

TRANSPORTATION SUFFICIENCY COMMENTS

Case Number: 26-0974

Sufficiency Meeting Date: 06/10/2026

Based on Site Plan Received: 05/15/2026

Assigned Transportation Case Planner: Sarah Rose

Findings:

The application has been deemed **INSUFFICIENT** for the reasons stated below. The applicant has until **June 25th,2025**, to cure the deficiencies. Applications which have not addressed the below issues by the required deadline will be automatically continued to the next available hearing, in which case the applicant must ensure a sufficient application has been submitted by the sufficiency deadline for that hearing date (otherwise it will again be automatically continued).

Although not necessarily sufficiency issues, staff may have provided additional comments of a more substantive nature for your consideration. A lack of the inclusion of such comments does not indicate staff support for what is being proposed. This review is generally intended to determine only whether the application is sufficient for review.

Where staff has indicated a required section is missing, it is incumbent upon the applicant to ensure that not only is the section provided, but that all required information listed within the DRPM that must be included within that section is provided. Applications which are resubmitted with missing required information will be deemed insufficient and continued to the next available hearing date.

We are happy to engage via emails/calls/meetings as time permits to answer questions you have about the applicable standards and/or process. We are unable to provide quality assurance/ quality control review (i.e. iterative reviews to evaluate whether or not an application/plan/study would be sufficient if submitted). Please ensure you thoroughly review each requirement in the DRPM and follow each specific requirement, as well as any other requests for information/modifications provided by staff below.

Note: Responses to these sufficiency items must be provided in writing, preferably together with the revised site plan/narrative/transportation analysis submittal that addresses these issues.

SUFFICIENCY ISSUES - ROUND 1
Note: Unless other timeframes are specified, please submit to zoning intake written responses to the below sufficiency items. All revised graphics, plans, Administrative Variance, Design Exception, and/or other information must be submitted by the sufficiency response deadline for the August 2026 ZHM hearing cycle (i.e. no later than June 25th, 2025).

Item	Type	Comment	Response
SR1-1	Issue with PD Site Plan	The required level of parking as displayed on the site plan appears to be miscalculated. In accordance with the table provided in Section 06.05.02 of the LDC, a total 36 spaces would be required.	
SR1-2	Issue with PD Site Plan	The proposed location of the signage, air pump station, and dumpster appears to block the internal vehicular ciruclation path.	
SR1-3	Issue with PD Site Plan	Pursuant to the the table provided in Section 06.05.02.N and Section 06.05.02.O of the LDC, the loading area does not meet the minimum width requirement (60ft for one space).	
SR1-4	Issue with PD Site Plan	In order for the site plan to be considered conceptual and to maintain the highest level of flexibility, staff would recommend removing a certain level of unnecesary detail (i.e. drive isles, signage, parking detail, etc.) which can be deferred to the site construction phase. The building and parking area can be bubbled. The internal circulation can be displayed a singular dashed line.	
SR1-5	Issue with Transportation Related Administrative Reviews	Bellamy Rd. has been identified as a 2-lane, Class 5, county-maintained, collector roadway with a posted speed of 35MPH. As such, there is a minimum spacing requirement of 245ft. As the proposed project access is unable to meet this minimum spacing requirement an administrative spacing variance will be required.	
SR1-6	Issue with Transportation Related Administrative Reviews	Bellamy Rd. has been identified as a 2-lane substandard county collector roadway. As such, this must be addressed in a way that satisfies the DRPM. (i.e. either stating the applicant intends to defer substandard roadway improvements to the time of plat/site construction, display the required improvements to bring the roadway up to standard, or apply for an DE/AV.) Upon review of this project with the county engineer, it has been determined that the substandard roadway improvments for Bellamy Rd. will include a 10-foot-wide multi-purpose path.	
SR1-7	Issue with Transportation Related Administrative Reviews	As previously communicated to the applicant, staff have identified several issues with an access onto Bellamy Rd. for this project. The project access cannot meet the minimum spacing requirement, several site access improvments will be required which include a 4ft traffic seperator, substandard roadway improvemnts will be required which will include a 10-foot-wide multi-purpose path, the existing turn lane on Bellamy Rd. is insufficient, and the existing right-of-way width of Bellamy Rd. is narrow. A graphic displaying that all of these required improvments can be accomodate given the limited right-of-way width and the project's limited frontage must be provided. Staff has reached out to the applicant's transportation consultant for a seperate meeting to discuss options.	
SR1-8	Issue with Transportation Analysis	The site access analysis is incomplete as it does not study the efficiency of the westbound or eastbound left turn lanes on Ehlich Rd. staff notes these are site access intersections which must be utilized by . To determin appropriate length of turn lanes with existing plus project traffic.	
SR1-9	Issue with Transportation Analysis	The site access analysis does include the eastbound left turn lane at the intersection of Ehlich Rd. and Bellamy Rd. or the westbound left turn lane at the intersection of Ehlich Rd. and Carrollwood Meadows Dr. to determine the appropriate length of each when accounting for existing and project traffic and as such is incomplete.	
SR1-10	Issue with PD Narrative	Application Narrative Does Not Meet Minimum DRPM Requirements. Required Sections Such as “Transportation Infrastructure Serving the Site”, “Substandard Roads”, “Developer Commitments”, and/or “External Connectivity” Must be Included in the Narrative	

OTHER ISSUES - ROUND 1

Note: Unless other timeframes are specified for a specific issue, please submit to zoning intake written responses to the above Other Issues and Questions. These responses, together with all revised graphics, plans, or other information necessary to address the above must be submitted no later than 21 days before the revised plan deadline for the hearing date being targeted (reference zoning schedule on County website). Staff appreciates when an applicant provides these information/responses sooner (i.e. with the sufficiency responses) if able to do so.

Item	Comment	Response
OI&Q-1		

OI&Q-2

OI&Q-3

OI&Q-4

OI&Q-5

OI&Q-6

OI&Q-7

OI&Q-8

OI&Q-9

OI&Q-10