From: julie mcclintock
To: comp plan
Subject: Central West Community Page
Date: Thursday, July 04, 2013 7:40:44 AM

Megan

Please make this remarkable exchange a part of the community record.

Thanks

--Julie

Begin forwarded message:

From: F Mistry
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2013 2:43 PM
To: Sarah K. McIntee
Cc: Lucy Davis ; Alan Tom ; EricDingfelder@yahoo.com ; Megan Wooley ; amymorrisryan@gmail.com ; miparker1@aol.com ; Jonathan Drake ; Abby Parcell ; Anothony Carey - Gmail ; Anthony Carey ; Julie McClintock ; Bruce Murray ;Buffie Webber ; David Bonk ; David Tuttle ; Deana Rhodeside ; Eric Hyman ; Gordon Merklein ; Jared Simmons ; JB Culpepper ; Jeff Kidd ; Jim Ward ; john ager ; Loryn Clark ; Mary Jane Nirdlinger ; Meredith Judy ; Mia Burroughs ;Mickey Jo Sorrell ; Todd LoFrese ; Whit Rummel ; tforcella@chccs.k12.nc.us ; Jonathan Enns ; Kristin Walker ; Katie Savelli ; Jessica Mejer ; Rebecca Campbell ; Lucy Steiner ; Chen, Xiaoxin ; gila kaniel ; John Poteat ; Colleen O'Brien
Subject: RE: Parking, being a progressive community? clarification addedum

Hi Sarah,

I must be doing something right for you to call me names. However, as they say "Sticks and stones may break bones, but words will never hurt me". When one gets involved in small town politics, one must be thick skinned enough to not get offended easily. By the way, dinosaurs ruled the earth for 350 million years compared to the poor prognosis for human existence on earth, and they did not die from their own mistakes but from a truly freakish one-in-a-60-million-years event.

Probably nobody on the SC has lived in urban areas

longer than I have done - 23 years in Bombay, 8 years in Boston, 6 years in LA, 2 years in San Francisco. So I know the advantages and disadvantages of living in urban areas. I also know the nightmare they can become when urbanization is not done right and we let developers and landowners to run roughshod on the planning process. I do not blame them for wanting more and more, but it is for us to keep it balanced so the town does not lose. If urban living is living in tiny apartments, on perpetually crowded streets, with plenty of pollution, noise, crime and high prices, you can keep it. But if putting some urban features in Chapel Hill, such frequent bus service, smoothly flowing roads, true mixed development (with day and night uses for buildings), town parks and plazas and wilderness trails, count me in. I suggested all these features in the vision statements which the citizens submitted to the SC last December. What do we have to do to make that happen?

Seriously, Sarah, if you have not already determined it, you and I are natural allies, since we both want Estes to be safe for children and pedestrians, and we do want it to become congested, so that you do not have the additional burden of pollution, traffic noise and honking outside your window. I truly empathize with your frustration for the last 28 years in not being able to do something about traffic on Estes. Could that be because others interests are easily able to distract you from this very important goal by getting you involved in other distracting issues (high density, green parking, etc)? I love your passion, but we all need to focus our energies on the most important job on hand.

Let us recapitulate what the SC has achieved in the past 6 months on the important issue of keeping Estes safe and uncongested, and make the CW area an attractive and inviting place. Let me give you a few examples:

- we have seen some very exciting and attractive pictures of streetscapes, BUT we have seen no

commitment of resources to make that happen from the town, state or developers. The Town Council told us clearly that there is no town and state money, and that Estes will remain a major east-west transportation corridor (five lanes in the future?). I am not from Missouri but "Show me the money".

- we have talked of plazas and parks, BUT, at our last meeting, one landowner complained that it would take over too much acreage, EVEN though the town would be providing a substantial benefit by increasing the zoning from R-1 to R-3, R-4 or R-5, THUS improving the profit on the currently R-1 zoned land.
- we have talked about the fact that Chapel Hill lacks affordable housing and that young people cannot afford to live here. BUT we have not heard any strong statements and commitments that maybe all or a mjority of the development in this area should focus on affordable and workforce housing. I do not mean a few token apartments and a small amount of money which I have seen in past agreements. Are we going to land up with overpriced condos like downtown and Route 54?
- we have talked about a frequent and extended hours bus service, BUT we have not heard any commitments from the town. INSTEAD we hear about Bus Rapid Transit along MLK which would save at most 5 minutes for a ride from I-40 to the UNC campus, and lose two lanes on MLK thus adding to congestion. There is no regular bus service on Estes (from Greensboro to Franklin) or along Seawell and Homestead. Are we going to agree to all this extra development without any assurance that congestion on Estes will be reduced? I do not want promises, and then a "sorry, we do not have the money".
- you made a very strong argument for preserving the wonderful ecology of the land south of Estes, BUT we have heard no suggestion that it should

