | - | 582 |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 2.5 | 0 | 23.1 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 891 | - | - | -371 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.126 | - | - | -0.473 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 9.6 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.4 | - | - | - |
| C | 2.4 |  |  |  |
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| MajorMinor | Major1 | Major2 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 421 | 0 | - | 0 | 1291 | 392 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 392 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 899 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4.12 | - | - | - | 6.42 | 6.22 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.42 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 2.218 | - | - | -3.518 | 3.318 |  |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 1138 | - | - | - | 180 | 657 |
| $\quad$ Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 683 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 397 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 1138 | - | - | - | 149 | 657 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 149 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 566 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 397 | - |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 2.5 | 0 | 22.2 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |


| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | 1138 | - | - | -353 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.172 | - | - | -0.412 |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | 8.8 | - | - | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | - | - | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | 0.6 | - | - | - |
| C | 2 |  |  |  |
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## APPENDIX I

## TURN LANE WARRANTS



INTERSECTION: Mitchell Mill Road \& Site Access 2

| SCENARIO | Movement | Turn Lane | Turning Volume <br> $\left(V_{\mathrm{R}} / \mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{L}}\right)$ | Approach / <br> Opposing Volume <br> $\left(\mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{A}} / \mathbf{V}_{\mathrm{o}}\right)$ | Symbol |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Build | EBL | Left | 101 | 637 |  |
| PM Build | EBL | Left | 176 | 379 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mitchell Mill Road and Site Access 2

| 2027 Build |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour | Approach | Right Turn <br> Volume | Approach <br> Volume | Warranted? |  |
| AM | Westbound | 11 | 637 | No |  |
| PM | Westbound | 26 | 379 | No |  |

## RIGHT TURN LANE WARRANTS



# APPENDIX J 

## MUTCD / ITRE

 SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS
## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

## Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 No-Build |


| Intersection |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | US 401 Bypass | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Jonesville Road / WB Left-Over |
| Analyzed with | 2 or more approach lanes | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 2861 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 424 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, Eight Hour Vehicular volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 420 | 630 | 336 (Cond. A) \& 504 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, Four Hour vehicular volume |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |


| Warrant 3, Peak Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |  | Condition B |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition Satisfied? | Condition A | Satisfied |  |  |  |
| Required values reached for | 1941 total, 41 minor, 0 delay | 2 hours |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 800 |  |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 100 | See Figure Below |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 4 |  |  |  |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)




## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

## Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 Build |


| Intersection Intormation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | US 401 Bypass | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Jonesville Road / WB Left-Over |
| Analyzed with | 2 or more approach lanes | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 2947 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 607 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, Elght Hour venicular Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 420 | 630 | 336 (Cond. A) \& 504 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.


Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)




# Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis 

Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 No-Build |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  | nformation |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | US 401 Bypass | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Eastern U-Turn Location |  |  |
| Analyzed with | 2 or more approach lanes | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |  |  |
| Total Approach Volume | 2886 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 173 vehicles |  |  |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |  |  |
| Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied |  |  |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, Eight Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 0 hours | 2 hours | 1 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 420 | 630 | 336 (Cond. A) \& 504 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, Four Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |
|  |  |  |
| Warrant 3, Peak Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |
|  | Condition A | Condition B |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2094 total, 100 minor, 0 delay | 1 hour |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 650 | See Figure Below |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 100 |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 4 |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)



## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 Build |


| Intersection Intormation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | US 401 Bypass | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Eastern U-Turn Location |
| Analyzed with | 2 or more approach lanes | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 2929 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 266 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 0 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 0 |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, EIght Hour venicular volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 420 | 630 | 336 (Cond. A) \& 504 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, Four Hour vehicular volume |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |


| Warrant 3, Peak Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition A | Condition B |  |  |  |
| Required values reached for | 2168 total, 157 minor, 0 delay |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | Satisfied |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 1 hour |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 650 | See Figure Below |  |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)



# Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis 

Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 No-Build |


| Intersection Information |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | Mitchell Mill Road | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Jonesville Road |
| Analyzed with | 1 approach lane | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 1708 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 518 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, Eight Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 350 | 525 | 280 (Cond. A) \& 420 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, Four Hour vehicular volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |
|  |  |  |
| Warrant 3, Peak Hour Vehicular volume |  |  |
|  | Condition A | Condition B |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 1178 total, 200 minor, 0 delay | 1 hour |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | 800 | See Figure Below |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 100 |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 4 |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)


## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Warrants 1-3 (Volume Warrants)

| Project Name | Hills at Harris Creek |
| :--- | :---: |
| Project/File \# | $20498-05$ |
| Scenario | 2027 Build |


| Intersection Intormation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Major Street (E/W Road) | Mitchell Mill Road | Minor Street (N/S Road) | Jonesville Road |
| Analyzed with | 1 approach lane | Analyzed with | 1 Approach Lane |
| Total Approach Volume | 2087 vehicles | Total Approach Volume | 675 vehicles |
| Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings | Total Ped/Bike Volume | 0 crossings |
| Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied | Right turn reduction of | 100 percent applied |

No high speed or isolated community reduction applied to the Volume Warrant thresholds.

| Warrant 1, EIght Hour venicular volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | Condition B | Condition A+B* |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied | Not Satisfied |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours | 2 hours | 2 (Cond. A) \& 2 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Major Street (veh/hr) | 350 | 525 | 280 (Cond. A) \& 420 (Cond. B) |
| Criteria - Minor Street (veh/hr) | 105 | 53 | 84 (Cond. A) \& 42 (Cond. B) |

* Should be applied only after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems.

| Warrant 2, Four Hour vehicular volume |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Condition Satisfied? | Not Satisfied |  |
| Required values reached for | 2 hours |  |
| Criteria | See Figure Below |  |


| Warrant 3, Peak Hour Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Condition A | Condition B |  |  |  |
| Required values reached for | 1450 total, 251 minor, 0 delay |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Total Approach Volume (veh in one hour) | Satisfied |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Volume (veh in one hour) | 2 hours |  |  |  |
| Criteria - Minor Street High Side Delay (veh-hrs) | 800 | See Figure Below |  |  |

Figure 4C-2 (Warrant 2-70\% Factor) \& Figure 4C-4 (Warrant 3-70\% Factor)


## TOWN OF ROLESVILLE PETITION FOR ANNEXATION

The items below are required in order to complete your application and shall be submitted when the application if filed.

