

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

We have three serious concerns about the quality of the recommended plan.

#1. THE PLAN HAS NOT BEEN WELL THOUGHTOUT. There is no explanation of the plan, no analysis of what it will achieve, and little attention to how it would be implemented. It does not explain the pattern of proposed streets, why it is a good plan and better than the alternatives, or how the order in which it would be constructed might affect how well it works. There is no analysis and evaluation of the traffic patterns generated or altered. It does not specify how various parts of the plan are to be implemented, or who would be responsible among the various local governments and developers. The plan places a proposed S.W. Durham Drive and the transit line in the network, even though they seem entirely out of place and unrealistic.

#2. THE PLAN IGNORES NECESSARY RETROFIT TO EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD STREETS. The proposed plan shows only the proposed future collector streets. In actuality, the proposed collector system includes existing neighborhood streets, to which the proposed streets connect. The plan ignores the need to retrofit those existing neighborhood streets to make them suitable as collector streets. The plan merely dumps new traffic onto existing neighborhood streets that were not designed to the same desirable standards proposed for new streets in the plan.

#3. THE PLAN MISSES THE CONCEPT OF "COMPLETE STREETS". The plan initially holds out the concept of "complete streets" that not only accommodate cars, bikes and pedestrians, but also become "part of the neighborhood environment." The emphasis in the design, however, is on accommodating traffic. Streets that are "part of the neighborhood" are particularly important to those of us living on existing streets that are already very much "part of our neighborhood environment." Without retrofitting existing streets that become collectors, our neighborhood environment is seriously damaged.

We realize the benefits of connecting neighborhoods and street systems and **would support a collector street plan that:**

1. **excludes the S.W. Durham Drive from the point where it crosses I-40 to highway 54**, and adapts either Farrington Road and/or George King Road. to meet the purposes served by the S.W. Durham Drive.
2. **has George King Road paved the entire distance from Ephesus Church Road to highway 54 early in the development process.** If that road is paved by developers in bits and pieces over a long period of time as developments are approved, traffic from the initial developments will be diverted to 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.
3. **provides an explicit implementation component to retrofit existing streets that are incorporated into the collector street system** to meet standards proposed for new collector streets as closely as possible. Retrofitting existing streets to accommodate pedestrian and bike traffic as well as calm auto traffic, while still keeping the street a desirable "part of the neighborhood, will require capital improvement funding by local governments, particularly the Town of Chapel Hill. Retrofitting is not possible through the use of development regulations, as proposed in the plan.

April 28, 2006

Metropolitan Planning Organization
101 City Hall Plaza, 4th Floor
Durham, NC 27701

To Whom It May Concern,

It has come to our attention that there are plans for a major arterial road to connect to Meadowmont Lane in Chapel Hill. As residents of Meadowmont Lane with two small children—a three-year-old and a one-year-old—who moved here with plans to stay for many years, we wanted to express our concern with those plans.

As you are no doubt aware, Rashkis Elementary School is located on Meadowmont Lane. Every morning between 7:25 and 8:15 I watch the traffic on Meadowmont Lane increase exponentially as parents take their children to school. But it's not just automobile traffic. The foot traffic also increases significantly, as numerous parents and their children walk to school. That's part of the beauty of the Meadowmont community, which is designed to be somewhat self-contained. It is also dangerous, of course, because children are unpredictable. We can tell them not to go in the street, but maybe they see a pretty butterfly or a shiny piece of foil, and they just can't help themselves. Combining the substantial pedestrian traffic—with a heavy percentage of children—with the normal Durham/Chapel Hill morning hour is a recipe for disaster. That will be a risk that is present (and as we all know, putting up a School Zone sign will not solve the problem, as many children already walk from outside the School Zone) every single morning of every single school day. If the road is completed, there is no question there will be an incident involving someone's children. When it happens, we'll all shake our heads as people do after tragedies and wonder, "How could this have been avoided?" Fortunately, you have the power to make sure it never happens.

We understand the difficulties of your job, because no one wants a major traffic increase near their home. But connecting 15-501 to Meadowmont Lane—a road that already has a significant speeding problem—is more than just a major traffic increase. It is a community-altering proposal that would destroy the reason many people moved to Meadowmont because of the way it negatively impacts our children.

We appreciate your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Adam and Stephanie Lucas
503 Meadowmont Ln.

Dear Mr. Henry;

My name is Jeff Tillman. My wife, Janis, and I live at 329 Nottingham Drive in Chapel Hill. We apologize for not attending the meeting of the TAC this morning. Work and previous school volunteer commitments got the best of us today. Our absence does not, however, minimize our desire to have our opinions heard.