be left alone and swapped for some other currently empty or poorly developed and partially utilized land in another part of Chapel Hill. This is one of the few green spaces in the heart of Chapel Hill, and we need to figure out a win-win solution to preserving it as a park. That would be true stewardship of the environment, instead of saying that tall buildings will save the environment.

- in an ideal world, we would all be living in idyllic villages and walk everywhere, BUT we live in a 200-year old town, and sometimes it is not realistic to walk everywhere. It is 2 miles from MLK to Franklin on Estes Drive, and most people do not have the time and energy to make that trek for routine errands. (One can save auto miles in other ways; for example, I make only 2-4 trips per month to the grocery stores, and do not hop into my car for a gallon of milk or the newspaper, and combine my trips to the bank, post office and library.)

I think there are a number of like minded persons like you and I on the SC, but they are unwilling to speak out for fear of being labelled "anti-development" when all we want is sensible and win-win development which does not degrade anyone's quality of life. The citizen's plan offers a reasonable pro-development scenario. Most citizens would agree with me and maybe that is why it probably raised such loud objections from some on the SC.

I think I have written enough and I am sure you get the idea. I shall be glad to sit with you and other like minded persons and discuss this further. Let me know when. We can all work together for the betterment of Chapel Hill.

Sincerely,
Firoz (your annoying dinosaur)

Date: Tue, 2 Jul 2013 19:12:17 -0400
From: sarhkamc@gmail.com
To: fmistry@hotmail.com
CC: lucycdavis@gmail.com; alantom@mindspring.com; ericdingfelder@yahoo.com; mwooley@townofchapelhill.org; amymorrisryan@gmail.com; miparker1@aol.com; jonathandrake@gmail.com; abby.parcell@gmail.com; thecareysare@gmail.com; acarey@sienahotel.com;mcclintock.julie@gmail.com; bmurray@chcymca.org; buffie@kw.com; dbonk@townofchapelhill.org; tuttledavs@aol.com; deanar@rhodeside-harwell.com; ehyman@nc.rr.com; merklein@unc.edu; jsimmonsphotography@gmail.com; jculpepper@townofchapelhill.org; jeff.kidd@facilities.unc.edu;jimward@nc.rr.com; agerjohn@gmail.com; lclark@townofchapelhill.org; mnirdlinger@townofchapelhill.org; meredithj@rhodeside-harwell.com; mia@miaburroughs.com; mjsorrell@gmail.com; tlofrese@chccs.k12.nc.us; whitr@aol.com; tforcella@chccs.k12.nc.us; jenns@chccs.k12.nc.us;kwalker@chccs.k12.nc.us; ksavelli@chccs.k12.nc.us; jmejer@chccs.k12.nc.us; rcampbell@chccs.k12.nc.us; steinerlucy@gmail.com; lchen@nccu.edu; gkaniel@nc.rr.com; john.poteat@ncleg.net; obrienhalla@nc.rr.com
Subject: Parking, being a progressive community? clarification addedum

Firoz, I just realized that you might take my "dinosaur" comment as an insult. You are not a dinosaur. What I am trying to, perhaps too colorfully pointing out, that we shouldn't be thinking status quo maintenance as we just might become extinct by not adapting.---Firoz is way to loveable to be a dinosaur.---Sarah

Firoz, are you trying to tell us that Chapel Hill is not

going to adapt to our changing world? That is such an un-Chapel-Hill-like attitude. You would like us to be the dinosaurs den as the Cretaceous comes to a close. Are you saying, if we had a frequent bus service, you would not use the bus? Are you saying that using a bus service is unrealistic for a lower carbon future? Are using scooters and bicycles unrealistic? Do you think that I, as a pedestrian and bus user, would like walking across more parking lots than I do already? I resent that fact that, as a pedestrian, I have to walk in heat that is 10-15 degrees hotter across a parking lot, beside unnecessarily wide streets, just so you can have the luxury of free parking wherever you go. Sorry, but I want to challenge your dinosaur-hood here. We are in the midst of a transportation/housing/energy use revolution. This revolution is necessary because of climate change. It is very unrealistic to assume that we don't have to change our behavior here.

