

**Town of Cary, North Carolina
Site Plan Staff Report
SAS Building P (13-SP-046)
Town Council Quasi-Judicial Hearing
March 6, 2014**

REQUEST

The applicant has requested approval of a site plan to develop a 247,633-square-foot office building on approximately 27 acres located on SAS Campus Drive at Trenton Road. The proposal includes Minor Modification requests for reductions in required parking, connectivity to the adjacent office building, and removal/replacement of champion trees.

SUBJECT PARCELS

Property Owner	Wake County Parcel Identification Number (PIN) (10-digit)	Real Estate ID Number	Deeded Acreage
SAS Institute, Inc. 100 SAS Campus Drive Cary, NC 27513	0775532365	0415054	26.89
Total Area			26.89

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Applicant's Agent	Art Chard George Finch/Boney and Associates, PA 308 North Boylan Avenue Raleigh, NC 27603 achard@gfba.net
<u>Location</u>	845 SAS Campus Drive
<u>Land Use Plan</u> Designation	Office and Institutional (OFC/INS)
<u>Zoning</u> Districts	Office/Research and Development (ORD)
Within Town Limits	Yes
Staff Contact	Kevin A. Hales, Senior Planner Town of Cary Planning Department P.O. Box 8005 Cary, NC 27512-8005 (919) 462-3944 kevin.hales@townofcary.org

LIST OF EXHIBITS

The following documents incorporated into this staff report are to be entered into the record for this hearing:

- [Exhibit A](#): 13-SP-046 Application (6 pages)
- [Exhibit B](#): 13-SP-046 Plan Set (67 pages) (*FTP site – Planning/Quasi-Judicial Cases/*)
- [Exhibit C](#): 13-SP-046 Tree Report (3 pages)
- [Exhibit D](#): 13-SP-046 Parking Reduction Justification (2 pages)
- [Exhibit E](#): SAS Bldg P Executive Summary (6 pages)
- [Exhibit F](#): Committed Elements (4 pages)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY OF REQUEST

George Finch/Boney and Associates, on behalf of the developer and the property owner, SAS Institute, has requested approval of a site plan to develop a 244,000-square-foot office building on 27 acres

located at 845 SAS Campus Drive. Access to the site would be via SAS Campus Drive, with no access from the site onto Trenton Road.

This project includes several Minor Modifications to the Town's development standards. The applicant has requested a reduction in the amount of required parking based on the amount of ancillary common areas provided within the building. The plan does not include a vehicular connection to the SAS Building Q site under construction to the west, though pedestrian connectivity is proposed. Finally, the tree survey identified 12 trees that are 30 inches or larger in diameter. The applicant has proposed to remove eight of the large-diameter trees and has provided a report prepared by an ISA Certified Arborist in support of its request.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Streams: A stream buffer separates this property from the SAS Q property located immediately to the northwest. A smaller stream buffer is located within the thoroughfare corridor buffer along a portion of the right-of-way for Interstate 40.

Floodplain: There is no floodplain or flood hazard area impacting development of the property.

Wetlands: There are no wetlands that would impact development of the property.

Topography: A ridge extends into the center of the property from SAS Campus Drive, and the topography drops approximately 80 feet toward the northern corner of the site.

Surrounding Land Uses:

North – Interstate 40

South – SAS Building C (opposite side of SAS Campus Drive)

East – NCDOT Regional Transportation Management Center (opposite side of Trenton Road)

West – SAS Building Q

SUMMARY OF PROCESS AND ACTIONS TO DATE

Notification

The Planning Department mailed notification of the public hearing on the site plan to property owners within 400 feet of the site on February 19, 2014. Notification was duly published on the Town's website on February 21 and on February 28, 2014.

Property Posting

Notice of the public hearing was posted on the property on February 20, 2014.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE (LDO)

Traffic

This project was not required by the LDO to perform a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) through the Town's consultants. In support of their testimony in regards to the approval criteria for site plans, the applicant engaged a traffic engineering consultant, VHB Engineering NC, to perform a TIA on their behalf. The results of the TIA are summarized in the executive summary (Exhibit E), and the improvements the applicant has committed to making with this project are summarized in Exhibit F. A brief synopsis of the improvements and the applicant's position on each is included below:

Trenton Road frontage

- Widen Trenton Road along the property frontage to one-half of the ultimate cross-section (3-lane minor thoroughfare within 70 feet of right-of-way) identified in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP).
 - The applicant has committed to widening Trenton Road to one-half of the ultimate cross-section identified in the CTP and to constructing the 10-foot-wide streetside trail identified in the PRCR Facilities Master Plan.

