#### Buncombe County Planning Board December 16, 2013

The Buncombe County Planning Board met December 16, 2013 in the meeting room at 30 Valley Street. Members present were Josh Holmes, Bud Sales, Chairman Tom Alexander, Bernie Kessel, Catherine Martin, Joe Sechler, Michelle Wood, and Jim Young. Also present was Josh O'Conner, Zoning Administrator; Jon Creighton, Assistant County Manager/Planning Director; Michael Frue, Staff Attorney; and Gillian Phillips and Debbie Truempy, Planning staff.

### Call to Order

Chairman Alexander called the meeting to order at 9:34 am.

#### Approval of Agenda

Mr. O'Conner indicated that there was a revised agenda, as ZPH2013-00048 had been withdrawn. Mr. Kessel made a motion to approve a revised agenda, which moved the Craig Coggins zoning (ZPH2013-00051) to 6a on the agenda, as a large amount of public were present regarding the case. Ms. Wood seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

#### Approval of Minutes (December 2, 2013)

Ms. Wood made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Ms. Martin seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

# **SUB2013-00372**: "Old Coggins Farm," located off of Old Coggins Place (PIN 9679-15-1760) is seeking master plan approval and **SUB2013-00371**: "Old Coggins Farm, Phase 1," located off of Old Coggins Place (PIN 9679-15-1760) is seeking preliminary approval.

The Board was provided with a copy of the development plan (ATTACHMENT A) and a copy of the staff proposed conditions (ATTACHMENT B). Ms. Truempy introduced the case to the Board. She indicated that the applicant was proposing 382 units for master plan approval, and was requesting Phase 1 be approved with 42 single family units. Ms. Truempy stated the applicant was proposing city water and Metropolitan Sewerage District (MSD) sewer, and had already spoken to the Erosion Control and Stromwater Management Departments but had not submitted plans. She then reviewed the proposed conditions for the Board. There was discussion about what would be the allowed density on the property.

Andy Baker, a member of the development team, was present to represent the case. He indicated that the homes in the development would range between 850 square feet and 2400 square feet, and discussed price point within the development. He discussed there being apartments in the development for older individuals, and how the existing agricultural use of the property would continue. He discussed the proposed uses for the property including a farm to table restaurant, and office space for a business incubator. Mr. Baker stated that they had held a public meeting regarding the project and the development team did understand that people had many questions regarding the development, and they wanted the public to have input into the project. Mr. Baker indicated that they had received a traffic study regarding the project (ATTACHMENT C), but had not had a chance to thoroughly review it. Mark Brooks, with Brooks Engineering, was also present, and summarized what the traffic study had indicated. The Board asked questions regarding the traffic study and proposed mixed uses on the property. Chairman Alexander indicated to the public that at this point he would open up the meeting for public comment, but that the comment should be limited to the technical aspects of the subdivision approval and not the proposed rezoning. The following individuals made public comment:

- David Priest, a resident of the Holly Hills Subdivision, raised concerns regarding traffic problems and the environmental impact the development would have.
- Bridget Nelson, a resident of Montford, raised concerns regarding traffic problems and the environmental impact of the development.

There was discussion regarding what further approval processes the applicant would have to go through.

- Ellie Waters, who resided in Fairview, raised concerns regarding a family graveyard on the property, and whether or not her family would still have access to it.
- Dede Stiles, a resident of Swannanoa, raised concerns regarding who was going to have to pay for the additional water and sewer connections.
- Bernard Scheunter raised concerns regarding traffic, and the reliability of a traffic study that was paid for by the developer.

Chairman Alexander and Mr. Kessel stated that a traffic engineer would not falsify a report as engineers had professional standards they all had to maintain. Mr. O'Conner indicated to those present that questions regarding the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) approval process could be directed to the District Engineer.

• Dr. Victoria Collins asked if the developers had considered providing public transportation options within the development.

David Case, a member of the development team, indicated that there had been some discussion regarding the idea of community car sharing.

- Bill Punchin, who resided in the River Run Subdivision, raised concerns regarding the developer being financially solvent enough to finish the development.
- Charles Wickle raised concerns regarding the buildings related to farming being in the floodplain.
- Laura Cruiser, who lived off of Old Farm School Road, raised concerns regarding what had happened to another development David Chase was involved with in Tucson, Arizona.

David Chase described the Sovano development in Tucson, Arizona.

Chairman Alexander closed the public hearing.

The Board discussed the proposed development with staff. The Board asked questions regarding the Board of Adjustment approval process, development in the floodplain, stormwater management, and the guarantee of improvements process for a subdivision development.

Mr. Kessel then made a motion to approve SUB2013-00372 (the master plan). Mr. Holmes seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Wood made a motion to approve SUB2013-00371 (Phase 1) of the development with staff conditions. Mr. Kessel seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

### Public Hearings (Zoning Map Amendments)

**ZPH2013-00051**: Craig Coggins applied to rezone a portion of tax lot PIN 9679-15-1760 (88 Old Coggins Place) which is currently zoned Residential District R-2 to Public Service District (PS); The Board was provided with the staff recommendation (Attachment D), and GIS maps (Attachment E) prior to the meeting. Ms. Truempy presented the case to the Board.

Andy Baker indicated that they were requesting the change from R-2 to PS, as a restaurant was not a permitted use in R-2, and PS also allowed retail spaces, offices, and a Bed and Breakfast. He indicated that having these uses on site would allow for less vehicular traffic from the site.

Chairman Alexander then opened the hearing for public comment. The following people made public comment:

- David Priest raised concerns about the commercialization of the site and floodplain.
- Mark Brooks indicated that the development team would try to address all the neighbors' concerns.
- Arnold Kilby, who owned property adjacent to the development, raised concerns regarding the development causing annexation of the surrounding area.
- Steve Morrision, who resided in the Holly Hills Subdivision, raised concerns regarding the neighborhood being impacted by being surrounded by Public Service zoning.
- Charles Wykle raised concerns regarding the character of the area being changed.
- Bill Queen, who resided in the River Run Subdivision, raised concerns regarding traffic and changing the rural character of the neighborhood.
- Lara Cruiser, of the Holly Hills Subdivision, raised concerns regarding the area remaining rural in nature.
- Neil Golden, of the River Run Subdivision, raised concerns regarding how the development would affect adjacent farmland.
- Karen Cruiser, the developer of the River Run Subdivision, raised concerns regarding development in the floodplain and indicated she thought the property should be developed similarly to the River Run Subdivision.
- Gary Clark raised concerns regarding the amount of property being requested for a change to PS zoning.
- Copper Cogggins, the property owner, indicated that her father was a developer along with a farmer, and voiced her support of the proposed development.
- Maria Cavallo, the realtor representing Ms. Coggins, voiced her support of the proposed project.
- Bill Pushon indicated that PS was not a rational zoning as the adjacent property zoned PS was woodlands.
- Bernard Scheunter raised concerns regarding the financial stability of the developer.
- Dede Stiles raised concerns regarding if the property changed hands what would be developed at the location.
- Ian Booth indicated that the proposal was a much more progressive model of development.
- Ron Inkspan indicated that he had spoken with the developers on numerous occasions and that their ideas were very innovative and the developers seemed to want to help build a community at the site.
- Annie MacDonald raised concerns regarding the permitted height in the PS zoning district, and expressed the need for more planning in the Swannanoa Valley.

- Janice Campbell, of the Holly Hills Subdivision, raised concerns regarding the proposed school and preserving the rural character of the area.
- Anne Kilby, an adjacent property owner, raised concerns regarding the floodplain and flooding.
- David Case, a member of the development team, described the reasons why they were requesting the PS zoning district, and further described the proposed development.

Chairman Alexander closed the public hearing, and reminded those present that the Board of Commissioners made the final decision regarding the proposed map amendment. Staff described the notification process for the next public hearing. The Board then discussed the proposal and the other approvals the development would need. Mr. Holmes made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed map amendment with the consistency statement provided on Attachment D. Ms. Woods seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

### Public Hearings (Zoning Map Amendments)

**ZPH2013-00045**: Timothy Deweese applied to rezone tax lot PIN 9722-81-7329 (32 Wiley Drive), which is currently zoned Residential District R-2 to Employment District (EMP);

The Board was provided with the staff recommendation (ATTACHMENT F), GIS maps (ATTACHMENT G), and correspondence from a nearby neighbor (ATTACHMENT H) prior to the meeting. Ms. Truempy presented the case to the Board.

Tim Deweese was present to represent himself. He indicated that he wished to place a manufactured home on the property while he constructed his house, and EMP allowed him to do that. The Board then discussed the surrounding uses on the property. Chairman Alexander read the correspondence from the neighbor provided to the Board (ATTACHMENT H) and opened the public hearing. The following individuals made public comment:

- John McAlister raised concerns regarding the property being rezoned to EMP and the other uses that would be allowed in that district.
- Jeff Plemmons raised concerns regarding how long a manufactured home would remain on the site.
- JR Plemmons requested that the property remain residentially zoned.
- Timothy Plemmons raised concerns regarding the quarry obtaining the property and expanding their operation.

There being no others wishing to speak, Chairman Alexander closed the public hearing. The Board discussed the proposed application. Ms. Wood raised concerns regarding the ongoing issue regarding manufactured homes in the County. Mr. Holmes made a motion to deny the proposed request with the consistency statement provided in ATTACHMENT F. Mr. Young seconded the motion and motion passed unanimously.

**ZPH2013-00047**: John Herron applied to rezone a portion of tax lot PIN 9626-80-3208 (1431 Brevard Road) from Single Family Residential District R-1 to Neighborhood Service District (NS); The Board was provided with the staff recommendation (ATTACHMENT I), and GIS maps (ATTACHMENT J) prior to the meeting. Ms. Truempy presented the case to the Board.

John Herron was present to represent his case personally. He discussed the financial investment that he has already made in the development of the property. He indicated the parcel was originally purchased

from Progress Energy but that a portion of the property had been returned to Progress for access to the utility right-of-way. He showed a large scale aerial to the board to indicate which portions of the parcel were owned by whom. He indicated that the property was initially purchased with commercial use as the intent.

There were no questions from the Board for the applicant.

Chairman Alexander then opened the hearing for public comment. The following people made public comment:

- Mary Jones was present to object to the proposed map amendment. She indicated that she lives to the southwest of the property under consideration and objects to any rezoning of the property. She noted that during the repair of the culvert and road, the cement trucks were disruptive to the character and safety of the neighborhood and that fill materials other than dirt or concrete may have been used. She also requested removal of the sign that Mr. Herron has placed at the intersection with Brevard Road, as it further compromised the safety of residents turning onto the street.
- Pete Watts raised concerns regarding the wetlands on the property. He indicated that he lives adjacent to the property and made Mr. Herron aware of the presence of the wetlands prior to his purchase of the land. Mr. Watts also raised concerns regarding potential extension of the utility right-of-way.

There being no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed. The board discussed the requested rezoning.

Mr. Sechler asked the applicant for clarification regarding his discussion of the "front" of the parcel. Mr. Herron indicated that he was referring to the portion of the parcel that was originally in Asheville's ETJ, and which has already been zoned CS.

Mr. O'Conner noted that Mr. Herron had changed his requested rezoning district based on the recommendation of the Planning Department. In response to a question from Ms. Wood, Mr. O'Conner confirmed that the parcel would be split-zoned, as half of the parcel was originally within Asheville's ETJ.

Mr. Holmes made a motion to approve request with the consistency statement provided in ATTACHMENT I. Mr. Sechler seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

# *Continued discussion of zoning language regarding the creation of a Resort District and related standards (ZPH2013-00050)*

The Board was provided with the proposed language prior to the meeting (ATTACHMENT K). Mr. O'Conner indicated that changes made due to the discussion at the last meeting were shown in blue on Attachment K. Staff requested that the Board make a motion to advertise the language for a public hearing for the January meeting. Mr. Kessel made a motion to ask staff to advertise for a public hearing. Mr. Holmes seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Continued discussion of zoning language regarding changes required by SL 2013-126 (ZPH2013-00059)

The Board was provided with the proposed language prior to the meeting (ATTACHMENT L) Mr. O'Conner described the proposed changes required by changes to state law for the Board. Ms. Wood raised questions about transparency concerning the zoning administrator directly introducing proposed changes to zoning language. Mr. Kessel made a motion to ask staff to advertise for a public hearing. Mr. Sales seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

# Continued discussion of zoning language regarding dimensional requirements (**ZPH2013-00060**), regarding setbacks for accessory uses (**ZPH2013-00061**), and regarding Planned Unit Development standards (**ZPH2013-00062**).

The Board was provided with the proposed language prior to the meeting (ATTACHMENT L). Chairman Alexander proposed that the Board review zoning language related to commonly discussed issues at the next regular meeting.

### **Adjournment**

There being no public comment, Mr. Sales made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Wood seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:14 pm.



- AND PROJECT ENGINEER'S APPROVAL.
- 3. FINAL INSPECTION SHALL COMMENCE AFTER SITE STABILIZATION.



CE-1.2

CE-1.3

CE-2.1

CE-2.2

CE-3.1

OWNER / DE

CASE ENTERPRISE.