I am working on a paper, and drawing it up, about possible parking and street design that has the least impact on run-off and the environment, but obviously, in the world we are changing to, the vehicles we will be using will be different than today's, most likely, because energy will be more expensive, vehicles will be smaller and homes will be smaller. Yes, we need to plan for today's vehicles, but we need to be cognizant that building impermeable parking anywhere on these sites, if not done extremely carefully, will adversely affect that pristine, virginal Cole Springs Branch creek I was just describing. Parking comes at a cost some of us are not willing to pay. The bus isn't just for other people to use. The adaptation to lower carbon living requires becoming more energy efficient. Energy efficiency isn't just for other people to do. WE are the "other people." We need to understand that many communities that use much of their land on asphalt have significant opportunity loss. Parking lots do not generate income. Parking lots waste energy because spacing things out wastes energy. Parking lots displace human activity. Human activity is what generates income. If you can get

a person to the store without their car, then you have more space for merchandise. The reason why that Cole stream is in such great condition is because this area has not been developed. It would be a shame to put our resources into making parking lots. As a pedestrian, I don't want to be walking across any parking lots. We will have parking, but it won't be in the form of parking lots. I am proposing what I call "green ribbon parking" flanking all streets, instead of parking lots. By keeping parking to the length of a vehicle on either side of the road, using permeable block, going across the slope, as all streets should be sited this way, if at all possible, to minimize run-off. The parking ribbons have a slight dip to catch run-off in a shallow channel, which is channeled into the landscapes spaces at either end. This green ribbon parking flanks both sides of the streets, nose in angled, at the nose end of all parking ribbons is a few feet of rain catch landscaping and street trees, then the sidewalk space. The permeable block, being between tree lines, is likely to develop moss from its partial rain catch service. The parked vehicles, by only having a one car depth row, means the spaces on either side of the parked car can be a very slow traffic pedestrian and cyclist realm space, as traffic has to slow for vehicles to park. This service lane space, in a boulevard pattern, can have a large treed median before the BRT lane and the other lanes, this puts trees on either end of the parked car-service road space, adding shade at either end. As vehicles become smaller, these ribbons can fit more vehicles while adding additional space to the pedestrian realm. Parking lots, where there are several rows interspersed with driving lanes, none of the space can be re-purposed into the pedestrian realm space.

The challenge in an energy efficient design is to always design spaces and mixed-use buildings that can serve multiple functions at all times of day and can be re-purposed for changing needs. Parking lots, other than ripping them up, can't do this. Green ribbon parking serves as a rain collection device, as a parking space for

a car, as a parking space for future vehicles, and as pedestrian realm space. It also becomes a very comfortable shaded place to wait for the bus.

This change in vehicle size and how we use transit, means, at some point, we may be ripping up parking lots because most are using these smaller vehicles to get around town. I am looking forward to this happening. I am so sick of walking across the University Mall parking lots. Ribbon parking who mean that parking in on the road. There is no need for parking lot drive spaces between rows. Carbon taxes will have to be large enough to make a difference. There will be lots of incentive for vehicles to shrink. Ribbon parking can adapt to this change. I have posted a bunch of pictures on the Flikr site, some of the flooding we have just had and some of the cute newer vehicles for urban use. Two of these electric urban tricycle vehicles could fit in one parking space. There is a transportation revolution going on with a special focus of having less car appliance, more moving people. Asphalt parking not only has impermeable surfaces that leads to the flood that we have just seen, by increasing run-off, asphalt also adversely affects the microclimate. Street trees are an important part of the design.

Being *realistic* means planning for a low carbon future. There is no one ounce of doubt in my mind that how we will be getting around in 2020 is likely to involve lots of scooters, smart-like cars and elf-like vehicles. There is quite a bit of investment now in developing the small urban electric vehicle, which would be able to get its energy from a variety of fuel/power technologies. Edison would have been so happy to see some of these vehicles.

Minimizing parking is part of all the things we need to do to shift our population's transportation behavior. This is not a dream, this is a climate reality. Change is an absolute necessity. The next generation is making their choice in living style based on the environmental

concerns, and fiscal reality, that they have. If you want me to start throwing climate change papers at you all, I could very easily do that. To save time, however, I suggest you all go on the assumption that designing mitigation strategies, planning for, and adapting to the affects of climate change, means assuming that there is a future that is different from the past that will be more challenging when it comes to energy use.

