




Charlotte Department of Transportation

Memorandum

Date: July 29, 2008

To: Tom Drake & Tammie Keplinger
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Department

From: 
Scott L. Putnam
Development Services Division

Subject: Rezoning Petition 08-118: Located on the south side of Erwin Road
between Moss Road and Ivey Creek Drive

Consistency with Transportation Action Plan (TAP): The two goals of the TAP that most directly affected the staff's review of this petition define the integration of land use and transportation, and the provision of transportation choices.

- Goal 1 of the TAP relies on the Centers, Corridors and Wedges land use strategy to be implemented. This project site is located in a Wedge and appears to support the Centers, Corridors, and Wedges land use strategy.
- Goal 2 of the TAP describes various connectivity and design features that are important for motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists. Specific comments are identified below that need to be addressed for CDOT's support of the petition and to bring the site plan into compliance with the TAP and best practices for multimodal transportation.

Vehicle Trip Generation

This site could generate approximately 560 trips per day as currently zoned. Under the proposed zoning the site could generate approximately 570 trips per day. This will have a minor impact on the surrounding thoroughfare system.

We have the following specific comments that are critical to CDOT's support of the rezoning petition:

1. It is our understanding that Access/Driveways Note 2 commits the petitioner/developer to design, construct, and dedicate the right-of-way for the proposed north/south connector. Please confirm. A left-turn lane is required on Erwin Road in addition to the one serving the driveway/private street identified in Comment 2 below.
2. According to the City of Charlotte's Driveway Regulations, CDOT has the authority to regulate/approve all private street/driveway and public street connections to the right-of-way of a street under the regulatory jurisdiction of the City of Charlotte. CDOT has determined that a left-turn lane is necessary to serve the traffic using the proposed street connections for this site. The engineering design and construction of the left-turn lane is the responsibility of the owner, and shall be performed by a professional engineer registered in the State of North

Carolina who has roadway-design experience. CDOT will only approve the proposed public/private street connection adjacent to the clubhouse provided that a left-turn lane is constructed on Erwin Road. We recommend the rezoning plan reflect the design of this required left-turn lane prior to submittal/approval of the public/private street connections. The left-turn lane needs to be designed using NCDOT standards with a minimum 150 feet of storage. This roadway improvement is required to meet the traffic demands of the proposed development.

3. A second public street needs to be constructed, running east-west across the site and stubbing to both property lines.
4. All new public streets need to be Residential Medium streets.
5. An 8-foot planting strip and 6-foot sidewalk needs to be built along the site's Erwin Road frontage.

We have the following specific comment that is important to CDOT's support of the rezoning petition. We would like the petitioner to give serious consideration to these comments/requests.

1. Private streets need to be designed to public street standards as described in the *Urban Street Design Guidelines* (USDG).

We have the following general comments that are provided to aid the petitioner in planning and subsequent permitting phases:

Erwin Road is an Avenue (USDG) requiring a minimum of 90 feet of right-of-way. The developer/petitioner should convey right-of-way in fee simple title to meet this requirement, measuring 45 feet from the centerline of the roadway.

Adequate sight triangles must be reserved at the existing/proposed street entrance(s). Two 35' x 35' and two 10' x 70' sight triangles are required for the entrance(s) to meet requirements. All proposed trees, berms, walls, fences, and/or identification signs must not interfere with sight distance at the entrance(s). Such items should be identified on the site plan.

The exact driveway location(s) and type/width of the driveway(s) will be determined by CDOT during the driveway permit process. The locations of the driveway(s) shown on the site plan are subject to change in order to align with driveway(s) on the opposite side of the street and comply with City Driveway Regulations and the City Tree Ordinance.

All proposed commercial driveway connections to a future public street will require a driveway permit to be submitted to CDOT for review and approval.

Any fence or wall constructed along or adjacent to any sidewalk or street right-of-way requires a certificate issued by CDOT.

Tom Drake & Tammie Keplinger

July 29, 2008

Page 3 of 3

A Right-of-Way Encroachment Agreement is required for the installation of any non-standard item(s) (irrigation systems, decorative concrete pavement, brick pavers, etc.) within a proposed/existing City maintained street right-of-way by a private individual, group, business, or homeowner's/business association. An encroachment agreement must be approved by CDOT prior to the construction/installation of the non-standard item(s). Contact CDOT for additional information concerning cost, submittal, and liability insurance coverage requirements.

To facilitate building permit/driveway permit review and approval, the site plan must be revised to include the following:

- Meet applicable Land Development Standards (latest revision).
- Dimension width of the existing and proposed driveways.
- Indicate the locations and widths of all adjacent and opposing driveways.
- Indicate typical parking module dimensions.
- Include a parking summary with figures for the numbers of parking spaces required and provided.
- Directional wheelchair ramps (two per corner) should be provided at all intersections of public or private streets.

If we can be of further assistance, please advise.

SLP

c: R. H. Grochoske (via email)
M. M. Magnasco – Review Engineer (via email)
B. D. Horton (via email)
A. Christenbury (via email)
E. D. McDonald (via email)
Neighboring Concepts/ James Williams (via email)
Rezoning File