# ATTACHMENT A

# PROJECT INFO

VELOPER:	CONTACT INFO:
LLC	CONTACT: DAVID CASE 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 P: 520-907-7704 EMAIL: david@caseenterprises.net
NG ASSOCIATES, PA	CONTACT: JOHN KINNAIRD, PE 17 ARLINGTON STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 P: 828-232-4700 EMAIL: jkinnaird@brooksea.com
NG ASSOCIATES, PA	CONTACT: PAUL SEXTON, PE 17 ARLINGTON STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 P: 828-232-4700 EMAIL: psexton@brooksea.com

# SHEET INDEX

SHEET TITLE
COVER SHEET
BOUNDARY SURVEY
MASTER PLAN
MASTER PLAN WITH SLOPE ANALYSIS
COLOR CODED MASTER PLAN
REZONING PLAN
PRELIMINARY PLAT & SITE PLAN (1 OF 3)
PRELIMINARY PLAT & SITE PLAN (2 OF 3)
PRELIMINARY PLAT & SITE PLAN (3 OF 3)
PRELIMINARY UTILITY & STORMWATER PLAN (1 OF 3)
PRELIMINARY UTILITY & STORMWATER PLAN (2 OF 3)
PRELIMINARY UTILITY & STORMWATER PLAN (3 OF 3)
ROAD PROFILES
ROAD PROFILES
DETAILS



o. REVISIONS/SUBMISSIONS Date									sion/Submission number with a triangle indicates changes made on this sheet
NC NORTHERE	ENGINEERING AND THE CARO	NORTH Z		CONTRACTOR OF	MANUMATING STATES	)		PERMIT SET	Revi
Designed: Reviewed:	Drawn: Scale:	DJD AS NOTED Checked: Date:	JHK 11-15-2103	17 Arlington Street	Asheville, N.C. 28801	Phone: 1-828-232-4700	Eav. 1-828-232-1331	www.hronksea.com	
Ę		SXICCAC		ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES			Planning • Engineering • Surveying		
	<b>JLD COGGINS FARM</b>	MASTER PLANS			NDRTH CAROLINA				
	0				BUNCOMBE COUN				



![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Figure_3.jpeg)

REVISIONS/SUBMISSIONS Date			/Submission number with a triangle indicates changes made on this sheet
S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S			Revision/S
CARO.	JOHT HUNNER		SET
NORTH STATE			PERMIT
Reviewed: MCB Scale: 1"=150' Date:	11-15-2103 ngton Street 2, N.C. 28801	-828-232-4700 228-232-1331	rooksea.com
Designed: JHK Drawn: DJD Checked:	JHK 17 Arli Ashevill	Phone: 1 Fav: 1-5	d www
	ENGINERING ASSOCIATES	Planning • Engineering • Surveying	Environmental Services
GGINS FARM ER PLANS	NORTH CAROLINA		
OLD CO( MAST	BUNCOMBE COUNTY		R PLAN
<sup>-</sup> roject No: <b>395313</b>	MP-1.1	)rawing Title:	MASTE

300

AUG. 2020

450

REMAINDER OF DEVELOPMENT: AUG. 2015

150

![](_page_9_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_2.jpeg)

 DEVELOPMENT N	OTES
OWNER / DEVELOPER	DAVID CASE 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801
ENGINEER	JOHN KINNAIRD, PE BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700
SURVEYOR	PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700
0 150	300 450

		Designed: Reviewed:		No. REVISIONS/SUBMIS	SIONS	te
OLD COGGINS FARM		JHK MUCB Drawn: Scale:	CANGINEERIA			
MASTER PLANS		DJD 1"=150' Checked: Date:	NORTH X			
		JHK 11-15-2103				
	ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES	17 Arlinaton Street	The second secon			
UNCOMBE COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA		Asheville, N.C. 28801	The Ford A Contraction of the Co			
	Dianina - Endinana - Pulana	Phone: 1-828-232-4700	)			
		Fax: 1-828-232-1331				
DED MASTER PLAN	<ul> <li>Environmental Services •</li> </ul>	www.brooksea.com	PERMIT SET	Revision/Submission number with a triangle inc	cates changes made on this s	leet

![](_page_11_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_3.jpeg)

	BEGIN:	END:
PHASE 1:	APRIL 2014	NOV. 2014
MIXED USE PARCEL:	AUG. 2014	AUG. 2015
MULTIFAMILY #1:	AUG. 2014	AUG. 2015
REMAINDER OF DEVELOPMENT:	AUG. 2015	AUG. 2020
0 150	300	450

![](_page_11_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

# PRELIMINARY PLAT LEGEND

Existing Boundary
Existing Creek (w / 30' Buffer)
Existing Building to Remain
100 Year Floodplain
500 Year Floodplain
Phase 1 Right of Way
⊚ <b></b> ⊗ Phase 1 Lot Line
— — Future Right of Way
Future Lot Line
Existing Pavement

# DEVELOPMENT NOTES

828-232-4700

ENGINEER	

SURVEYOR

OWNER / DEVELOPER DAVID CASE CASE ENTERPRISES, LLC 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 JOHN KINNAIRD, PE BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828-232-4700 PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801

![](_page_14_Picture_5.jpeg)

			$\overline{)}$
		EXISTING CREEK	
			30' UNDIS
KIL DB. 2372 PB. 155, PIN: 9679 Zone:	.BY , PG. 255 PG. 191 –95–8963 R–2	3	

CURVE	RADIUS	ARC LENGTH	CHORD LENGTH	CHORD BEARING	DELTA ANGLE
C1	147.50'	11.75'	11.75'	S 04°34'53" W	4°33'53"
C2	147.50'	43.41'	43.26'	S 15°17'43" W	16°51'48"
C3	15.00'	20.07'	18.61'	S 14°36'07" E	76°39'27"
C4	172.50'	15.39'	15.39'	N 50°22'28" W	5°06'46"
C5	172.50'	43.71'	43.59'	S 40°33'33" E	14°31'03"
C6	172.50'	20.38'	20.37'	S 23°15'26" E	6°46'14"
C7	172.50'	35.45'	35.39'	N 13°59'05" W	11°46'27"
C8	172.50'	44.97'	44.84'	N 00°37'47" W	14°56'09"
C9	112.50'	28.70'	28.62'	S 14°08'46" W	14°36'56"
C10	15.00'	20.00'	18.55'	S 16°44'30" E	76°23'28"
C11	185.00'	71.18'	70.74'	S 65°57'35" E	22°02'43"
C12	185.00'	40.19'	40.11'	S 83°12'20" E	12°26'47"
C13	412.50'	34.58'	34.57'	S 75°20'19" E	4°48'13"
C14	112.50'	39.47'	39.26'	N 59°41'35" E	20°06'01"
C15	412.50'	53.80'	53.76'	S 81°28'37" E	7°28'23"
C16	112.50'	24.18'	24.13'	N 75°54'02" E	12°18'53"
C17	412.50'	41.98'	41.96'	S 88°07'45" E	5°49'53"
C18	412.50'	38.91'	38.90'	N 86°15'10" E	5°24'17"
C19	412.50'	15.25'	15.25'	N 82°29'28" E	2°07'06"
C20	15.00'	23.73'	21.33'	N 36°44'42" E	90°37'33"
C21	15.00'	23.40'	21.10'	S 53°15'18" E	89°22'27"
C22	375.00'	22.21'	22.21'	S 06°52'15" E	3°23'39"
C23	67.50'	31.61'	31.32'	S 68°38'38" W	26°49'40"
C24	67.50'	40.97'	40.35'	N 24°13'39" E	34°46'43"
C25	127.50'	22.00'	21.97'	N 01°53'42" E	9°53'10"
C26	127.50'	37.44'	37.30'	N 11°27'36" W	16°49'26"
C27	127.50'	7.71'	7.71'	S 21°36'16" E	3°27'55"
C28	127.50'	39.01'	38.86'	S 44°09'54" E	19.4793
C29	15.00'	20.07'	18.61'	N 88°44'26" E	76°39'27"
C30	147.50'	31.25'	31.19'	S 56°28'53" W	12°08'22"
C31	375.00'	52.40'	52.36'	S 10°43'11" W	8°00'25"
C32	375.00'	39.88'	39.86'	S 17°46'09" W	6°05'33"
C33	325.00'	12.61'	12.61'	N 19°42'16" E	2°13'21"
C34	325.00'	44.16'	44.13'	N 14°42'01" E	7°47'09"
C35	325.00'	44.50'	44.47'	S 06°53'06" W	7°50'42"
C36	200.00'	120.40'	118.59'	S 72°10'59" E	34°29'29"
C37	90.00'	118.15'	109.85'	N 44°26'53" E	75°13'11"
C38	150.00'	69.93'	69.30'	N 06°31'00" W	26°42'36"
CJO	1 100100				

LINE	BEARING	DISTANCE
L1	S 19°52'19" E	11.93'
L2	N 06°50'18" E	4.83'
L3	S 06°50'18" W	10.75'
L4	S 89°25'44" E	29.58'
L5	S 00°34'16" W	30.00'
L6	S 89°25'44" E	44.69'
L7	S 82°03'28" W	10.68'
L8	N 82°03'28" E	42.46'
L9	N 82°03'28" E	42.46'
L10	N 81°25'55" E	25.80'
L11	S 82°03'28" W	41.03'
L12	S 81°25'55" W	40.76'
L13	S 82°03'28" W	38.67'
L14	S 82°03'28" W	41.01'
L15	N 82°03'28" E	27.68'
L16	S 06°50'18" W	27.39'
L17	N 06°50'18" E	38.32'
L18	N 06°50'18" E	28.27'
L19	N 02°48'48" E	31.11'
L20	N 19°52'19" W	11.52'
L21	S 19°01'10" E	32.59'
L22	N 19°52'19" W	40.12'
L23	S 58°36'08" E	23.80'
L24	N 52°55'51" W	15.43'
L25	S 78°55'06" E	19.85'
L26	S 78°55'06" E	16.42'
L27	S 62°33'04" W	20.07'
L28	S 20°48'56" W	10.44'
L29	N 20°48'56" E	33.03'

![](_page_14_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_0.jpeg)

•	NEW STABILIZATION TIMEFRAMES						
	Site Area Description Stabilization Timeframe Exceptions						
٩	Perimeter dikes, scales, ditches, and slopes 7 Days None						
ĝ	High Quality Water (HQW) Zones	7 Days	None				
$\square$	Slopes steeper than 3:1	7 Days	If slopes are 10' or less in length and are not steeper than 2:1, 14 days are allowed				
Γ	Slopes 3:1 or flatter	14 Days	7 days for slopes greater than 50' in length				
Į	All other areas with slopes flatter than 4:1	14 Days	None, except for perimeters and HQW Zones				

PHASE 1 DEVELOPMENT N	OTES
Subdivision Name:	OLD COGGINS FARM
Total Project Area:	169.106 Ac.
Phase 1 Área:	10.13 Ac.
PIN No.:	9679-15-1760
Existing Zoning:	R-2
Proposed No. Lots (PH1):	42
Density:	4.1 units / acre
Max. Building Height:	35'
Township:	SWANNANOA
Water:	CITY OF ASHEVILLE
Water Supply Watershed:	N/A
Sewer:	MSD OF BUNCOMBE CO
Length of Private Roads (PH1):	2997.7 linear feet
Length of Shared Drives (PH1):	2,98.7 linear feet
Total Length of Roads / Drives (PH1):	3,296.4 linear feet
Length of Corridor Over 90' Wide:	155 linear feet (4.7%)
Lot Frontage:	(No lot over 18%)
Disturbed Årea (Infrastructure only):	9.50 ACRES
Site Location Latitude:	35°36'46"N
Site Location Longitude:	-82° 27' 48" W
Note: No portion of Phase 1 is within Note: Construction estima	the 100yr floodplain. ted to begin May 2014.

DEVELOPMENT N	IOTES
OWNER / DEVELOPER	DAVID CASE CASE ENTERPRISES, LLC 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801
ENGINEER	JOHN KINNAIRD, PE BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700
SURVEYOR	PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700

![](_page_16_Figure_4.jpeg)

150

SCALE: 1"=50'

![](_page_16_Figure_5.jpeg)

	NEW STABILIZATION TIMEFRAMES						
	Site Area Description Stabilization Timeframe Exceptions						
	Perimeter dikes, scales, ditches, and slopes 7 Days None						
Ø	1 High Quality Water (HQW) Zones 7 Days None						
	Slopes steeper than 3:1         7 Days         If slopes are 10' or less in length and are n           steeper than 2:1, 14 days are allowed						
4	Slopes 3:1 or flatter	14 Days	7 days for slopes greater than 50' in length				
l	All other areas with slopes flatter than 4:1	14 Days	None, except for perimeters and HQW Zones				

# DEVELOPMENT NOTES

OWNER / DEVELOPER	DAVID CASE CASE ENTERPRISES, LLC 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801
ENGINEER	JOHN KINNAIRD, PE BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700
SURVEYOR	PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700

![](_page_17_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_3.jpeg)

SHARED DRIVE "A"

![](_page_18_Figure_5.jpeg)

Date				nges made on this sheet
REVISIONS/SUBMISSIONS				omission number with a triangle indicates cha
No.	ARAGAMARA BAR	ALL AND AL AND ALL AND		ZMIT SET
CING INE ER INC.	DOC NORTH TO CAROLINA	ALL C-3725		
Designed: Reviewed: JHK MCB Drawn: Scale:	DJD 1"=50' Checked: Date: JHK 11-15-2013	17 Arlington Street Asheville, N.C. 28801	Phone: 1-828-232-4700 Fax: 1-828-232-1331	www.brooksea.com
		ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES	Planning • Engineering • Surveying	
NS FARM	PLANS	NORTH CAROLINA		
OLD COGGI	MASTER	BUNCOMBE COUNTY		OFILES
ect No: <b>313</b>		۲۲-۲. ۱	ving Title:	ROAD PR

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

Dota String String							n/Submission number with a triangle indicates changes made on this sheet
	CARONEER NO.	NORTH SACURATION NORTH		A C-3 C-3 C-3 C-4 C-3 C-4		PERMIT SET	Revision
Designed: Reviewed:	JHK MCB Drawn: Scale:	DJD 1"=50" Checked: Date:	ынк 17 Arlinaton Street	Asheville, N.C. 28801	Phone: 1-828-232-4700	Fax: 1-828-232-1331	
			ENGINERING ASSOCIATES		Planning • Engineering • Surveving		
	OLD COGGINS FARM	MASTER PLANS		BUNCOMBE COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA			DFILES
	Project No: <b>395313</b>		CE-2.2		Drawing Title:		RUAD PRC

![](_page_19_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

- 2.5. A rain gauge shall be maintained on site.
- 2.6. A written record of the daily rainfall amounts shall be retained.
- 2.7. At least once per week, each erosion control measure shall be inspected to ensure that it is operating correctly and records maintained.
- 2.8. Inspections shall also be made within 24 hours of rain events over 1/2 inch.
- 2.9. The quality of all stormwater discharges shall be observed and recorded. 2.10. If any visible sedimentation is leaving the site or entering waters of the state, corrective action
- shall be taken immediately to control the discharge of sediments. 3. Self-Inspection records shall be kept on site and made available to the Erosion Control Inspector upon request.
- 4. All drainage easements must be grassed and/or rip-rapped per the plans to control erosion. 5. The escape of sediment from the site shall be prevented by the installation of erosion and sediment
- control measures and practices prior to, or concurrent with, land-disturbing activities. 6. Erosion control measures will be maintained at all times. If full implementation of the approved plan does not provide for effective erosion control, additional erosion and sediment control measures shall be implemented to control or treat the sediment source and an amended plan be submitted
- and approved showing modified erosion control devices. The site shall receive temporary/permanent seeding within 7 days of completion of grading
- operations. 8. All work in the NCDOT right-of-way to be done in accordance with NCDOT specifications and standards.
- 9. Contractor to provide inlet protection at each structure as storm system is constructed. 10. All grading and erosion control operations and installations must be done in accordance with BUNCOMBE COUNTY's engineering standard specifications and details.
- 11. Install and maintain temporary sediment basins during rough grading. 12. Provide watertight joints on any storm drains where velocities exceed 15 ft/sec (see pipe chart).
- 13. All perimeter dines, swales, slopes, and ditches, and all slopes steeper than 3:1 shall be stabilized in 7 days. All other slopes must be stabilized in 14 days.

## **INSPECTION SCHEDULE:**

- 1. NO CONSTRUCTION SHALL COMMENCE PRIOR TO A PRECONSTRUCTION MEETING WITH THE PROJECT ENGINEER, THE CONTRACTOR, AND A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE BUNCOMBE COUNTY.
- 2. NO EQUIPMENT SUBSTITUTION SHALL BE MADE WITHOUT MANUFACTURER(S)
- AND PROJECT ENGINEER'S APPROVAL.
- 3. FINAL INSPECTION SHALL COMMENCE AFTER SITE STABILIZATION.

![](_page_21_Figure_22.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_23.jpeg)

CE-1.2

CE-1.3

CE-2.1

CE-2.2

CE-3.1

OWNER / DE

CASE ENTERPRISE.

