

(A)

ATTACHMENT 6

From: Carol Abernethy **On Behalf Of** Cal Horton
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 9:38 AM
To: 'Dean S Miner'
Cc: JB Culpepper; Bill Thorpe; Jason Baker; Kevin Wolff; Laurin Easthom; Robin Cutson; Walker Rutherford; Will Raymond ; Bree Bean; Bruce Heflin; Cal Horton; Catherine Lazorko; Emily Dickens; Flo Miller; Ralph Karpinos; Sabrina Oliver; Sandy Cook; Toni Pendergraph; Bill Strom; Cam Hill; Dorothy Verkerk ; Ed Harrison; 'Edith Wiggins'; 'Jim Ward'; Jim Ward (w) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; Sally Greene (w)
Subject: Email RE: Maywood Way Connector

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member, Council candidate(s) and to senior staff members.

*Carol Abernethy
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office
Town of Chapel Hill*

From: Dean S Miner [mailto:dean.miner@duke.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 8:31 AM
To: Town Council
Subject: Maywood Way Connector

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to you today as a citizen concerned for the safety of my children. Both my wife and I are Pediatricians. We recently moved to Chapel Hill in July of 2005, and we have been very pleased with our transition. We are delighted with the family friendly nature of Chapel Hill, and we are impressed with the fact that the city seems to take the interests of children to heart, as manifest by the quality of its schools and the foresight of legislative protection such as laws mandating the use of bicycle helmets.

Needless to say, we were surprised after we attended the Transportation committee meeting regarding the Maywood connector road, that the town council decided to proceed with the connector. From the perspective of the town's development goals and given the obvious additional protection for our children that an "emergency access only" connector would provide, it makes no sense to us why the town would want to proceed with plans for a full vehicular access connector.

It is our hope that both the mayor and the town council will seriously reconsider the ruling of the transportation committee, and down grade the Maywood connector to "emergency access" only. In a city that is home to the American Board of Pediatrics, a national organization dedicated to the health and safety of children, this seems to be the most appropriate course of action.

Sincerely,

Dean S. Miner, M.D. and Ki Lynn Abel, M.D.

Gene Poveromo

22

From: Sandy Cook
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 9:50 AM
To: Gene Poveromo
Subject: FW: Email RE: Letter for Mayor and Council members

Attachments: Mayor and Council.doc



Mayor and
Council.doc (39 KB)

Sandy Cook, CMC
Deputy Town Clerk
Town of Chapel Hill
405 Martin Luther King, Jr., Blvd.
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
(919) 968-2743

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

From: Carol Abernethy On Behalf Of Cal Horton
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2005 9:37 AM
To: 'Gary Waldo'
Cc: JB Culpepper; Bill Thorpe; Jason Baker; Kevin Wolff; Laurin Easthom; Robin Cutson; Walker Rutherford; Will Raymond ; Bree Bean; Bruce Heflin; Cal Horton; Catherine Lazorko; Emily Dickens; Flo Miller; Ralph Karpinos; Sabrina Oliver; Sandy Cook; Toni Pendergraph; Bill Strom; Cam Hill; Dorothy Verkerk ; Ed Harrison; 'Edith Wiggins'; 'Jim Ward'; Jim Ward (w) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; Sally Greene (w)
Subject: Email RE: Letter for Mayor and Council members

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member, Council candidate(s) and to senior staff members. At your request, it will also be included in materials for the September 26 council meeting.
Carol Abernethy
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office
Town of Chapel Hill

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

From: Gary Waldo [mailto:gary_waldo@med.unc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2005 10:27 PM
To: Town Council
Subject: Letter for Mayor and Council members

To whom it may concern:

Please include the attached letter concerning the Maywood connector between Larkspur and Chapel Watch Village in the packet for the Mayor and Town Council members for the meeting scheduled on Monday Sept. 26, 2005.