1. A complete copy of the last deed of record for proof of ownership
2. An annexation boundary plat/map for recordation at the Wake County Register of Deeds Office (mylar plat) prepared by a professional land surveyor showing the boundaries of the area or property for annexation into the Town of Rolesville.
3. A complete copy of the written metes and bounds description based on the annexation boundary plat/map.

## SECTION 1 - LOCATION

Is the area contiguous with the existing primary corporate limits? Satellite corporate limits is not primary. $\square$ Yes or $\boxtimes$ No Note: If the land is contiguous to any existing carporate limits, the proposed annexation boundary will include all intervening right-of-ways for streets, easements, and other areas as stated in North Carolina General Statute $\S 160-131$ (1).

## SECTION 2 - VESTED RIGHTS

NC General Statues require petitioners of both contiguous and non-contiguous annexations to file a signed statement declaring whether vested rights have been established in accordance with G.S. 160A-385.1 or 153A-344.1 for properties subject to the petition. Do you declare vested rights for the property subject to this petition? $\square$ Yes or $\boxtimes$ No

## SECTION 3 - PROPERTY DETAILS

| PIN Number | Real Estate ID <br> Number | Deed Book <br> Number | Page <br> Number | Acreage To Be <br> Annexed | Wake County <br> Assessed Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1757761273 | 0443802 | DB016701 | PG 00363 | 10.48 | 8196,750 |
|  |  | DB | PG |  | $S$ |
|  |  | PB |  | $S$ |  |

## SECTION 4 - SIGNATURES AND VERIFICATION

We, the undersigned owners of the real properies contained in the metes and bounds description and plat/map attached hercto, respectfully request that the area described above be annexed and mode part of the Town of Rolesville, North Carolina. By signing below, we acknowledge that all information is correct.

- If property owned by INDIVIDUALS (NOTE: All legal owners mast sign including both husband and wife)

$\qquad$ Date Signed

21 Mar 2022 Date Signed

- If property owned by a COMPANY OR CORPORATION (NOTE: The company or corgoration must be legally registered with the State of North Carolina - Office of the Secretary of State)

Name of Corporation

Printed Name of Registered Agent
Signature of Registered Agent

Address, State, Zip of Registered Office:


## TOWN OF ROLESVILLE PETITION FOR ANNEXATION

The items below are required in order to complete your application and shall be submitted when the application if filed.

1. A complete copy of the last deed of record for proof of ownership
2. An annexation boundary plat/map for recordation at the Wake County Register of Deeds Office (mylar plat) prepared by a professional land surveyor showing the boundaries of the area or property for annexation into the Town of Rolesville.
3. A complete copy of the written metes and bounds description based on the annexation boundary plat/map.

## SECTION 1 -LOCATION

Is the area contiguous with the existing primary corporate limits? Satellite corporate limits is not primary. $\square$ Yes or $\boxtimes$ No Note: If the land is contiguous to any existing corporate limits, the proposed annexation boundary will include all intervening right-of-ways for streets, easements, and other areas as stated in North Carolina General Statute §160.131(1).

## SECTION 2 - VESTED RIGHTS

NC General Statues require petitioners of both contiguous and non-contiguous annexations to file a signed statement declaring whether vested rights have been established in accordance with G.S. 160A-385.1 or 153A-344.1 for properties subject to the petition. Do you declare vested rights for the property subject to this petition? $\square$ Yes or $\boxtimes$ No

## SECTION 3 - PROPERTY DETAILS

| PIN Number | Real Estate ID <br> Number | Deed Book <br> Number | Page <br> Number | Acreage To Be <br> Annexed | Wake County <br> Assessed Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1757778982 | 0443803 | DB20-E | PG 114 | 97.41 | $\$ 1,954,590$ |
| 1757750520 | 0074789 | DB 20-E | PG 114 | 0.69 | 8179,871 |
|  |  | DB | PG |  | S |

## SECTION 4 - SIGNATURES AND VERIFICATION

We, the undersigned owners of the real properties contained in the metes and bounds description and plat/map attached hereto, respectfully request that the area described above be annexed and made part of the Town of Rolesville, North Carolina. By signing below, we acknowledge that all information is correct.

- If property owned by INDIVIDUALS (NOTE: All legal owners must sign including both husband and wife)

- If property owned by a COMPANY OR CORPORATION (NOTE: The company or corporation must be legally registered with the State of North Carolina - Office of the Secretary of State)

Name of Corporation

Printed Name of Registered Agent
Signature of Registered Agent

Address, State, Zip of Registered Office:

Printed Name of Registered Agent
-


## TOWN OF ROLESVILLE PETITION FOR ANNEXATION

The items below are required in order to complete your application and shall be submitted when the application if filed.

1. A complete copy of the last deed of record for proof of ownership
2. An annexation boundary plat/map for recordation at the Wake County Register of Deeds Office (mylar plat) prepared by a professional land surveyor showing the boundaries of the area or property for annexation into the Town of Rolesville.
3. A complete copy of the written metes and bounds description based on the annexation boundary plat/map.

## SECTION 1-LOCATION

Is the area contiguous with the existing primary corporate limits? Satcllite conporate limits is not primary. $\square$ Yes or $\triangle$ No Note: If the land is contiguous to any vxisting corporate limits, the proposed annexation boundary will inchude all intervening right-of-ways for streats, eascments, and other areas as stated in Noxth Carolina Gencral Statute \$160-131(1).