# PROJECT INFO

VELOPER:	CONTACT INFO:
LLC	CONTACT: DAVID CASE 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 P: 520-907-7704 EMAIL: david@caseenterprises.net
	CONTACT INFO:
NG ASSOCIATES,	PA CONTACT: JOHN KINNAIRD, PE 17 ARLINGTON STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 P: 828-232-4700 EMAIL: jkinnaird@brooksea.com
	CONTACT INFO:
NG ASSOCIATES,	PA CONTACT: PAUL SEXTON, PE 17 ARLINGTON STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 P: 828-232-4700 EMAIL: psexton@brooksea.com

# SHEET INDEX

SHEET TITLE	
COVER SHEET	
BOUNDARY SURVEY	
MASTER PLAN	
MASTER PLAN WITH SLOPE ANALYSIS	
COLOR CODED MASTER PLAN	
REZONING PLAN	
PRELIMINARY PLAT & SITE PLAN (1 OF 3)	
PRELIMINARY PLAT & SITE PLAN (2 OF 3)	
PRELIMINARY PLAT & SITE PLAN (3 OF 3)	
PRELIMINARY UTILITY & STORMWATER PLAN (1 OF 3)	
PRELIMINARY UTILITY & STORMWATER PLAN (2 OF 3)	1
PRELIMINARY UTILITY & STORMWATER PLAN (3 OF 3)	1
ROAD PROFILES	
ROAD PROFILES	
DETAILS	

![](_page_21_Picture_28.jpeg)

			Desianed: Reviewed:			SEVICIONIC /CLIDMICCIONIC	
(			JHK MCB	CONFECTOR STATES	.0N		במוע
C C	OGGINS FARM		Drawn: Scale:	Chon the second of the second			
<b>A</b>	STER PLANS		DJD AS NOTED Checked: Date:	NORTH Z			
			JHK 11-15-2103				
		ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES	17 Arlinaton Street	OTTO DE CO			
	NORTH CAROLINA		Asheville, N.C. 28801	AND THE REPORT OF THE REPORT O			
			Phone: 1-828-232-4700				
			Fax: 1-828-232-1331				
			www.hronksea.com	PERMIT SET			
					Revision/Submission nu	umber with a triangle indicates changes made	e on this sheet

![](_page_22_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_3.jpeg)

REVISIONS/SUBMISSIONS Date			/Submission number with a triangle indicates changes made on this sheet
S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S			Revision/S
CARO.	JOHN WILLING		SET
NORTH STATE			PERMIT
Reviewed: MCB Scale: 1"=150' Date:	11-15-2103 ngton Street 2, N.C. 28801	-828-232-4700 228-232-1331	rooksea.com
Designed: JHK Drawn: DJD Checked:	JHK 17 Arli Ashevill	Phone: 1 Fav: 1-5	d www
	ENGINERING ASSOCIATES	Planning • Engineering • Surveying	Environmental Services
GGINS FARM ER PLANS	NORTH CAROLINA		
OLD CO( MAST	BUNCOMBE COUNTY		R PLAN
<sup>-</sup> roject No: <b>395313</b>	MP-1.1	)rawing Title:	MASTE

300

AUG. 2020

450

REMAINDER OF DEVELOPMENT: AUG. 2015

150

![](_page_24_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

DEVELOPMENT NOTES OWNER / DEVELOPER DAVID CASE 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 ENGINEER JOHN KINNAIRD, PE BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700 SURVEYOR PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700			
OWNER / DEVELOPER DAVID CASE 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 ENGINEER JOHN KINNAIRD, PE BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700 SURVEYOR PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700	_	DEVELOPMENT N	OTES
ENGINEER JOHN KINNAIRD, PE BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700 SURVEYOR PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700		OWNER / DEVELOPER	DAVID CASE 54 BARTLETT STREET ASHEVILLE, NC 28801
SURVEYOR PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700		ENGINEER	JOHN KINNAIRD, PE BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700
		SURVEYOR	PAUL SEXTON, PE RLS BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, PA ASHEVILLE, NC 28801 828–232–4700
			A
0 150 300 450		0 150	300 450

		Designed: Reviewed:	- 「「「丁丁丁」」」」」」、	No. REVISIONS/SUBMISSI	VS Date
OLD COGGINS FARM		JHK MUCB Drawn: Scale:	ENGINEERIA		
MASTER PLANS		DJD 1"=150" Checked: Date:	NORTH SS NORTH		
		JHK 11-15-2103			
	ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES	17 Arlington Street	Contraction of the second seco		
UNCOMBE COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA		Asheville, N.C. 28801	A C-3V C-3V C-3V C-10V C		
	Diamina - Engineering - Puntating	Phone: 1-828-232-4700	)		
		Fax: 1-828-232-1331			
DED MASTER PLAN	<ul> <li>Environmental Services •</li> </ul>	www.brooksea.com	PERMIT SET	Revision/Submission number with a triangle indica	s changes made on this sheet

![](_page_26_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_3.jpeg)

	BEGIN:	END:
PHASE 1:	APRIL 2014	NOV. 2014
MIXED USE PARCEL:	AUG. 2014	AUG. 2015
MULTIFAMILY #1:	AUG. 2014	AUG. 2015
REMAINDER OF DEVELOPMENT:	AUG. 2015	AUG. 2020
0 150	300	450

![](_page_26_Figure_5.jpeg)

## ATTACHMENT B

Buncombe County Planning Board Meeting Recommended Staff Conditions **SUB2013-00371 and SUB 2013-000372** 12/16/2013 Old Coggins Farm Subdivision (Master Plan and Phase 1)

### SUB2013-00372 MASTER PLAN

No proposed staff conditions for the master plan.

### SUB2013-00371 Phase 1

If approved by the Buncombe County Planning Board, the applicant shall provide the following information on a revised set of plans (if necessary) submitted to the Buncombe County Department of Planning and Development:

- Indicate areas designated as high hazard or moderate hazard on the Buncombe County Slope Stability Index Map prepared by the North Carolina Geological Survey on the submitted slope analysis.
- 2. Indicate the approximation of wooded and open areas prior to development on the submitted plans.
- 3. Indicate the existing use of the land within and abutting the subdivision.
- 4. Indicate on the submitted plans that the 4.7% of road corridor width which is over 90 feet does not exceed 135 feet. Indicate corridor height meet the standards within the Buncombe County Land Development and Subdivision Ordinance.
- 5. Provide proof of approval of road names and addresses from E-911 Addressing.
- 6. Provide a written statement from the Buncombe County Erosion Control Officer stating that an Erosion Control Plan has been submitted and approved for the project. *No grading shall occur on the site until an approved Buncombe County Erosion Control permit is obtained.*
- 7. Provide a written statement from the Buncombe Stormwater Ordinance Administrator stating that a Stormwater Plan has been submitted and approved for the project. *No grading shall occur on the site until an approved Buncombe County Stormwater Control permit is obtained.*
- 8. Provide a copy of the approved North Carolina Department of Transportation driveway permit.
- 9. Indicate areas of road construction in excess of 30 percent natural slope and for all areas designated as High Hazard or Moderate Hazard on the

Buncombe County Slope Stability Index Map prepared by the North Carolina Geological Survey, and an investigation for colluvial deposits shall be made or indicate that no such areas exist on the submitted plan.

- 10.Provide proof of approval of system design for City of Asheville water lines. Proof of acceptance of the water lines into the City of Asheville's water system will be required prior to recordation of a final plat or release of a financial guarantee.
- 11.Provide proof of approval of system design from the Metropolitan Sewerage District. Proof of acceptance of the sewer lines into the Metropolitan Sewerage District sewage system will be required prior to recordation of a final plat or release of a financial guarantee.
- 12. Indicate the following on the submitted plans, or that no provisions have been made:
  - a. Provisions for electrical and telephone services;
  - b. Provisions for cable television service, if applicable; and
  - c. Provision of natural gas lines; if applicable.
- 13.Provide proof of approval of Planned Unit Development from Buncombe County Board of Adjustment.
- 14. Show location of private driveways for each individual lot.

![](_page_29_Picture_0.jpeg)

# TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

ATTACHMENT (

For

# **OLD COGGINS FARM**

LOCATED IN BUNCOMBE COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA

Prepared For: Brooks Engineering Associates 17 Arlington Street Asheville, North Carolina 28801

Prepared By: J. M. Teague Engineering, PLLC 525 North Main Street Waynesville, North Carolina 28786

December 2013

*JMT Project 0248 Client 0164-1-07-0248* 

### **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

This report summarizes the findings of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) that was performed for the Old Coggins Farm development proposed in Buncombe County, North Carolina on Old Farm School Road (SR 2408) just west of Warren Wilson College. The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of the anticipated traffic associated with this development including trip generation, trip distribution, intersection delay, vehicle queue, and intersection capacity. Each of these aspects will be analyzed to determine any potential adverse traffic impacts on the adjacent roadway network from the proposed development. (*Figure 1*)

![](_page_30_Picture_4.jpeg)

FIGURE 1 – SITE LOCATION

### **PROPOSED SITE USE AND ACCESS**

The site plan consists of mixed-use development on roughly 169-acres containing residential, commercial, and institutional land uses. The development is comprised of 262 single-family dwelling units, 120 condo/townhome dwelling units, a 22,000 square-foot school with around 250 students, and 50,000 square feet of mixed use commercial development. The 50,000 square feet of mixed use commercial development is proposed to contain a restaurant (3,000 square-feet), small retail (5,000 square-feet), and general office space making up the rest (42,000 square-feet). The proposed site will have one primary full access point onto Old Farm School Road and tie-in at the existing Sunnybrook Drive. (*Figure 2*)

![](_page_31_Figure_4.jpeg)

(SITE PLAN PROVIDED BY BROOKS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES)

### PARAMETERS AND STUDY AREA

As determined through discussions with North Carolina Department of Transportation officials and engineering judgment, the study area of this TIA includes:

- Old Farm School Road (SR 2408) @ Lower Grassy Branch Road (SR 2403)
- Old Farm School Road @ Riceville Road (SR 2002)
- Riceville Road @ Warren Wilson Road (SR 2416)
- Site @ Old Farm School Road

Peak period turning movement counts were obtained at the study intersections - AM Peak Period (7:00 - 9:00 AM) and PM Peak Period (4:00 - 6:00 PM). AM and PM peak hours for each intersection were analyzed for existing traffic conditions, background traffic conditions at full build-out, and full build-out traffic conditions (2020).

The AM and PM peak hours for each intersection are as follows:

- Old Farm School Road @ Lower Grassy Branch Road
  - AM Peak Hour 7:30 AM 8:30 AM
  - PM Peak Hour 5:00 PM 6:00 PM
- Old Farm School Road @ Riceville Road
  - $\circ$  AM Peak Hour 7:30 AM 8:30 AM
  - PM Peak Hour 4:30 PM 5:30 PM
- Riceville Road @ Warren Wilson Road
  - AM Peak Hour 7:45 AM 8:45 AM
  - PM Peak Hour 4:45 PM 5:45 PM

Other parameters include:

- Assumed 2% annual growth for Background traffic
  - NCDOT approved growth factor
- Peak Hour Factor of 0.90 for projected conditions
- When applicable, internal capture rate is capped at 15%

### SURROUNDING LAND USES

The proposed site is located in Buncombe County, NC northwest of the City of Asheville, NC near Warren Wilson College. Warren Wilson College is a private four-year college that requires each student to work an on-campus job and acquire a pre-determined number of hours of community service over the four years. Residential areas are located adjacent to the west, north, and south of the proposed development.

### **SURROUNDING ROADWAYS**

The proposed study area includes intersections and roadway segments on the following facilities: Old Farm School Road, Lower Grassy Branch Road, Riceville Road, and Warren Wilson Road.

Old Farm School Road is a two-lane east-west road that connects Lower Grassy Branch Road to Riceville Road. There is no posted speed limit on Old Farm School Road but there are advisory speed signs posted alongside various warning signs at several locations along the road stating a recommended speed of 25 mph. The road consists of two 10-foot wide lanes within the vicinity of the proposed development. There are multiple "No Parking Any Time" signs located along Old Farm School Road due to a nearby trail system.

Lower Grassy Branch Road is a two-lane roadway that connects US 70 to Riceville Road. The posted speed limit is 35 mph and the road consists of two 9-feet wide lanes. Lower Grassy Branch Road has multiple horizontal and vertical curves along the entirety of the road.

Riceville Road is a two-lane north-south road that connects US 70 to Warren Wilson Road by way of a loop from Warren Wilson Road north and then back south to US 70. The posted speed limit is 35 mph and the road consists of two 10-feet wide lanes. The northern section of Riceville Road provides access to US 70 for the residential areas surrounding the proposed development. The southern section provides access to Warren Wilson College and also to US 70 via Warren Wilson Road.

Warren Wilson Road is a two-lane north south road that connects US 70 to Warren Wilson College. Riceville Road intersects Warren Wilson Road near Warren Wilson College. The posted speed limit is 35 mph and the road consists of 11-feet wide lanes. At this intersection, South Lane connects directly across from Riceville Road and leads directly into the Warren Wilson College campus.

## **EXISTING TRAFFIC**

Turning movement counts were conducted during the AM Peak Period (7:00AM – 9:00AM) and during the PM Peak Period (4:00PM – 6:00PM) at the intersections of: Old Farm School Road @ Lower Grassy Branch Road, Old Farm School Road @ Riceville Road, and Riceville Road @ Warren Wilson Road. The AM and PM peak hours were identified and the existing peak hour volumes are shown in *Figure 4*. The complete turning movement counts can be found in *Appendix A*.

![](_page_35_Figure_2.jpeg)

FIGURE 3 – EXISTING AM AND PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC
#### **BACKGROUND TRAFFIC**

Background traffic is defined as the traffic that would be at the studied intersections at the time or anticipated project completion (build-out), without the proposed development. Background traffic is comprised of existing traffic and any increase or decrease in volumes which might occur from general growth trends in the surrounding area or from nearby specific developments. Although there are several methods in determining the background traffic and the corresponding growth rate, the generally accepted method is to use 2% annual growth unless other information is available. NCDOT officials confirmed the use of a 2% growth factor for the roadway network surrounding the proposed development. The anticipated project completion year (build out) is 2020. The anticipated background traffic is shown in *Figure 5*.



FIGURE 4 – BACKGROUND AM AND PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC

#### TRIP DISTRIBUTION

The trip distribution for this development was estimated from the existing traffic volume patterns within the surrounding roadway network, the surrounding population densities, the location of the proposed development, and engineering judgment. The trip distribution percentages are shown in *Figure 5*.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF PASS-BY TRIPS**

The method of determining pass-by trips was also obtained from the ITE Trip Generation Manual. Pass-by trips are a subset of trip generation that applies to commercial / retail developments. They are defined as trips to and from the site that occur from vehicles that are *already* on the studied roadway for other purposes. A pass-by trip percentage reduction of 43% (ITE recommended reduction) was assumed for the restaurant portion of this development. The reduction calculations can be seen in *Table 1* below.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF INTERNAL TRIP CAPTURE**

The ITE definition of "mixed-use development" requires that some trips between on-site land uses to be made without travel on the off-site street system. As a result, it is important to know for a mixed-use development how much of the trip generation uses the public street system to reach off-site destinations and how much stays within the development without using external roads. This is the premise behind determining internal trip capture—the portion of trips that stay totally within the development. These trips, which have both ends (origin and destination) within the site, are known as internal trips. Also of concern in the site planning process is the internal trip capture rate, which is the percentage of trips that remain internal to the site. For this development, an internal trip capture rate of 15% was applied to the restaurant and retail land uses. The reduction calculations can be seen in *Table 1* below.