Janis and I have studied the plans after attending two of the three public meetings presented by the TSC. They stimulated a lot of conversation among residents of Nottingham Drive. There are a few comments that I would like to make with regard to the TSC proposal.

While no one can deny the necessity of the SW Durham Drive, I do question the chosen route for many reasons. Why not continue the route down the existing George King Road until it intersects Hwy. 54? It would appease the residents of Meadowmont who do not want a major road passing in front of Rashkis Elementary. Could you not make a smaller collector street to connect the two? Would that not save a considerable amount of money in construction over the wetlands? Would it not have less of an environmental impact on that area? Would that affect fewer Durham County taxpayers? I do realize it would impact potential tax generating commercial property on Hwy. 54. However, it would impact a future commercial development less than having a possible 12K cars pass in front of an elementary school. I could also argue that having the SW Durham Drive meet Hwy. 54 there would increase the appeal of that property. It would have terrific access to all of the Triangle and therefore more appealing to potential investors.

I think carrying the proposed SW Durham Drive following George King Road until it meets Hwy. 54 merits consideration for many reasons. It will be the most cost effective, affect the fewest people and be the most environmentally friendly option. Thank you for considering this in your review process.

Jeffrey Tillman

Jeffrey and Janis Tillman
329 Nottingham Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
919-490-0160

To Durham TAC Board Members:

My clients, George Smart and William Green, object to the collector road recommendation being presented at the meeting on Wednesday because it potentially affects their property in an unnecessarily negative way. Their property is bounded by Farrington Road, Cleora Drive, Crescent Drive and Rutgers Road.

We believe that the collector road study is too detailed, moving far beyond the notion of “collector road” and into streets that should be planned as part of an overall site design during development. The current plan shows two roads across the north part of the property, effectively taking away two acres (and the only structure) of a 15-acre property.

Please note that we expect to have roads crossing our property to provide connectivity with surrounding land. We have been working with adjacent property owners for several years, and a plan we have developed for the property specifically addressed connections. We believe that roads such as the ones shown on our property should be addressed in the context of adjacent development, not in a plan such as this one. We have been told by the planners that these roads do not have to be built as shown on this plan and can be adjusted at site plan approval. We are fearful, however, that plans such as these get cast in concrete long before a truckload ever shows up.

Please request that staff and consultants modify the plan to focus only on the few roads that are truly needed as part of a collector system. Please do not approve the plan as recommended by staff.

Thank you,

Anne E. Stoddard

Principal

The Stoddard Group: Real Estate Consultants

2404 Pathway Drive

Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Phone: (919) 932-5310

Fax: (919) 932-5372

Cell: (919) 614-3214

www.stoddardgroup.net

From: Chris Selby [cselby@med.unc.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2006 12:10 PM

To: Henry, Andrew

Cc: hunte044@mc.duke.edu

Subject: Celeste Circle

May 16, 2006

Dear Andrew Henry,

Thank you very much for responding to my questions.

With the Collector Street Plan, steps are being taken toward directing new roads through our neighborhood, at least one of which, a redirected Farrington Road, can be expected to be quite busy. Since this would destroy the character of our community on Celeste Circle I am interested in opposing the current draft Plan.

I believe it would be productive for me to be in a position to suggest alternatives. The problem in my view is a consequence of the following: 1) the properties west of Celeste Circle, up to Ephesus Church Road, when developed, will need access to NC 54, and 2) the Farrington Road/NC 54 intersection is to be atrophied. Consequently, paths for the anticipated traffic are being laid through my neighborhood.

I write to ask what are the obstacles to the following?

Create a new intersection with a traffic light at George King/NC 54 and pave George King for some distance towards Ephesus Church Road. The newly paved section of George King Road might go all of the way to Ephesus Church Road, only to SW Durham Drive, or along a new road bed towards a connection with Farrington Road near where Farrington Road crosses I-40. An alternative to this would be to create a new intersection with NC 54 not at George King, but where Crossland Drive comes close to NC 54, and create a new road through the Crossland Drive stubout which parallels George King Road. This latter alternative is less attractive since there are three homes located on Crossland Drive, and this road is part of our neighborhood; however, something of this nature was proposed in two of the CSP Alternatives (A and B) presented at Workshop number 2.

As far as the obstacles to the above scenarios, what could be done to overcome them?

Since I have seen what developers are capable of accomplishing from the example of the intersection of I-40 at Southpoint Mall, I am encouraged that resources may exist to accommodate the alternatives described above.

Thank you again for your help.