## SECTION 2 - VESTED RTGMTS

NC General Statues require petitioners of both contiguous and non-contiguous annexations to file a signed statement declaring whether rested rights have been established in accordance with G.S. 160A-385.1 or 153A-344. 1 for properties subject to the petition. Do you ded lare vested rights for the property subject to this petition? $\square$ Yes or $\boxtimes$ No

## SECTION 3 - PROPERTY DETAILS

| PIN Number | Real Estate ID <br> Number | Deed Book <br> Number | Page <br> Number | Acreage To Be <br> Annexed | Wake County <br> Assessed Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1757778982 | 0443803 | DB20-E | PG 114 | 97.41 | $81,954,590$ |
| 1757750520 | 0074789 | DB20-E | PG 114 | 0.69 | 5179,871 |
|  |  | DB | PG |  | 8 |

## SECTION 4 -SIGNATURES AND VERIFICATION

W. the undersignat ouncrs of the real properties contoined in the meter and bounds Jesctiption and plat/mup attarhed hercto, respetifully reppurst that the area describnd above be annexed and mode part of the Toxn yf Relesvillc, North Carelina. By signing below, we ackatwledge thut all informanion is correct.

- If property owned by INDIVIDUALS (NOTE: All legal owners must sign including both husband and wife)

- If property owned by a COMPANY OR CORPORATION (NOTE: The company or corporation must be legally registercd with the State of North Carolina - Office of the Secretary of State)

Name of Corporation

Printed Name of Registered Agent
Signature of Registered Agent
 PETITION FOR ANNEXATION

The items below are required in order to complete your application and shall be submitted when the application if filed.

1. A complete copy of the last deed of record for proof of ownership
2. An annexation boundary plat/ nap for recordation at the Wake County Register of 1)eeds Office (mylar plat) prepared by a professional land surveyor showing the boundaries of the area or property for annexation into the Town of Rolesville.
3. A complete copy of the written metes and bounds description based on the amexation boundary plat/map.

SECTION 1 - LOCATION
Is the area contiguous with the existing primary corporate limits? Satellite corporate limits is not primary. $\square$ Yes or No Note: If the land is contigumas to any casting corporate hints, the proposed annexation boundary will ind ide all intervening right of ways for streets. easements, and other areas as stated in North (arelina General Statute §160 131il).

SECTION 2 - VESTED RIGHTS
NC General Statues require petitioners of both contiguous and noncontiguous annexations to file a signed statement declaring whether vested rights hate been established in accordance with G.S. $160 \mathrm{~A}-385.1$ or $153 \mathrm{~A}-344.1$ for properties subject to the petition. Do you declare vested rights for the property subject to this petition? $\square$ Yes or $N$ or

SECTION 3 - PROPERTY DETAILS

| PIN Number | Real Estate ID <br> Number | Deed Book <br> Number | Page <br> Number | Acreage To Be <br> Annexed | Wake County <br> Assessed Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1757758529 | 0493307 | DB 018421 | PG 00370 | 24.08 | $\$$ |
|  |  | DB | PG |  | $\$$ |
|  |  | DB | PG |  | $\$$ |

SECTION 4 - SIGNATURES AND VERIFICATION

We, the undersigned owners of the real properties contained in the metes and bounds description and plat/map attached hereto, respectfully request that the area described above be annexed and made part of the Town of Rolesville North Caroling. By signing below. we acknowledge that all information is correct.

- If property owned by INDIY1DUALS (NOTE: All legal owners must sign including both husband and wife)


Signature of Owner \#2
Date Signed

- If property owned by a COMPANY OR CORPORATION (NOTE: The company or corporation must be legally registered with the State of North Carolina - Office of the Secretary of State)


Name of Corporation
Stephen Ellis
Printed Name of Registered Agent
Signature of Registered Agent
6801 Falls of Meuse Rd. Suite 108 Raleigh, NC 27615
Address, State, Lip of Registered Office:

:OTT: CARCLINA
FAKE COUNTY


VIARFANTY DEED

THIS DEED, made this 21th day of Marci:, ! 059 , by Romie $C$. Fatkirs and wife, Irma Kirkland tatkins; Claitorne Matk!ns and wife, E: : zabeti: Satk!n5; Iore dyscue and husband, Srvin R. Ayscue; 11 Iton \#atkirs and w:fe, Excell Watkins; Jane :latkins Puffir and husband, Sarlie Ruffir; Louis Natkins ans wife, Nevassestatkins; Javid M. Jat\%irs, sirgle, all of Nake Comity, North Carolina, and Lois :Vatkins :Iar. ind iusbard, Leo . Vard, of Jurtam County, North Carolina, of the first Fart, to Jonnell Itatkins and wife, Daisy Watkins, of Iake County, Nor th Cayol:na, of the second yart;

VITNESSETH:
That said parties of the first part, in consideration of One Hundred ( 5100.00 ) Dollars, and other valuable considerations to them paid by said parties of the second part, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, have hargained and sold, and by these presents do grant, bargain, sell, and convey to said parties of the second part, their heirs and assigns, a certain tract or parcel of land in :lake County, State of North Carolina, adjoining the lands of J. M. Jones, Mrs. A. P. Upchurch, and others, and bounded as follows:

BEGINNING at stake on the North side of the Traboro Road, corner of Lot No. 4; thence along the lines of Lot No. 4, N. $22^{8} 30^{\circ}$ E. 658 feet to a stake; thence N. $47^{\circ} 30^{\circ}$ E. 1223 feet to a stake; thence
N. 3100 feet to a stake and pointers on the south side of Powell ${ }^{\circ}$ s

Greek; thence up with the various courses of said Greek to a stake
corner of Int No. 2; thence South along the line of Lot No. 2, 4600
feet to a =take on the Kelly Branch 5C feet Nest of J. M. Jones'
corner; therse jown with the various courses of said branch to a
stake cosmer of J. M. Iones; thenco along Jones line S. $23^{\circ} \%$ onf
feet to a stake on the North side of the Traboro Road; thence aloriq
said road N. $81^{\circ} \mathrm{A}, 600$ feet to the BEGINNING, containing $111-3 / \%$. acres and being lot No. ? of the division of the lands of the late acres and being Lot No. ? of the divisian of the lards of the tate fohn $\mu$. Nathins, an of of hecds off: fon for Wake County; and being the same property cenveyed by deed racorded in Book 752 , page 599 , Jake Comnty Rent sry.