#### **TRIP GENERATION**

The trip generation data was compiled from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition and engineering judgment. The studied land use and the associated typical weekday trip generation spreadsheet and calculations are shown in *Table 1*.

**For Land Use Code 210 (Single-Family Housing)**, the "equation" method was used in lieu of the "rate" method, in accordance with NCDOT guidelines. The ITE equation for the trip generation is:

T = 0.7(x) + 9.74 where T= number of daily trips and x = number of dwelling units (AM Peak) LN(T) = 0.9LN(x) + 0.51 where T= number of daily trips and x = number of dwelling units (PM Peak)

**For Land Use Code 230 (Residential Condo/Townhome)**, the "equation" method was used in lieu of the "rate" method, in accordance with NCDOT guidelines. The ITE equation for the trip generation is:

LN(T) = 0.8LN(x) + 0.26 where T= number of daily trips and x = number of dwelling units (AM Peak) LN(T) = 0.82LN(x) + 0.32 where T= number of daily trips and x = number of dwelling units (PM Peak)

For Land Use Code 520 (Elementary School), the "rate" method was used in lieu of the "equation" method, in accordance with NCDOT guidelines. The proposed school will be comprised of 250 students and around 22,000 square feet.

**For Land Use Code 932 (High Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant)**, the "rate" method was used in lieu of the "equation" method, in accordance with NCDOT guidelines. The proposed restaurant will be comprised of roughly 3,000 square feet.

**For Land Use Code 230 (Specialty Retail Center)**, the "equation" method was used in lieu of the "rate" method, in accordance with NCDOT guidelines. It should be noted that this land use code assumes no site trips within the AM peak hour and hence there is not an equation for the AM peak hour. The equation for the trip generation is:

T = 2.4(x) + 21.48 where T = number of daily trips and x = 1000 square feet gross floor area. (PM Peak)

**For Land Use Code 710 (General Office)**, the "equation" method was used in lieu of the "rate" method, in accordance with NCDOT guidelines. The ITE equation for the trip generation is:

LN(T) = 0.8LN(x) + 1.55 where T= number of daily trips and x = 1000 square feet gross floor area (AM Peak) T = 1.12 (x) + 78.81 where T= number of daily trips and x = 1000 square feet gross floor area (PM Peak)

Trip assignments were distributed using the percentages found in *Figure 5* and shown as AM and PM Peak Hour ingress and egress site generated trips in *Figure 6*. *Appendix B* contains the corresponding trip generation data from the ITE Trip Generation Software by Microtrans.

				AM	Peak	PM	PM Peak	
Land Use (ITE Code)	Size	Unit	(vpd)	(vr	oh)	( <b>v</b>	ph)	
	L	<u> </u>	('P~)	IN	OUT	IN	OUT	
Single Family Residential (210)	262	Dwelling Units	2,522	48	145	158	93	
Anticipated Total Site Trips			2,522	48	145	158	93	
Total Peak Hour Pass-By Trips				0	0	0	0	
Total Peak Hour Internal Capture Trip	S			0	0	0	0	
Total Peak Ho	our Volur	ne for LUC 210		48	145	158	93	
Residential Condo/Townhouse (230)	120	Dwelling Units	754	10	50	47	23	
Anticipated Total Site Trips			754	10	50	47	23	
Total Peak Hour Pass-By Trips				0	0	0	0	
Total Peak Hour Internal Capture Trip	s			0	0	0	0	
Total Peak Ho	our Volur	ne for LUC 230		10	50	47	23	
Elementary School (520)	250	Students	323	63	50	18	20	
Anticipated Total Site Trips	Anticipated Total Site Trips					18	20	
Total Peak Hour Pass-By Trips				0	0	0	0	
Total Peak Hour Internal Capture Trip	S			0	0	0	0	
Total Peak Ho	our Volur	ne for LUC 520		63	50	18	20	
Restaurant (932)	3,000	SF	381	18	17	20	14	
Anticipated Total Site Trips			381	18	17	20	14	
Total Peak Hour Pass-By Trips (43%)	Reductio	n – PM Peak)		0	0	(9)	(6)	
Total Peak Hour Internal Capture Trip	s (15% J	Reduction)		(3)	(2)	(3)	(2)	
Total Peak He	our Volur	ne for LUC 932		15	15	8	6	
Specialty Retail (814)	5,000	SF	222	0	0	15	19	
Anticipated Total Site Trips			222	0	0	15	19	
Total Peak Hour Pass-By Trips				0	0	0	0	
Total Peak Hour Internal Capture Trip	s (15% R	eduction)		0	0	(2)	(3)	
Total Peak Ho	our Volur	ne for LUC 814		0	0	13	16	
General Office (710)	42,000	SF	684	82	11	21	104	
Anticipated Total Site Trips			684	82	11	21	104	
Total Peak Hour Pass-By Trips		0	0	0	0			
Total Peak Hour Internal Capture Trip		0	0	0	0			
Total Peak Ho	our Volur	ne for LUC 710		82	11	21	104	
TOTAL PEAK HOUR VOLUME FOR ROA	ADWAY I	NETWORK		218	271	265	262	

TABLE 1 – TYPICAL TRIP GENERATION

#### **BUILD-OUT TRAFFIC**

Build-out traffic is defined as the total traffic volume that will be present on the surrounding roadway network at the time of project completion and full occupancy. This time is assumed to be 2020. Build-out traffic was calculated by adding the background traffic and site traffic. *Figure 7* shows the anticipated build-out AM & PM Peak Hour traffic.



FIGURE 5 – TRIP DISTRIBUTION AM AND PM PEAK HOUR



FIGURE 6 – ANTICIPATED AM AND PM PEAK HOUR SITE GENERATED TRIPS



FIGURE 7 – BUILD-OUT AM AND PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC

#### METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The studied intersections were analyzed using Synchro. Synchro is a specialized software package that allows the user to model intersections and roadway networks to determine levels of service (LOS), based on the thresholds specified in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) published by the Transportation Research Board. Synchro also provides analysis of capacity, vehicle delay, volume to capacity ratio (v/c), queue lengths, traffic signal timing, and vehicle flow rate.

The HCM defines capacity as "the maximum hourly rate at which persons or vehicles can reasonably be expected to traverse a point during a given time period under prevailing roadway, traffic, and control conditions". LOS is a term used to represent different driving conditions, primarily with respect to traffic congestion. It is defined as a "qualitative measure describing operational and perceptional conditions within a traffic stream". LOS "A" represents free flow traffic conditions with no congestion. LOS "F" represents severely impacted traffic flow due to vehicle congestion. LOS is generally determined by the total "Control Delay" experienced by drivers. Control delay is vehicle delay that is ultimately caused by the traffic control device. This includes deceleration delay, queue move-up time delay, stopped delay, and acceleration delay. (*Table 2*)

UN-SIGNALIZED	INTERSECTION	SIGNALIZED I	NTERSECTION
Level of Service	AVERAGE CONTROL DELAY PER VEHICLE (Seconds)	Level of Service	AVERAGE CONTROL DELAY PER VEHICLE (Seconds)
Α	0-10	Α	0-10
В	10-15	В	10-20
С	15-25	С	20-35
D	25-35	D	35-55
E	35-50	35-50 E	
F	> 50	>50 F	

#### HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL LEVEL OF SERVICE AND DELAY

<Table 2>

Usually, at a signalized intersection LOS "D" is considered the lowest acceptable LOS. However, it is not unusual for a side street or private driveway at an un-signalized intersection to experience LOS "F" during a peak hour. The analysis for un-signalized intersections can project very high delays on the side street, thus it is recommended to use LOS measurements as a comparative tool rather than a design tool. The volume to capacity ratio can sometimes be an indication of roadway LOS. (*Table 3*)

LEVEL OF SERVICE	V/C Ratio	PERCENT OF FREE FLOW SPEED (PEAK HOUR)
Α	0.50 AND BELOW	90% OR GREATER
В	0.60 то 0.69	70% то 90%
С	0.70 то 0.79	50%
D	0.80 то 0.89	40%
E	0.90 то 0.99	33%
F	1.00 and Above	25% or less

<Table 3>

It can be seen as the v/c ratio approaches 1.0 (the point where volume equals capacity), the LOS deteriorates dramatically.

The 95<sup>th</sup> Queue is defined to be the vehicle queue (back-up) that has only a 5% probability of being exceeded during the analysis period. At un-signalized intersections, p0 is the probability of a queue free state.

#### **ANALYSIS OF EXISTING CONDITIONS**

In order to estimate the existing LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue at the study intersections, the existing traffic volumes from the AM & PM peak hours were analyzed using existing lane configurations and traffic control conditions. (*Tables 3 – 5*) The capacity analysis (Synchro Reports) for the existing conditions can be found in *Appendix C*. The estimated delay was field verified and found to generally coincide with the Synchro calculations.

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ LOWER GRASSY BRANCH ROAD ANALYSIS OF EXISTING AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAK HOU	R	<b>PM PEAK HOUR</b>			
APPROACH	Queue Free	LOS and	V/C	Queue Free	LOS and	V/C	
	(percent)	Delay (sec)	Ratio	(percent)	Delay (sec)	Ratio	
Westbound	92	A 9.7	0.08	90	A 10.0	0.10	
Northbound	100	A 0.0	0.05	100	A 0.0	0.09	
Southbound	100	A 0.3	0.00	99	A 1.1	0.01	

#### <Table 3>

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ RICEVILLE ROAD ANALYSIS OF EXISTING AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAK HOU	R	PM PEAK HOUR			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	
Eastbound	93	B 10.8	0.09	90	B 11.0	0.11	
Northbound	99	A 1.2	0.01	97	A 1.6	0.03	
Southbound	100	A 0.0	0.14	100	A 0.0	0.09	

<Table 4>

#### RICEVILLE ROAD @ WARREN WILSON ROAD ANALYSIS OF EXISTING AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAK HOU	R	PM PEAK HOUR		
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio
Eastbound	76	C 15.5	0.37	87	B 13.5	0.23
Westbound	96	B 14.9	0.06	92	C 16.1	0.12
Northbound	93	A 3.1	0.07	92	A 3.4	0.08
Southbound	99	A 0.3	0.01	99	A 0.3	0.01

#### <Table 5>

#### **ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS**

In order to estimate the background LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue at the study intersections, the background traffic volumes from the AM & PM peak hours were analyzed using existing lane configurations and traffic control conditions. (*Tables* 6 - 8) Please note that a peak hour factor of 0.90 is typically used for any projected traffic volumes to simulate consistent traffic flow over the peak hour period. There may be some instances when background conditions appear to operate more efficiently than existing conditions. This is due to the assumed value of 0.90 being different than field measured peak hour factors. The capacity analysis (Synchro Reports) for the background conditions can be found in *Appendix C*.

		PEAK HOU	R	PM PEAK HOUR			
APPROACH	Queue Free	LOS and	V/C	Queue Free	LOS and	V/C	
	(percent)	Delay (sec)	Ratio	(percent)	Delay (sec)	Ratio	
Westbound	93	A 9.6	0.07	92	A 9.9	0.08	
Northbound	100	A 0.0	0.05	100	A 0.0	0.09	
Southbound	100	A 0.2	0.00	100	A 0.8	0.00	

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ LOWER GRASSY BRANCH ROAD ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ RICEVILLE ROAD ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAF	K HOU	UR PM PEAK HOUR				R
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	LO Dela	S and y (sec)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	LO Dela	S and y (sec)	V/C Ratio
Eastbound	96	В	10.3	0.06	92	В	10.7	0.10
Northbound	99	Α	0.8	0.01	98	A	1.2	0.02
Southbound	100	A	0.0	0.13	100	A	0.0	0.09

<Table 7>

#### RICEVILLE ROAD @ WARREN WILSON ROAD ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAK HOU	OUR PM PEAK HOUR			
APPROACH	Queue Free	LOS and	V/C	Queue Free	LOS and	V/C
	(percent)	Delay (sec)	Ratio	(percent)	Delay (sec)	Ratio
Eastbound	94	B 13.6	0.31	85	B 14.1	0.25
Westbound	98	C 15.3	0.03	92	C 17.5	0.11
Northbound	93	A 3.5	0.07	90	A 3.9	0.10
Southbound	100	A 0.1	0.00	100	A 0.2	0.00

<Table 8>

#### ANALYSIS OF BUILD-OUT TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

In order to estimate the build-out LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue at the study intersections, the build-out traffic volumes from the AM & PM peak hours were analyzed using existing lane configurations and traffic control conditions. (*Tables* 9 - 12) The capacity analysis, (Synchro Reports), for the build-out conditions can be found in *Appendix C*.

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ LOWER GRASSY BRANCH ROAD ANALYSIS OF BUILD-OUT AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAK HOU	R	PM PEAK HOUR			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	
Westbound	74	B 11.4	0.27	72	B 12.1	0.29	
Northbound	100	A 0.0	0.11	100	A 0.0	0.17	
Southbound	99	A 0.8	0.01	99	A 1.8	0.01	

<Table 9>

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ RICEVILLE ROAD ANALYSIS OF BUILD-OUT AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAK HOU	R	PM PEAK HOUR			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	
Eastbound	88	B 12.5	0.29	81	B 13.5	0.34	
Northbound	92	A 4.1	0.08	90	A 4.2	0.10	
Southbound	100	A 0.0	0.14	100	A 0.0	0.11	

*<Table 10>* 

#### RICEVILLE ROAD @ WARREN WILSON ROAD ANALYSIS OF BUILD-OUT AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAK HOU	UR PM PEAK HOUR			R
APPROACH	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio
Eastbound	66	C 22.9	0.61	65	C 24.1	0.58
Westbound	95	C 18.9	0.09	88	C 23.8	0.20
Northbound	89	A 4.5	0.11	87	A 4.6	0.13
Southbound	100	A 0.1	0.00	100	A 0.2	0.00

*<Table 11>* 

#### PROPOSED SITE ACCESS @ OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD ANALYSIS OF BUILD-OUT AM/PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	AM	PEAK HOU	R	PM PEAK HOUR			
APPROACH	Queue Free	LOS and	V/C	Queue Free	LOS and	V/C	
	(percent)	Delay (sec)	Ratio	(percent)	Delay (sec)	Ratio	
Eastbound	91	A 5.7	0.09	89	A 5.7	0.11	
Westbound	100	A 0.1	0.00	100	A 0.2	0.00	
Northbound	98	B 12.1	0.03	99	B 13.1	0.02	
Southbound	70	C 15.2	0.46	64	C 18.0	0.53	

*<Table 12>* 

#### **COMPARISON OF BACKGROUND VS. BUILD-OUT CONDITIONS**

A comparison of the background and build-out LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue at the study intersections are shown in *Tables 13-18*.

### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ LOWER GRASSY BRANCH ROAD COMPARISON OF BACKGROUND AND BUILD-OUT AM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	BAG	CKGROUND		BUILD-OUT			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	AM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	AM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	
Westbound	93	A 9.6	0.07	74	B 11.4	0.27	
Northbound	100	A 0.0	0.05	100	A 0.0	0.11	
Southbound	100	A 0.2	0.00	99	A 0.8	0.01	

<Table 13>

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ LOWER GRASSY BRANCH ROAD COMPARISON OF BACKGROUND AND BUILD-OUT **PM** PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	BAC	CKGROUND		BUILD-OUT			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	PM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	PM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	
Westbound	92	A 9.9	0.08	72	B 12.1	0.29	
Northbound Left	100	A 0.0	0.09	100	A 0.0	0.17	
Northbound Right	100	A 0.8	0.00	99	A 1.8	0.01	

*<Table 14>* 

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ RICEVILLE ROAD COMPARISON OF BACKGROUND AND BUILD-OUT AM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	BACKGROUND				BUILD-OUT			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	AM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)		V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent) AM Peak Hour LO & Delay (s		l Peak 1r LOS elay (s)	V/C Ratio
Eastbound	96	В	10.3	0.06	88	В	12.5	0.29
Northbound	99	Α	0.8	0.01	92	A	4.1	0.08
Southbound	100	Α	0.0	0.13	100	A	0.0	0.14

#### <Table 15>

#### OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD @ RICEVILLE ROAD

#### COMPARISON OF BACKGROUND AND BUILD-OUT PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	BAG	CKGROUND		BUILD-OUT			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	PM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	PM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	
Eastbound	92	B 10.7	0.10	81	B 13.5	0.34	
Northbound	98	A 1.2	0.02	90	A 4.2	0.10	
Southbound	100	A 0.0	0.09	100	A 0.0	0.11	

<Table 16>

#### RICEVILLE ROAD @ WARREN WILSON ROAD COMPARISON OF BACKGROUND AND BUILD-OUT AM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	BAG	CKGROUND		BUILD-OUT			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	AM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	AM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	
Eastbound	94	B 13.6	0.31	66	C 22.9	0.61	
Westbound	98	C 15.3	0.03	95	C 18.9	0.09	
Northbound	93	A 3.5	0.07	81	B 11.6	0.18	
Southbound	100	A 0.1	0.00	100	A 0.1	0.00	

*<Table 17>* 

#### **RICEVILLE ROAD @ WARREN WILSON ROAD**

#### COMPARISON OF BACKGROUND AND BUILD-OUT PM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	BAG	CKGROUND		<b>BUILD-OUT</b>			
Approach	Queue Free (percent)	PM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	Queue Free (percent)	PM Peak Hour LOS & Delay (s)	V/C Ratio	
Eastbound	85	B 14.1	0.25	65	C 24.1	0.58	
Westbound	92	C 17.5	0.11	88	C 23.8	0.20	
Northbound	90	A 3.9	0.10	87	B 13.0	0.23	
Southbound	100	A 0.2	0.00	100	A 0.2	0.00	

<Table 18>

#### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### Old Farm School Road @ Lower Grassy Branch Road:

As can be seen in *Tables 13 and 14*, the difference in LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue between normal background traffic growth and the anticipated trips generated by the project is only minimally increased. Even though the LOS for the westbound approach drops from a LOS A to LOS B during the AM and PM peak hours, the difference in delay is within the tolerance level expected for an un-signalized intersection. During the AM peak hour, the delay is increased by 1.8 seconds – 9.6 seconds (LOS A) to 11.4 seconds (LOS B). During the PM peak hour, the delay is only increased by 2.2 seconds – 9.9 seconds (LOS A) to 12.1 seconds (LOS B).

The resulting LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue are within acceptable levels and no changes are recommended at this intersection to accommodate traffic generated by the site. The addition of site generated traffic is not anticipated to degrade general roadway or driver safety at this intersection.

#### Old Farm School Road @ Riceville Road:

As can be seen in *Tables 15 and 16*, the difference in LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue between normal background traffic growth and the anticipated trips generated by the project is only minimally increased. During the AM peak hour, the delay is increased by 2.2 seconds – 10.3 seconds (LOS B) to 12.5 seconds (LOS B). During the PM peak hour, the delay is only increased by 2.8 seconds – 10.7 seconds (LOS B) to 13.5 seconds (LOS B). The difference in delay is within the tolerance level expected for an un-signalized intersection.

The resulting LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue are within acceptable levels and no changes are recommended at this intersection to accommodate traffic generated by the site. The addition of site generated traffic is not anticipated to degrade general roadway or driver safety at this intersection.

#### Riceville Road @ Warren Wilson Road:

As can be seen in *Tables 17 and 18*, the difference in LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue between normal background traffic growth and the anticipated trips generated by the project is only minimally increased. The resulting LOS, delay, and v/c ratio are within acceptable levels. Even though the LOS for the eastbound approach drops from a LOS B to LOS C during both the AM and PM peak hours, the difference in delay is within the tolerance level expected for an un-signalized intersection.

During the AM peak hour, the delay is only increased by 9.3 seconds – 13.6 seconds (LOS B) to 22.9 seconds (LOS C). During the PM peak hour, the delay is only increased by 10.0 seconds – 14.1 seconds (LOS B) to 24.1 seconds (LOS C).

Both during the AM and PM peak hours, the northbound approach, particularly the left turn movement, drops from a LOS A to B. Due to the low opposing traffic volumes, no mitigation should be required for this movement.

No changes are recommended at this intersection to accommodate traffic generated by the site. The addition of site generated traffic is not anticipated to degrade general roadway or driver safety at this intersection.

#### Proposed Site Access @ Old Farm School Road:

As can be seen in *Table 12*, the resulting LOS, delay, v/c ratio, and queue are within acceptable levels for the proposed site access @ Old Farm School Road. During both the AM and PM peak hours, the southbound approach (proposed site access) is anticipated to operate at a LOS C. Even though a LOS C is acceptable for an un-signalized intersection, special consideration should be given to the design of the southbound approach as a two-lane egress geometry.

As proposed, the site access approach is designed as a single-lane, full access intersection. If this approach was redesigned to include a right-turn lane and a "through and left-turn lane", vehicles turning right onto Old Farm School Road would not need to queue in order to wait for through or left turning vehicles to make their movement. As can be seen in *Tables 19 & 20* below, providing a right-turn lane reduces the intersection delay for the southbound approach and reduces the overall queue within the development.

#### PROPOSED SITE ACCESS @ OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD COMPARISON OF SINGLE-LANE ACCESS AND RIGHT-TURN LANE ACCESS AM PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	SINGLE	LANE ACC	CESS	RIGHT-TURN LANE			
APPROACH	95 <sup>th</sup> queue Length (feet)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	95 <sup>th</sup> queue Length (feet)	LOS and Delay (sec)	V/C Ratio	
Eastbound	7	A 5.7	0.09	7	A 5.7	0.09	
Westbound	0	A 0.1	0.00	0	A 0.1	0.00	
Northbound	2	B 12.1	0.03	2	B 11.6	0.03	
Southbound	61	C 15.2	0.46	32	B 12.5	0.30	

#### *<Table 12>*

#### PROPOSED SITE ACCESS @ OLD FARM SCHOOL ROAD COMPARISON OF SINGLE-LANE ACCESS AND RIGHT-TURN LANE ACCESS **PM** PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

	SINGLE LANE ACCESS				RIGHT-TURN LANE			
Approach	95 <sup>th</sup> queue Length (feet)	LOS and Delay (sec)		V/C Ratio	95 <sup>th</sup> queue Length (feet)	ue LOS and Delay (sec)		V/C Ratio
Eastbound	9	A	5.5	0.11	9	А	5.7	0.11
Westbound	0	Α	0.2	0.00	0	А	0.2	0.00
Northbound	1	В	13.0	0.02	1	В	12.7	0.02
Southbound	71	C	17.6	0.51	41	В	14.1	0.36

#### *<Table 12>*

Although the westbound and eastbound approaches operate adequately at site build-out, vehicles anticipated to turn left or right into the site from Old Farm School Road are quite heavy, especially when compared to having no vehicles making this movement during background conditions.

The NCDOT Policy on Street and Driveway Access to North Carolina Highways (*Driveway Manual*) addresses this situation and requires turning lanes once turning volumes reach certain levels. Figure 7

(Build-Out AM and PM Peak) show 107 vehicles making a left turn into the site during the AM Peak period and 134 vehicles making the same movement during the PM peak period. Based on these left turn volumes, and according to the Driveway Manual, a left turn lane with 100 feet storage is required. Figure 7 also shows 109 vehicles making a right turn into the site during the AM Peak period and 138 vehicles making the same movement during the PM peak period. Based on these right turn volumes, and according to the Driveway Manual, a right turn lane with 100 feet storage is required.

NCDOT has indicated that construction of these auxiliary turning lanes should contain a lane width similar to the existing travel lanes on Old Farm School Road. Turn lane design and construction, corresponding taper length, traffic control plans, and pavement marking plans should also be consistent with methodology found in the NCDOT Roadway Standard Drawings and Standard Specifications.

## Appendix A

**TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS** 

## Appendix B

**TRIP GENERATION WORKSHEET** 

# Appendix C

**INTERSECTION ANALYSIS REPORTS** 



#### BUNCOMBE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REZONING ANALYSIS

CASE NUMBER PROPOSED ZONING CHANGE LOCATION PIN ACREAGE : ZPH2013-00051 : R-2 to PS : 88 Old Coggins Place : 9679.15.1760 : approximately 106.8 acres of a 169.10 acre tract

**APPLICANT/OWNER:** 

CRAIG COGGINS 65 TOWN MOUNTAIN ROAD ASHEVILLE NC 28801

#### DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

<u>BOARD CONSIDERATIONS</u>: The Board must determine if there is a reasonable basis for the requested change. An applicant's showing of reasonableness must address the totality of the circumstances and must demonstrate that the change is reasonable in light of its effect on all involved. <u>Good Neighbors of South Davidson v. Town of Denton</u>, 355 N.C. 254, 559 S.E.2d 768 (2002). Determination must be, the "product of a complex of factors." <u>Chrismon v. Guilford County</u>, 322 N.C. 611, 370 S.E.2d 579 (1988). Among the factors relevant to this analysis are the size of the tract in question; the compatibility of the disputed zoning action with an existing comprehensive zoning plan; the benefits and detriments resulting from the zoning action for the owner of the newly zoned property, his neighbors, and the surrounding community; and the relationship between the uses envisioned under the new zoning and the uses currently present in adjacent tracts. <u>Id</u>.

REZONING ANALYSIS: The applicant requests the rezoning approximately 106.8 acres of a 169.10 acre tract from R-2 (Residential District) to PS (Public Service District). The subject property is located on the north side of Old Farm School Road, at the intersection of Old Farm School Road and Old Coggins Place. The tract is currently a working farm that contains a farm house and various other structures. The property is adjacent to the Warren Wilson College Campus, which is zoned PS. As the property is adjacent to property that contains an institutional use it would be appropriate to rezone the subject property to PS. Additionally, the west section of the subject property is proposed to be left R-2 to transition to existing residential uses.

The proposed map amendment is consistent with the Buncombe County Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Reasonable proximity to public utilities
- Majority of the property is outside slopes greater than 25%
- Property is outside of areas greater than 2500'
- Majority of property is outside of flood area

As the subject property is adjacent to an existing large institutional use (Warren Wilson College), it would be appropriate to zone the property PS. The proposed PS zoning would not be detrimental to the owner, adjacent neighbors, and surrounding community as it is consistent with the surrounding property. Therefore the Buncombe County Department of Planning and Development recommends **APPROVAL** of the request.

#### LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY STATEMENTS

CONSISTENT: The proposed map amendment is consistent with the Buncombe County Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Reasonable proximity to public utilities
- Majority of the property is outside slopes greater than 25%
- Property is outside of areas greater than 2500'
- Majority of property is outside of flood area

As the property is adjacent to a large institutional use (Warren Wilson College) the proposed map amendment is appropriate and is therefore reasonable and in the interest of the public.

NOT CONSISTENT: The map amendment is not consistent with the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Not completely outside of steep slope areas
- Not completely outside of flood area
- Does not have reasonable proximity to a major transportation corridor

As the property is adjacent to property zoned R-2 and R-1, the proposed map amendment would be detrimental to the owner, adjacent neighbors, and surrounding community as it is not consistent with the surrounding residentially zoned property. Therefore, the requested zoning would not be reasonable and in the interest of the public.





Ν

#### Craig Coggins Map Amendment





Created By: Buncombe County Planning Date: November 24, 2013





Planning Board Hearing Date: December 16, 2013

Created By: Buncombe County Planning Date: November 24, 2013



#### BUNCOMBE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REZONING ANALYSIS

CASE NUMBER PROPOSED ZONING CHANGE LOCATION PIN ACREAGE : ZPH2013-00045 : R-2 TO EMP : 32 Wiley Drive : 9722.81.7329 : 5.0 acres

APPLICANT/OWNER:

#### TIMOTHY DEWEESE 588 PINEY KNOB ROAD MARSHALL, NC 28753

#### DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: DENIAL

<u>BOARD CONSIDERATIONS</u>: The Board must determine if there is a reasonable basis for the requested change. An applicant's showing of reasonableness must address the totality of the circumstances and must demonstrate that the change is reasonable in light of its effect on all involved. <u>Good Neighbors of South Davidson v. Town of Denton</u>, 355 N.C. 254, 559 S.E.2d 768 (2002). Determination must be, the "product of a complex of factors." <u>Chrismon v. Guilford County</u>, 322 N.C. 611, 370 S.E.2d 579 (1988). Among the factors relevant to this analysis are the size of the tract in question; the compatibility of the disputed zoning action with an existing comprehensive zoning plan; the benefits and detriments resulting from the zoning action for the owner of the newly zoned property, his neighbors, and the surrounding community; and the relationship between the uses envisioned under the new zoning and the uses currently present in adjacent tracts. <u>Id</u>.

REZONING ANALYSIS: The applicant requests the rezoning of approximately 5.0 acres from R-2 (Residential District) to EMP (Employment District). The subject property is located at the end of Wiley Drive, which is located off of Old Marshall Highway. The tract is currently undeveloped. While a portion of the northern boundary of the tract is adjacent to property zoned EMP, which contains a quarry, the surrounding property is zoned R-1 and R-2. The subject property is surrounding on almost all sides by residentially zoned property that does not allow manufactured homes. A map amendment of EMP would not be appropriate, as it would not only allow numerous commercial and industrial uses but also allow manufactured housing.

The proposed map amendment to EMP, which allows commercial and industrial uses, would not be consistent with the Buncombe County Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Not within proximity of public utilities
- Not within proximity of transportation corridor
- Contains area of slope greater than 25%

The subject property is within a established residential area that does not allow manufactured homes, commercial, or industrial uses and the requested EMP zoning would not be appropriate. The proposed EMP zoning would be detrimental to the owner, adjacent neighbors, and surrounding community as it is not consistent with the surrounding property zoned for residential uses. Therefore the Buncombe County Department of Planning and Development recommends **DENIAL** of the request.

#### LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY STATEMENTS

NOT CONSISTENT: The map amendment is not consistent with the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Not within proximity of public utilities
- Not within proximity of transportation corridor
- Contains area of slope greater than 25%

As the property is adjacent to property zoned for residential uses, the proposed EMP zoning would be detrimental to the owner, adjacent neighbors, and surrounding community as it is not consistent with the surrounding residential property. Therefore, the requested zoning would not be reasonable and in the interest of the public.