Trenton Road and SAS Campus Drive (unsignalized)

- Construct an exclusive left-turn lane on the northbound Trenton Road approach with a minimum of 200 feet of storage and appropriate taper.
 - The applicant has committed to making the improvements as recommended in the TIA.

- Construct an exclusive right-turn lane on the southbound Trenton Road approach with a minimum of 100 feet of storage and appropriate taper.
 - The applicant has committed to making the improvements as recommended in the TIA.

SAS Campus Drive and Building P driveway (unsignalized)

- Construct the southbound, stop-controlled driveway approach to provide one ingress lane and two egress lanes, including an exclusive right-turn lane and an exclusive left-turn lane with a minimum of 100 feet of storage and appropriate taper.
 - The applicant has committed to making the improvements as recommended in the TIA.
- Restripe the inside eastbound through lane and outside westbound through lanes on SAS Campus Drive to allow left- and right-turn movements into the site.
 - The applicant has committed to making the improvements as recommended in the TIA.

North Harrison Avenue and I-40 Eastbound ramps (signalized)

- NCDOT has plans to widen and restripe the intersection that will reduce delay and decrease queuing along North Harrison Avenue. However, the proposed improvements will not fully remedy the situation along the corridor.
 - These improvements would be made by the NCDOT and would not be tied to the development of this property.
- NCDOT is in the preliminary stages of a feasibility study (FS-1005A) for additional improvements to reduce congestion along I-40 in this area.
 - These improvements would be made by the NCDOT and would not be tied to the development of this property.
- A suggestion was made to potentially allow the outside right-turn lane from the eastbound I-40 off-ramp to flow freely and maintain signalization of the inside right-turn lane. The implementation of this unconventional approach would reduce delay and would improve level of service (LOS) at intersection; however, it may also introduce undesirable weaving movements in the area.
 - The applicant has not proposed to make this improvement.

North Harrison Avenue and Weston Parkway/Richard Drive (signalized)

- Widen and restripe the southbound North Harrison Avenue approach to accommodate an additional southbound lane, while retaining the current southbound free-flow, right-turn lane. This improvement may require extending the third receiving lane on North Harrison Avenue south of Weston Parkway approximately 1,000 feet south of the intersection for safe merging maneuvers.
 - The applicant has proposed no improvements at this intersection due to the limited impact (only 1% of the projected future volume) the proposed office building would have on the intersection.

Trenton Road and Trinity Road (unsignalized)

- The TIA indicates that the southbound Trenton Road approach is projected to operate poorly during the afternoon peak hour.
 - Research into the accident history at this intersection shows no pattern of accidents related to traffic congestion or unsafe traffic movements. Therefore, no improvements are proposed to this intersection at this time.

SAS Campus Drive and Research Drive/Building V driveway (unsignalized)

- The TIA recommends monitoring this intersection for operational concerns in the future.
 - There is no mention of this recommendation in the applicant's committed elements.

Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Improvements

Trenton Road is identified as a 3-lane cross-section in the CTP. This would require a 45-foot section back-of-curb to back-of-curb within a 70-foot right-of-way. The proposed widening is not included in the current plan set due to the necessary coordination with various outside agencies. However, the applicant has committed to have the road widening plans approved and constructed prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the building.

Buffers and Streetscapes

The subject property is bounded by Interstate 40 on the north and is, therefore, subject to the Town of Cary's 100-foot Thoroughfare Corridor Buffer (TCB) along that property line. No disturbance would be

proposed within the TCB, and any existing vegetation would be supplemented to meet a Type A (opaque) buffer standard. The streetscape along Trenton Road, which is classified as a minor thoroughfare road, would be required to be 30 feet in width. The applicant is proposing to provide this required streetscape, supplementing the existing material as necessary following the required widening of Trenton Road.

Internal to SAS' campus, a 15-foot streetscape would be provided along SAS Campus Drive consistent with the LDO requirement along local streets. A 10-foot Type C (aesthetic) buffer would be provided between the proposed building and building Q that is under construction to the west.