I detect a lot of fear from folks about these changes ruining Chapel Hill, or the property values therein. Chapel Hill has always been a progressive community. Those who were attracted to living here like that progressive, fear-not, attitude. We have typically had done things that few other communities have done. In the past, Chapel Hill has never run in fear from technological or sociological advances, like in civil rights, education, free bus service, and environmental protection. We have historically taken on the risk that come from being an early adopter of change. What I am hearing now, though, is very uncharacteristic of progressive Chapel Hill. I am hearing that fols are afraid that developers will not take on the challenge to make the area a better place to live than it is now.

For those who think that the status quo is fine, I will point again to the fact that we have large bunches of school children being driven to school, we have pedestrians and cyclists being challenged by speeding vehicles, we have very little shopping in our neighborhood, most of us are not able to walk anywhere, we waste more energy that most of the rest of the world, we live in large houses that our children's generation can't afford to buy, the middle class, the class that can buy Chapel Hill homes, is shrinking, once more, because we are now behind Raleigh and Durham in progressive planning and development, everyone wants to move to those, more urban, places. Chapel Hill, with its old school buildings and dated street infrastructure, is losing its charm. Teachers can afford to live here. Even the youngest professors can't afford to

live here.

Yes, lets be more realistic. Maintaining the status quo is not realistic.

Sarah

On 7/2/2013 1:12 PM, F Mistry wrote:

> Hi Lucy,
>
> Thank you for the link. Nobody questions that more dense and lesser cars mean less pollution. Such calculators are great for comparing green-field sites, but we have existing (inadequate) infrastructure and neighborhoods. I doubt we want to do all new development in CW **without including a single new parking spot**, since it will all be walkable. I wish the same for Carolina North. But that is dreaming. Let us make something everyone can live with.
>
> We should have all the tools and information in front of us as we discuss on July 18. Specific information for our area is also relevant to our discussion on roads and traffic.
>
> Regards,
> Firoz
>
> ---
>
> CC: alantom@mindspring.com; sarhkamc@gmail.com; ericdingfelder@yahoo.com; mwooley@townofchapelhill.org; amymorrisryan@gmail.com; miparker1@aol.com;

jonathandrake@gmail.com;
abby.parcell@gmail.com;
thecareysare@gmail.com;
acarey@sienahotel.com;mcclintock.julie@gmail.com; bmurray@chcymca.org;
buffie@kw.com;
dbonk@townofchapelhill.org;
tuttledavs@aol.com; deanar@rhodeside-harwell.com; ehyman@nc.rr.com;
merklein@unc.edu;
jsimmonsphotography@gmail.com;
jculpepper@townofchapelhill.org;jeff.kidd@facilities.unc.edu; jimward@nc.rr.com;
agerjohn@gmail.com;
lclark@townofchapelhill.org;
mnirdlinger@townofchapelhill.org;
meredithj@rhodeside-harwell.com;
mia@miaburroughs.com;
mjsorrell@gmail.com;
tlofrese@chccs.k12.nc.us;
whitr@aol.com;tforcella@chccs.k12.nc.us;
jenns@chccs.k12.nc.us;
kwalker@chccs.k12.nc.us;
ksavelli@chccs.k12.nc.us;
jmejer@chccs.k12.nc.us;
rcampbell@chccs.k12.nc.us;
steinerlucy@gmail.com; lchen@nccu.edu;
gkaniel@nc.rr.com; john.poteat@ncleg.net;
obrienhalla@nc.rr.com
From: lucycdavis@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Central West impact on Phillips Middle School
Date: Tue, 2 Jul 2013 12:48:32 -0400
To: fmistry@hotmail.com

Please find this link to a very interesting calculator of the implications of density to other important factors, including traffic, infrastructure needs and environmental factors:

http://www.sierraclub.org/sprawl/density/summary.asp

Thanks.

Lucy Davis

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 2, 2013, at 12:26 PM, F Mistry <fmistry@hotmail.com> wrote:

> Hi Megan, Mary Jane, Amy, Michael, David and the yet-unidentified traffic expert,
>
> Please see Alan Tom's email below which provides a rational and well-reasoned argument for collecting data sooner rather than later.
>
> We have planned a Committee Charette #3 on roads and traffic for July 18. I request the town staff and their traffic experts to collect this information prior to this meeting, so that we may have a productive discussion on July 18. Planning without taking into account the major constraints of the area is meaningless and wasteful, and we should not fall into that trap. As Alan Tom states "our work is hard enough without having to plan in the absence of key data about safety and current (and projected) levels of traffic congestion".

