

ACCESS MANAGEMENT EXCEPTION REQUEST: AM-E
ACCESS MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS 24 VAC 30-73
SECTION 120

Submitted by: Bret Flory		Date: 8/13/2021
Email Address: bflory@crossarchitects.com		Phone: (972) 398-6644
Address: 879 Junction Drive, Allen, TX 75013		
Project Name: Caliber Collision - Seminole Trail	Rte # US 29	Locality: Albemarle County
Description of Project: Caliber Collision is proposing to occupy the vacant 10,500 s.f. building at 1720 Seminole Trail, which was previously a Goodwill store. The parcel has two right-in / right-out driveways on the US 29 southbound exit lanes to Rio Road. This AME request refers to the north driveway, which is 270 feet north of the existing CVS driveway.		
VDOT District: Culpeper		Area Land Use Engineer: Adam Moore, P.E.

NOTES:

- (1). Submit this form and any attachments to one of the District's Area Land Use Engineers.
- (2). See Section 120 of the Regulations for details on the requirements, exceptions, and exception request review process.
- (3). Attach additional information as necessary to justify the exception request(s).
- (4). If a traffic engineering study is required, the decision on the request will be based on VDOT engineering judgment.
- (5). Use the LD-440 Design Exception or the LD-448 Design Waiver forms for *design and engineering standards*, e.g. radius, grade, sight distance. See [IIM-LD-227](#) on VDOT web site for additional instructions.

Select the Exception(s) Being Requested

- ☐ **Exception to the shared commercial entrance requirement.** (Access M. Regulations Section 120 C.2)

Reason for exception:

- ☐ **A. An agreement to share the entrance could not be reached with adjoining property owner.**

☐ **Attached:** Written evidence that adjoining property owner will not share the entrance.

- ☐ **B. Physical constraints: topography, adjacent hazardous land use, stream, wetland, other.**

☐ **Specify constraint:** _____

☐ **Attached:** Documentation of constraint such as aerial photo or topographic map.

- ☐ **Exception to the vehicular connection to adjoining undeveloped property requirement.** (Section 120 C.4)

Reason for exception:

- ☐ **A. Physical constraints: topography, adjacent hazardous land use, stream, wetland, other.**

☐ **Specify constraint:** _____

☐ **Attached:** Documentation of constraint such as aerial photo or topographic map.

- ☐ **B. Other reason:** _____

☐ **Exception to the commercial entrance shall not be located within the functional area of an intersection requirement.** (See Regulation Section 120 C. 1; Appendix F, Rd Design Manual)

☐ **Attached:** A traffic engineering study documenting that the operation of the intersection and public safety will not be adversely impacted.

☒ **EXCEPTION TO THE SPACING STANDARDS FOR:**

- **Commercial entrances; intersections/median crossovers (Table 2-2);**
- **Commercial entrances/intersections near interchange ramps (Tables 2-3, 2-4); or**
- **Corner clearance (Figure 4-4).** Appendix F, Road Design Manual

Information on the Exception Request

☒ **ON A STATE HIGHWAY**

Functional classification: Principal Arterial: ☒ Minor Arterial: ☐ Collector: ☐ Local: ☐

Posted speed limit: 45 mph

☐ **NEAR AN INTERCHANGE RAMP** (Submittal of a traffic engineering study required)

☐ **CORNER CLEARANCE** (Submittal of a traffic engineering study required)

Type of intersection/entrance: Signalized ☐ Unsignalized ☒ Full Access ☐ Partial Access ☒

Required spacing distance 305 ft

Proposed spacing distance 270 ft

Requested exception: Reduction in required spacing 35 ft

REASON FOR EXCEPTION:

☒ **A. To be located on an older, established business corridor along a highway where existing spacing did not meet the standards prior to 7/1/08 or 10/14/09.** (Regulation Section 120 C.3.c)

☒ **Attached:** Dated aerial photo of corridor identifying proposed entrance/intersection location.

☐ **B. Not enough property frontage to meet spacing standard, but the applicant does not want a partial access right-in/right-out entrance.** (Section 120 C.3.f)

☐ **Attached:** A traffic engineering study documenting that left turn movements at the entrance will not have a negative impact on highway operation or safety.

☐ **C. To be located within a new urbanism mixed use type development.** (Section 120 C.3.d)

☐ **Attached:** The design of the development and compliance with intersection sight distance.

☐ **D. The proposed entrance meets the signal warrants but does not meet the signalized intersection spacing standard. The applicant requests an exception to the spacing standard.**

☐ **Attached:** A traffic engineering study that (i) evaluates the location's suitability for a roundabout and (ii) provides documentation that the proposed signal will not impact safety and traffic flow. (Section 120 C.5)

ACCESS MANAGEMENT EXCEPTION REQUEST: AM-E
ACCESS MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS 24 VAC 30-73
SECTION 120

Submitted by: Bret Flory		Date: 8/13/21
Email Address: bflory@crossarchitects.com		Phone: (972) 398-6644
Address: 879 Junction Drive, Allen, TX 75013		
Project Name: Caliber Collision - Seminole Trail	Rte # US 29	Locality: Albemarle County
Description of Project: Caliber Collision is proposing to occupy the vacant 10,500 s.f. building at 1720 Seminole Trail, which was previously a Goodwill store. The parcel has two right-in / right-out driveways on the US 29 southbound exit lanes to Rio Road. This AME request refers to the south driveway, which is 160 feet north of the existing CVS driveway.		
VDOT District: Culpeper		Area Land Use Engineer: Adam Moore, P.E.