Champion Trees

The required tree survey of the site identified 12 trees in excess of 30 inches in diameter (at breast height or DBH) scattered across the site. The applicant engaged John W. Monroe, an ISA certified arborist (SO-5260), to examine the trees to evaluate their condition and to determine their suitability for consideration as champion trees due to size, health, or other professional criteria. Mr. Monroe's report is attached to this staff report as Exhibit C. Mr. Monroe determined that four of the twelve trees were in poor condition and recommended removal from the site. The remaining eight trees were deemed to be in "good" or "very good" health, and recommendations in the report were limited to maintenance pruning of a couple of trees.

Trees 1, 5, 9, and 12 were identified by the arborist as being in poor health. Of these, trees 1, 5, and 9 would be removed from the site due to their location in relation to the proposed site improvements. Tree 12 would be retained on the site since it is located within a wooded area approximately 70 feet from the parking lot. The remaining trees were considered healthy and, therefore, were subject to the restrictions on champion tree removal in the LDO. Removal and replacement of these trees constitute Minor modifications to the development standards and will be discussed individually below:

- Tree 3 is a 32-inch yellow (or tulip) poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*) noted as being in very good condition. The tree is located in a portion of the site identified for parking that would serve as access to the service area of the building.
- Tree 4 is a yellow poplar that is in very good health and is 36 inches in diameter. The tree is located in the proposed location for one of the temporary sediment basins being used for sedimentation control during construction.
- Tree 6 is a 30-inch yellow poplar located in the northern portion of the site, just outside of the thoroughfare corridor buffer. The tree is identified as being in good condition and is also located in the area of the same sediment basin as tree 4.
- Tree 10 is a 35-inch yellow poplar in very good condition and is located in the middle of a proposed parking bay. Due to the location of the tree in a draw that will include approximately 20 feet of fill in that location, this tree is proposed for removal and replacement.
- Tree 11 is a 32-inch white oak (*Quercus alba*) located on a wooded rise east of the proposed parking lot. The tree is proposed for retention on the site; however, the proposed layout includes a retaining wall that encroaches into the critical root zone (CRZ) of the tree more than 25%. This tree would be considered as having been removed and would require replacement trees due to the amount of encroachment into the CRZ.

The applicant has proposed replacement tree plantings consistent with the LDO requirements. The plan proposes the removal of 165 inches of champion tree diameter to be replaced with 180 inches of replacement diameter. The replacement trees would be installed at a minimum of six inches diameter and would be a mix of red maple (*Acer rubrum* 'October Glory'), Dura-Heat[®] river birch (*Betula nigra* 'BNMTF'), and sawtooth oak (*Quercus acutissima*).

Connectivity with Adjacent Properties

The LDO requires that non-residential development provide cross-access with adjacent parcels to encourage shared parking and shared access points onto streets. The applicant has requested that Town Council not require a vehicular cross-access to the adjacent office building (building Q). There is a stream buffer that runs along a portion of the joint property line, and outside of the buffer there are topographical issues with provision of a vehicular connection.

Parking

Table 7.8-1 in the LDO establishes a required parking ratio for professional/business office uses of one parking space per 300 square feet of building square footage. This ratio would require 826 parking spaces based on the gross building square footage of 247,633 square feet. However, Section 7.8.2(C)(2) requires that different use areas of a building be calculated individually. The applicant has indicated that the LDO ratio does not provide a realistic picture of the parking demands on the site due to the amount of "secondary areas" such as conference rooms, collaboration space, and food service areas. The justification statement provided by the applicant has indicated a required parking space count of 693 spaces based on the resultant square footage of primary office space.

The applicant has requested to provide 575 parking spaces based on usage data collected at other buildings within the SAS campus. This represents a 17% reduction in the amount of required parking based on their proposed parking count. This is within the 25% reduction allowable to council through Section 3.19. If the parking space requirement was calculated on the gross square footage of the building, the requested reduction would be 30%.

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN WORKSHEET
AND
SUGGESTED MOTIONS**

Section 3.9.2(l) of the LDO states that a development plan may be approved by the Town Council only if it meets six listed criteria. As part of determining whether the first criterion is satisfied, council must determine whether to grant the minor modifications to the development standards requested by the applicant. A roadmap of the decisions council must make is provided below:

WORKSHEET 1

1. Does the plan comply with all applicable requirements of the LDO, including the development and design standards of Chapters 7 and 8 as well as the dedication and improvements provisions of Chapter 8 as well as all applicable Town specifications?

