

Collector Street Plan Public Comments - Public Workshop #3

General Comments:

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Relevance
Email	3/21/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>We had an opportunity to speak briefly during the third collector street information session. At your request I am attaching a copy of the petition outlining significant concerns of the Meadowmont Community relative to the SW Durham Collector Street Plan. To date, nearly 600 signatures have been collected including 100% of Phase I, II, and III Meadowmont Lane residents residing in Durham and Orange counties.. A large majority of the Durham County based Cedars' residents have also signed as have residents throughout the Meadowmont Community. A hard copy of the signed petition will be mailed to your office. As most residents only recently became aware of the impact the collector/arterial street plans will have on the community, signatures are still being collected.</p> <p>Beyond the areas of concern noted on the attached request, we are attempting to determine why many residents were not aware of the Collector Street Plan in time to attend the October public session.. As we mentioned to you a few weeks ago, the Meadowmont Community Association first became aware of the public information session in January of this year.</p> <p>At a separate information session, the Chapel Hill MPO representative acknowledged that the plan on file in the city differs from the plan presented to Meadowmont residents via the development office. Given that the neighborhood has been in existence only a few years might help put the high emotions in perspective.</p> <p>For all of the above reasons, and for the very real concern expressed on the attached petition, I add my voice to those asking that Kimley-Horn and Associates' recommendation not be forwarded to the MPO or any other agency until some of these concerns are addressed. We realize that the Meadowmont community is more impacted by the arterial street plan that has been under discussion for several years. We implore you, as the City of Durham's Transportation Planner, to do everything in your power to take a fresh look at the Southwest Durham Parkway alignment that was presented as a key link to the Collector Street Plan. There appear to be numerous alternatives to the alignment such that it will not have such a major impact on neighborhood schools, the retirement center, and residents.</p>	Meadowmont

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Revlevance
Email	3/21/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	As a resident of Meadowmont Lane in Chapel Hill, I must express my strong objections to the proposed collector street plan currently under consideration. The quality of life in this quiet neighborhood will dramatically decline if this plan is enacted, and residents, young school children, and many retirement-age citizens will be threatened by the enormous increases in proposed traffic volumes along this street. I ask you, with all earnestness, to please explore all other available options. Of course, I would be happy to answer any questions that might arise.	Meadowmont

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Relevance
Email	3/21/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>To: The Chapel Hill-Carrboro-Durham Metropolitan Planning Organization; the City of Chapel Hill; the counties of Orange and Durham; the North Carolina Department of Transportation; and all agencies and individuals associated with the Southwest Durham Collector Street Plan:</p> <p>We, the residents of the Meadowmont Community, petition the above agencies and individuals to remove all streets within the boundaries of the Meadowmont development from any consideration pertaining to the Southwest Durham Collector or Arterial Street Plan.</p> <p>We, as residents, consider any collector or arterial road system connecting Highways 15/501 to Highway 54 via the Meadowmont Community to be in direct conflict with the real or implied promotion of the neighborhood as a safe, pedestrian friendly and environmentally sensitive development.</p> <p>More specifically, we as residents believe there are alternative and less costly road systems that will not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> jeopardize the safety and welfare of children in the Meadowmont Community, many of whom walk to a neighborhood based elementary school. • <input type="checkbox"/> jeopardize the safety and welfare of the Meadowmont based Cedars Retirement community members who walk along, or drive through, the narrow tree lined community streets. • <input type="checkbox"/> jeopardize the safety and welfare of Meadowmont community homeowners and their families as they walk or drive through a high density neighborhood. • <input type="checkbox"/> generate noise and sound pollution associated with significantly increased traffic flow through narrow streets with relatively close, front yard set backs along community streets. • <input type="checkbox"/> have a negative environmental impact on county, city and developer promoted wetlands, greenways, walking trails, and wildlife preserves in the Meadowmont Community • <input type="checkbox"/> create a complex bridge and roadway system through creek, swamp, and green areas when less complicated and intrusive infrastructure is possible. <p>As residents of the Meadowmont Community, the town of Chapel Hill and the Counties of Durham and Orange, we encourage the above agencies to consider placing any connecting, or arterial roads through less developed areas of Durham County and to remove all streets in the Meadowmont Community from any proposed connector or arterial plan.</p>	Meadowmont