Sincerely,
Chris Selby

From: Eric Nelson [ericnelson@nc.rr.com]
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2006 12:02 PM
To: comments@dchcmpo.org
Subject: DCHC MPO Website: Collector Street Plan

This is an enquiry e-mail via <http://www.dchcmpo.org> from:
Eric Nelson <ericnelson@nc.rr.com>

Hi

I know that you have received a lot of complaints about the proposed location of SW Durham Drive, and I just wanted to put in a vote for the project to go ahead as planned. The current intersection of Ephesus Church Rd and Farrington Rd is really dangerous if you are turning left onto Farrington Rd, and it looks like the extension of SW Durham Drive will solve that issue for us.

Thanks!

Eric and Shirley Nelson
4320 Trenton Rd. Chapel Hill NC

From: Edward Cornet [ed_cornet@unc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 3:28 PM
To: Henry, Andrew
Cc: jhee@mindspring.com; CRAZPCL1@aol.com
Subject: Southwest Durham Collector Street Plan

Dear Mr. Henry,

I am a home owner on Nottingham Drive in the Oaks subdivision. I was unable to make the public hearings but I have a concern I would like to voice.

It is not clear what problem the the transportation department is trying to solve with respect to the connections to Nottingham Drive and Lancaster Drive within our sub-division. Is the purpose to make it easier for us to get to 54, 40 or another major thoroughfare, or is the purpose to make it easier for others to transit through our neighborhood ?

If it is the former I know that the issue of improving our egress has NOT been raised within our homeowners association. If it is the later I know that our homeowners are concerned about ANY increase in traffic for several reasons. We are so concerned that we are paying to have SPEED TABLES installed to inhibit speeding and enhance the safety of our children. Furthermore the Nottingham and Lancaster connections would funnel traffic past the Chapel Hill Country Club. On summer days and evenings this area is already jammed with cars on both sides of the street using the facilities. Small children go back and forth to the cars. The neighbors are aware and take precautions. Someone new to the area might not be so careful and an accident is much more likely.

I thanks to you and your team for your work on the effort to improve transportation flow; however, in this instance I believe that the situation is fine the way it stands. No need to spend any more of our tax payer dollars.

Thanks,

Edward Cornet
130 Nottingham Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

On 6/12/06 3:11 PM, "CRAZPCL1@aol.com" <CRAZPCL1@aol.com> wrote:

Ed,

This is the website of the Collector Street.

DCHC-MPO - Southwest Durham Collector Street Plan http://www.dhcmpo.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=35&Itemid=35

I think that depending on who you would like to talk to, there are several references.

Claudia Crassweller

June 9, 2006

Dear Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee,

I am writing to the members of the Transportation Advisory Committee, which will meet on June 14, 2006 to hear public comment regarding the Draft Collector Street Plan.

I live off NC 54 near I-40 on Celeste Circle in the Eastwood Park Neighborhood. Most of my neighbors and I are opposed to components of the Plan as they pertain to our neighborhood. We plan to present a petition, and explain our position and possible alternatives to the plan at the meeting.

I would like to take this opportunity in advance of the meeting on June 14 to make one point very clear so that it does not get lost among the many speakers and details that are presented.

The Plan proposes to atrophy the intersection of Farrington Road and NC 54, and to create a new Farrington Road. The re-routing of Farrington Road is inappropriate, because the scope of the Collector Street Plan is collector streets. Farrington is a minor thoroughfare, not a collector street. The literature describing the Plan goes to great lengths to say that minor thoroughfares such as the planned Southwest Durham Drive are not to be considered in the Plan, because thoroughfares are outside the scope of the Plan.

The Plan enables itself to re-route this thoroughfare, Farrington, by erroneously drawing Farrington on the Plan map as "currently a collector street". This is one of several errors on the map in the area of my neighborhood. The map also indicates part of Celeste Circle and Crescent Drive as "currently collector streets". However, Celeste is a local street, and Crescent Drive is partly a gravel road and partly a dirt path waist high in weeds where the Plan indicates that it is a collector street. Also, the NC 54 Service Road currently functions as a collector street, but is not indicated as such in the Plan.

The net result of these mapping errors is to make the rerouting of Farrington appear to be both reasonable on paper and legitimate. However, it is not reasonable because the net result will be to send the arterial traffic of Farrington, over 9,000 trips a day and climbing, down a local street, Celeste Circle.

Why would the planners attempt something that is not appropriate? I believe that the planners are under pressure to re-route Farrington and feel unable to wait until the long-range plan is reviewed in the fall of 2008. At the review of the long-range transportation plan it will be appropriate to consider re-routing minor thoroughfares such as Farrington and Southwest Durham Drive. Rather than wait, they have erroneously called Farrington a collector street and are trying to re-route it now, in the Draft Collector Street Plan that is under the review of the TAC.