Applicant's Statement: Applicant requested that its site plan designer, George Finch/Boney and Associates, P.A., prepare the site plan in accordance with the design standards of Chapters 7 and 8, the dedication and improvement provisions of Chapter 8, and the other applicable Town Specifications. George Finch/Boney and Associates, P.A. confirms that, except for the two [actually three] minor modifications noted below, the site plan was prepared as instructed. Applicant is not aware of any assertion by the Town or others that the plan fails to comply with applicable regulations.

Staff Observations: The plan is generally consistent with the requirements of the LDO, with the exceptions of the minor modifications outlined in worksheet 1.

Once council has made a decision on the minor modifications, it may then turn to the remaining site plan approval criteria:

WORKSHEET 2

2. Does the plan adequately protect other property, or residential uses located on the same property, from the potential adverse effects of the proposed development?
3. Does the plan provide harmony and unity with the development of nearby properties?
4. Does the plan provide safe conditions for pedestrians or motorists and prevent a dangerous arrangement of pedestrian and vehicular ways?
5. Does the plan provide safe ingress and egress for emergency services to the site?
6. Does the plan provide mitigation for traffic congestion impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the project?

WORKSHEET 1

1. Does the plan comply with all applicable requirements of this Ordinance, including the development and design standards of Chapters 7 and 8 as well as the dedication and improvements provisions of Chapter 8 as well as all applicable Town specifications? (Note: Plans within Planned Developments may be subject to different requirements based on the approval).

The request for the reduction in parking is governed by Section 7.8.2(H) of the LDO. Section 3.19 of the LDO governs minor modifications to other requirements of the LDO.

Town Council should consider and approve the minor modification requests below pursuant to section 3.19.1(C)(2) of the LDO. Council may approve a minor modification to the development standards at any point before it approves the associated development plan. However, in order to approve a requested minor modification, the council must find the following:

- (1) *That the modification advances the goals and purposes of this Ordinance and*
- (2) *That the modification either*
 - A. *Results in less visual impact or more effective environmental or open space preservation, or*
 - B. *Relieves practical difficulties in developing a site. In determining if "practical difficulty" exists, the factors set forth in Section 3.20.5, "Approval Criteria" (for Variances) shall be considered.*

The criteria for determining whether or not "practical difficulty" exists include the following:

- a. Whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance;*
- b. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;*
- c. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of public services such as water and sewer;*
- d. Whether the applicant purchased the property with knowledge of the requirement; and*
- e. Whether the applicant's predicament can be mitigated through some method other than a variance.*

In granting a minor modification, council may require conditions that will substantially secure the objectives of the standard that is being modified and that will substantially mitigate any potential adverse impact on the environment or on adjacent properties, including but not limited to additional landscaping or buffering. In addition to the requirements of Section 3.19, individual requests may have additional criteria for consideration.

- 1. Request that the Town Council reduce the parking requirement for the proposed office building from 693 spaces to 575 spaces. This includes corollary consideration of the applicant's justification to require 693 spaces based on the amount of common spaces within the proposed building.**

- (1) Does the modification advance the goals and purposes of this Ordinance?

Applicant's Statement: The modification provides for adequate parking to support the building, will not burden adjoining properties with parking associated with the building and allows for a smaller parking lot with less impervious surface and less disturbance of existing vegetation.

Staff Observations: The town is aware of no parking concerns with other buildings within the SAS campus. The reduction in the required surface parking would also allow more separation between the proposed parking lot and properties along Trenton Road.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

- (2) Does the modification result in less visual impact or more effective environmental or open space preservation or relieve practical difficulties in developing a site?

Applicant's Statement: The modification allows for a smaller parking lot with greater preservation of existing open space, greater separation from other properties, less impervious surface, and less disturbance of existing vegetation.

Staff Observations: The reduction in impervious surface area would result in more available open space and in reduced stormwater run-off from the site. In addition, the parking lot would be located farther from the Trenton Road Corridor.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

- (3) [From Section 7.8.2(H)] Will the reduced number be sufficient to satisfy the demand for parking expected for the use, based on the nature of the use, the number of trips generated, the times of day when the use generates the most trips, and the extent to which other establishments are located on the same property and may reduce the number of vehicle trips required between different establishments.