NOTES:

- (1). Submit this form and any attachments to one of the District's Area Land Use Engineers.
- (2). See Section 120 of the Regulations for details on the requirements, exceptions, and exception request review process.
- (3). Attach additional information as necessary to justify the exception request(s).
- (4). If a traffic engineering study is required, the decision on the request will be based on VDOT engineering judgment.
- (5). Use the LD-440 Design Exception or the LD-448 Design Waiver forms for *design and engineering standards*, e.g. radius, grade, sight distance. See [IIM-LD-227](#) on VDOT web site for additional instructions.

Select the Exception(s) Being Requested

- ☐ **Exception to the shared commercial entrance requirement.** (Access M. Regulations Section 120 C.2)

Reason for exception:

- ☐ **A. An agreement to share the entrance could not be reached with adjoining property owner.**

☐ **Attached:** Written evidence that adjoining property owner will not share the entrance.

- ☐ **B. Physical constraints: topography, adjacent hazardous land use, stream, wetland, other.**

☐ **Specify constraint:** _____

☐ **Attached:** Documentation of constraint such as aerial photo or topographic map.

- ☐ **Exception to the vehicular connection to adjoining undeveloped property requirement.** (Section 120 C.4)

Reason for exception:

- ☐ **A. Physical constraints: topography, adjacent hazardous land use, stream, wetland, other.**

☐ **Specify constraint:** _____

☐ **Attached:** Documentation of constraint such as aerial photo or topographic map.

- ☐ **B. Other reason:** _____

☐ **Exception to the commercial entrance shall not be located within the functional area of an intersection requirement.** (See Regulation Section 120 C. 1; Appendix F, Rd Design Manual)

☐ **Attached:** A traffic engineering study documenting that the operation of the intersection and public safety will not be adversely impacted.

☒ **EXCEPTION TO THE SPACING STANDARDS FOR:**

- **Commercial entrances; intersections/median crossovers (Table 2-2);**
- **Commercial entrances/intersections near interchange ramps (Tables 2-3, 2-4); or**
- **Corner clearance (Figure 4-4).** Appendix F, Road Design Manual

Information on the Exception Request

☒ **ON A STATE HIGHWAY**

Functional classification: Principal Arterial: ☒ Minor Arterial: ☐ Collector: ☐ Local: ☐

Posted speed limit: 45 mph

☐ **NEAR AN INTERCHANGE RAMP** (Submittal of a traffic engineering study required)

☐ **CORNER CLEARANCE** (Submittal of a traffic engineering study required)

Type of intersection/entrance: Signalized ☐ Unsignalized ☒ Full Access ☐ Partial Access ☒

Required spacing distance 305 ft

Proposed spacing distance 160 ft

Requested exception: Reduction in required spacing 145 ft

REASON FOR EXCEPTION:

☒ **A. To be located on an older, established business corridor along a highway where existing spacing did not meet the standards prior to 7/1/08 or 10/14/09.** (Regulation Section 120 C.3.c)

☒ **Attached:** Dated aerial photo of corridor identifying proposed entrance/intersection location.

☐ **B. Not enough property frontage to meet spacing standard, but the applicant does not want a partial access right-in/right-out entrance.** (Section 120 C.3.f)

☐ **Attached:** A traffic engineering study documenting that left turn movements at the entrance will not have a negative impact on highway operation or safety.

☐ **C. To be located within a new urbanism mixed use type development.** (Section 120 C.3.d)

☐ **Attached:** The design of the development and compliance with intersection sight distance.

☐ **D. The proposed entrance meets the signal warrants but does not meet the signalized intersection spacing standard. The applicant requests an exception to the spacing standard.**

☐ **Attached:** A traffic engineering study that (i) evaluates the location's suitability for a roundabout and (ii) provides documentation that the proposed signal will not impact safety and traffic flow. (Section 120 C.5)

- ☐ E. The development's 2nd (or additional) entrance does not meet the spacing standards but is necessary for the streets to be accepted into the secondary system. (Section 120 C.3.e)

☐ Attached: Information on the development that identifies the location of entrances.

- ☐ F. To be located within the limits of a VDOT and locality approved access management corridor plan.

☐ Attached: Aerial photo of corridor identifying proposed entrance/intersection location. (Sect 120 C.3.b)

FOR VDOT USE ONLY

Recommendation on Exception Request: Approve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deny <input type="checkbox"/>		Date: 8/17/21
Area Land Use Engineer or: _____		Name Adam J. Moore, P.E.
<p>Remarks:</p> <p>The Residency recommends approval based on the following factors and conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condition of approved site plan showing acceptable entrance geometry. 2. The proposed use is expected to generate fewer trips than the previous active use. 3. The right lane of the GSI ramps function as continuous right turn lanes and should remain adequate for this use. 4. The existing north entrance is shared so removal or shifting of it is infeasible. 5. The southern entrance is needed to circulation of tow/vehicle delivery trucks. 6. The local lanes of Route 29 at Route 631 were constructed in part to serve the businesses near the intersection. This parcel is one such site. <p>Verbal concurrence by Carrie Shephard, PE given 4/26/21.</p>		

Exception Request Action: Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Denied <input type="checkbox"/>		Date:
District Administrator or Designee: _____		Michelle A Shropshire 2021.08.26 13:45:31-04'00'
Name (and position if Designee) _____		
<p>Remarks:</p>		

District Staff: Please email copy to Bradley.Shelton@VDOT.Virginia.gov