The ultimate goal of the planners, I believe, is to remove the light at the Farrington/NC 54 intersection since rush hour traffic backs up onto the interstate. This ultimate goal is good, but inappropriately re-routing Farrington traffic down our local street is not good, especially considering the availability of options.

Re-routing Farrington down our local street will destroy the character of our community. It will destroy affordable housing that is in the path of proposed streets. If it is done according to the current Draft Collector Street Plan, I believe that it will be done by inappropriate means.

I will be very grateful if you will please consider these facts and viewpoints as you review the Plan.

Sincerely,

Chris Selby, Ph.D.
138 Celeste Circle
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
cselby@med.unc.edu
403-1388 (h)
966-8824 (w)

P.S., the recent memo from the LPA to the TAC clarifies that Celeste Circle is not currently a collector street.

From: CRAZPCL1@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2006 12:42 PM
To: Henry, Andrew
Subject: Collector Road into the Oaks
Andy,

I do not think I will be able to attend the meeting on Wednesday night in that it is my husband's birthday.

I wanted to make my opinion known about the plan to put collector roads into the Oaks, specifically onto my street, Lancaster Drive. I am, for the record, against both roads coming into the Oaks, but my true concerns lies in a collector roads impact on my street in particular.

We: 1. Are a residential neighborhood with many young children.

2. Already have a problem with speeding, both from commercial vehicles and private vehicles that do not appear to feel any need to adhere to the current speed limit. I personally have had a pet killed by a vehicle. I also have had vehicles tailgate me and flash their lights at me in an attempt to speed me up, when I was going the posted speed limit.

3. Have a great deal of parking along Lancaster Drive, such as during children's swim meets, peak times of pool attendance, and golf tournaments. Children often dart out away from their parent's grasp, as children will do.

4. Have golfers use Lancaster to cross from different holes on the course at all hours of the day and days of the week.

Our street does not have adequate sidewalks to have safe pedestrian traffic, in the event of a collector road.

I urge you to rethink and reroute this collector road idea away from a residential area that is not equipped to handle increased traffic and increased unsafe conditions.

Claudia Jordan Crassweller
201 Lancaster Drive
960-0904

June 14, 2006

Dear TAC members:

This is a brief comment about the Southwest Durham collector road plan. Thank you for undertaking this project. I have lived in Meadowmont for two years, and I agree with the position recently taken by the Meadowmont homeowners association board. I do not have their written position in front of me, but the president, Gary Barnes, described their position this way:

The board supports connectivity, and would support a connection of Meadowmont Lane, as long as it is a collector road and not an arterial road.

This seems to me to be a reasonable approach. When the Meadowmont master plan was approved in 1995, I was on the Chapel Hill Town Council. It was a matter of public record, and much public discussion, that Meadowmont Lane would probably some day connect with another road.

Thank you for your hard work on our transportation issues.

Rosemary Waldorf
Bryan Properties, Inc.
300 Market Street, Suite 120A
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
Office 919.933.4422
Cell 919.414.2047
waldorf@nc.rr.com

From: Joan Lash [lash.williams@mindspring.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 4:56 PM

To: Henry, Andrew; Beckmann, Ellen

Subject: SW Durham/SE Chapel Hill Collector Streets

We are writing regarding the proposed SW Durham/SE Chapel Hill Collector Streets about which there is a public hearing this evening.

We live on Lancaster Drive, directly across the street from the Chapel Hill Country Club; we moved here in 1999. Two things have happened recently with the Club that have changed Lancaster Drive considerably. Since these are recent events, we wanted to bring them to your attention before the plan goes any further.

Last year, the Club completely remodeled and rebuilt its swimming pool. In addition to adding heat so the pool can be open longer during the season, it also changed the pool's point of entry. This has meant that a lot of people now are parking on Lancaster Drive, as well as on Newcastle which feeds off of Lancaster, because it is closer for them to walk to the pool entrance this way. It is now the norm that cars are parked on both sides of Lancaster on weekend days.

In addition, the Club started a new member drive last year and hired a membership coordinator who has been very efficient. In early 2004, the Club had 619 memberships. Since that time, the club has added 170 memberships (which translates, of course, to many actual members), and with attrition, is currently over 700 memberships. Its goal is to soon be "full" at 800 memberships.

Not only has the number of memberships increased, the demographics also have changed as many of the new memberships represent young families. With the Club population younger, its programming now includes a lot more activities year-round, including family-oriented dining options on weekday nights which already are very popular.