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Relevance
			Respectfully Submitted, The signatures on the attached pages are intended to be an integral part of this document.	
	3/21/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>I live at 103 Springdale Way in Meadowmont. I'm sending you this e-mail to voice my concern over the proposed "cut-through" to Meadowmont Lane. My wife and I moved here from Los Angeles in March of last 2005 in search of a quite family oriented place to raise our daughter. Meadowmont is perfect! There is very little traffic; it's quiet, safe, clean and peaceful – with the exception of new house construction. The collector street would reverse everything I just mentioned. Safety would be a big concern with people flying down our streets. Residents of Meadowmont and The Oaks are just about the only people who obey the posted speed limit signs. This collector street would practically encourage people to blast down our streets at high speeds. If I can manage to keep from getting hit while walking my daughter to the park or riding my bike pulling the Burley Buggy, in the bike lane, to the Carolina Café, we still have to contend with the dirt and noise that is produced from 12,000 cars per day rolling down our streets.</p> <p>Criminals look for easy access. Having a house in phase III of Meadowmont discourages break-in's due to the limited escape route. This weekend a car window was smashed and a wallet taken at The Chapel Hill Country Club. Giving criminals an easier access, like the collector street, is simply unacceptable. We made a choice to live in Meadowmont for all the aforementioned reasons – Meadowmont Realty promised that the "Protected Wetlands" at the end of Meadowmont lane would "NEVER" be developed. That is why we own a house here – as do many others on Meadowmont Lane and Phase III.</p>	Meadowmont

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Revlevance
Email	3/21/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>I am a resident of Meadowmont, in what is known as the Phase III development. My home sits at the corner of Meadowmont Lane and Park Bluff N. Drive, sitting squarely next to the stubbed section of road that now (as of Oct 2005) is marked with signs noting "Road Subject to Future Expansion". My wife and I have followed the recent collector street planning meetings, having attended the second and third public hearings.</p> <p>We want to go on record and be clear that we are opposed to having Meadowmont Lane designated an arterial connecting road within the overall plan. We feel that the increased traffic, resultant noise, and increased pollution will pose significant and real risks to public safety. We are not opposed to the overall collector plan, but prefer expanded consideration of the use of George King Road as a connector to highway 54 .</p> <p>We are not supportive of a bridge being built across the wetlands area from Meadowmont Lane to other parts of SW Durham.</p>	Meadowmont

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Relevance
Email	3/24/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>Thank you for the presentation at the recent Collector Street Plan□Public Workshop #3 on the evening of March 21, 2006. I was pleased to see that some attention had been paid to my earlier requests that the Arboretum on George King Road be preserved. Following the meeting I still had four major concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The road along the southern boarder of the Arboretum appears to travel across the dam that was constructed in the 1950's to form the lake on the Arboretum property. A number of valuable trees were planted along this dam. The dam is currently the entrance to the property and is a single lane driveway. If this were to become a road, as shown on the map distributed for the March 21st meeting, not only would it require considerable construction costs, but also for the Arboretum there would be three unfortunate consequences: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The plantings along the dam would be destroyed. b. The pond would be accessible to the public because the edge of the pond would be within the right-of-way. Anyone who wanted to launch a boat from this edge of the pond would have the right to do so. c. The road would cut through and largely destroy the northeastern corner of the Arboretum. 2. The plan shows a collector road that stops abruptly at the eastern boundary of the property. Early in the presentation portion of the meeting I understood that such roads were envisioned to continue through at some time in the future. In this case, a road that is planned (but not shown on the map) would cross directly through the Arboretum. Again, this would involve very serious damage to the plantings. 3. If constructed at the expense of the Arboretum, the widening and paving of George King Road would remove an extensive portion of the property along the entire western boundary, and it would sacrifice a valuable buffer from the traffic along this thoroughfare. <p>Thank you very much for your willingness to consider these efforts to conserve this valuable Arboretum and to make it available to the North Carolina Botanical Garden as a resource for future generations.</p>	General Theme
	3/22/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	See letter from Ed Kaiser.	General Theme

