

General Public Comments - Public Workshop #2

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Relevanc
Eastwood Park	01/10/06	Public Workshop #2	Our neighborhood has no sidewalks and the roads are lined with ditches. If traffic is directed through the middle of our neighborhood, it will make it impossible to walk or ride bikes on our streets.	Comment
Five Oaks	01/10/06	Public Workshop #2	I was dismayed to see that all three alternative plans seem to include a new road between Danziger Dr. and Old Chapel Hill Rd., across from Five Oaks Drive. Being a resident of the Five Oaks neighborhood, I travel the roads in the area frequently and do not understand the logic of adding a road in between Mt. Moriah and Watkins roads, both of which fill the same need as the proposed road (and are only ~ 1/2 mile apart). I would suggest adding a traffic light to Mt. Moriah at Old Chapel Hill as an alternative, since adding a new road would seem to only exacerbate traffic problems in the area.	Comment
General	1/10/6	Public Workshop #2	See letter to Kimley-Horn from Chas. H. Sells, Inc., Michael N. Surasky, P.E.	Comment
George King Road	01/10/06	Public Workshop #2	See letter from NC Botanical Gardens	Comment
Lancaster Drive	01/10/06	Public Workshop #2	See letter from citizen Post	Survey

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Revlevanc
	01/10/06	Public Workshop #2	<p>As you might imagine, we in the Oaks Villas neighborhood are all very concerned about the fate of Lancaster Drive on which some of our houses front, including mine. I can understand its potential role as a collector, but we have a speeding problem already on this street because of its width and relatively straight alignment. We would strongly urge that, if it is to be a collector, it be connected somewhat circuitously through new development and to George King or Farrington or the proposed thoroughfare extension of Meadowmont Lane, to discourage its use as a pseudo-thoroughfare. Also, its excessive width promotes high speed, and it should have medians and a bike lane to create narrower traffic lanes and slower traffic, as well as speed bumps. Also, we would urge speedy completion of that thoroughfare connection to Meadowmont and/or hwy 54. That would eliminate the need to use Lancaster Drive instead of a thoroughfare.</p>	Comment

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Relevanc
	01/10/06	Public Workshop #2	<p>My neighbors share my concerns about ANY extension of Lancaster Drive. All three maps show that Lancaster could become the most direct shortcut thoroughfare from Farrington Road and/or 54 to Ephesus Church Road, Old Chapel Hill/Durham Road, and then on to 15-501 providing quick access for residential/commercial areas that abound north and west of The Oaks.</p> <p>Already we have cars flying (at 40-50 mph) up Lancaster and screeching to a halt when they discover that Lancaster does not go through to George King or beyond. Because of the wideness of Lancaster, we are plagued with speeders (delivery trucks, pizza cars, etc); and every neighbor meeting revolves around this dilemma for homeowners in The Oaks. In spite of the addition of 4 traffic islands and multiple speed bumps on Pinehurst and Burning Tree, our neighborhood is already unable to slow down the speeders between Meadowmont and Ephesus Church Road. We even have observed drivers who have raced through the traffic islands – destroying the trees and shrubbery – and their cars!</p> <p>Your plans concern all of us who live here at the eastern end of Lancaster. We are a neighborhood of ‘empty nester homes’ with most drivers over the age of 60 plus the western end of Lancaster has mostly families of small children, a country club complex with walking golfers plus golf carts crossing Lancaster all day everyday, a swimming complex that has daily swim hours plus hosts regional swim meets for several hundred children at a time, and a popular club house for special events with large numbers of attendees. I believe any extension of Lancaster will only accentuate the problems at hand in providing safety for all drivers and all residents.</p> <p>I think that there should be no implementation of the Southwest Durham Collector Street Plan until some major decisions are made about the 54/1-40 intersection. That location is a nightmare and it seems imperative that our local and state government(s) resolve that problem in a long term way before encouraging more traffic that new developments would bring. You would know more how to structure the collector street plan AFTER the 54/1-40 dilemma is solved.</p> <p>I do want to compliment you on your openness and accessibility in revealing</p>	Comment

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Relevanc
			<p>your plans to our community. I have attended every public meeting you have announced and found your staffers to be professional, concerned, good listeners and adroit at diffusing some ardent opponents of your plans. You reflect well on Durham County government.</p> <p>I hope that you will continue to develop plans that do not undermine the neighborhoods already in existence and heed our concerns for what we KNOW is going to occur if you extend our street. I have studied your maps with a close eye and I think extending Lancaster Drive in any way is not a good idea.</p>	
Meadowmont Lane	01/10/06	Public Workshop #2	<p>My concern is the connector from Hwy 54 via Meadowmont Lane (Harris Teeter) to Watkins Road.</p> <p>My preference would be an option D – connect 54 via Barbee Chapel (or to the east of Barbee Chapel) around the East Side of the Meadowmont subdivision. A small feeder street from Meadowmont at it's current terminal point could connect to the collector street. There is room for parking etc for an eventual rail hookup.</p> <p>Next is option a. Option c is horrible – it would turn the residential part of Meadowmont Lane into a major thoroughfare!</p>	Comment