Furthermore, the Chapel Hill Country Club is undertaking a major renovation which, in addition to improving its golf and tennis retail spaces, also will expand its physical facilities with an entirely new 2-story wing and an outdoor pavilion. These changes will make the Club much more attractive for large events such as weddings which will have an even greater impact on traffic flow on Lancaster Drive.

Yesterday, there was a swim meet at the Club. At 5:14 last evening, the parking lot was completel full and in addition, there were 117 cars parked on Lancaster and Newcastle -- 47 on the south side of Lancaster Drive, 41 on the north side, 10 on Lancaster Drive extension (on the other side of Pinehurst), and 19 on Newcastle Drive. When cars are parked on both sides of Lancaster, the remaining roadway is very limited and what makes it worse is the fact that many little kids are getting in and out of those cars and running across the street.

Since we have seen such a change in traffic and parking patterns in just this last year, we wanted to apprise you of these developments as we know that Lancaster Drive is very different today than it was when you began your studies about these collector streets.

We are asking you to re-look at adding more cars to Lancaster Drive as the impact of the Chapel Hill Country Club is much greater than before and it will get worse as additional memberships are added and people start using the Club to its full extent.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joan Lash and Ray Williams
104 Lancaster Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
(919)933-1266
Lash.Williams@Mindspring.com

From: Chris Selby [cselby@med.unc.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, June 20, 2006 12:47 PM

To: William.Bell@durhamnc.gov; gordonam@mindspring.com; azaffron@townofcarrboro.org; duckdogcross@aol.com; Catotti, Diane; bmheron@co.durham.nc.us; ehallman@nc.rr.com; Woodard, Mike; ereckhow@aol.com

Subject: Collector Street Plan: George King Road

June 20, 2006

Dear Transportation Advisory Committee Members,

The possibility of paving the southern end of George King Road has been an important issue in the developing Collector Street Plan. The emails that follow, from the NCDOT (Chris Murray), indicate that it should be relatively easy to acquire the necessary environmental permitting from the Corps of Engineers, which will be necessary since George King, a gravel road, passes through and alongside Corps of Engineers land. This information contrasts with the June 14 Memo from the LPA to the TAC, which states that, regarding George King Road, "there might be delays or permanent barriers to receiving a permit to make improvements".

A second set of emails (below, Tasha Johnson) indicates that the paving of George King has already been considered by the NCDOT, and probably would already have been completed, if not for the fact that some as yet unidentified resident or residents living beside George King do not wish to donate right of way to allow the paving to proceed. Consequently, George King Road is on the state's right of way hold list, meaning that state funds will be made available and the road will be paved by the state when the right of way becomes available.

A popular road plan advocated by residents at the June 14 meeting of the TAC was the rerouting of the proposed Southwest Durham Drive to a location east of Corps lands and west of Eastwood Park. In particular, Farrington Road passing south from the overpass at I-40 would connect not with the proposed Southwest Durham Drive and pass through Meadowmont, but instead would connect with the southern end of George King, which has access to NC 54.

Please note that if this popular plan for a Farrington/George King Road were to be undertaken, it would require paving only the southern end of George King, where

there are no residents, and thus it would avoid the requirement to obtain right of way from residents living on George King to the north.

Consequently, in light of this popular plan, paving of George King is “doable”, and it could even be done and paid for by the state. It will provide a paved “stubout” from which development can proceed northward along the new Farrington/George King route. It will not constitute the type of piecemeal upgrade of George King that will promote “cut-through” traffic with Meadowmont. The construction of a light and an intersection of George King with NC 54, which would facilitate but would not be required for access of southern George King with NC 54, may be considered when the Long Range Transportation Plan is reviewed.

The paving of the southern end of George King to satisfy a modified Collector Street Plan will likely require communication and coordination between the TAC and NCDOT. The TAC would likely need to communicate that paving of only the southern end will satisfy the Collector Street Plan and will benefit public transportation needs. This level of communication appears consistent with the MPO’s Memorandum of Understanding for Continuing, Cooperative, and Comprehensive Planning; however, this communication appears to be a novel aspect of the Street Plan, which envisages that streets will be constructed by the initiative and actions of developers, not by the initiative of the TAC plus the initiative and action of the NCDOT.

If the members of the TAC feel as though this is new information pertinent to the creation of an improved Street Plan, this correspondence may be forwarded to the appropriate agency which is currently modifying the Collector Street Plan. It is not clear what, if any, opportunities may exist for residents to contribute input to the Plan before a final version is decided.