CONSISTENT: The proposed map amendment is consistent with the Buncombe County Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Outside high elevations
- Outside of flood areas

As the property is adjacent to property zoned EMP, the proposed map amendment is appropriate and is therefore reasonable and in the interest of the public.



Case Number: ZPH2013-00045 Approximate Property Size: 5.0 acres Application Date: November 8, 2013 Planning Board Hearing Date: December 16, 2013




Ν

### Timothy Deweese Map Amendment

Case Number: ZPH2013-00045 Approximate Property Size: 5.0 acres Application Date: November 8, 2013 Planning Board Hearing Date: December 16, 2013



Created By: Buncombe County Planning Date: November 24, 2013





From:	Jon Creighton
То:	Gillian Phillips
Subject:	FW: ZPH2013-00045 on Dec. 16 Planning Board agenda
Date:	Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:34:57 AM

From: Mark Plemmons [mailto:plemmons.mark@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:27 AM
To: Jon Creighton
Subject: Re: ZPH2013-00045 on Dec. 16 Planning Board agenda

Dear Mr. Creighton,

Thanks for talking with me about the rezoning proposed by Timothy Deweese at 32 Wiley Drive.

As I mentioned to you, we are not opposed to what Mr. Deweese is trying to do, but our family is opposed to the more intensive Employment District (EMP). The district opens up our area, which is residential (many mobile and modular homes included) and agricultural, to things such as a quarry or some industrial and commercial uses. I am sure Mr. Deweese is opposed to these uses as well. We just can't be sure that he will always be the property owner.

We support his effort to build a home on the property and support his effort to live in a mobile home on the property prior to completion of the house. When he purchased the property from our family, there was no zoning and what he is trying to do would have been allowed.

It's a big jump from no zoning to R-2 to EMP. It would seem that there would be some type of transitional zone that would allow what he wants.

As I mentioned to you on the phone, we would not be opposed to any type special use zoning that eliminates the heavy uses from this district. I know it is done in other parts of North Carolina and gives property owners and their neighbors a way to effectively plan and build. The Deweeses are good people and good neighbors. We hope that you will find a reasonable way to allow them to build their home.

Mark Plemmons 2924 Dylan Place Concord, N.C. 28027 704-490-3715

P.S. - My family owns 30 Wiley Drive, 6 Wiley Drive and 5 Wiley Drive.



#### BUNCOMBE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REZONING ANALYSIS

CASE NUMBER PROPOSED ZONING CHANGE LOCATION PIN ACREAGE : ZPH2013-00028 : R-1 to NS : 1431 Brevard Road : 9626.80.3208 : 5.47 acres

APPLICANT/OWNER:

JOHN HERRON PO BOX 6411 ASHEVILLE, NC 28816

#### DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

<u>BOARD CONSIDERATIONS</u>: The Board must determine if there is a reasonable basis for the requested change. An applicant's showing of reasonableness must address the totality of the circumstances and must demonstrate that the change is reasonable in light of its effect on all involved. <u>Good Neighbors of South Davidson v. Town of Denton</u>, 355 N.C. 254, 559 S.E.2d 768 (2002). Determination must be, the "product of a complex of factors." <u>Chrismon v. Guilford County</u>, 322 N.C. 611, 370 S.E.2d 579 (1988). Among the factors relevant to this analysis are the size of the tract in question; the compatibility of the disputed zoning action with an existing comprehensive zoning plan; the benefits and detriments resulting from the zoning action for the owner of the newly zoned property, his neighbors, and the surrounding community; and the relationship between the uses envisioned under the new zoning and the uses currently present in adjacent tracts. <u>Id</u>.

REZONING ANALYSIS: The applicant requests the rezoning of approximately 5.47 acres from R-1 (Residential District) to NS (Neighborhood Service District). The subject property is located at the intersection of Fore Road and Brevard Road. The tract is currently undeveloped. A portion of the property to the north that was previously within the City of Asheville's ETJ is zoned CS, and there is an established commercial corridor to the north of the subject property. The property to the southeast of the subject property is zoned NS (Neighborhood Service District). NS would be an appropriate zoning for the subject property, given its proximity to property zoned NS and would create a distinct separation between the property zoned CS to the north of the subject property and the residential zoned property to the southwest.

The proposed map amendment is consistent with the Buncombe County Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Reasonable proximity to a transportation corridor
- Reasonable proximity to public utilities
- Outside high elevations
- Outside of flood areas

The subject property is adjacent to property zoned for low density residential uses, and would be appropriate as a transitional area zoned NS, between the CS commercial corridor on Brevard Road and the low density residentially zoned property to the southwest. The proposed NS zoning would not be detrimental to the owner, adjacent neighbors, and surrounding community as it is consistent with the

surrounding property. Therefore the Buncombe County Department of Planning and Development recommends **APPROVAL** of the request.

### LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY STATEMENTS

CONSISTENT: The proposed map amendment is consistent with the Buncombe County Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Reasonable proximity to a transportation corridor
- Reasonable proximity to public utilities
- Outside high elevations
- Outside of flood areas

As the property is adjacent to property zoned NS, the proposed map amendment is appropriate and is therefore reasonable and in the interest of the public.

NOT CONSISTENT: The map amendment is not consistent with the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan as the Land Use Constraint maps within the Buncombe County Comprehensive Land Use Plan, 2013 Update shows the following regarding the subject property:

- Not outside of steep slope areas
- Not outside of moderate and high slope stability hazards
- Adjacent to property zoned for low residential uses.

As the property is adjacent to property zoned for low density residential uses, the proposed NS zoning would be detrimental to the owner, adjacent neighbors, and surrounding community as it is not consistent with the surrounding low density residential property. Therefore, the requested zoning would not be reasonable and in the interest of the public.





Ν

### John Herron Map Amendment





Created By: Buncombe County Planning Date: November 24, 2013





# Map Amendment

0	0	.1	0	.2
	-			
				iwiies

Subject Property OU **Zoning Overlays Zoning Districts** PS Blue Ridge Parkway Overlay R-1 BDM Protected Ridge Overlay R-2 CS Protected Ridge & Parkway R-3 Steep Slope/High Elev. EMP R-LD Steep Slope/High Elev. & Pkwy NS

Ν

Case Number: ZPH2013-00047 Approximate Property Size: 5.47 acres Application Date: November 12, 2013 Planning Board Hearing Date: December 16, 2013

Created By: Buncombe County Planning Date: November 24, 2013

### ATTACHMENT K

### Add to Section 78-581. Definitions.

Recreational facilities are those facilities, not otherwise categorized on the permitted use table, utilized for one (1) or more sports or recreation activities such as, but not limited to, bowling, skating, water sports, baseball, basketball, tennis, golf, riding, hiking, fishing or similar sports or recreational uses.

### Amend Sec. 78-636. Use districts; enumeration.

For the purpose of this article, the zoning districts of Buncombe County as delineated on the official zoning map of Buncombe County, adopted by the board of commissioners, shall be divided into the following designated use districts:

R-LD	Low-Density Residential District
R-1	Single-Family Residential District
R-2	Residential District
R-3	Residential District
CS	Commercial Service District
EMP	Employment District
PS	Public Service District
CR	Conference Center/Resort District
NS	Neighborhood Service District
BDM	Beaverdam Low-Density Residential District
OU	Open Use District

### Amend Sec. 78-640. Statement of district intent.

(h) Public Service District (PS). The PS Public Service District is intended to be a district that includes, but is not limited to, governmentally owned properties; schools and large college properties; recreation parks and facilities; emergency services; <u>and</u> community clubs <del>and conference centers</del> with mixed uses which may include housing, hotels, retail shops, religious or secular retreats, and associated accessory uses. Such uses should currently have public water and sewer services available or have a provision for internal supply of appropriate utilities.

### Add Subsection 78-640(i) and renumber the following subsections accordingly.

(i) Conference Center/Resort District (CR). The CR Conference Center/Resort District is intended to be a district that includes, but is not limited to large tourist-related facilities held in single ownership, summer/day camp properties, and conference centers held in single ownership or held collectively by related entities. Facilities within this district may include housing, hotels, retail shops, religious or secular retreats, and associated accessory uses. Such uses should currently have public water and sewer services available or have a provision for internal supply of appropriate utilities.

(i)(i) Beaverdam Low-Density Residential District (BDM). It is the purpose and intent of the

Beaverdam Low-Density Residential District to protect existing development in Beaverdam Valley from incompatible use; to provide for low-density residential and agricultural uses; and, to set certain standards for such uses based upon an analysis of existing and future conditions of topography, access, public water and sewer utilities, and community facilities, as well as health, safety and general welfare considerations.

(j)(k) Open Use District (OU). The OU Open Use District is established as a district in which all uses are allowed by right, except for certain uses that are regulated as conditional uses so as to ensure that neighborhood impact is mitigated. The neighborhood impact from conditional uses will be mitigated through the use of minimum specific site standards combined with general standards which provide the flexibility to impose a higher level of specific site standards dependent upon the degree of neighborhood impact. No zoning permit shall be required for permitted uses in the OU Open Use District.

### Amend Sec. 78-641. Permitted uses.

(a)	Permitted use table.	Uses are permitted in	the various zoning	districts pursuant to	Table 1.
-----	----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	----------

	Table 1 – Permitted Use Table											
Uses		P = Permitted C = Allowed as Conditional Use Blank Space = Not Permitted										
						Dist	ricts					
	R-LD	R-1 R-2 R-3 NS CS EMP PS <u>CR</u> BDM OU									OU	
Single-family residential dwelling, including modular	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>	Р	Ρ	
Duplex/Two-family residential dwelling			Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Р	
Multifamily residential dwelling units (only one building)			Ρ	Р	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	<u>P</u>			
Open-Use Multifamily dwelling (less than six units on single lot)											Ρ	
Open-Use Multifamily dwelling (six or more units on single lot)											С	
Manufactured/mobile homes-Residential	Р			Р			Р				Р	
Manufactured/mobile home parks				С							Р	
Planned unit developments			С	С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>		Р	
Subdivisions	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р	
Accessory buildings	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р	

	Table 1 – Permitted Use Table											
				<u> </u>	Alley	P = Pe	rmitted	onelli				
					= Allov Blank S	ved as	Not Pe	onal U	se 1			
Uses						Dist	ricts		<u> </u>			
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU	
Adult Entertainment Establishments						С	с				С	
Amusement Parks						С	С	С	<u>C</u>		С	
Animal hospitals and veterinarian clinics					Р	Р	Р				Р	
Asphalt Plants							С				С	
Banks and other financial institutions					Р	Р	Р	с	<u>C</u>		Р	
Bed and breakfast inns	Р		С	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	P		Р	
Campus office use			С		Р		·	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Cemetery	Р		Р	Р		Р		Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Chip Mills											С	
Churches	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р	
Clubs or lodges				Р	С	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Concrete Plants							С				С	
Day nursery and private kindergarten	С	С	С	С	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Family care home	Р	Р	Р	Р				Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р	
Funeral homes						Р	С	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Government protective services			Р	Р	Р	Ρ	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Ρ	
Greenhouses, commercial (nursery, lawn and garden products)					Р	Ρ	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Р	
Hazardous Waste Facilities											С	
Home occupations	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р	
Hospitals, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, retirement communities				С		Ρ	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Р	
Hotels and motels						Р	С	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Incinerators											С	

	Table 1 – Permitted Use Table											
						P = Pe	rmitted					
				С	= Allov	ved as	Conditi	onal U	se			
Uses					Blank S	pace =	Not Pe	rmitteo	ł			
						Dist	ricts					
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU	
Junkyards							С				С	
Kennels				С	Р	Р	Р				Р	
Landing Strips				С		С	С	С	<u>C</u>		С	
Laundry and dry cleaning services					Р	Р	с	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Libraries			Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Manufacturing and processing operations						Р	Р				Р	
Mining and Extraction Operations							с				С	
Motor Sport Facilities											С	
Motor vehicles maintenance and repair					С	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Motor vehicles sales and rental						Р	Р				Р	
Motor vehicles service stations (fueling stations)					Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
National Guard and Reserve Armories						Р	Р	Р			Р	
Nightclubs, bars and pubs					Р	Р	Р		<u>P</u>		Р	
Physical fitness centers					Р	Р	С	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Postal and parcel delivery services					С	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Printing and lithography						Р	Р				Р	
Private recreation facilities- profit (bowling alleys, skating rinks, country- clubs, etc.)			e	e	e	P	e	P	P		P	
Professional and business offices and services					Р	Р	Р	Р			Р	
Public or private nonprofit- recreational facilities- (parks, playgrounds, etc.)	C	С	C	C	₽	₽	₽	₽			₽	
Private utility stations and substations, pumping stations, water and sewer	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р	

	Table 1 – Permitted Use Table											
Uses				C	= Allov Blank S	P = Per ved as ( pace =	rmitted Conditi Not Pe	onal Us ermitted	se I			
						Dist	ricts					
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU	
plants, water storage tanks (less than 2 acres in total footprint)												
Private utility stations and substations, pumping stations, water and sewer plants, water storage tanks (2 acres or greater in total footprint)	С	С	С	С	С	с	С	С	<u>C</u>	С	С	
Public utility stations and substations, pumping stations, water and sewer plants, water storage tanks (less than 2 acres in total footprint)	С	С	С	С	Ρ	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>	С	Ρ	
Public utility stations and substations, pumping stations, water and sewer plants, water storage tanks (2 acres or greater in total footprint)	С	С	с	с	С	С	С	С	C	С	с	
Radio, TV and telecommunications towers	с			с		С	С	С	<u>C</u>		Р	
Recreation use, nonprofit	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>Р</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>		<u>P</u>	
Recreation use, profit			<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u><u>C</u></u>	<u>P</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>		<u>P</u>	
Repair services (electrical and appliances)					Р	Ρ	Ρ				Ρ	
Restaurants, <u>eating</u> establishments and cafés					Р	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Ρ	
Retail trade, commercial services, sales and rental of merchandise and equipment (inside building with no outside sales storage)					Ρ	Ρ	С	С	P		Ρ	
Retail trade, commercial services, sales and rental of merchandise and equipment						Ρ	С		<u>P</u>		Ρ	
Rooming house			С	Р	Р	Р	С	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
Schools, public and private		С	С	С		Р		Р	<u>P</u>		Р	
SchoolsVocational, business and special						Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>		Р	

Table 1 – Permitted Use Table											
Uses			P = Permitted C = Allowed as Conditional Use Blank Space = Not Permitted Districts								
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU
schools											
Shooting Ranges – Outdoor Commercial									<u>C</u>		С
Slaughtering Plants					(						С
Solid Waste Facilities – Landfills, Transfer Stations, Materials Recovery							С	с			С
Storage and warehousing					с	Р	Р	Р	<u>C</u>		Р
Theaters						Р		Р	<u>P</u>		Р
Travel trailers				С					<u>P</u>		Р
Travel trailer parks				С					<u>C</u>		Р
Vacation rentals	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р
Vacation rental complex				С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>	С	С
Wholesale sales						Р	P		<u>C</u>		Р
						,	1				

### Amend Sec. 78-642. Dimensional requirements.

The dimensional requirements for structures and land in the various zoning districts shall be in accordance with Table 2.