Alan Tom has described it well, but I shall repeat here what is needed:

1) **A current traffic study** which outlines the traffic situation on key roads/intersections in Central West, along with projections of the effects on this traffic situation of other development projects which will be online in the next few years; for this study to be relevant, it should have been done very recently and under real life conditions (when the schools and university are in session, and over a significant period of time).

2) Information on the way in which **State regulations** limit what design changes can be made to Estes, concerning, for example, traffic circles, ingress/egress, etc. Do we need the State's permission to build without setbacks as some have suggested?

I can look into inviting a State DOT representative to our discussion, though it would be better if the town staff invited the rep. Please let me know.

3) I would like to hear from the town traffic experts, as to their **agreement or critique of the article** referenced by Tom, namely, Wendell Cox titled "How Urban Density Intensifies Traffic Congestion and Air Pollution" (attached as a pdf document and also available: http://americandreamcoalition.org/landuse/denseair.pdf). How do our experts recommend we handle the increased traffic density due to the higher density favored by the town?

Please confirm receipt of this email, and also confirm that you will be collecting and providing this information for our discussion on July 18. I realize all the material may not be available immediately, so

we should prepare a schedule as to when it will be provided, and how it meshes with our required decision-making. Please provide the information a few days before July 18 to allow us to review it and come prepared.

Yesterday, the Mayor made it explicitly clear that he would like us to complete our work on schedule, and your provision of this information on a timely basis is most essential.

Thank you.

Regards,
Firoz Mistry

From: alantom@mindspring.com
To: sarhkamc@gmail.com; EricDingfelder@yahoo.com
CC: jonathandrake@gmail.com; abby.parcell@gmail.com; amymorrisryan@gmail.com; thecareysare@gmail.com; acarey@sienahotel.com; mcclintock.julie@gmail.com; BMurray@chcymca.org; buffie@kw.com; dbonk@townofchapelhill.org; tuttledavs@aol.com;deanar@rhodeside-harwell.com; ehyman@nc.rr.com; fmistry@hotmail.com; merklein@unc.edu; jsimmonsphotography@gmail.c

om;
jculpepper@townofchapelhill.org; Jeff.Kidd@facilities.unc.edu;
jimward@nc.rr.com;
agerjohn@gmail.com;lclark@townofchapelhill.org;
lucycdavis@gmail.com;
mnirdlinger@townofchapelhill.org;
mwooley@townofchapelhill.org; meredithj@rhodeside-harwell.com;
mia@miaburroughs.com;
miparker1@aol.com;
mjsorrell@gmail.com;
tlofrese@chccs.k12.nc.us;whitr@aol.com;
tforcella@chccs.k12.nc.us;
jenns@chccs.k12.nc.us;
KWalker@chccs.k12.nc.us;
ksavelli@chccs.k12.nc.us;
jmejer@chccs.k12.nc.us;
RCampbell@chccs.k12.nc.us;
steinerlucy@gmail.com;
lchen@nccu.edu;
gkaniel@nc.rr.com;john.poteat@ncleg.net;
obrienhalla@nc.rr.com;
alantom@mindspring.com
Subject: Re: Central West impact on Phillips Middle School
Date: Tue, 2 Jul 2013 06:38:02 -0400

Sarah's comment is directed in part to me because I made a statement, at the end of last night's meeting, about the need to explore the implications of the land use patterns on street traffic, particularly for Estes but also

other key roads in Central West. So I was essentially arguing against the approach being used last evening of planning the land use patterns first, then, at some later time, worrying about what these land use patterns might mean for traffic. For your planning to be productive, I'd think you'd want to tie land use patterns and traffic considerations together.

Concerning traffic, there are two, separable issues. First, there is the question of **safety** which I think can be addressed by making Estes (in particular) a safe street. Everyone talks about this goal -- Estes as a safe street -- but no one seems willing to lay out a specific plan for accomplishing this goal, despite the fact that a number of relevant ideas are floating around.