There is excepted from the above described tract of land a one (1) acre tract, more or less, and more particulariy fescribed as follows:

A11 that certain tract or parcel of lard located in Nake Forest
Townshir, Na:e Forest, North Carolina, and being on the North side

## seou1318 mice334

of the Tarboro Road, and containing 1 acire, more or less, and more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point in the senter of the Tarboro Road, corner with the land of J. M. Jones; runring thence along the center of said Tarboro Road N. $19^{\circ} \% .210$ feet to a point, corner with the land of R. O. Natkins; running thence alonq the R. O. Natkins' line N. $23^{\circ}$ E. 210 feet to a point, another corne: with the lands of ?. O. Watkins; running theree along ?. O. Natkins" line S. $18^{\circ}$ E. 210 feet to a point in the 1 line of J. M. Jones; running thence with the line of J. M. Jones S. $22^{\circ} \%$. 2IC feet to the point and nlace of BEGINNING, and being a part of Lot No, 3 of the J. M. Satrins' farm, accoruing to a maf: and survey made by Fittman Stell, rins farm, accoruing to a mat
Surveyor, dated April, 1925.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the aforesaid tract or parcel of land, and
all privileges and appurtenances thereto belonging, to the said parties of the second part, their heirs and assigns, to their only use and behoof in fee simple absolute forever.

And the said parties of the first part, for themselves and their heirs, executors, and administrators, covenant with said parties of the second part, their heirs and assigns, that they are seized of said premises in fee and have right to convey in fee simple; that the same are free and clear from all encumbrances, and that they do hereby forever warrant and will forever defend the said title to the same against the lawful claims of all persons whomsoever.

IN TESTIMONY MHEREOF, the said parties of the first part have hereunto set their hands and seals, the day and year first above written.




1, Iflewry $h^{3}$.enc. Tho_. Notary Public, to hereby certify that ca: lie tiffin personally appeared before me this day ar! acknowlelned the dice execution of the fo: eqoing instrument.


STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA:


The forgoing Curtifirate(s) of

are adjudge dy to be in due form and cornet. Let the instrument, with the certificate be registered.

tetantolerk Superior Court, Wake County, N. C.
Filed for registration at. $1: \sqrt{0} 7 \mathrm{Cl}$. and registered in the office of the Register of Deeds for

${ }_{\text {in look }} / 3 / 8.8$ Pass 3.33 $\qquad$ ... 10_....
Probate 25 \& Paid
Registration $\$$ $\qquad$


## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA wake county

 THIS DEED, Made this $2 \sqrt{1}$

 WITNESSETH, Than said- OMB O Da
 hint - paid by $\qquad$
$\qquad$ the receipt of whish is hereby acknowledged, ha \& bargained and sold, and by these presents do. \& - grant, bargain, sell and convey to said_
 parcel of land in $Q$ - Wake Beginning at stake on the Reside of the FArboro Road, corner of lot No.4; thence along the lines of lot Nos, N. 22 deg. $30^{\prime}$ E. $658^{\prime}$ to a stake; thence N. 47 deg. $30^{\prime}$ E. 1223' to a stake, thence N. 3100 ft . to a stake and pointers on the south side of Powell's creak; thence up with the various courses or said Creek to a stake corner of lot Wc.2; thence south along the line of lout No.2, $4600^{\prime}$ to a stake on the Kelly Branch $50^{\prime}$ West of J. M. Jones ${ }^{\prime}$ corner, thence down with the various courses of said Branch to a stake corner of $T$. M. Jones; thence along Tones line s. 23 deg. W. B86' to a stake on the north side of the larboro Road, thence alone said road N. Bl deg. W. 600' to the beginning, containing one hundred and fourteen and three-fourths acres(114娄) and being lot No. 3 or the Division or the lands of the late John M. Watkins, a map of which is recorded in the book of maps in the Register of Deeds office for Wake County .


TO HAVE NO TO HOLD He aforesaid tract or parcel of land, and all privileges and appurtenances thereto belonging, to the said.
 heirs and assigns, that__ 1 brances, and that_-_-_-_-_do ese hereby forever warrant and will forever defend the said title to the same against the claims of all persons whomsoever.


 before me this dar and acknowledged the (luedxecution of the annexed Deed of Conveyance; asd-the-aid

 eaton, bervegitatered.

Witness my hand and flivate seal, this ._L NORTH CAROLINA-Wake Couny/fing foregoing gertificate of
 County, State of 1 on th o colima






WAKE COUNTY, NC

# NORTH CAROLINA SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED 

Excise Tax: $\$ 1445.00$
Wake County REID Out of 0046970
Mail/Box to: Grantee
This instrument was prepared by: Kenneth L. Eagle, 105 Weston Estates Way, Cary, NC 27513
Brief description for the Index: 25.125 Acres, north side of Mitchell Mill Road (NCSR 2224)

| THIS DEED made this 15 day of February 2022, by and between |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRANTOR |  |  | GRANTEE |
| Mitchell Mill Road Investors LLC, <br> a North Carolina limited liability company |  | Ellis Land Investment Company, LLC, a North Carolina limited liability company |  |
| Address: | 105 Weston Estates Way Cary, NC 27513 | Address: 6801 Falls of Neuse Road, Suite 108 <br>  Raleigh, NC 27615 |  |
| Enter in appropriate block for each Grantor and Grantee: name, mailing address, and, if appropriate, character of entity, e.g. corporation or partnership. |  |  |  |
| The designation Grantor and Grantee as used herein shall include said parties, their heirs, successors, and assigns, and shall include singular, plural, masculine, feminine or neuter as required by context. |  |  |  |
| WITNESSETH, that the Grantor, for a valuable consideration paid by the Grantee, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, has and by these presents does grant, bargain, sell and convey unto the Grantee in fee simple, all that certain lot or parcel of land situated in Wake Forest Township, Wake County, North Carolina and more particularly described as follows (the "Property"): |  |  |  |

## SEE EXHIBIT A ATTACHED HERETO AND INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE.

The Property was acquired by Grantor by instrument recorded in Book 11505, Page 2324.
None of the Property herein conveyed includes the primary residence of Grantor.