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Revlevance
Email	3/21/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>I live on Lancaster Drive and was unable to come to the meeting tonight. I think it is an awful idea to have more traffic on our street. Some of the cars that travel this road now, particularly nonresidents, already are driving too fast due to the wide street. To add additional, nonresidential traffic to our street without traffic calming devices in place is a BAD idea.</p> <p>Why do you want to turn a nice residential neighborhood into a raceway?</p> <p>BAD MOVE! Funnel the traffic elsewhere!</p>	Lancaster Drive
	3/22/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>Mr. Henry, just a note to let you know I attended the collector street meeting last night. I was so sorry to see the verbal abuse that "Roger" sorry can't remember his last name, took from some of the crowd. You know the old saying, "don't kill the messenger", I don't think it is right how some people took out their frustrations on him during the presentation. I appreciate the hard work that has been put into this and the fact that we have been asked our opinion. Please let "Roger" know that some of us appreciate his knowledge and help.</p>	Roger
	3/08/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>I see that there is not any improvements along the Watkins/Farrington Road section connecting to the new major thoroughfare, "SW Durham Drive"...Today there is an inordinate amount of traffic using these two roads and the existing Farrington Road is deteriorating very rapidly. They were not designed to carry the heavy truck traffic now using this corridor. When we moved to our home 17 years ago there was a weight limit on Farrington Road. Now heavily laden trucks of all sorts are using this road as a "bypass".</p> <p>Why are these two roads not included in the upgrade program?</p>	Farrington Road
	3/08/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>i'm writing on behalf of my husband and myself to express our opposition to the proposed plan to make the fearrington road intersection a right-turn only network. having a kindergartner at creekside elementary, as well as another younger son who will be attending creekside, and living in sw durham, we need to go straight through that intersection or turn left to get home from school. with the knowledge that we will be traversing this intersection at least twice a day for the next eight years at least makes it a very pressing concern for us that we'd be re-routed and have to backtrack to get home.</p>	Farrington Road

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Relevance
Email	2/24/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>I reside at 157 Celeste Circle and was out of town during the last public workshop #2 held on January 10th. In talking to my neighbor Mrs.. Walker, she told me that one of the plans calls for a new connector road to go though where my house is. In looking at Alternative "C" it appears that she is correct. Can you confirm this?</p> <p>As of now, what plan is most likely to be considered, Plan A, B or C and what is the time table to start the project? Is it 1-3 years or 3-5 years away? I suppose for obvious reasons I would prefer plan A or B</p> <p>I moved here from Virginia 5 years ago and love the neighborhood but am very concern about how this project will increase traffic as well as future commercial development.</p>	Celeste Circle
	3/26/06	Public Workshop #3/Email	<p>I attended the last meeting 21 March and was very disappointed with the presentation.</p> <p>The consultant had not done his homework-ie.. did not know that Chapel Hill will be installing 6 speed bumps on Pankhurst Dr and 4 bumps on Nottingham Dr. and 1 on Lancaster Dr. He said the one connector off Nottingham did not have a name yet. Well I have correspondence from 2003 that has Kilkenney named.</p> <p>The scope of the study area is too limited. It should include the impact of the new developments on 54. The offices on the South side of 54 have impacted traffic through the Oaks.</p> <p>The latest version of the arterial seems to adversely effect more people than earlier versions. When asked why the new road doesn't follow George King, the consultant did not have a good answer " its not paved." Why go through an established neighborhood when you can direct the road through sparsely populated areas?</p> <p>As the current head of the Oaks III HOA, my neighbors see no need to cut through Kinsale now since it does not connect to the arterial road. East West Partners can use George King and leave us alone.</p>	General Theme
VoiceMail	3/23/06	Public Workshop #3/VoiceMail	<p>Gary Barnes contacted Andy Henry on March 23, 2006 to: 1) voice support for the collector plan to reduce traffic that comes through the Meadowmont area; 2) let it be known that the community association did not sign the petition brought forward by a group of homeowners; 3) request information on the project number of vehicle trips on Southwest Durham Drive; 4) ask if George King Road could become an arterial road; and, 5) ask if any of the road connectors to the Oaks will be taken out of the recommended collector street network.</p> <p>Mr. Barnes leads the Meadowmont Community Association and is a member of the Chapel Hill Transportation Board.</p>	General Theme

Category	Date	Source	Input	Input Revlevance
VoiceMail	3/23/06	Public Workshop #3/VoiceMail	Arthur Deberry, resident of the Cedars, left a voicemail for Andy Henry on March 23, 2006. Mr. Deberry stated that he supported the opening of the road through the backside of Meadowmont that goes to US 15-501. He believes this outlet is important to reduce the congestion on NC 54, and the road opening would be a benefit for everybody.	General Theme