Table 2. Dimensional Requirements										
		Densi	ity	Minimu Requir						
Districts	Minimum Lot Area (Square Feet)	Minimum Land Area <sup>1,2</sup> Per Dwelling Unit (Square Feet)	Maximum Number Dwelling Units Per Acre	Front Yard (From Right- of-Way)	Side Yard	Rear Yard	Maximum Height (Feet)			
R-LD Residential	43,560	43,560 Plus: 0 for one additional detached unit	2	10	10	20	35			

Table 2. Dimensional Requirements											
		Densi	ty	Minimu Requir	m Yard Set ements in I	back <sup>=</sup> eet					
Districts	Minimum Lot Area (Square Feet)	Minimum Land Area <sup>1,2</sup> Per Dwelling Unit (Square Feet)	Maximum Number Dwelling Units Per Acre	Front Yard (From Right- of-Way)	Side Yard	Rear Yard	Maximum Height (Feet)				
R-1 Residential	30,000 (no water or sewer) 15,000 (water only) 10,000 (water and sewer)	30,000 (no water or sewer) 15,000 (water only) 10,000 (water and sewer) Plus: 0 for one additional detached unit	8	20	10	20	35				
R-2 Residential	Same as R-1	Same as R-1 Plus: 0 for first additional unit Plus: 3,000 for each additional unit	12	20	10	20	35				
R-3 Residential	Same as R-1	Same as R-2	12	20	10	20	35				
NS Neighborhood Service	Same as R-1	Same as R-2	12	20	10	20	35				
CS Commercial Service	30,000 (no water or sewer) 15,000 (water only) 5,000 (water and sewer)	Same as R-1, except 5,000 with water and sewer Plus: 0 for first additional unit Plus: 3,000 for each additional unit	13	10	10	10	50				
EMP Employment	Same as R-1	Same as R-2	12	20	10	20	90				
<u>CR</u> <u>Conference</u> <u>Center/Resort</u>	Same as R-1	Same as R-2	<u>12</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	50 (plus 1ft additional for each additional 5 feet of setback from all property lines up to 100ft total).				
PS Public Service	Same as R-1	Same as R-2	12	20	10	20	50				
BDM Beaverdam	See Footnote 5 and 7	See Footnote 5 and 7	See Footnote 5 and 7	See Footnote 6 and 7	15	25	35				
OU Open Use		No dimensional	requirements ex	cept as applied to	o conditional use	es.					

### Delete Sec. 78-644. Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District in its entirety.

(a) Purpose. The Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District is established to provide an area for the development of the historic Biltmore Estate oriented uses and associated facilities. The creation of this special overlay district recognizes the significance of the estate and the National Historic Landmark status and historic boundary designations as being unique to the area. The Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District shall provide additional regulations that take precedent over the underlying Commercial Service District (CS) zoning designation by Buncombe County.

Given this basis for establishment of a special overlay district, this district will apply only to the boundaries of the Biltmore Estate and to no other properties within the City of Asheville and will provide areas for the development and expansion of facilities which serve primarily tourists and vacationers, but also serve the necessary operational needs of the estate. Development standards are established to protect adjacent land uses from the adverse impacts of development within the boundaries of the Biltmore Estate while recognizing the existing development activities on the estate grounds and the needs of the estate to expand services to meet the needs of the local community.

(b) Defined boundaries. The Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District shall encompass and apply to all lands identified to be within the jurisdiction of Buncombe County and specifically within the boundaries of the Historic Landmark Designation for Biltmore Estate, excluding those areas within the town boundaries of the Town of Biltmore Forest and any lands within the Biltmore Village Historic District.

(c) *Permitted uses.* In addition to including all existing uses at the time of acceptance of this Zoning Overlay District text, the following are permitted uses, by right:

#### **Residential**

**Dwellings**, multi-family

Dwellings, single-family detached

**Recreational** 

Camps, campgrounds

**Golf courses** 

Passive parks, lakes and ponds

Public/semi-public

Convention and conference centers

Fire/police stations

Accessory uses

Barber shops and salons when an accessory to the principal use

Bed and breakfast inns

Bookstores when an accessory to the permitted use

Candy, pastry, ice cream and snack shops when an accessory to the principal use

Florists when an accessory to the principal use

Gift shops when an accessory to the principal use

Health and fitness facilities when an accessory to the principal use

Restaurants and associated food services (including beverages)

Studios, galleries, and workshops for artists, craftspeople, designers, photographers

Equipment repair

Manufacturing when accessory to the principal use-

Transportation systems operation and repair

**Recycling collection centers** 

(d) Conditional uses. The following are conditional uses:

Fishing, including guided fishing and clinics

Shooting, skeet, clay, target, sporting clay/gun club facilities

**Driving/training schools** 

Lodging facilities

Public utilities and related facilities

Antenna

Bars, nightclubs, brew pubs

#### (e) Development standards.

- (1) *Density standards.* The maximum average gross residential density per acre within a prescribed lot in the Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District shall be 12 dwelling units for residential and 100 units per acre for lodging.
- (2) Structure size standards. None.

(3) Lot size standards. The minimum lot size for all uses in the Biltmore Estate Historic — Property Overlay District shall be 10,000 square feet.

(4) Yard setback requirements. The following shall be the minimum yard requirements for uses in the Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District.

*Front:* 35 feet, except that the minimum setback may be reduced to five feet in pedestrian-oriented areas where road widening is not anticipated provided that all parking is located to the side or rear and not closer to the street than the facade of the principal structure, and where pedestrian-oriented design features are incorporated in building and site design.

Side: Ten feet.

Rear: 20 feet.

The minimum spacing between structures shall, in addition, be as per the City of Asheville Fire Prevention Code.

- (5) Impervious surface standards. The maximum impervious surface coverage in the Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District for any single, defined lot shall be 80 percent.
- (6) Height standards. The maximum height of structures in the Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District shall be 35 feet for detached and attached residential structures, 80 feet for lodging uses, and 45 feet for all other uses, except in the transition area described below in subsection (8).

The permitted height of buildings and structures in the Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District may be increased by one foot for each two feet of additional front, side, and rear setbacks up to a maximum height of 100 feet.

- (7) Recreational/open space standards. It is understood that any requisite open space and recreation standards imposed by the county are off-set by the amount of continuously preserved open space that makes up the larger portion of the existing estate. No other additional open space/recreational standards/requirements shall apply within the boundaries of the Biltmore Estate Historic Property Overlay District.
- (8) Design and operation standards.

*Exterior lighting:* All exterior lighting shall be shielded such that light is not directed toward adjacent residential property and such that no light sources are visible.

Outdoor sound systems: Outdoor sound systems shall be directed away from internal and adjacent residential areas and shall not operate between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m.

*Transition area:* Within 300 feet of an adjacent residentially zoned area, restrictions shall be placed on the height and location of uses other than those permitted in the adjacent residential zone. Height of buildings and structures located in this area shall be subject to the height limitations established in the least restrictive adjacent residential zone. Primary entrances of buildings and structures located in the transition area shall be directed away from residential uses. Restaurants, bars and nightclubs, facilities for animals (stables), mechanical equipment, and maintenance facilities shall not be located in the transition area.

### Renumber and Amend Sec. 78-6445. Steep Slope/High Elevation Overlay District

(a) *Purpose*. The Steep Slope/High Elevation Overlay District is established in recognition that the development of land in steep, mountainous areas involves special considerations and requires unique development standards. This section is intended to limit the intensity of development, preserve the viewshed and protect the natural resources of Buncombe County's mountains and hillsides at elevations of 2,500 feet above sea level and higher, consistent with the recommendations of the 1998 Buncombe County Land Use Plan.

- (b) Applicability. This section shall apply to the portion of Buncombe County at elevations of 2,500 feet above sea level and higher and having a natural slope of 35 percent or greater as specifically identified and delineated on the zoning map entitled "The Official Zoning Map of Buncombe County, North Carolina."
- (c) Permitted uses. Uses are permitted in the High Elevation/Steep Slope Overlay District

pursuant to the following table. All uses not listed are not allowed.

(d) *Conditional uses.* All conditional uses shall be administered in accordance with Division VI of this chapter.

		Steep	Slope/	High Ele	evation	Overla	y Permitt	ed Us	e Table		
		P = Pe	ermitte	d							
		C = Al	lowed	as Cond	itional U	lse					
Uses		Blank	Space	= Not Pe	ermitted						
		Distri	cts								
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU
Single-family residential dwelling, including modular	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>	Р	Ρ
Duplex/Two-family residential dwelling			Р	Ρ	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>		Ρ
Multifamily residential dwelling units (3 or more units)			с	С	С	с	С	С	<u>C</u>		С
Townhomes (3 or more units)			С	С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>		С
Manufactured/mobile homes-Residential	Р			Р			Р				Р
Manufactured/mobile home parks				С							С
Planned unit developments			С	С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>		С
Subdivisions	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>	Р	Р
Accessory buildings	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>	Р	Р
Bed and breakfast inns, gross floor area less than 5,000 sq. ft.	Р		с	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Р
Bed and breakfast inns, gross floor area 5,000 sq. ft. or more	С		с	С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>		С
Cemetery	Р		Р	Р		Р		Р	<u>P</u>		Р
Churches	Р	P	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>	Р	Р
Clubs or lodges, gross floor area less than 5,000 sq. ft.				С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>		С
Day nursery and private kindergarten	С	С	С	С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>		С
Family care home	Р	Р	Р	Р				Ρ	<u>P</u>	Р	Р
Government protective services			Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Р

Steep Slope/High Elevation Overlay Permitted Use Table														
Uses		P = Permitted C = Allowed as Conditional Use Blank Space = Not Permitted Districts												
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU			
Home occupations	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р			
Hospitals, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, retirement communities				С		С	с	С	<u>C</u>		С			
Libraries								С	<u>C</u>		С			
Mining and Extraction Operations							С				С			
National Guard and Reserve Armories						Р	Р	P			Ρ			
Private recreation facilities- for profit, outdoor (parks, playgrounds, tennis courts, etc.)			c	0	G	G	c	¢	<u>C</u>		C			
Private recreation facilities- for profit, gross floor area- less than 5,000 sq. ft (bowling alleys, skating- rinks, country clubs, etc.)			G	G	G	G	G	G	G		G			
Professional and business offices and services, gross floor area less than 5,000 sq. ft.					Ρ	Р	Ρ	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Ρ			
Public or private nonprofit- recreational facilities, outdoor (parks,- playgrounds, tennis courts, otc.)	C	Ç	G	C	<del>.</del>	₽	Þ	<del>P</del>	<u>P</u>		<del>,</del>			
Public or private nonprofit- recreational facilities, indoor, gross floor area- less than 5,000 sq. ft. (bowling alleys, skating- rinks, gymnasiums, etc.)	G	G	G	G	P	P	Þ	<del>P</del>	<u>P</u>		Þ			
Public or private nonprofit- recreational facilities, indoor, gross floor area- 5,000 sq. ft. or more- (bowling alleys, skating- rinks, gymnasiums etc.)					¢	e	e	e	Ē		e			
Private utility stations and substations, pumping stations, water and sewer plants, water storage tanks	С	С	С	С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>	С	С			

Steep Slope/High Elevation Overlay Permitted Use Table														
Uses		P = Permitted C = Allowed as Conditional Use Blank Space = Not Permitted Districts												
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU			
Public utility stations and substations, pumping stations, water and sewer plants, water storage tanks	С	С	С	С	С	С	С	с	<u>C</u>	С	С			
Radio, TV and telecommunications towers	С			с		с	с	С	<u>C</u>		с			
Recreation facilities, nonprofit, indoor, gross floor area less than 5,000 sq. ft.	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>		<u>P</u>			
Recreation facilities, nonprofit, indoor, gross floor area 5,000 sq. ft. or more					CI	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	C	<u>C</u>		<u>C</u>			
Recreation facilities, nonprofit, outdoor	Ċ	C	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	P	P	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>		<u>P</u>			
Recreation facilities, profit, outdoor			<u>C</u>	C	CI	C	<u>C</u>	C	C		<u>C</u>			
Recreation facilities, profit, indoor gross floor area less than 5,000 sq. ft.			<u>C</u>	C	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>		<u>C</u>			
Repair services, gross floor area less than 5,000 sq. ft. (electrical and appliances)					Р	Р	Ρ				Р			
Restaurants, <u>eating</u> <u>establishments and cafés</u> , gross floor area less than 5,000 sq. ft.					Р	Р	Ρ	Ρ	P		Р			
Retail trade, commercial services, sales and rental of merchandise and equipment, gross floor area less than 5,000 sq. ft. (inside building with no outside sales storage)					Ρ	Ρ	С	С	<u>C</u>		Ρ			

Steep Slope/High Elevation Overlay Permitted Use Table													
Uses	P = Permitted C = Allowed as Conditional Use Blank Space = Not Permitted												
		Distri	Districts										
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU		
Schools, public and private		С	С	С		С		С	<u>C</u>		С		
SchoolsVocational, business and special schools						С	С	с	<u>C</u>		С		
Travel trailers				Р					<u>P</u>		Ρ		
Travel trailer parks				С					<u>C</u>		С		
Vacation rentals	Ρ	Р	Ρ	Ρ	P	Р	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>	Ρ	Ρ		
Vacation rental complex; less than 11 units				С	С	с	С	С	<u>C</u>	С	С		

### Renumber and Amend Sec. 78-64<u>56</u>. Protected Ridge Overlay District

(a) *Purpose*. The Protected Ridge Overlay District is established in recognition that the development of land in steep, mountainous areas involves special considerations and requires unique development standards. This section is intended to limit the density of development, preserve the viewshed and protect the natural resources of Buncombe County's protected mountain ridges, consistent with the recommendations of the 1998 Buncombe County Land Use Plan and supplemental to the provisions of the Mountain Ridge Protection Act of 1983. Further, in accordance with North Carolina General Statutes §153A-342, this Protected Ridge Overlay District provides for additional requirements on properties within one or more underlying general districts related to the erection, construction, reconstruction, alteration, repair, or use of buildings, or structures within the Protected Ridge Overlay District in addition to the general

underlying zoning regulations including, but not limited to, height, number of stories and size of buildings and other structures.

- (b) Applicability. This section shall apply to all Buncombe County mountain "ridges" whose elevation is at least 3,000 feet and whose elevation is 500 or more feet above the elevation of an adjacent valley floor and including 500 foot buffers, measured horizontally from the center line of the ridge as specifically identified and delineated on the zoning map entitled "The Official Zoning Map of Buncombe County, North Carolina."
- (c) *Permitted uses.* Uses are permitted in the Protected Ridge Overlay District pursuant to the following table. All uses not listed are not allowed.
- (d) *Conditional uses.* All conditional uses shall be administered in accordance with Division VI of this chapter.