Submitted electronically by Ellis \& Winters LLP in compliance with North Carolina statutes governing recordable documents and the terms of the submitter agreement with the Wake County Register of Deeds.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the Property and all privileges and appurtenances thereto belonging to the Grantee in fee simple.
And the Grantor covenants with the Grantee, that Grantor has done nothing to impair such title as Granter received, and Grantor will warrant and defend the title against the lawful claims of all persons claiming by, under or through Granter, other than the following exceptions:

1. Ad valorem property taxes for 2022 and subsequent years.
2. Right of way of Mitchell Mill Road (North Carolina Secondary Road 2224).
3. All rights of way, easements, restrictions, agreements, and other matters of record affecting the Property recorded in the office of the Register of Deeds for Wake County, North Carolina, including, without limitation, the following:
a. Easement to Carolina Power and Light Company recorded in Book 2830, Page 24.
b. Rights of others entitled thereto in and to the continued uninterrupted flow of any portion of Kelly Branch on or adjoining the Property.
c. Riparian or littoral rights incident to any branches, creeks, streams, or other waters on or adjoining the Property.
d. Rights of adjoining property owners in and to any ditches on or adjoining the Property.
e. Matters that would be shown by a current survey of the Property.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Grantor has caused this Deed to be executed in its company name by its duly authorized official, as of the day and year first above written.

Mitchell Mill Road Investors LLC,
a North Carolina limited liability company


Wake County, North Carolina
I certify that the following person personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged to me that he executed the foregoing Deed:
 .
Date: February 15,2022
(affix seal or stamp here)


La mew y - ward
Printed/Typed Name:
 My Commission Expires: $\qquad$ Aug 3, 2026

## EXHIBIT A <br> PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

LYING AND BEING in Wake Forest Township, Wake County, North Carolina, adjoining the right of way of Mitchell Mill Road (North Carolina Secondary Road 2224), and being more particularly described as follows (all recording references are to the office of the Register of Deeds for Wake County, North Carolina):

BEGINNING at an iron pipe found in the north right-of-way line of Mitchell Mill Road, said point being a common corner with the southeast corner of property owned now or formerly by Donnell Watkens (see Deed Book 1318, Page 333); then running along the following lines:

With the eastern boundary line of Watkens, North 18 degrees 12 minutes 00 seconds East 893.03 feet to an iron pipe set;

Continuing with the eastern boundary line of Watkens, North 18 degrees 12 minutes 00 seconds East 50.00 feet to a point in the Kelly Branch;

The along center line of Kelly Branch:
North 39 degrees 14 minutes 44 seconds East 7.31 feet; South 56 degrees 54 minutes 35 seconds East 48.61 feet; South 70 degrees 54 minutes 35 seconds East 24.61 feet; North 70 degrees 48 minutes 45 seconds East 25.45 feet; South 40 degrees 27 minutes 21 seconds East 28.19 feet; South 89 degrees 23 minutes 35 seconds East 32.88 feet; South 36 degrees 29 minutes 25 seconds East 17.15 feet; North 87 degrees 07 minutes 56 seconds East 15.72 feet; South 51 degrees 42 minutes 06 seconds East 21.14 feet; South 89 degrees 24 minutes 42 seconds East 33.05 feet; South 02 degrees 01 minutes 35 seconds East 17.48 feet; South 81 degrees 55 minutes 17 seconds East 15.31 feet; North 69 degrees 56 minutes 02 seconds East 14.47 feet; South 47 degrees 41 minutes 48 seconds East 9.88 feet; South 10 degrees 48 minutes 42 seconds West 17.64 feet; South 60 degrees 44 minutes 48 seconds East 46.31 feet; South 37 degrees 39 minutes 08 seconds East 49.81 feet; South 12 degrees 22 minutes 12 seconds East 24.12 feet; South 29 degrees 48 minutes 24 seconds East 30.28 feet; South 82 degrees 27 minutes 46 seconds East 31.99 feet; South 59 degrees 14 minutes 13 seconds East 17.52 feet; South 84 degrees 17 minutes 27 seconds East 25.35 feet; South 34 degrees 56 minutes 33 seconds East 75.35 feet; South 76 degrees 29 minutes 04 seconds East 27.94 feet; South 53 degrees 56 minutes 59 seconds East 23.48 feet; North 62 degrees 42 minutes 03 seconds East 27.98 feet; South 12 degrees 06 minutes 52 seconds East 39.01 feet; South 19 degrees 20 minutes 23 seconds East 50.44 feet;