Second, there is the issue of traffic **congestion** which I worry will result from some of the higher population density plans being considered. On this point I recommend to you an article by Wendell Cox titled "How Urban Density Intensifies Traffic Congestion and Air Pollution" (attached as a pdf document and also available:http://americandreamcoalition.org/landuse/densair.pdf). One of Cox's key conclusions (p. 1) is that the proponents of the new urbanism "assume that by forcing densities higher, people will be more inclined to abandoned their automobiles and use public

transit, bicycles or walking as an alternative. Unfortunately, nothing could be further from the truth." He then uses research from the U.S. (and other Western countries) to show how increased density tends to lead to more traffic congestion no matter what attempts are made to foster the use of public transit; this is not the only point to the article, but it is a central one. Take a look at this article.

There is another issue vis-à-vis traffic. The Steering Committee lacks **basic data about traffic** such as: 1) A current traffic study which outlines the traffic situation on key roads/intersections in Central West, along with projections of the effects on this traffic situation of other development projects which will be online in the next few years; 2) Information on the way in which State regulations limit what design changes can be made to Estes, concerning, for example, traffic circles, ingress/egress, etc. If I were on the Steering Committee, I would be demanding that such basic information be provided to me. Your work is hard enough without having to plan in the absence of key data about safety and current (and projected) levels of traffic congestion.

Alan Tom

From: Sarah K. McIntee
Sent: Monday, July 01, 2013 10:37 PM
To: EricDingfelder@yahoo.com
Cc: Jonathan Drake ; Abby Parcell

; Amy Ryan ; Anothony Carey - Gmail ; Anthony Carey ; mcclintock.julie@gmail.com ; Bruce Murray ; Buffie Webber ; David Bonk ; David Tuttle ; Deana Rhodeside ; Eric Hyman ; Firoz Mistry ; Gordon Merklein ; Jared Simmons ; JB Culpepper ; Jeff Kidd ; Jim Ward ; john ager ; Loryn Clark ; Lucy Carol Davis ; Mary Jane Nirdlinger ; Megan Wooley ; Meredith Judy ; Mia Burroughs ; Michael Parker ; Mickey Jo Sorrell ; Todd LoFrese ; Whit Rummel ; tforcella@chccs.k12.nc.us ; Jonathan Enns ; Kristin Walker ; Katie Savelli ; Jessica Mejer ; Rebecca Campbell ; Lucy Steiner ;Chen, Xiaoxin ; gila kaniel ; John Poteat ; Colleen O'Brien ; Alan Tom
Subject: Re: Central West impact on Phillips Middle School

Eric and Katie, Alan et al,

Alan has continued to express concern tonight about the safety of a higher density plan, so I have added him to the list here so you can both read my response. Alan I have seen the "studies" and they are not credible studies. They are put out by one of these anti-regulatory ultra conservative organizations, like those who actively deny climate change.

It is my understand that children were sent home with information about the public workshops we had. Our schools representative is Mia Burroughs.

You are not alone in your concern, but you are mis-attributing safety problems to

higher land use density. If low density was related to pedestrian safety, then Estes Drive would be a safe road today. It is not. Urban streets, with lights at every block, the traffic not exceeding 25 mph, is a safer walking environment. The speed of traffic on Estes is normally 45 mph, twice as fast as it should be. Good street design is helpful in making a safer street. The more density in development on the road, the slower the traffic has to go. The slower traffic speed will also reduce volume because it becomes faster and easier to bike and walk. Right now, one of the biggest safety concerns around the school is parents driving their kids to/from school. When my children walked to school parents did not do this. Children walked to school. They had one crossing guard. Now we have traffic jams of parents, we now have kiss and go lines, we now have 4 crossing guards. Driving children has displaced walking children. the increasing traffic has made it less safe for those who are still walking. Part of making the schools safer is for your children to walk.

Safety of pedestrians and cyclists is the highest priority for the CWSC. What we have now is quite unsafe. We will be

addressing traffic issues very soon, in mid to late-July. There is near consensus that the speed of traffic on Estes should slow down to 25 mph, that that this speed would be assured by use of traffic calming devices and lights. The slowing of the traffic is the first step in making Estes Drive safer.

From the studies that I have seen, and from my personal experiences as a walking school girl in Massachusetts, density makes an are more walkable, not less, by putting destinations closer, by being able to support bike and ped infrastructure through facilities, by slowing down traffic, which cars will do if there is a streetscape to look at. Suburban sprawl is very unsafe. More children die on suburban streets than old style neighborhood urban streets. Drivers also go faster in a more benign landscape, like on country roads, and they do not watch for pedestrians. In order to get additional pedestrian signals for crossing, there has to be enough income from the developer investment to help pay for these. Just getting sidewalks and bikes paths/lanes will not provide crossing facilities, which is the biggest safety issue.

