



## Williams Corner and Polks Landing off of US 15-

Project: **501**

Page 1 of 4

Meeting Date: 4/1/2008 Report Date: 4/9/2008 Meeting Location: NCDOT-Asheboro

Reuben Blakley (NCDOT), Justin Bullock (NCDOT), Rob Stone (NCDOT), Mike Horn (Kimley Horn), Tom Hofmann (Zapolski and Rudd), Travis Fluitt (Kimley Horn), Glenda Toppe (Jerry Turner & Assoc.), Trenton Stewart (Arcadia Eng.), Brantley Powell (HBP Prop.), Angela Birchett (Chatham Co. Planning), Benjamin Howell (Chatham Co. Planning), Keith Megginson

Participants: (Chatham Co. Planning)

Distribution: Same

Following are notes from the above referenced meeting. These are for your review and reference. Please notify our office within 5 working days of any omissions or corrections. Action items have an asterisk (\*) above them. Reports are distributed to all participants and others listed above.

### I. *Introductions*

### II. *Explanation of Process*

- Reuben Blakley (RB) – NCDOT required driveway permit for the development. The driveway permit is signed off by the county, usually Charlie Horn for Chatham County. This office has seen site plans for this development and received Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for this development. The TIA's were sent to congestion management and revisions to the TIA's were requested. Revised TIA's were submitted in January and congestion management supplied comments back to the District in late February. It is my understanding that we are here today to discuss the comments from congestion management and give recommendations on improvements for the development.

### III. *Discussion of Congestion Management Comments*

- Mike Horn (MH) – Filling in for Richard Adams
- Travis Fluitt (TF) – Is okay with congestion management comments except for two main issues. Provided conceptual layout of congestion management comments of Option 1 and Option 2.
- (MH) – Feels like Option 2 is the option they would like to move forward with.
- (RB) – We had sent congestion management comments to Travis with Kimley Horn (KH) to help facilitate the review process, however the final comments/recommendations would come from the District Office. Before moving forward we would like for KH to address two other issues:
  1. Additional intersections should be analyzed showing existing and full build out conditions within the TIA. All intersections along US 15-501

from and including Manns Chapel Road and US 15-501 to Andrews Store Road and US 15-501 should be analyzed. In addition, the intersection of Lystra Road and Jack Bennett Road should be analyzed.

2. Full build out traffic of Briar Chapel should be considered as background traffic. The TIA only considers 60% of the Briar Chapel traffic. At some point in time both developments will be fully built out and that traffic should be accounted for somewhere. Since Briar Chapel has submitted there TIA's the Williams Corner/Polks Landing development should consider 100% of Briar Chapel Traffic as background traffic.
- Rob Stone (RS) – All of Briar Chapel traffic should be considered within the TIA for Williams Corner/Polks Landing.
  - (MH) – This would require a redo of the analysis. The additional trips from the Briar Chapel development would be a percentage of the 40% additional traffic depending on the trip distributions.
  - (TF) – The additional 40% of the Briar Chapel traffic would add approximately 200 additional peak hour trips in each direction on US 15-501.
  - (RB) – The development is considered as one development from a traffic standpoint.
  - (MH) – Decisions have not been made amongst the developers as to what improvements are shared.
  - (RS) – Analysis of Briar Chapel traffic should be considered with the approved Briar Chapel improvements in place.
  - (MH) – Full build out volumes for Briar Chapel will be taken from the Briar Chapel TIA
  - (TF) – Feels like the additional comments should have been given earlier in the review process.
  - Brantley Powell (BP) – What is the time frame for these revisions to the TIA to be complete?
  - (MH) – Would need at least two weeks to provide addendum to TIA may could do it quicker.
  - (BP) – When project was originally approved it had a two year limitation to obtain a building permit. Deadline to get a building permit is first of October. If road cannot be established then he cannot proceed with his side of the development and may have to pull the plug on the project.
  - (RB) – Another concern that has not been addressed is the comment in the congestion management comments that require all crossovers to be approved by the State Traffic Engineer. The District Office does not anticipate a problem with the crossover, however a driveway permit will not be issued until crossover revisions are approved the State Traffic Engineer.
  - (MH) – Since revision requests are from the District can the District/Division review the revision instead of sending it to congestion management.
  - (RS) – Review could be done within Division and discuss with Congestion Management in approximately 4 weeks.
  - (RB) – How are the developers planning to work together on improvements? Do you anticipate using one contractor?
  - (BP) – Were waiting to see what the improvements were before deciding on how to proceed.

- (MH) – Does not see all improvements being installed at one time. Project should be issued two driveway permits. One for the east side with a set of improvements and one for the west side with a set of improvements.
- (RB) – From a traffic standpoint and from the public's perspective they see the project as one project. The schedule of improvements needs to be done in such a manner to impact the traffic as little as possible. We will need to review construction staging process to minimize impacts to traffic. We can handle the construction of improvements through the encroachment agreements.
- Tom Hoffman (TH) – Some improvements may need to be installed to provide access to the development during building process.
- Angela Birchett (AB) – Read part of the Conditional Use Permit. As part of the conditional use permit the county has stipulated that the entrances be constructed in a way that does not match either option from Congestion Management.
- (MH) – Analysis was done and showed that the two full movements as stated in the Conditional Use permit worked. Moved existing median opening from 700' to 1200'. Allowed green time on US15-501 to increase traffic flow.
- (RS) – There is not a superstreet design such as what congestion management recommended in Division 8.
- (MH) – Full movement alternative that was analyzed in the TIA is the preferred alternative.
- (RS) – Three signals would provide less phases and move traffic along US15-501 better.
- (MH) – Drivers are not familiar with shown superstreet design.
- Keith Megginson (KM) – Road within Polks Landing cannot be a NCDOT road due to access points needed by developer's site plan?
- (RB) – Road can be a NCDOT road if it is built to NCDOT standards. Does the county require road to be public or maintained by NCDOT?
- (AB) – "A public road built to NCDOT standards and dedicated to NCDOT"
- (KM) – The commissioners may be okay with road if it is built to NCDOT standards.
- (RB) – Do the commissioners/county consider built to NCDOT standards the pavement structure or the whole traffic design?
- (KM) – The pavement structure.
- (RB) – We can provide the pavement structure recommendations outside of what design will make the traffic work.
- (TF) – Would the county consider a right in only approximately 100-200' from US15-501 to help remove traffic from Polks Landing Road as soon as possible?
- (KM) – We would leave the traffic recommendations up to NCDOT and whether or not the traffic works. This would require a revision to the conditional use permit.
- (MH) – Can get the same progression of traffic along US15-501 with the two proposed signals than we can with the three signals congestion management proposed.
- (TF) – The request of the county to prevent commercial traffic on Polks Landing Road was not explicitly stated in the TIA, however it was discussed with Regina Page in congestion management.
- (RB) – We trust Congestion Management recommendations and we will not be able to provide final comments without going over all of this with them.
- Glenda Toppe (GT) – What would happen if NCDOT requires something that does not match the approved conditional use permit?

## Meeting Notes

Page 4 of 4

4/1/2008

- (AB) – If there is a substantial change it would have to go back through the board. The changes shown from congestion management are a “substantial” change.
- (RB) – No alternative is “off” the table until a final comment letter is sent from this office.
- (TH) – Is there a way for the county to “pause” the approval contingent on NCDOT approval?
- (KM) – An extension would be a request for change and would have to go back to the board. May be possible to word request to ask for the extension and change in one step to not have to come back twice.
- (MH) – Would like to know if the dual full movement alternative is still an option as soon as possible.
- (AB) – Deadline for board is April 18.