Sincerely,

Chris Selby
138 Celeste Circle
City of Durham

Mr. Selby,

We typically do not have a problem obtaining environmental permits for impacts to wetlands, streams and regulated riparian buffers associated with secondary road construction projects. We have to follow a step-down process where we attempt to avoid, minimize and then provide compensatory mitigation for impacts associated with our projects.

I do not begin assessment of any roadway project until it is on the paving list for the calendar year. This paving list is typically provided by the County Maintenance Engineer.

Chris Murray

christopher_selby@med.unc.edu wrote:

> Dear Mr. Murray,

>

> I communicated with Tasha Johnson about the prospects for the paving George King Road, and when it came to the part about the environmental permits, she deferred me back to you. For paving a gravel road of this nature, in which some of it goes through Corps of Engineers land, part of which is gameland and a small section of which is wetland, is there much difficulty in getting the environmental permits? By difficulty I mean would it delay a paving project by 3 or 4 months or more? Does it happen very often that it is not possible to obtain an environmental permit?

>

> Thank you for your help.

>

> Chris Selby

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: Chris Murray <cmurray@dot.state.nc.us>

> Date: Tuesday, June 13, 2006 1:28 pm

> Subject: Re: George King Road (SR 1112)/Durham County

> To: Chris Selby <tselby@med.unc.edu>

> Cc: "Alsmeyer, Eric C SAW" <Eric.C.Alsmeyer@saw02.usace.army.mil> ,

> "Duckson, Ralph C SAW" <Ralph.C.Duckson@saw02.usace.army.mil> , "Tasha

> N. Johnson, P.E." <tnjohnson@dot.state.nc.us>

>

> > Mr. Selby,

> >

> > We had a chance to discuss these roadways with Ms. Tasha Johnson, P.E. (District 2 Engineer). She informed us that George King Road is currently on the right-of-way hold list. Additionally, we cannot find any records of Crossland Drive. I suggest that you might want

> > to contact Ms. Johnson at (919) 560-6854 for additional information
> > concerning these roadways. No environmental permits have been
> > obtained for either of these roadways.

> >
> > Sincerely,
> >
> > Chris Murray
> > NCDOT Division 5 Environmental Supervisor

> > "Alsmeyer, Eric C SAW" wrote:

> > > By copy of this e-mail, I am requesting that Chris Murray of
> > > NCDOT, Division 5 (Tel. 560-6081), and Ralph Duckson of the Army
> > > Corps of Engineers, Jordan Lake (Tel. 542-2227,x25), either call
> > > Mr. Selby (Tel. 966-8824) or have the appropriate person call him.
> > > Mr. Selby is asking about the possibility of paving the southern
> > > 1/2 of George King Road (SR 1112) in southwest Durham County. As
> > > I understand it, the purpose of the paving would be to provide
> > > improved access to NC 54 from potential development that would
> > > access the public highways at the northern 1/2 of George King Road
> > > (currently unpaved also). The Corps of Engineers owns most of the
> > > land adjacent to both sides of the current NCDOT right-of-way on
> > > the southern end of George King Road, and a lot of that land is
> > > likely wetlands.
> > > Please reply or call me if you have further questions for me.

> > > Thank you,

> > > Eric Alsmeyer
> > > Project Manager
> > > US Army Corps of Engineers
> > > Raleigh Regulatory Field Office
> > > Tel: (919) 876-8441, ext 23
> > > Fax: (919) 876-5823
> > > Regulatory Homepage: <http://www.saw.usace.army.mil/WETLANDS>

> > > Please help us better serve you! Take our brief online Customer
> > > Service Survey.
> > > (<http://www.saw.usace.army.mil/scripts/rws3.pl?FORM=regulatory>)

> > > -----
> > > From: Chris Selby [<mailto:cselby@med.unc.edu>]

> > > Sent: Friday, June 09, 2006 7:35 AM
> > > To: Alsmeyer, Eric C SAW
> > > Subject: George King Road

> > > Dear Mr. Alsmeyer,

> > > I am a resident of southwestern Durham, living near the Corps of

> > > Engineers land where there is the "Upper Little Creek Wildfowl
> > > Impoundment". I am curious about development in our area and was
> > > directed to you with my questions by the Corps of Engineers
> > > website.
> > >
> > > I am interested to know what would be the prospects for permitting
> > > the paving of the southern end of George King Road, which is
> > > currently a gravel road that passes alongside and through Corps of
> > > Engineers Land. Might it be exempt? Also, I recall that some
> > > time ago there was a plan to pave George King, and that plan was
> > > thwarted by the local residents. Do you recall if a permit was
> > > granted some time in the past to allow the paving of the southern
> > > end of George King Road?
> > >
> > > Near George King (just to the northeast) is Crossland Drive, which
> > > has a stubout in Corps of Engineers land. I am also curious to
> > > know about the prospects for permitting of an extension of
> > > Crossland Drive to the north where it could connect with future
> > > development.
> > >
> > > Thank you very much for your help.
> > >
> > > Sincerely,
> > >
> > > Chris Selby
> > >
> >