South 77 degrees 09 minutes 16 seconds East 19.10 feet; South 07 degrees 23 minutes 00 seconds East 8.05 feet; South 27 degrees 33 minutes 46 seconds West 17.80 feet; South 02 degrees 52 minutes 45 seconds East 17.25 feet; South 56 degrees 32 minutes 15 seconds East 19.64 feet; South 12 degrees 52 minutes 10 seconds East 26.30 feet; South 77 degrees 21 minutes 17 seconds East 19.17 feet; South 22 degrees 18 minutes 41 seconds East 19.39 feet; South 65 degrees 53 minutes 52 seconds East 24.78 feet; South 19 degrees 31 minutes 10 seconds West 13.15 feet; South 71 degrees 14 minutes 44 seconds East 11.65 feet; North 78 degrees 16 minutes 05 seconds East 30.35 feet; North 66 degrees 40 minutes 56 seconds East 29.69 feet; North 52 degrees 43 minutes 45 seconds East 52.03 feet; South 84 degrees 05 minutes 40 seconds East 20.63 feet; North 75 degrees 05 minutes 35 seconds East 16.99 feet; South 68 degrees 27 minutes 23 seconds East 16.87 feet; North 81 degrees 44 minutes 06 seconds East 14.34 feet; South 74 degrees 50 minutes 19 seconds East 19.97 feet; North 49 degrees 38 minutes 31 seconds East 44.60 feet; South 62 degrees 45 minutes 51 seconds East 22.37 feet; North 57 degrees 04 minutes 06 seconds East 21.98 feet; South 85 degrees 24 minutes 11 seconds East 37.57 feet; North 62 degrees 13 minutes 03 seconds East 23.16 feet; South 54 degrees 59 minutes 08 seconds East 19.65 feet; South 15 degrees 17 minutes 54 seconds East 38.18 feet; South 05 degrees 38 minutes 36 seconds East 33.15 feet; South 15 degrees 59 minutes 03 seconds West 8.22 feet; South 53 degrees 28 minutes 36 seconds West 20.78 feet; South 27 degrees 04 minutes 40 seconds East 79.74 feet; North 82 degrees 47 minutes 20 seconds East 21.90 feet; South 66 degrees 58 minutes 30 seconds East 28.16 feet; South 81 degrees 40 minutes 19 seconds East 27.96 feet; South 51 degrees 33 minutes 15 seconds East 16.75 feet; South 06 degrees 37 minutes 45 seconds West 10.90 feet; South 19 degrees 04 minutes 40 seconds West 14.50 feet; South 48 degrees 42 minutes 21 seconds East 17.71 feet; South 61 degrees 22 minutes 03 seconds East 39.43 feet; and South 36 degrees 38 minutes 48 seconds East 39.44 feet to a point in the center line of Kelly Branch, in the western boundary line of property owned now or formerly by Joseph H. Wagner (see deeds recorded in Book 5816, Page 277 and Book 2619, Page 775 and maps recorded in Book of Maps 1985, Page 2212 and Book of Maps 1993, Page 446);
then leaving the center line of Kelly Creek and running with the western boundary line of said property of Wagner along the following two (2) lines:

South 01 degrees 27 minutes 33 seconds East 19.71 feet; and
South 00 degrees 27 minutes 33 seconds East 10.00 feet to a point in the eastern boundary line of the Property herein described and a common corner with the southwest corner of said property of Wagner and with the northwest corner of property owned now or formerly by Charles Spencer Jones (see deed recorded in Book 10112, Page 1534);
then with the western boundary line of said property of Jones, along the following two (2) lines:
South 00 degrees 27 minutes 33 seconds East 10.00 feet; and
South 00 degrees 27 minutes 33 seconds East 552.55 feet to a spike set in the centerline of Mitchell Mill Road;
then along the centerline of Mitchell Mill Road the following lines:
North 71 degrees 32 minutes 39 seconds West 24.07 feet;
North 74 degrees 13 minutes 18 seconds West 51.42 feet;
North 75 degrees 48 minutes 52 seconds West 259.87 feet;
North 75 degrees 14 minutes 33 seconds West 152.68 feet;
North 74 degrees 15 minutes 20 seconds West 51.96 feet;
North 74 degrees 59 minutes 06 seconds West 50.07 feet;
North 74 degrees 05 minutes 27 seconds West 50.77 feet;
North 73 degrees 34 minutes 20 seconds West 99.95 feet;
North 72 degrees 45 minutes 42 seconds West 52.88 feet;
North 73 degrees 37 minutes 20 seconds West 98.57 feet;
North 74 degrees 31 minutes 11 seconds West 100.00 feet;
North 75 degrees 15 minutes 51 seconds West 96.96 feet;
North 75 degrees 39 minutes 32 seconds West 154.21 feet;
North 76 degrees 20 minutes 42 seconds West 100.91 feet;
North 77 degrees 07 minutes 54 seconds West 104.34 feet; and
North 77 degrees 21 minutes 31 seconds West 70.97 feet to a spike set in the centerline of Mitchell Mill Road, a common corner with the southeast corner of the aforesaid property owned now or formerly by Watkens;
then with the eastern boundary line of said property of Watkens, North 18 degrees 12 minutes 00 seconds East 30.14 feet to the point and place of BEGINNING,
and being Tract 1 , containing a total of 25.125 acres (1.043acres in the right of way of Mitchell Mill Road and 24.082 outside of the right of way of Mitchell Mill Road), as shown on a survey entitled "Boundary Survey of Hampton and Cole Property", prepared by Kenneth Close, Inc., dated July 10, 2003.

Prepared By: Gwynn \& Edwards, P.A. (without title exam or tax advice)
Mail After Recording to: GRANTEE

## NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL WARRANTY DEED

This Deed made this 15 day of February, 2017, by and between DAISY WATKINS, GRANTOR, to RANDALL WATKINS and wife, LAURA WATKINS, GRANTEES, whose mailing address is 3278 Landing Falls Lane, Raleigh, NC 27616.

The designation Grantor and Grantee as used herein shall include said parties, their heirs, successors, and assigns, and shall include singular, plural, masculine, feminine or neuter as required by context.

WITNESSETH, that the Grantor, for valuable consideration paid by the Grantee, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, has and by these presents does grant, bargain, sell and convey unto the Grantee in fee simple, all that certain lot or parcel of land situated in Wake County, North Carolina and more particularly described as follows:

BEING ALL OF TRACT 1 containing 10.524 gross acres as shown on map entitled "Exempt Subdivision for Randall Watkins, Wake Forest Township, Wake County, North Carolina" by Williams-Pearce and Assoc., Professional Land Surveyors, P.A., dated 12/08/2016 and recorded in Book of Maps 2017, Page 218, Wake County Registry.

This deed was prepared without a title search and drafting attorney makes no representation as to title or estate.

This is not the primary residence of the Grantor.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the aforesaid lot or parcel of land and all privileges and appurtenances thereto belonging to the Grantee in fee simple.

And the Grantor covenants with the Grantee, that Grantor is seized of the premises in fee simple, has the right to convey the same in fee simple, that title is marketable and free and clear of all encumbrances, and that Grantor will warrant and defend the title against the lawful claims of all persons

```
Submitted electronically by "Gwynn & Edwards, PA"
in compliance with North Carolina statutes governing recordable documents
and the terms of the submitter agreement with the wake county Register of Deeds.
```

whomsoever except for the exceptions hereinafter stated. Title to the property hereinabove described is subject to the following exceptions:

1. 2017 ad valorem taxes; and
2. Any rights of way and easements of record, if any.