My children went to these schools. I have been petitioning for sidewalks and crossing protections for 28 years. Most of the painting of the crosswalks, lighting, signaling improvements, happened as a result of my complaints. Hopefully, you all will petition the town and NCDOT to assure a slower traffic stream on Estes Dr.

There will not be any development without a solution to to the Estes Drive traffic speed and volume issues. The traffic studies have to show that any development would not add speed or volume to traffic on this unacceptably busy road.

To make it work, everyone is going to have to give a little. Safer streets don't just happen. The drivers have to be made to drive slower through better design and enforcement.

Volume is an issue, but speed is the more critical issue of the two. Carolina North's traffic generation potential so far exceeds any development that could occur on Estes Drive that any contribution from CW developments is not significant. This is because, once a two lane road becomes jammed, it can't add any more cars. This

forces drivers to choose alternative routes. Eventually, there is a down regulation of volume, because of perception of route timeliness.

Sarah McIntee

On 7/1/2013 5:41 PM, Jonathan Drake wrote:

> We, the members of the School Improvement Team for Guy B. Phillips Middle School, are interested in the proposed Central West focus area development proposals, and wish to express some concerns related to that process.
>
> There are about 670 students and 90 staff at our school, which is directly next to the Central West plot, much of which falls within our school's walk zone. Immediately next to Guy B. Phillips sits one of our feeder schools, Estes Hills Elementary, which itself has about 500 students and 95

staff.

In short, there are more than thirteen hundred students and staff at these two schools. A substantial number of our students walk to their schools, and some must cross very busy roads to get there. The rest, of course, are transported to and from campus aboard a vehicle.

Both schools are accessed by Estes Drive, obviously, which we are told is currently classified a grade F road under North Carolina Department of Transportation standards. Parents of Phillips and Estes Hills students are already painfully aware of how congested this and nearby roads become in the morning at school drop-off times, when their vehicles are combined with those of work commuters using this heavily-

traversed artery. Similarly, after sporting and post-school events at Phillips, sometimes even a single car emerging from our campus must wait three or four minutes for a break in the rush-hour traffic that saturates Estes Drive.

It's a given that the Central West project will add to the traffic volume on Estes Drive. Added to this reality is the future development of nearby Carolina North -- estimated to bring 1500 parking spaces in the first phase alone.

We believe that it is paramount that any final approved plan for the Central West project emphasize and respect the well being of the children attending our schools, by addressing the likelihood of even more burdensome traffic on Estes

Drive, and by considering the safety of our students on a campus that could be a stone's throw from any businesses and other establishments that locate within the newly developed zone.

We are not opposed to reasonable and responsible development of the Central West plot, but are concerned that to date, the process narrowing down proposals for the development have not properly incorporated the interests of our students, staff and parents. We would hope that the Central West steering committee would officially solicit feedback about the project and its likely impact on our schools from our administration, faculty and the parents of our students.

Nothing of the

sort has yet transpired; indeed, we are not aware of any official communication between the steering committee and our two schools, either through broadcasts to its parents, or via organizations representing our specific interests, such as the School Improvement Teams and the Parent Teacher Associations.

Some ideas that we think merit serious consideration in your planning process are for a density level that does not unnecessary burden current and future infrastructure in the area; traffic calming measures on Estes Drive; careful creation of safe and attractive bicycle and pedestrian lanes; and placement of genuinely safe pedestrian crossing points

(including possibly overhead pedestrian/bike bridges). Crucially, the arrangement of any aspects of Central West that would yield significantly more traffic, such as the commercial part of the development, would best feed directly in from and out onto MLK Boulevard, sparing further congestion on Estes Drive.

From our perspective, a central question is how can we ensure that measures to protect children's safety will be adopted before zoning changes are made. We sincerely feel that a careful and deliberate process that involves school stakeholders, rather than rushing to meet a September or November deadline for the finalization of a small area plan, is merited.

Yours
respectfully,

Guy B Phillips
Middle School
Improvement
Team
(co-chairs Eric
Dingfelder
<EricDingfelder@
yahoo.com> and
Katie Savelli
<ksavelli@chccs.
k12.nc.us>)