

Sent: Thu 10/12/2006 12:22 AM
To: Council Members
Subject: Collector Street Plan

October 11, 2006

Durham City Council

Dear Madams and Sirs:

I am writing in regard to the Southeast Chapel Hill and Southwest Durham County Collector Street Plan.

I am a resident of Chapel Hill, but in Durham County. I have one child that attends Creekside Elementary in Durham County.

I think it is abhorrent that any road bordering a school should be classified as a collector street.

Under the current plan, both Ephesus Church and George King Roads would be reclassified as collector streets.

As currently zoned, Ephesus Church Road is very dangerous to children and families. It is marked at 35 mph in both counties and is regularly sped upon without regard to bicyclists and pedestrians. Sidewalks are intermittent and the road shoulder varies between a steep drop into overgrown ditches, level gravel shoulder, and curbs that have been driven over.

The existence of the traffic circle at the intersection of Ephesus Church and Pope Road does little or nothing to calm traffic as there is complete visibility, unlike, for example the traffic circle on Pinehurst (south of Ephesus Church Road farther to the West into Orange County) which is landscaped with trees, bushes and plants to obscure and subsequently slow down traffic at that intersection.

Instead of making Ephesus Church Road busier as a collector street, traffic needs to be slowed down via a landscaped traffic circle with fully developed shoulders and the installation of additional traffic calming devices, such as rumble strips.

George King Road, on the other hand is a street used twice daily by parents picking up and dropping off their children at Creekside Elementary and the schools' buses. It lies less than 20 yards from where the 730 Creekside students eat their lunch and wait for their buses or parents to pick them up. No amount of landscaping, curbs, and grading on a collector street will ensure their safety.

My family has made it a priority to bike and/or walk

to school. Currently due to the lack of sidewalks and heavy, speeding (45 mph at least) traffic, it is impossible to walk to school without endangering my children. Biking is difficult, but we employ many safety devices to ensure our visibility (lights, flags, reflective striping etc.).

My family is no different than many families in the neighborhoods surrounding Creekside Elementary. Daily, I receive comments from parents saying they wish they could walk to school or bike, but the roads are just too busy.

The Southeast Chapel Hill and Southwest Durham County Collector Street Plan advocates for a complete street strategy (page 56/chapter 5, page 3 of the plan) as a method to make roadways community oriented and useful for a variety of modes of transportation. Pursuant to this concept the plan states on page 58 (Chapter 5, page 5) the following in regard to children biking:

Children riders lack experience mixing with vehicular traffic and their bicycle use is primarily for recreation and may be monitored by their parents. This group prefers residential streets with low motor vehicle speed limits and traffic volumes. Well-defined separation of bicycles and motor vehicles on collector streets should be required as a minimum. Ideally, separate bike paths would be provided as part of a greenway system.

If these were values of the planning committee, then why would roads bordering an elementary school purposely be made busier?

Regards,

-----Original Message-----

From: william dunk [mailto:advisors@beecom.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 09, 2006 7:55 PM
To: Henry, Andrew
Cc: w dunk
Subject: Southwest Durham Collector Street Plan

Mr. Henry:

We are citizens of Durham County who will be directly affected by the Collector Plan as well as proposed high density housing along the Durham Border near George King as well as the proposed 'derailment' of the mass transit station in the neighborhood.

We are not receiving announcements of these proposals and the planning and would appreciate being notified in full in a timely manner. This is quite surprising to us.

We would appreciate your help in this matter.

Sincerely

William P. Dunk
325 Nottingham Drive
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515

P.S. Do you know if there is some reason why affected citizens are not being given full and timely disclosure of these developments?

--

William Dunk Partners Inc.
P.O. Box 3687
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
www.globalprovince.com
Advisors to Senior Management:
www.globalprovince.com/williamdunkpartners.htm

Visit our website to sign up for our
free weekly email newsletter.

--

From: CRAZPCL1@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2006 5:12 PM
To: Henry, Andrew
Subject: Re: Lancaster Drive collector road proposal
Dear Mr. Henry,

I seems that this idea of the collector roads continues to be pursued in spite of the protestations of the citizen that will be affected by them.

We already have a significant problem with speeding on Lancaster with just citizens who reside in this area.

In addition, our road is heavily used by children and their parents from all parts of Durham and Chapel Hill and beyond when swim meets are held at Chapel Hill Country Club.