Thank you,
Gary Waldo
303 Old Larkspur Way
Chapel Hill

September 19, 2005

The Honorable Kevin C. Foy
Mayor of Chapel Hill
And
Members of the Chapel Hill Town Council

Dear Mayor Foy and Town Council members:

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns regarding the Maywood connector between the Larkspur neighborhood and the proposed Chapel Watch Village (CWV) development in north Chapel Hill. My name is Gary Waldo and I live at 303 Old Larkspur Way with my wife and four year old daughter. As you are aware the residents of Larkspur and other proximate neighborhoods have previously presented concerns and reasons for our opposition to the Maywood connector before the Town Council, the Planning Board and the Transportation Board. The Transportation Board recently voted, by a very close margin of four to three, to recommend opening the Maywood connector. My family strongly opposes this recommendation for reasons I will detail below.

1. The Zoning Compliance Permit for Larkspur was conditional on the installation of a notification sign at the Maywood stub-out prior to the issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy of the homes (See Memorandum to Mayor and Town Council from W. Calvin Horton, Town Manager and Ralph D. Karpinos, Town Attorney dated June 27, 2005 and the Zoning Compliance Permit for Larkspur dated November 11, 2002). The required signage indicating the intention to open the Maywood stub-out into an adjoining development was not erected until July 2005, a time at which approximately 50% of the planned homes in Larkspur were occupied. This unfortunate oversight should not have occurred and the absence of this information has resulted in home purchases that may not have occurred had the information been posted as required by the aforementioned permit.
2. Clear disagreement exists within the Transportation Board as to the need for or value of opening the Maywood connector. A four to three vote in favor of opening the connector does not reflect a compelling mandate for this additional road.
3. The traffic impact analysis conducted by the town suggests relatively low usage of the road in question. If you subscribe to this analysis, the connector will not serve to alleviate any current or future traffic congestion. So why build another road that will be used only lightly? Certainly the residents of Larkspur do not desire vehicular access in this location. Moreover, due to the circular nature of Old Larkspur Way and Maywood, the Maywood connector will confer no advantage to service vehicles. Municipal bus stops located at the park and ride lot on Eubanks road and a new bus stop on the larger collector road Weaver Dairy Road extension would better serve residents of the surrounding neighborhoods and the buses would avoid driving over traffic calming devices that would be required for safety throughout Larkspur.
4. We disagree with the existing traffic study and feel there will be more traffic moving through our neighborhood than indicated by the study and that much of

this traffic will be drivers not destined for our neighborhood but rather cutting through in order to get from point A to point B. We feel there is an inherent difference between a 'cut-through driver' and a 'resident driver' that has profound implications for the safety of the many young children in the neighborhood. Every day, upon turning onto Old Larkspur Way, I am keenly aware of the large number of children, including my four year old daughter, that play in our neighborhood and I try to drive cautiously with their safety in mind. A 'cut-through driver' may not be aware of the large number of children playing on the small lots near the road and the foremost concern of the 'cut-through driver' is getting from point A to point B. There are many aggressive drivers traveling the roads in the vicinity of Larkspur. Every day drivers on Weaver Dairy Road extension between the intersections of Old Larkspur Way and Lonebrook Drive tailgate me. One recent weekend I was actually passed on three different occasions while traveling at 30 mph (posted speed limit 25 mph) along this single lane section of road. We cannot afford to allow cut-through traffic of any volume through the neighborhood.

5. A Memorandum from the Transportation Board to David Bonk, Principal Transportation Planner, August 9, 2005 stated that "the connection of Larkspur to Chapel Watch Village will result in:
 - Greater access and quicker response times for emergency vehicles;
 - More efficient ...provision of public services...;
 - Decreased traffic on arterial streets; and
 - More continuous and direct routes that encourage travel by walking and bicycling."