Protected Ridge Overlay Permitted Use Table													
Uses	P = Permitted C = Allowed as Conditional Use Blank Space = Not Permitted												
		Districts											
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU		
Single-family residential dwelling, including modular	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	P	Ρ	<u>P</u>	Р	Ρ		
Manufactured/mobile homes-Residential	Р			Р			Р				Ρ		
Subdivisions	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р		
Accessory buildings	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р		
Cemetery	Р		Р	Р		Р		Р	<u>P</u>		Р		
Churches	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р		
Family care home	Р	Р	P	Р				Р	P	Р	Р		
Government protective services			Р	Р	Р	Ρ	Р	Ρ	<u>P</u>		Р		
Home occupations	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р		
Public or private nonprofit- recreational facilities, outdoor (parks,- playgrounds, tennis courts,- etc.)	e	e	e	e	P	P	P	P	<u>₽</u>		P		
Private utility stations and substations, pumping stations, water and sewer plants, water storage tanks	С	с	С	С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>	С	С		

Protected Ridge Overlay Permitted Use Table											
Uses	P = Permitted         C = Allowed as Conditional Use         Blank Space = Not Permitted         Districts										
	R-LD	R-1	R-2	R-3	NS	CS	EMP	PS	<u>CR</u>	BDM	OU
Public utility stations and substations, pumping stations, water and sewer plants, water storage tanks	С	С	С	С	С	С	С	С	<u>C</u>	С	С
Recreational facilities, nonprofit, outdoor	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>P</u>	Р	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>		<u>P</u>
Vacation rentals	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	P	Р	Р	<u>P</u>	Р	Р

### ATTACHMENT L

# Dec 16, 2013

Initial Presentation of Zoning Ordinance Changes

- Changes required by State Law 2013-126 Zoning/Board of Adjustment Changes
- Changes to dimensional requirements
- Changes to accessory setbacks
- Changes to PUD standards

# Changes required by State Law 2013-126 – Zoning/Board of Adjustment Changes

### Amend Sec. 78-717 as follows:

Proposed changes or amendments to this article may be initiated by the Buncombe County Board of Commissioners, Buncombe County Planning Board, board of adjustment, zoning administrator or one or more owners of property within the area proposed to be changed. The board of commissioners, the planning board, and the board of adjustment, and the zoning administrator shall not be required to make application to the zoning administrator in order to initiate a change or amendment to this article. All proposed amendments to this Article or zoning map shall be submitted to the planning board for review and comment; however, neither the planning board nor the board of commissioners will consider a proposed change or amendment initiated by one or more property owners that was denied within the preceding 12 months by the board of commissioners.

### Amend Sec. 78-621 by deleting subsection (2) and replacing it with the following:

(2) Administrative review. The board of adjustment shall hear and decide appeals from any order, requirement, decision or determination made by the zoning administrator in the enforcement of this article, as provided in section 78-603 as well as appeals and requests for variances pursuant to any Chapter or Article of the Code of Ordinances for Buncombe County indicating that such appeals or requests for variances shall be heard by the board of adjustment. Such appeals and requests for variances shall be conducted in accordance with Sec. 78-623, Appeals and applications, below. Further, in all cases in which requests for variances are heard by the Board of Adjustment references to this article or chapter shall be deemed to be references to such Chapter or Article from which the appeal or request for variance is made, as appropriate, and references to appeals under this article or chapter shall be deemed to be references to requests for variances, as appropriate. The concurring vote of four-fifths of the members of the board of adjustment shall be necessary grant any variance. A majority vote of the members of the board of adjustment is necessary to reverse any order, requirement, decision, or determination of the zoning administrator, or to decide in favor of the applicant any matter which it is required to pass under this article or to effect any variation in this article.

### Amend Sec. 78-621 by deleting subsection (4) and replacing it with the following:

(4) Variances. When unnecessary hardships would result from carrying out the strict letter of the zoning ordinance, the board of adjustment shall vary any of the provisions of the zoning ordinance upon a showing of all of the following:

- (a) Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance. It shall not be necessary to demonstrate that, in the absence of the variance, no reasonable use can be made of the property.
- (b) The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography. Hardships resulting from personal circumstances, as well as hardships resulting from conditions that are common to the neighborhood or the general public, may not be the basis for granting a variance.
- (c) The hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner. The act of purchasing property with knowledge that circumstances exist that may justify the granting of a variance shall not be regarded as a self-created hardship.
- (d) <u>The requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the</u> <u>ordinance, such that public safety is secured, and substantial justice is achieved.</u>

No change in permitted uses may be authorized by variance. Appropriate conditions may be imposed on any variance, provided that the conditions are reasonably related to the variance. In granting a variance, the board of adjustment shall make findings that the requirements of this article have been met. The board of adjustment shall make a finding, and written notice of the decision shall be prepared as prescribed in subsection 78-623(d). In granting any variance, the board of adjustment may prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards in conformity with this article. Violation of such conditions and safeguards, when made a part of the terms under which the variance is granted, shall be deemed a violation of this article and punishable as described under section 78-583.

Any other ordinance that regulates land use or development may provide for variances consistent with the provisions of this subsection.

A nonconforming use of neighboring land, structures or buildings in the same district, and permitted uses of land, structures or buildings in other districts will not be considered grounds for the issuance of a variance.

### Amend Sec. 78-622 by deleting subsection (c) and replacing it with the following:

(c) *Hearings.* All board of adjustment hearings shall be conducted in accordance with N.C. Gen. Stat. §153A-345.1 or as amended.

### Amend Sec. 78-623 by deleting subsection (b) and replacing it with the following:

(b) *Procedure for Filing Appeals*. All statute of limitations and procedures for filing an appeal to the Board of Adjustment are set forth in N.C. Gen. Stat. §153A-345.1 or as amended.

Amend Sec. 78-623 by deleting subsection (d) and replacing it with the following:

(d) *Decisions*. All board of adjustment decisions shall be made in accordance with N.C. Gen. Stat. §153A-345.1 or as amended.

Amend Sec. 78-677 by deleting subsection (c) and replacing it with the following:

(c) Notice of hearings. All board of adjustment public notice shall be conducted in accordance with N.C. Gen. Stat. §153A-345.1 or as amended.

Amend Sec. 78-677 by deleting subsection (h) and replacing it with the following:

(h) *Decisions*. All board of adjustment decisions shall be made in accordance with N.C. Gen. Stat. §153A-345.1 or as amended.

Amend Sec. 78-677 by deleting subsection (k) and replacing it with the following:

(k) Lack of development; effect on permit. Conditional use permits shall be retain vesting in accordance with N.C. Gen. Stat. §153A-344.1 or as amended.

# Changes to dimensional requirements

		Table 2.	Dimen	sional	Require	ments			
		<u>Density</u>	<u>Min</u> i	imum Yaro	d Setback F	Requirem	ents in F	<u>eet</u>	
<u>Districts</u>	<u>Minimum</u> Lot Area (Square Feet)	Maximum Number Dwelling Units Per Acre	Front Yard Public Sewer	<u>Side</u> <u>Yard</u> <u>Public</u> <u>Sewer</u>	<u>Rear</u> Yard Public Sewer	<u>Front</u> <u>Yard</u>	<u>Side</u> Yard	<u>Rear</u> Yard	<u>Maximum</u> <u>Height</u> (Feet)
<u>R-LD</u> <u>Residential</u>	<u>43,560</u>	2 per lot. No acreage based density requirement.	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>R-1</u> Residential	30,000 (no water or sewer) 12,000 (public sewer only) 8,000 (public water and sewer)	2 per lot. No acreage based density requirement.	<u>10</u>	Z	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>R-2</u> Residential	30,000 (no water or sewer) 10,000 (public sewer only) 6,000 (public water and sewer)	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>R-3</u> Residential	Same as R-2	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>NS</u> <u>Neighborhood</u> <u>Service</u>	<u>30,000</u> (no water or <u>sewer)</u> <u>10,000 (sewer</u> only) <u>5,000</u> (water and <u>sewer)</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>CS</u> <u>Commercial</u> <u>Service</u>	<u>Same as NS</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>EMP</u> Employment	Same as NS	<u>12</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>90</u>
PS Public Service	Same as NS	<u>12</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>50</u>
BDM Beaverdam	See Footnote 5 and 7	See Footnote 5 and 7	<u>See</u> Footnote <u>6 and 7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>25</u>	See Footnote <u>6 and 7</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>OU</u> Open Use		No	dimensional r	equirements e	xcept as applie	d to condition	al uses.		
	1								

### Amend Sec. 78-642 by deleting Table and replacing it with the following:

# Changes to accessory setbacks

### Amend Sec. 78-663. Accessory structures and buildings.

Accessory buildings shall not be erected in any front yard building setback; or side yard setback; within 20 feet of any side street or highway right-of-way line; or within ten feet of any rear lot line.

Accessory uses or structures shall not involve any use or structure otherwise prohibited by this division or requiring a conditional use permit. Accessory uses or structures shall meet the following standards:

- (1) Front yard setback, 20 feet;
- (2) Side yard setback, ten feet; and
- (3) Rear yard setback, ten feet.

Accessory uses or structures shall not involve any use or structure otherwise prohibited by this division or requiring a conditional use permit. Accessory uses or structures with a building footprint of less than 320 square feet and a height of less than 15 feet shall meet the following standards:

- (1) Front yard, set forth per relevant zoning district under Sec. 78-642;
- (2) Side yard setback, seven feet; and
- (3) Rear yard setback, seven feet.

<u>Accessory uses or structures with a building footprint of greater than 320 square feet or a height of</u> <u>more than 15 feet shall meet the following standards:</u>

- (1) Front yard, set forth per relevant zoning district under Sec. 78-642;
- (2) Side yard setback, ten feet; and
- (3) Rear yard setback, ten feet.

The front yard setback requirements of this section shall not apply to accessory structures on lots where the existing primary structure is a legal nonconformance with respect to the front setbacks set forth under Sec. 78-642. In such cases, the setback shall be that of the aforementioned existing buildings.

# Changes to PUD Standards

### Amend Sec. 78-581. Definitions.

Planned unit development (PUD) means more than two principal buildings or uses proposed to be constructed on a single lot, any building with a gross floor area of 35,000 square feet or more, or any residential complex of five or more units. Residential units within a planned unit development may include single-family detached or attached units, townhouse developments, garden apartments, patio homes, and other types of residential units, excluding mobile homes and mobile home parks. For purposes of the Steep Slope/High Elevation Overlay District only, planned unit development means more than two principal buildings or uses proposed to be constructed on a single lot, any building with a gross floor area of 10,000 square feet or more, or any residential complex of three or more units. <u>A planned unit</u> development also refers to developments which contain structures which exceed the maximum height allowed within the zoning district; such planned unit developments are prohibited within the overlay districts.

### Amend Sec. 78-678. Conditional use standards.

Planned unit developments. Planned unit development standards shall be as follows:

- a. *Purpose*. The purpose of this section is to afford substantial advantages for greater flexibility and improved marketability through the benefits of efficiency which permit flexibility in building siting, mixtures of housing types, and land use. Residential densities are calculated on a project basis, thus allowing the clustering of buildings in order to create useful open spaces and preserve natural site features.
- b. Land development standards. The following land development standards shall apply for all planned unit developments. Planned unit developments may be located in the R-2, R-3, NS, CS, EMP, and PS relevant districts as conditional uses, subject to a finding by the board of adjustment that the following conditions are met:
  - 1. Ownership control. The land in a planned unit development shall be under single ownership or management by the applicant before final approval and/or construction, or proper assurances (legal title or execution of a binding sales agreement) shall be provided that the development can be successfully completed by the applicant.
  - 2. Density requirements. There are no density requirements for nonresidential uses as long as the proposed project does not violate the intent of the district in which it is located. The proposed residential density of the planned unit development (dwelling units per acre as shown in section 78-642) shall conform to that permitted in the district in which the development is located. If the planned unit development lies in more than one district, the number of allowable dwelling units must be separately calculated for each portion of the planned unit development that is in a separate district, and must then be combined to determine the number of dwelling units allowable in the entire

planned unit development.

- 3. *Frontage requirements.* Planned unit developments shall have access to a highway or road suitable for the scale and density of development being proposed.
- 4. Land uses. A mixture of land uses shall be allowed in any planned unit development. However, within residential districts, nonresidential uses shall not constitute the primary use in the planned unit development, and nonresidential uses shall be carefully designed to complement the residential uses within the planned unit development. All planned unit developments must be compatible with and not violate the intent of the zoning district<sub>-</sub>; however, said uses may include uses not permitted under Sec. 78-641 within the zoning district(s) within which the project is located, provided that the board of adjustment finds that nonresidential uses do not disrupt the character of the community.
- 5. *Minimum requirements.* Minimum requirements for land development are as follows:
  - The normal minimum lot size and requirements for interior setbacks are hereby waived for the planned unit development, provided that the spirit and intent of this section are complied with in a total development plan, as determined by the board of adjustment. The board of adjustment shall exercise ultimate discretion as to whether the total development plan does comply with the spirit and intent of this section.
  - Height limitations. No building or structure shall exceed the height limitations of the district in which it is located. Maximum structure height may be waived for the planned unit development, provided that unique elements of the development impose requirements for additional height that are not universal throughout the zoning district. Additionally, planned unit developments in excess of the normal maximum height require that the spirit and intent of this section are complied with in a total development plan, as determined by the board of adjustment. The board of adjustment shall exercise ultimate discretion as to whether the total development plan does comply with the spirit and intent of this section.
  - Required distance between buildings. The minimum distance between buildings shall be 20 feet or as otherwise specified by the board of adjustment to ensure adequate air, light, privacy, and space for emergency vehicles.
  - Every dwelling unit shall have access to a public or private street, walkway or other area dedicated to common use, and there shall be provision for adequate vehicular circulation to all development properties, in order to ensure acceptable levels of access for emergency vehicles.
- 6. *Privacy*. Each development shall provide reasonable visual and acoustical privacy for all dwelling units. Fences, insulation, walks,

barriers, and landscaping shall be used, as appropriate, for the protection and aesthetic enhancement of property and the privacy of its occupants, screening of objectionable views or uses, and reduction of noise. Multilevel buildings shall be located within a planned unit development in such a way as to dissipate any adverse impact on adjoining low-rise buildings and shall not invade the privacy of the occupants of such lowrise buildings.

- 7. Perimeter requirements. Perimeter requirements are as follows:
  - Structures located on the perimeter of the development must be set back from property lines and rights-of-way of abutting streets in accordance with the provisions of the zoning ordinance controlling the district within which the property is situated.
  - Structures other than single-family detached units located on the perimeter of the development may require screening in a manner which is approved by the board of adjustment.
- 8. *Water and sewer systems.* Plans and accompanying documentation to ensure that the water and sewer systems proposed for the planned unit development have been approved by the appropriate local and state agencies and submitted as part of the application.
- 9. *Parking.* Preliminary plans shall include parking provisions for all proposed uses within the planned unit development in accordance with section 78-658. When more than one use is located in the planned unit development, the minimum required parking shall be the sum of the required parking for each use within the development. Parking requirements may be waived for the planned unit development, provided that the spirit and intent of this section are complied with in a total development plan, as determined by the board of adjustment. The board of adjustment shall exercise ultimate discretion as to whether the total development plan does comply with the spirit and intent of this section.
- 10. *Pedestrians and bicycles.* Any pedestrian and bicycle path circulation system and its related walkways shall be designed to minimize conflicts between vehicle and pedestrian traffic.
- 11. *Layout*. Layout of parking areas, service areas, entrances, exits, yards, courts and landscaping, and control of signs, lighting, noise or other potentially adverse influences shall be such as to protect the residential character within the PUD district and desirable character in any adjoining district.
- 12. Conveyance and maintenance mechanisms. Conveyance and maintenance of open space, recreational areas and communally owned facilities shall be in accordance with G.S. 47-1 et seq. the Unit Ownership Act and/or any other appropriate mechanisms acceptable to the board of adjustment.