The impact of continued further development will change further our streams and ponds. I think specifically of the dead, orange watered pond on Donegal. The only animals that reside in that pond are the sinking duck decoys that live there.

Who do you all listen to? The citizens who are impacted by your continued pursuit of this development are consistently AGAINST the collector roads planned for our neighborhoods. PLEASE STOP!

Claudia Crassweller

From: Chicita Culberson [mailto:cculb@duke.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 3:47 PM
To: Henry, Andrew
Cc: Becky Heron; Ellen Reckhow
Subject: SW Durham-SE Chapel Hill Collector Street Plan

Dear Mr. Henry:

Johnny Randall, Assistant Director of the North Carolina Botanical Garden in Chapel Hill and I attended the September 13 TAC meeting discussing the Revised Southwest Durham/Southeast Chapel Hill Collector Street Plan. We are particularly concerned by the impact of the collector street planned along the southern border of the Arboretum at 5501 George King Road. This road would seriously impact valuable plantings, including a collection of Magnolias (see the list below) introduced in this location ca. 40 or more years ago.

1. *Asimina triloba* (Pawpaw) planted in 1963
2. *Magnolia kobus* (Kobus Magnolia) planted in 1963
3. *Magnolia stellata* (Star Magnolia) planted in 1960
4. *Magnolia X loebneri* (hybrid) planted in 1967
5. *Magnolia X soulangiana* (Saucer Magnolia) Planted in 1959

Additionally, any collector street planned for this route must cross a low area that receives the very significant runoff from a 64-acre watershed feeding through the Arboretum pond. Development being planned for areas in this watershed will surely increase this runoff and seriously impact the proposed road intersecting George King Road as shown on the current Collector Street Plan.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Sincerely,

Chicita Culberson
5501 George King Road
Durham, NC 27707

-----Original Message-----

From: Debbie Hunt [mailto:ddhunt@duke.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2006 9:45 AM
To: Ahrendsen, Mark; david.bonk@Durhamnc.gov
Cc: Henry, Andrew; Beckmann, Ellen
Subject: Collector Street/Southwest Durham Drive Comments

Thank you for allowing our family to speak with Mr. Mark Ahrendsen and Mr.

Wesley Parham at the collector street meeting on Tuesday, October 10.

As

we discussed at the meeting, we have serious concerns regarding how the proposed collector streets and Southwest Durham Drive would impact our tract of land located across from the Creekside Elementary School. As proposed, if we develop the land, collector streets will be required from

Weston Downs Drive and from Randall Road in Bakers Mill Subdivision to this

tract. The collector streets would divide our property and make an awkward

loop or "Y". Also, as proposed, the Southwest Durham Drive would split our

tract in two, separating a portion of the land on the east side of the drive and limiting its use and value.

As the possible realignment of the Southwest Durham Drive is being considered, we would like to have further discussion with you regarding possible solutions that would lessen the impact on our property. One possible solution to this problem that we discussed with Mr. Ahrendsen last

night would be to run the Southwest Durham Drive along the eastern property

line of our tract. This path would not divide our property into two separate tracts. Another possible solution would be to run the path along

side the "creek" on our property and closer to Randall Road so the collector street could tie into the SW Durham Drive. However, we would need to take this under advisement before pursuing this route.

In summary, we would welcome the opportunity to work with the appropriate

agencies to find a more feasible way of running these roadways that would

lessen the impact on our property. We do not believe that our tract of

land should have to bear such a large burden of new collector streets and

roadways in this area and we would like to discuss options further. Our

phone contact numbers are listed below for your convenience.

Regards,

Bobby and Debbie Daniel Hunt

Bobby and Debbie Hunt	919-489-8022
Wayne Daniel	919-730-3529
David Daniel	919-967-9811

From: RJTBCHNC@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2006 12:17 PM
To: Henry, Andrew
Subject: Re: Collector Street Issue

Hello Mr. Henry,

I am have been a resident of the Oaks for over 13 years and have lived on Lancaster Drive for most of that period. I know you have heard many concerns that the residents have with the connection of the collector roads into and through our neighborhood. I also wish to express my concern and would love the opportunity to briefly chat with you about the issues involved.

I also wish to express my concern over notification. This issue impacts the lives, homes, safety, noise level, mail retrieval, property values, etc of not only the residents of two counties but also a thriving, expanding, viable, country club and its members and property. It is difficult to know which government is actually in charge of this, who has the final say so and when and what meetings to attend. Unfortunately, many residents find out about meetings with only a day notice or after the fact. I have received a notice of the meeting scheduled for October 10th, 2006 at Creekside Elementary School, but specific, clear notification of meetings and discussions pertinent to the collector issues does not seem to be forthcoming to all of the people/businesses/property owners/neighbors/Homeowners Associations who will be affected by these issues.

