

Mayor Kevin Foy
Members of the Council
Town of Chapel Hill
306 North Columbia
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

November 3, 2006

Email: mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org

Dear Mayor Foy and Town Council Members:

As you consider the Southwest Durham Collector Street Plan, please do not be misled by any comments that the Southwest Durham Parkway Alignment is a long range issue. Just last month, the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) agreed to put in place a process to re-evaluate the alignment on the Durham side of the border. A request to ensure that the entire alignment be reviewed, including that section that passes through Chapel Hill, was denied.

The process to re-evaluate the alignment is in response to Durham Commissioner concerns about Creekside School proximity. The alignment is also being addressed on the Durham side of the border due to pending Durham County development plans in close proximity to the current alignment.

Transportation staff may suggest that any Southwest Durham Drive re-alignment in Durham will not be a functional change. Yet, each minor change that is accepted in Durham will further lock Chapel Hill into an arterial road passing through the Meadowmont Community. Given the way that Meadowmont has developed, the alignment passing through the community is no longer a practical, cost effective or safe alternative.

As a reminder, Meadowmont Community residents are not opposed to connectivity. We are adamantly against Meadowmont Lane being upgraded to an arterial road with concrete medians, increased speed limits and increased traffic. The Chapel Hill-Carrboro School District, the Meadowmont Builders, East West Partners and the residents of Meadowmont have all been caught off guard by the direction the arterial road plan is going. We need you to help us.

Please do your part to make certain Chapel Hill voices are heard. More specifically we ask you to give strong direction to our MPO and TAC representative and staff including:

- 1.) Clearly stating that **any process** put in place to re-evaluate the alignment of the proposed Southwest Durham Drive must include the entire alignment, not just the area in Durham.

96

2.) Should you approve the SW Durham Collector Street plan, approve it with the caveat that Meadowmont Lane will remain a **Collector Street** inclusive of appropriate calming devices, bicycle lanes, and grass medians.

3.) Present a strong directive that the Southwest Durham Drive alignment plan should consider use of George King Road and less dense areas to the East of the Meadowmont Community as the major connectors.. Now is the time before Durham development plans block the opportunity.

4.) Present our representative with strong direction that consideration be given to re-aligning Southwest Durham Drive along the same path as the proposed light rail system (behind and to the East of Meadowmont and the Cedars).

5.) Share your same message with the MPO and TAC representatives in Orange County and in Carrboro. Their votes on the measure will be necessary to outweigh the voting rights of the Durham contingent.

Thank you for your attention to this serious matter.

Sincerely,

Charles Paterno
405 Meadowmont Lane
Chapel Hill

(97)

From: Morris Wallack [mailto:morriswallack@nc.rr.com]
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2006 4:06 PM
To: Town Council
Cc: susan egnoto
Subject: Collector Street plan and Meadowmont Lane

711 Meadowmont Lane
Chapel Hill NC 27517

November 6, 2006

Mayor Kevin Foy
Members of the Council
Town of Chapel Hill
306 North Columbia
Chapel Hill NC 27514

Reference: Southwest Durham Collector Street Plan and impact on Chapel Hill, Meadowmont Lane and surrounding areas.

Mayor Kevin Foy
Council Members, Chapel Hill Town Council
(via email at mayorandcouncil@townofchapelhill.org)

Dear Mayor Foy and respected members of the Town Council:

My wife (Susan Egnot) and I are residents of the Town of Chapel Hill living in the Durham County section of Meadowmont, precisely at the intersection (end) of Meadowmont Lane and Park Bluff N. Drive. We have two children ages 15 and 9 living in our home.

I would like to express my concerns (and reinforce others positions) regarding the collector street plan and its relation to Meadowmont Lane.

As a resident of Meadowmont, I and others support collector street plans to link areas to ensure even and balanced traffic flows. However, given recent developments where Durham County is re-evaluating the plan vis-a-vis routing near or away from Creekside Elementary school, along with other developments, I strongly urge that the Chapel Hill Council take up re-evaluation as well on behalf of the residents in Chapel Hill. It is imperative the Council take action now.

Specifically, I would urge you and your Council give ~~strong direction~~ to Chapel Hill's MPO and TAC representatives to :

1. Ensure that the re-evaluation process for collector street plans affecting Durham ALSO INCLUDE CHAPEL HILL impact, throughout the entire route.
2. Approve the collector street plan ~~only if Meadowmont Lane remains a collector street~~, and is NOT designated an arterial road. In addition appropriate calming devices, bicycle lanes and medians remain or are put in place to ensure a safe and appropriate passage of traffic at the current 25 MPH posted limits.
3. Advocate on behalf of the entire plan that alternatives like George King Road are included to balance traffic with development and housing density increases expected in Durham
4. Consider the alternative routing of Southwest Durham drive along similar proposed paths for proposed light rail system/ fixed transportation behind and to the East of Meadowmont and The Cedars.

98

5. Share your message with Carrboro and Orange County MPO and TAC representatives. Their votes are needed to balance voting interests of Durham contingents.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

**Morris C. Wallack
711 Meadowmont Lane
Chapel Hill NC 27517
919 933 3110**



From: Karen Lewis [mailto:tokyokaren@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2006 2:47 PM
To: Town Council
Subject: Meadowmont Lane

Dear Mayor Foy and Member of the Chapel Hill Town Council,

I would like to request that the Town of Chapel Hill support making Meadowmont Lane a collector street and not an arterial road. My husband and I own a home on the Orange County side of Meadowmont Lane and my mother-in-law, Lucile Lewis, owns a condominium on the Durham County side in the Cedars of Chapel Hill. I am very concerned about the safety of all residents in Meadowmont, especially the young and the elderly. My mother-in-law turns 96 years old this month and was diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease this year. She currently resides at the DuBose Health Center at the Cedars of Chapel Hill. Her one great joy is to walk outside every day (with an assistant) and cross Meadowmont Lane on her way to visit the shops in Meadowmont. The traffic currently is too fast and the road is in need of calming devices. If Meadowmont Lane is made an arterial road with a larger volume of traffic at higher speeds, she will not be able to cross the road safely and enjoy her daily walks.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,
Karen R. Lewis
306 Parkridge Ave.
Chapel Hill, NC 27517

(100)

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

From: Bill Freeman [mailto:bfreeman@meadowmont.com]
Sent: Monday, November 06, 2006 9:42 AM
To: Town Council
Subject: Collector Street program and Meadowmont Lane

I am a resident of Meadowmont of Chapel Hill in Durham County and live just off Meadowmont lane near the proposed bridge accross the wetlands. Along with many of the residents of Meadowmont I was surprised (to say the least) that Meadowmont Lane is planned to become an arterial road with 12000 to 15000 cars per day volume and that this plan has been "well lnown" for over 15 years.

I support the position outlined by Mr> Paterno.

I believe that the Town of Chapel Hill has two responsibilities:

1. to listen to it's residents (aka taxpayers) and to enact their will - downgrade Meadowmont Lane from an arterial road to a collector street in all plans, and
2. to inform existing and future residents of the true status of this proposed road - I cannot believe the (mis?)informationabout the road circulating and the lack of a clear statement of what is the real plan.

I believe an additional information or another sign should be added to the signs for the fixed guide way on Meadowmont Lane.

Bill Freeman