Our response to these conclusions:

- Emergency vehicles navigating the traffic calming devices required for safety in Larkspur would not experience improved response times. Furthermore, emergency access can be provided through a pedestrian and bike only access, a scenario that would not require traffic calming devices.
 - Significant gains in the efficiency of providing public services are difficult to imagine given the relatively small size of the neighborhood and the circular nature of Old Larkspur Way and Maywood Way which would always require service vehicles to 'back-track' to some extent. (Also see 3. above regarding bus service.)
 - The notion that a public official would recommend the use of neighborhood roads to decrease traffic on arterial streets is appalling.
 - We also want to encourage pedestrian and bike travel.
6. A clear alternative for a second vehicular access into Larkspur exists in the Butterfield Court stub-out. This alternative could provide second access without encouraging cut-through traffic and the residents of Larkspur would support opening the road at this location.
 7. The developer of CWV has indicated a slight preference for providing only pedestrian and bike access to Maywood but no vehicular access. This scenario would also have the very desirable consequence of allowing the Chapel Watch developer more options as far as vegetative buffers between Larkspur and CWV.

This would be a more environmentally friendly and aesthetically pleasing choice for both neighborhoods.

8. A pedestrian and bike only access would encourage greater interaction between the residents of Larkspur and CWV and would encourage a more healthy lifestyle for all residents by promoting walks and bike trips in a safe and more aesthetically pleasing environment. These are precisely the kinds of activities a progressive town like Chapel Hill should encourage. Having vehicular access along this corridor would greatly diminish the frequency and quality of these activities.

The Town Council, Planning Board, and Transportation Board face a difficult and necessary task with respect to developing “a balanced, multi-modal transportation system that will enhance mobility for all citizens, reduce automobile dependence and preserve/enhance the character of Chapel Hill” (2000 Comprehensive Plan page 92). I appreciate the Town Councils’ constant review and revision of plans as projects evolve and mature. Taking the time on a case-by-case basis to weigh the benefits for Chapel Hill residents of opening new roads against the disadvantages (expense, time, public safety, environmental impact, aesthetic loss, and quality of life) is essential if we are to preserve the characteristics of Chapel Hill that we all enjoy.

Many residents from Larkspur and nearby neighborhoods have spoken in various forums or written letters requesting that the Maywood connector **not** be open to vehicular traffic. These are the people who will be affected every day for as long as we remain in these communities by the decision the Town Council makes concerning the Maywood connector. To my knowledge, no one who lives in the affected neighborhoods or drives these roads on a daily basis has expressed support for opening this road. No one has delineated any clear advantage to opening the Maywood connector to vehicular traffic. Unanimity of opinion is lacking within the Transportation board. In the absence of any clear advantage for opening the road and in the face of such a unanimous opposition by the area residents to the opening of Maywood for vehicular access we feel the Town council should vote to limit the access between Larkspur and CWV to pedestrian, bike and emergency vehicle only. This is the right choice for the area residents, for the environment, and for a progressive community.

We respectfully and earnestly request the Mayor and members of the Town Council take action to protect and promote the safety and health of the residents of Larkspur, Chapel Watch Village and surrounding neighborhoods and to encourage environmentally friendly and aesthetically pleasing development in North Chapel Hill by voting for pedestrian, bike, and emergency vehicle access only on the Maywood connector.

Respectfully,

Gary Waldo

26

From: Emily Dickens
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2005 11:17 AM
To: Bill Strom; Cam Hill; Dorothy Verkerk (dverkerk@nc.rr.com); Ed Harrison; Edith Wiggins; Jim Ward; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt; Sally Greene (sally@ibiblio.org)
Cc: Bruce Heflin; Cal Horton; Carol Abernethy; Flo Miller; Ralph Karpinos; Sabrina Oliver; Toni Pendergraph
Subject: FW: Larkspur

From: Matt Hapgood [mailto:matt.hapgood@alumni.duke.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2005 11:16 AM
To: Kevin Foy
Subject: Larkspur

Dear Mayor Foy,

I am writing in reference to the Larkspur connection to Chapel Watch. As a member of the town Transportation Board I am very familiar with the facts and emotions surrounding this issue, and would like to reiterate to the council the importance of connectivity and adhering to a sensible town-wide transportation plan.