The property hereinabove described was conveyed to Grantor by instrument recorded in Book 1318, Page 333, Wake County Registry.

A map of the above-described property is recorded in Book of Maps 2017, Page 218, Wake County Registry.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, the Grantor has hereunto set her hand and seal the day and year first above written.


STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

## (i) cien Cun- Franty

I, a Notary Public of the County and State aforesaid, certify that DAISY WATKINS personally appeared before me this day and acknowledged the voluntary execution of the foregoing instrument. Witness my hand and official stamp or seal, this $/ 5$ day of FEBRUARY, 2017.



## LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS

5333 Mitchell Mill Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587 (PIN: 1757750520; REID: 0074789)
BEING all of Lot 1 as shown on that plat titled "Minor Subdivision for Daisy Watkins" by Williams-Pearce \& Assoc., P.A., recorded in Book of Maps 2005, Page 2287, Wake County Registry.

## 3645 Rock Farm Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587 (PIN: 1757761273; REID: 0443802)

BEING all of Tract 1 containing 10.524 gross acres as shown on map entitled "Exempt Subdivision for Randall Watkins, Wake Forest Township, Wake County, North Carolina" by Williams-Pearce and Assoc., Professional Land Surveyors, P.A., dated 12/08/2016 and recorded in Book of Maps 2017, Page 218, Wake County Registry.

0 Mitchell Mill Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587 (PIN: 1757778982; REID: 0443803)
BEGINNING at stake on the North side of the Traboro Road corner of Lot No. 4; thence along the lines of Lot No. 4, N. $22^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ E. 658 feet to a stake; thence N. $47^{\circ} 30^{\prime}$ E. 1223 feet to a stake; thence N. 3100 feet to a stake and pointers on the south side of Powell's Creek; thence up with the various courses of said Creek to a stake corner of Lot No. 2; thence South along the line of Lot No. 2, 4600 feet to a stake on the Kelly Branch 50 feet West of J.M. Jones' corner; thence down with the various courses of said branch to a stake corner of J.M. Jones; thence along Jones line S. $23^{\circ} \mathrm{W} .886$ feet to a stake on the North side of the Traboro Road; thence along said road N. $81^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$. 600 feet to the BEGINNING, containing 114-3/4 acres and being Lot No. 3 of the division of the lands of the late John M. Watkins, a map of which is recorded in Book of Maps in the Register of Deeds office for Wake County; and being the same property conveyed by deed recorded in Book 752, Page 599, Wake County Registry.

There is excepted from the above described tract of land a one (1) acre tract, more or less, and more particularly described as follows:

All that certain tract or parcel of land located in Wake Forest Township, Wake Forest, North Carolina, and being on the North side of the Tarboro Road, and containing 1 acre, more or less, and more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at a point in the center of the Tarboro Road, corner with the land of J.M. Jones; running thence along the center of said Tarboro Road N. $18^{\circ} \mathrm{W} .210$ feet to a point, corner with the land of R.O. Watkins; running thence along the R.O. Watkins' line N. $23^{\circ}$ E. 210 feet to a point, another corner with the lands of R.O. Watkins; running thence along R.O. Watkins' line S. $18^{\circ}$ E. 210 feet to a point in the line of J.M. Jones; running thence with the line of J.M. Jones S. $23^{\circ}$ W. 210 feet to the point and place of BEGINNING, and being a part of Lot No. 3 of the J.M. Watkins' farm, according to a map and survey made by Pittman Stell, Surveyor, dated April, 1925.

# 5326 Mitchell Mill Road, Wake Forest, NC 27587 (PIN: 1757738648; REID: 0046970) 

LYING AND BEING in Wake Forest Township, Wake County, North Carolina, adjoining the right of way of Mitchell Mill Road (North Carolina State Road 2224), and being more particularly described as follows:

## TRACT ONE:

BEGINNING at an iron pipe found in the north right-of-way line of Mitchell Mill Road, said point being the common corner of Lois Jones Merriman Heirs' property and the southeast comer of Donnell Watkens (Deed Book 1318, Page 333, Wake County Registry); thence North 18 degrees 12 minutes 00 seconds East 893.03 feet to an iron pipe set; thence North 18 degrees 12 minutes 00 seconds East 50.00 feet to a point in the Kelly Branch the following courses and distances: North 39 degrees 14 minutes 44 seconds East 7.31 feet; South 56 degrees 54 minutes 35 seconds East 48.61 feet; South 70 degrees 54 minutes 35 seconds East 24.61 feet; North 70 degrees 48 minutes 45 seconds East 25.45 feet; South 40 degrees 27 minutes 21 seconds East 28.19 feet; South 89 degrees 23 minutes 35 seconds East 32.88 feet; South 36 degrees 29 minutes 25 seconds East 17.15 feet; North 87 degrees 07 minutes 56 seconds East 15.72 feet; South 51 degrees 42 minutes 06 seconds East 21.14 feet; South 89 degrees 24 minutes 42 seconds East 33.05 feet; South 02 degrees 01 minutes 35 seconds East 17.48 feet; South 81 degrees 55 minutes 17 seconds East 15.31 feet; North 69 degrees 56 minutes 02 seconds East 14.47 feet; South 47 degrees 41 minutes 48 seconds East 9.88 feet; South 10 degrees 48 minutes 42 seconds West 17.64 feet; South 60 degrees 44 minutes 48 seconds East 46.31 feet; South 37 degrees 39 minutes 08 seconds East 49.81 feet; South 12 degrees 22 minutes 12 seconds East 24.12 feet; South 29 degrees 48 minutes 24 seconds East 30.28 feet; South 82 degrees 27 minutes 46 seconds East 31.99 feet; South 59 degrees 14 minutes 13 seconds East 17.52 feet; South 84 degrees 17 minutes 27 seconds East 25.35 feet; South 34 degrees 56 minutes 33 seconds East 75.35 feet; South 76 degrees 29 minutes 04 seconds East 27.94 feet; South 53 degrees 56 minutes 59 seconds East 23.48 feet; North 62 degrees 42 minutes 03 seconds East 27.98 feet; South 12 degrees 06 minutes 52 seconds East 39.01 feet; South 19 degrees 20 minutes 23 seconds East 50.44 feet; South 77 degrees 09 minutes 16 seconds East 19.10 feet; South 07 degrees 23 minutes 00 seconds East 8.05 feet; South 27 degrees 33 minutes 46 seconds West 17.80 feet; South 02 degrees 52 minutes 45 seconds East 17.25 feet; South 56 degrees 32 minutes 15 seconds East 19.64 feet; South 12 degrees 52 minutes 10 seconds East 26.30 feet; South 77 degrees 21 minutes 17 seconds East 19.17 feet; South 22 degrees 18 minutes 41 seconds East 19.39 feet; South 65 degrees 53 minutes 52 seconds East 24.78 feet; South 19 degrees 31 minutes 10 seconds West 13.15 feet; South 71 degrees 14 minutes 44 seconds East 11.65 feet; North 78 degrees 16 minutes 05 seconds East 30.35 feet; North 66 degrees 40 minutes 56 seconds East 29.69 feet; North 52 degrees 43 minutes 45 seconds East 52.03 feet; South 84 degrees 05 minutes 40 seconds East 20.63 feet; North 75 degrees 05 minutes 35 seconds East 16.99 feet; South 68 degrees 27 minutes 23 seconds East 16.87 feet; North 81 degrees 44 minutes 06 seconds East 14.34 feet; South 74 degrees 50 minutes 19 seconds East 19.97 feet; North 49 degrees 38 minutes 31 seconds East 44.60 feet; South 62 degrees 45 minutes 51 seconds East 22.37 feet; North 57 degrees 04 minutes 06 seconds East 21.98 feet; South 85 degrees 24 minutes 11 seconds East 37.57 feet; North 62 degrees 13 minutes 03 seconds East 23.16 feet; South 54 degrees 59 minutes 08 seconds East 19.65 feet; South 15 degrees 17 minutes 54 seconds East 38.18 feet; South 05 degrees 38 minutes 36 seconds East 33.15 feet; South 15 degrees 59 minutes 03 seconds West 8.22 feet; South 53 degrees 28 minutes 36 seconds West 20.78 feet; South 27 degrees 04 minutes 40 seconds East 79.74 feet; North 82 degrees 47 minutes 20 seconds East 21.90 feet; South 66 degrees 58 minutes 30 seconds East 28.16 feet; South 81 degrees 40 minutes 19 seconds East 27.96 feet; South 51 degrees 33 minutes 15 seconds East 16.75 feet; South 06 degrees 37 minutes 45 seconds West 10.90 feet; South 19 degrees 04 minutes 40 seconds West 14.50 feet; South 48 degrees 42 minutes 21 seconds East 17.71 feet; South 61 degrees 22 minutes 05 seconds East 39.43 feet; South 30 degrees 38 minutes 48 seconds East 39.44 feet; South 00 degrees 27 minutes 33 seconds East 19.71 feet; South 00 degrees 27 minutes 33 seconds East 10.00 feet; South 00 degrees 27 minutes 33 seconds East 10.00 feet; then South 00 degrees 27 minutes 33 seconds East 552.55 feet to a spike set in the centerline of Mitchell Mill Road; thence along the centerline of Mitchell Mill Road the following courses and distances: North 71 degrees 32 minutes 39 seconds West 24.07 feet; North 74 degrees 13 minutes 18 seconds West 51.42 feet; North 75 degrees 48 minutes 52 seconds West 259.87 feet; North 75 degrees 14 minutes 33 seconds West 152.68 feet; North 74 degrees 15 minutes 20 seconds West 51.96 feet; North 74 degrees 59 minutes 06 seconds West 50.07 feet; North 74 degrees 05 minutes 27 seconds West 50.77 feet; North 73 degrees 34 minutes 20 seconds West 99.95 feet; North 72 degrees 45 minutes 42 seconds West 52.88 feet; North 73 degrees 37 minutes 20 seconds West 98.57 feet; North 74 degrees 31 minutes 11 seconds West 100.00 feet; North 75 degrees 15 minutes 51 seconds West 96.96 feet; North 75 degrees 39 minutes 32 seconds West 154.21 feet; North 76 degrees 20 minutes 42 seconds West 100.91 feet; North 77 degrees 07 minutes 54 seconds West 104.34 feet; North 77 degrees 21 minutes 31 seconds West 70.97 feet to a spike set in the centerline of Mitchell Mill Road; thence North 18 degrees 12 minutes 00 seconds East 30.14 feet to the point and place of BEGINNING and being Tract 1 containing a total of 25.125 acres ( 1.043 acres in the right-of-way of Mitchell Road and 24.082 outside of the right-of-way of Mitchell Mill Road), as shown on a survey entitled "Boundary Survey of Hampton and Cole Property", prepared by Kenneth Close, Inc., dated July 10, 2003.


## CERTIFICATE OF SUFFICIENCY

## ANX22-04 - Hills at Harris Creek

To the Board of Commissioners of the Town of Rolesville, North Carolina:

I, Robin E. Peyton, Town Clerk, do hereby certify that I have investigated the attached petition and hereby make the following findings:
a. The petition contains an adequate property description of the area(s) proposed for annexation.
b. The area described in the petition is contiguous to the Town of Rolesville primary corporate limits as required by G.S. 160A-31.
c. The petition is signed by all owners of real property lying in the area described therein.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Town of Rolesville, this 5th day of October 2022



Proposed Rezoning
PROPOSED CHANGES




Town approved Bikeways shown in Blue
Town approved Greenways in Green
Subject site shown in green
ELLISt




Community Features
DOG PARK



ELLIS
PICKLEBALL COURT





[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vehicle-trips computed using the mode split and vehicle occupancy values provided in Table 2-P
    ${ }^{2}$ Person-Trips
    ${ }^{3}$ Total estimate for all other land uses at mixed-use development site is not subject to internal trip capture computations in this estimator
    *Indicates computation that has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

[^1]:    Notes
    ~: Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