Tasha Johnson wrote:

Oh yes... I forgot that part. Once we obtain right of way then we still have to go through environmental permitting. I imagine it will still be just a back road. When we build these secondary unpaved roads, we don't designate them collectors, arterials, etc. But we do try to build them with 10 foot lanes, 4-6' shoulders, etc., which is similar to the residential collector guidelines established in the NCDOT subdivision manual.

Chris Selby wrote:

Dear Tasha Johnson,
Thank you for your response.
You finished your previous email stating that George King road "...will be paved with the next funding allocation" (assuming that right-of-way is obtained). I have a couple of more questions.

What about the permitting requirements of the Corps of Engineers? It appears that a small section of the road passes through wetlands and for a private developer that might create a problem. Does the state have an easy time dealing with a situation like that? Also, can you tell what kind of road it would be? I have heard of roads classified as local, collectors, and arterials (which is the same as thoroughfares). Can you guess if it would be 25 or 35 mph?

Thanks again for your help.

Chris Selby

From: Tasha N. Johnson, P.E. [mailto:tnjohnson@dot.state.nc.us]

Sent: Thursday, June 15, 2006 8:59 AM

To: Chris Selby

Subject: Re: George King Road

Chris,

being on the right of way hold list means that the required right of way can not be obtained from one of more of the property owners along the road. The owners of adjoining property must dedicate, free of charge, a 50-60 foot swath of land to provide enough room to build the road according to current standards. Thats usually, but not always because sometimes the alignment has to be shifted, 30" from the center of the existing alignment.

George King Road had the funding available, but not the right of way. I am not sure which property owner(s) did not dedicate the right of way. If the needed right of way becomes available, the road will move back to the top of the paving priority list and will be paved with the next funding allocation.

Hope that helps.

Tasha N. Johnson, P.E.

District Engineer, Div5/Dist2

Chris Selby wrote:

Dear Tasha Johnson,

Mr. Murray contacted my by email to tell me that you had discussed George King Road, which I brought up because I was curious about what would be the prospects for paving it. Mr. Murray suggested that I contact you and said that George King is currently on the right-of-way hold list. I am just a resident, can you please tell me what is meant by a right-of-way hold list, and what does that have to do with having it paved?

I thought that being a state road, that the state would be able to pave it (it is currently a gravel road) if it felt that there were a need, and if the plan to upgrade the road satisfied the requirements of the Corps of Engineers, since it passes alongside and through

Corps land.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,
Chris Selby

To: Transportation Advisory Committee
Date: June 29, 2006

Southwest Durham/Southeast Chapel Hill Collector Street Plan

We, residents of Oaks III, located within Durham County and Orange County and the Town of Chapel Hill, are opposed to the Draft Plan for the following reasons:

(1) Traffic Impact

The most glaring deficiency of the Draft Plan is that it does not measure or even estimate the traffic impact on existing streets.

The Town of Chapel Hill requires a complete Traffic Impact Study for any action that will add more than five hundred (500) vehicles per day to an existing street.

The Draft Plan will clearly add more than five hundred (500) vehicles per day to a number of Chapel Hill Streets.

Therefore, a Traffic Impact Study is required by Town rules and precedents. Certainly, wise planning and a proper respect for existing neighborhoods require that traffic impacts be quantified and projected and that collector roads not encourage “cut-through” traffic onto existing neighborhood streets.

(2) Nottingham is a “Local” Street

According to the MPO, a collector road is to “draw traffic from local streets and expedite movement of this traffic...to an arterial or collector.”

The Draft Plan dumps collector roads Kinsale and Kilkenny onto Nottingham, which is in complete contravention of the key function of a collector road plan. Collector roads are supposed to operate in exactly the opposite manner of the way they are depicted in the Draft Plan.

Recently, the Chapel Hill Town Council has reiterated its designation of Nottingham as a “local” street.

The Draft Plan is fundamentally flawed by designating Kinsale and Kilkenny as collector roads and dumping their traffic onto a “local” street.