I understand the Larkspur neighborhood is not happy about this. But are the residents of Larkspur and their children more important than the residents of Pinehurst Drive? Lake Shore Drive? Each of these streets are clearly residential, yet each also serves as a critical component of our transportation system. If we listened to the emotionally laden arguments of Larkspur residents, we should close each of these roads, and many others, to eliminate the possibility of cut-through traffic.

Larkspur was created less than 3 years ago with the stipulation, by the town council, that their be connectivity to Eubanks Road. Has anything changed since the houses were built? No. It has merely changed from a best practices / planning discussion to a heated emotional issue.

If, as a result of connectivity, there is more traffic than forecasted on Larkspur, there are many solutions to remedy the problem - everything from traffic calming devices to bollards on the road to close it to non-emergency vehicles. But the T-board looked into these traffic issues and did not feel this was at all likely.

Please make the right decision. If every neighborhood took the Larkspur attitude and we eliminated connectivity it wouldn't be a good thing.

Sincerely,

Matt Hapgood

September 19, 2005

Dear Mayor and Council,

The following are my thoughts concerning the recent Transportation Board discussion on the Maywood/Eubanks connector. My family has lived in Chapel Hill for over 40 years and my wife, son and I currently live at 209 Old Larkspur Way. We attended the recent Transportation Board meeting and learned much about the issues at hand.

The three most interesting facts that were revealed during the meeting are listed below.

1. The core argument for those in favor vehicular connectivity is that it will improve traffic flow between Eubanks and points south. Those in favor also maintain that vehicular connectivity will not produce much additional traffic in the Larkspur community. These two viewpoints contradict each other.
2. The single most verifiable piece of data from the traffic study is the current travel time from Eubanks to Homestead via MLK Blvd. Independent measurements conducted by both Mrs. Couch (a member of Larkspur Safety First) and a Transportation Board member produced data that revealed the traffic study data to be **egregiously wrong**. In my mind, this renders the integrity of the entire traffic study suspect. I especially take issue with the additional traffic flow that is predicted.
3. It was stated by Mr. Post that the road north of the Maywood/Larkspur intersection is designed by its narrow width to be used as a "local road", not a "connector road". Creating the vehicular cut through would go against the constructed design of the road.

Thank you for your continued dedication to the town and its citizens.

Sincerely,

Paul Hodulik

From: Carol Abernethy On Behalf Of Cal Horton
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2005 10:30 AM
To: 'Renuka Soll'
Cc: Bill Thorpe; Jason Baker; Kevin Wolff; Laurin Easthom; Robin Cutson; Tanya Riemer; Walker Rutherford; Will Raymond ; Bree Bean; Bruce Heflin; Cal Horton; Catherine Lazorko; Emily Dickens; Flo Miller; Ralph Karpinos; Sabrina Oliver; Sandy Cook; Toni Pendergraph; Bill Strom; Cam Hill; Dorothy Verkerk ; Ed Harrison; 'Edith Wiggins'; 'Jim Ward'; Jim Ward (w) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; Sally Greene (w)
Subject: Email RE: Larkspur Connection

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member, Council candidate(s) and to senior staff members.
Carol Abernethy
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office
Town of Chapel Hill

From: Renuka Soll [mailto:rvsoll@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2005 9:52 AM
To: Town Council
Subject: Larkspur Connection

Renuka Soll
302 Old Larkspur Way
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
#919 969 1454

Dear Mayor and Council;

I know that you have heard arguments for and against opening up the road between Larkspur and Eubanks Road. I just want to share some personal examples of why opening this road has me worried.

I have two children in elementary school. No matter how many times I've said to look both ways before crossing the road, they forget. The kids in Larkspur know each other and play at each other's houses every day. My kids, as well as the neighborhood children, cross streets to get to each other's houses. I have seen them run across the street in front of cars. The Larkspur community is aware of it, and the cars go slowly along this road for this reason. I feel that opening up the extension will put our kids in danger.