Applicant's Statement: The reduced number of parking spaces will be sufficient. SAS owns and operates other buildings with similar characteristics (i.e., office buildings with substantial space dedicated to café and employee support facilities) and has monitored parking requirements of those buildings. The requested reduction, while not complying with the generic requirements of the Ordinance, complies with the specific and documented requirements of similar SAS buildings.

Staff Observations: The town is aware of no parking concerns on the SAS campus and would anticipate similar operations at the new office building.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

2. Request that the Town Council approve the removal and the replacement of five champion trees per Section 7.2.5 of the LDO

- a. Remove a 32-inch yellow poplar identified as tree 3.
- b. Remove a 36-inch yellow poplar identified as tree 4.
- c. Remove a 30-inch yellow poplar identified as tree 6.
- d. Remove a 35-inch yellow poplar identified as tree 10.
- e. Allow encroachment into more than 25% of the CRZ for a 32-inch white oak identified as tree 11.

- (1) Does the modification advance the goals and purposes of this Ordinance?

Applicant's Statement: The maintenance of open space and substantial efforts described above to preserve champion trees, together with the landscape plan, all advance the Ordinance's goal of maintaining significant and meaningful vegetative cover and of maintaining to the maximum extent practical champion trees or providing for trees that will become champion trees.

Staff Observations: The removal of the champion tree requested would allow development of the parking lot associated with the proposed building in a more compact manner than would otherwise be possible.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

- (2) Does the modification result in less visual impact or more effective environmental or open space preservation or relieve practical difficulties in developing a site?

Applicant's Statement: The modification relieves the practical difficulties in developing the site. Specifically, approximately 14.71 acres of the property (around 55%) must be impacted to accommodate the planned use. Efforts to shift, reconfigure, and separate the required space have all failed to avoid impacting champion trees. The current configuration impacts the smallest number of champion trees possible and centrally locates the improvements within the site, thereby maximizing buffers on the site perimeter, while still maintaining the required development area.

Staff Observations: The removal of the champion trees would allow the applicant to make grade changes to deal with the significant topographical changes across the site and to create a compact and efficient parking field.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

3. Request that the Town Council eliminate the requirement for a vehicular cross-access provision to the Building Q site.

- (1) Does the modification advance the goals and purposes of this Ordinance?

Applicant's Statement: None provided

Staff Observations: Cross-access provisions on this property would need to be located within close proximity to SAS Campus Drive given the environmental and topographical constraints along the western property line. SAS Campus Drive is a low-volume street which has public access control at either end. Therefore, the cross-access sought by the LDO would provide little benefit on this particular site.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

- (2) Does the modification result in less visual impact or more effective environmental or open space preservation or relieve practical difficulties in developing a site?

Applicant's Statement: None provided

Staff Observations: The elimination of vehicular cross-access would allow the preservation of existing vegetation along the common property line.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

- (3) [From Section 7.10.3(C)] Are appropriate bicycle and pedestrian connections provided between adjacent developments or land uses?

Applicant's Statement: Appropriate bicycle and pedestrian connections are shown on the site plan. Those connections include sidewalks along SAS Campus Drive and walking paths in the interior of the site and connecting to adjoining developed sites.

Staff Observations: An integrated pedestrian network connects the buildings across the SAS campus in-lieu of traditional sidewalk along SAS Campus Drive. The proposed building would tie into that network.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

SUGGESTED MOTIONS FOR MINOR MODIFICATION REQUESTS

MOTION TO APPROVE ALL MINOR MODIFICATION REQUESTS:

For the reasons discussed, I move that we APPROVE the Minor Modification requests made by the applicant as the requests meet all the approval criteria of Sections 3.19.1, 7.8.2(H), and 7.10.3 of the LDO.

This approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. *[insert any conditions necessary to bring the project into compliance with the LDO or other standards]*

MOTION TO APPROVE INDIVIDUAL MINOR MODIFICATION REQUESTS:

For the reasons discussed, I move that we APPROVE Minor Modification requests number(s) _____ made by the applicant as the requests meet all the approval criteria of Sections 3.19.1, 7.8.2(H), and/or 7.10.3, as appropriate, of the LDO.

This approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. *[insert any conditions necessary to bring the project into compliance with the LDO or other standards]*

MOTION TO DENY ALL MINOR MODIFICATION REQUESTS:

For the reasons discussed, I move that we DENY the Minor Modification requests made by the applicant as the requests do not meet all the approval criteria of Sections 3.19.1, 7.8.2(H), and/or 7.10.3 of the LDO.

MOTION TO DENY INDIVIDUAL MINOR MODIFICATION REQUESTS:

For the reasons discussed, I move that we DENY Minor Modification requests number(s) _____ made by the applicant as the requests do not meet all the approval criteria of Section Sections 3.19.1, 7.8.2(H), and/or 7.10.3, as appropriate, of the LDO.

WORKSHEET 2

2. Does the plan adequately protect other property, or residential uses located on the same property, from the potential adverse effects of the proposed development?

Applicant's Statement: The plan adequately protects other property from the potential adverse effects of the proposed development. The property is bounded to the north by Interstate 40, to the east by Trenton Road and property owned by the North Carolina Department of Transportation. On all other sides the property abuts property owned by the applicant. The proposed development of the property is compatible with the uses on surrounding properties and should not adversely impact the values of those surrounding properties. The site plan provides buffering and separation from surrounding properties that minimize visual and auditory impacts, if any, and the site plan includes stormwater management devices that will avoid stormwater impacts on adjoining properties.

Staff Observations: The proposed office building would not be located in the immediate vicinity of any residential uses and provides buffers around the perimeter as required by the LDO.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

3. Does the plan provide harmony and unity with the development of nearby properties?

Applicant's Statement: The office use proposed in the site plan is consistent with the current and planned office uses of properties to the west and south of the subject property, consistent with the Interstate 40 transportation corridor that exists north of the subject property and with any use likely to be proposed by North Carolina Department of Transportation for its property east of the property and across Trenton Road.

Staff Observations: The proposed office building is consistent with the remainder of the corporate campus on which it would be located.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

4. Does the plan provide safe conditions for pedestrians or motorists and prevent a dangerous arrangement of pedestrian and vehicular ways?

Applicant's Statement: The site plan provides sidewalks along SAS Campus Drive, adjacent to the parking lot shown on the plan, connects to existing walking trails that connect buildings on the SAS campus, provides crosswalks across SAS Campus Drive (which has speed calming devices and a reduced posted speed limit already in place), and provides for vehicular ingress, circulation, and egress in a safe manner.

Staff Observations: The proposed office building would be served by SAS Campus Drive and by the off-street pedestrian network provided across the SAS Campus.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

5. Does the plan provide safe ingress and egress for emergency services to the site?

Applicant's Statement: The plan includes roadways of adequate width for emergency service vehicles and provides adequate turn radii for emergency vehicles entering the site. The plan has been inspected by Town emergency services personnel and all comments were satisfactorily addressed through mutually agreeable improvements.

Staff Observations: The plan would provide safe ingress and egress for all emergency services.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

6. Does the plan provide mitigation for traffic congestion impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the project?

Applicant's Statement: Applicant has submitted a traffic impact analysis prepared by Lyle Overcash, P.E., of VHB Engineering NC, P.C., an executive summary of that analysis, and a letter from Mr. Overcash that offers committed elements regarding transportation improvements. Those committed elements provide mitigation for traffic impacts reasonably expected to be generated by the project.

Staff Observations: The applicant has provided a list of committed traffic mitigations as described in the body of this report.

TEST SATISFIED? __ YES __ NO

SUGGESTED MOTIONS FOR SITE PLAN

MOTION TO APPROVE THE SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN

For the reasons discussed, I move that we **APPROVE** the proposed subdivision and site plan with conditions as stated below, as it meets all of the approval criteria set of Section 3.9.2(I).

This approval is conditioned upon the following:

1. The applicant must satisfactorily address any remaining Development Review Committee comments on the master plan set submitted for signature.
2. *[insert any additional conditions necessary to bring the project into compliance with the LDO or other standards]*

OR

MOTION TO DENY THE SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN

For the reasons discussed, I move that we **DENY** the proposed subdivision and site plan, as it does not meet all of the approval criteria set forth in Section 3.9.2(I).