I just tried to reach you by phone and would love to have an opportunity to speak to you if you have a moment. I can be reached at (919) 971-3125. If there is a convenient time for me to call back, let me know.

Thank you, Jean Nance (Lancaster Drive)

Dear Mayor Foy and Chapel Hill Town Council members. Next Wednesday October 18th a Public Forum is scheduled. I understand that David Bonk will present the latest DCHC-MPO Collector Street Plan. I am sure you all know that there is great concern within The Oaks and Meadowmont communities regarding the impact of this Plan on our communities and that the concerns and needs we have voiced over the last year have not really been taken into consideration.

As an owner in The Oaks Villas who lives on Lancaster, I, along with many of my neighbors, have great concern about the impact collector streets would have on our neighborhoods. I have attached the most recent Villas Owners' Association Statement along with an earlier Statement from The Oaks neighborhoods for your review. Some of you may have already seen it. It should not take much of your time.

We oppose the plan as drafted because it fails to meet the issue of attaching the collector street system to existing neighborhood streets without dealing with the negative impacts. If the plan were modified to deal with our concerns, we could support it. But, there has been little inclination from the DCHC-MPO or planning consultant to do that. From our perspective, it is imperative that the collector streets, including existing streets incorporated into the system, be constructed according to the specification for a true collector street (speed and safety considerations built in). Additionally, a funding stream needs to be identified, agreed upon by Durham County, the Town of Chapel Hill and Orange County and made available at the appropriate time to retrofit existing streets converted to collectors. Finally, we must have assurances that (a) Lancaster will only be opened to emergency traffic until the entire length of George King Road is paved, and (b) that alternative options will be provided to get into and out of the new developments without being funneled through our neighborhood for years. We have MAJOR CONCERNS about increased traffic, speeding and safety. The current Plan study area shows an ending at the Durham/Orange County line. A traffic study needs to be conducted past county lines to the Pinehurst Circle. The impact of the swim season at CHCC needs to be considered as our streets are clogged with parked cars on both sides of the street during these events.

The folks in the Oaks Villas and many Oaks III residents live in Durham County but are part of the Town of Chapel Hill. We really need the Town to partner with Durham County and come up with solutions to the concerns we have voiced. Thanking all of you in advance for your time and consideration of our concerns.

Dick Dennis for The Oaks Villas

Feel free to contact us:

Bill Sax, President of The Oaks Villas Owner's Association bas4@duke.mail.edu

Ed Kaiser, VP of The Oaks Villas Owner's Association ekaiser1@nc.rr.com

Dick Dennis, Architectural Review, OVOA rldennis@nc.rr.com

STATEMENT OF THE OAKS VILLAS RESIDENTS' CONCERNS AND
SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDED
SOUTHWEST DURHAM COLLECTOR STREET PLAN

We have two serious concerns about the recommended plan and corresponding suggestions for solutions.

1) We are concerned that George King Road is proposed to be paved by developers in bits and pieces as developments are approved one by one over a long period of time. That will cause traffic from the initial developments to be diverted for years onto existing neighborhood streets -Lancaster, Nottingham, Donegal, and New Castle, and eventually to Pinehurst and Burning Tree Drives in the Oaks. Those streets will become de facto mini-thoroughfares for many years.

Thus we urge two modifications to the plan to solve this problem:

- A. Early in the development of the area, pave the entire length of George King Rd from Ephesus Church Rd. to Hwy 54 and improve the intersections at both ends of George King Road. The plan will not work if you depend on piecemeal implementation of that critical collector street by developers.
- B. Limit connections from new developments to Lancaster and other existing neighborhood streets to emergency vehicles until such time as George King Road provides collector street service across the entire area.

2) The plan provides no implementation component to retrofit existing streets that are incorporated into the collector street system, so that our neighborhood streets approximate the standards proposed for new streets.

- A. Thus, we urge modification of the plan to incorporate a capital improvement funding program by local governments, particularly the Town of Chapel Hill and Durham County or the MPO, to bring existing streets to the approximate standards of the new streets. Retrofitting cannot be feasibly implemented through subdivision and other development regulations.

September 15, 2006