Additionally, most days I travel down Weaver Dairy Road Extension to get from Seawell Elementary to my gym after dropping off my children at school. Many cars do the same thing to cut through to Martin Luther King Blvd. I always travel at 25 MPH. Most of the time, the cars behind me catch up, tail me, and try to push me to go faster. Weaver Dairy Road Ext is being used for cut through traffic and many don't follow the speed limit. I feel that the same will happen in Larkspur putting our kids at risk. Our children's safety should not be compromised.

Please vote for not opening up the extension road in Larkspur for vehicular traffic.

Thank you for your time.

Renuka Soll

29

From: Carol Abernethy **On Behalf Of** Cal Horton
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2005 5:49 PM
To: 'Jessica R Brack'
Cc: Bill Thorpe; Jason Baker; Kevin Wolff; Laurin Easthom; Robin Cutson; Tanya Riemer; Walker Rutherford; Will Raymond ; Bree Bean; Bruce Heflin; Cal Horton; Catherine Lazorko; Emily Dickens; Flo Miller; Ralph Karpinos; Sabrina Oliver; Sandy Cook; Toni Pendergraph; Bill Strom; Cam Hill; Dorothy Verkerk ; Ed Harrison; 'Edith Wiggins'; 'Jim Ward'; Jim Ward (w) ; Kevin Foy; Mark Kleinschmidt ; Sally Greene (w)
Subject: Email RE: Letter to support Larkspur on 9/26

A copy of your email message has been forwarded to each Council Member, Council candidate(s) and to senior staff members.

*Carol Abernethy
Exec. Asst., Manager's Office
Town of Chapel Hill*

From: Jessica R Brack [mailto:jrbrack@nc.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2005 11:00 PM
To: Town Council
Cc: Amy Chute
Subject: Letter to support Larkspur on 9/26

Please include the attached letter for the meeting on 9/26 where the Larkspur/Chapel Watch Village connection will be discussed.
Thank you.
Jessica

September 15, 2005

Dear Members of the Chapel Hill Town Council:

My name is Jessica Brack. My husband, Mike, and I live in the Larkspur neighborhood with our two daughters, Kate (4 years old) and Samantha (2 years old). We moved to Chapel Hill in March of 2004 and very quickly bought a house in Larkspur. We were attracted by its size (86 homes), population of children, and wide streets.

We absolutely love this neighborhood and care for the community a great deal. What we love the most is that our children can safely play outside, can ride their bikes on the streets, and the adults can congregate at the clubhouse, pool, playground and streets while our children play together. We are a true neighborhood, a true community of people who care about each other.

We were very disturbed to hear about the potential of vehicular access between Larkspur and Chapel Watch Village. We are in full support of the request for limiting the access between Larkspur and Chapel Watch Village to allow pedestrians and bicycles only. We strongly believe that if this request is not granted, our children's safety will be at risk.

I have been involved with the Larkspur Safety First committee since it was first formed. So far, I have heard only two arguments in favor of vehicular access. The first argument is the town strategy of connectivity, yet no one has been able to definitively prove that connectivity translates to vehicular access vs. pedestrian and bicycles. In fact, there are previous Town Council meeting minutes that clearly indicate some Town Council members interpret and support the concept of connectivity to mean pedestrian and bicycles.

The other argument we have heard is that there will not be a significant increase in traffic. It has been estimated that 5-10 additional trips per day will result from providing vehicular access. While members of our committee have serious concerns over the validity of this estimate, even if we assume that this study and resulting estimate are valid, it is still built on assumptions and it is still an estimate. The only certainty is that no one is going to know what will really happen until it is too late. It only takes the lethal combination of one car traveling too fast and children outside playing to result in a serious accident. As a parent of two small children, I am not willing to risk their safety on assumptions and see what happens.

So please understand that from my perspective, I see all risk and no benefit. We sincerely hope that you will vote against vehicular access between Larkspur and Chapel Watch Village. Thank you for your consideration,

Jessica R. Brack
Mike J. Brack

Kate G. Brack (4)
Samantha J. Brack (2)