(3) Nottingham has Existing Traffic Safety Problems

After a long study period of the traffic safety problems on Nottingham, the Chapel Hill Town Council has recently authorized four (4) speed tables to be built on Nottingham. The Oaks III residents are in the process of raising over \$8,000 to pay for

speed tables that are visible and functional and that are in keeping with those already installed along Pinehurst.

The Draft Plan will increase and encourage “cut-through” traffic onto Nottingham.

Any traffic increase, especially “cut-through” traffic, will compound the already dangerous traffic safety problems.

The Draft Plan is directly at odds with the neighborhood concerns and the Chapel Hill Town Council action to help make Nottingham a slower, safer street.

(4) Pinehurst / Ephesus Church Road Intersection

This key intersection is just outside the study area of the Draft Plan, but it should have been included in the study area.

The Pinehurst / Ephesus intersection is characterized by poor sight distances, and it is on the inside of a curve, with opposing traffic from Sharon. Because of the short block between Nottingham and Ephesus, there is inadequate stacking distance. In addition, because of the traffic calming median in Pinehurst, there is almost no stacking distance for left turns.

The Draft Plan will place intolerable levels of new traffic onto the Pinehurst / Ephesus intersection. It would appear that this intersection cannot handle the level of collector road traffic that will result from the Draft Plan.

(5) Southeast Chapel Hill Streets are Circuitous and Tend to Disperse Traffic

The existing street system in the Oaks, Colony Woods, Briarcliff, Ridgefield, and Meadowmont is characterized by residential streets that are circuitous and do not form a “grid” pattern.

The Draft Plan proposes a classic “grid” pattern on the new collector roads east of the Oaks.

Such a “grid” pattern will dump concentrated collector traffic onto the much more circuitous routes in Chapel Hill.

The “grid” pattern is not appropriate for Southeast Chapel Hill because it will be detrimental to and will unfavorably change the existing neighborhood patterns.

(6) The Draft Plan is “Car-Centric”

The preamble of the plan discusses the importance of accommodating other modes of travel, such as pedestrian and bicycle routes, but the plan only contains

pathways for cars and trucks. The Draft Plan makes no special accommodations for walkers or bikers.

There are many different types of connectivity that link neighborhood and streets together. The Draft Plan is “car-centric.” The only way to have a true multi-mode plan for the twenty-first century is to supplement the plan with pedestrian routes and bike routes. Until that is done, the Draft Plan only serves one constituency – the truck and car owners.

(7) Maida Vale

The Draft Plan is “topsy-turvy.”

The Oaks is developed at two (2) units per acre. Maida Vale will be developed at six (6) units per acre.

The Draft Plan shows two (2) collector roads dumping into the Oaks from the east.

Maida Vale has zero collector roads.

It is clear that the Draft Plan expects traffic to come from the high density neighborhood (Maida Vale) to the low density neighborhood (Oaks).

This topsy-turvy Draft Plan is in direct contravention of the goal of protecting the nature and character of existing neighborhoods.

For all of the above reasons, we urge the Transportation Advisory Committee to NOT APPROVE this plan.

Resident:
Steve Pendergraft

Address:
401 Nottingham Drive, Chapel Hill,
North Carolina 27517

From: Ann Atkins [annatkins@nc.rr.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 07, 2006 7:33 PM

To: Henry, Andrew; william.bell@durhamnc.gov; Catotti, Diane; bmheron@co.durham.nc.us

Subject: Collector Street Plan - Eastwood Park

To whom it may concern:

We have been residents of Eastwood Park for 38 years and support the Collector Street Plan (CSP). Eastwood Park is made up of 30 houses on Celeste Circle, 3 house on Crossland Drive and 14 houses on Nelson Highway (Hwy 54 service road).

Recently we were presented with a petition to sign objecting to the CSP and did not sign. It is our understanding that we were not the only family that did not agree to sign the petition. The petition will be presented in conjunction with the July 14th, 7 p.m. meeting downtown in Durham. Please note that our neighborhood is no longer the nice single family owned area that it was when we bought here. In the last 2 years, Durham has approved a daycare and a group home on Nelson Highway. The daycare only has 6 parking spaces, but at any time in the afternoon there will be 10 cars parked in the yard and along the road obstructing traffic and walkers. We objected to the group home, but got it anyway. We are not so naive as to believe these boys are there because they have been good little boys. Would you like to buy our house after we disclose this information just 2 doors down from us?

Also, keep in mind we now have 30% of our neighborhood as rentals and several abandoned homes. The abandoned homes look terrible and are on both Celeste Circle and Nelson Hwy.

Thank you for your time. Please feel free to contact us.

Eddie and Ann Atkins
2308 Nelson Highway

493-8107