

**Responses to the Council Comments from the
May 11, 2009 Carolina North Public Hearing**

**Transportation Area
Carolina North Development**

1. A Council Member asked to revise the analysis change the mode/split to increase the transit, walk, and bike trips.

Response: See June 3, 2009 TIA for Carolina North, Addendum 1 with additional analysis prepared by VHB.

http://townhall.townofchapelhill.org/agendas/2009/06/08/11/tia-table_of_contents.htm

2. A Council Member enquired the process for about the traffic calming on Town and State Maintained roads.

Response: Traffic calming practices on Town maintained roads are available at: <http://www.townofchapelhill.org/DocumentView.aspx?DID=1546>. For State maintained roads, a negotiation between the interested parties (Town, University and DOT) is required. NCDOT does not generally approve traffic calming devices such as speed tables but has previously approved traffic circles, roundabouts, and medians.

3. A Council Member enquired how the staff recommends bicycle and sidewalk pedestrians that connect the Carolina North development to Carrboro via Estes Drive

Response: See stipulation in the Development Agreement 5.8.16 for improvements on Estes Drive between Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. and Seawell School Road.

4. A Council Member asked the process for direct access from I-40 to Eubanks Road Park and Ride Lot.

Response: See sections 5.8.9 and 5.8.22 in the Development Agreement for joint planning and evaluation of park and ride facilities. Analysis of the service area would include the Eubanks Road Park and Ride Lot.

5. A Council Member asked for in-street pedestrian sign on Estes Drive near the schools

Response: This item requires coordination with the school system and NCDOT.

6. A Council Member asked for the connection between traffic and number of parking spaces.

Response: The TIA analysis uses the parking spaces, trip generation rates and parking ratios to project estimated traffic on the study roads.

7. A Council Member asked if the staff is recommending particular number of spaces.

Response: See 5.8.7 in the Development agreement

8. A Council Member asked if elongated roundabouts can be implemented on Martin Luther King Jr Blvd.

Response: The Development Agreement calls for specific improvements to be planned on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd; an elongated roundabout would need to be evaluated by DOT.

9. A Council Member asked if we are considering recommendations from NC 86 Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Study in the implementation of the access to Carolina North development.

Response: See 5.8.15 in the development agreement where these improvements are addressed

10. A Council Member asked for the travel time from point A to B after the buildout of the Carolina North Development.

Response: See current travel time data included in the TIA (Table 4-8 & 4-9) and the projected changes with the Construction of Carolina North (from May 11, 2009 presentation by VHB to Town Council) at:
http://townhall.townofchapelhill.org/agendas/2009/05/11/additional_info/additional%20info-Carolina%20North%20TIA%20Presentation%205-11-09%20final.pdf

11. A Council Member asked if the staff is considering developing the roadway network system around the proposed Carolina North that is consistent with the Complete Street concept.

Response: See various requirements in the Development Agreement relating to road design and approval (e.g. 5.8.3), sidewalks (e.g. 5.8.16), bicycle facilities (e.g. 5.8.17), transit (e.g. 5.8.A, various), and landscape (e.g. 5.21).

12. A Council Member asked to revise the analysis by reducing specific land use parking ratios. Changes to Parking Ratios

Response: See June 3, 2009 TIA for Carolina North, Addendum 1 containing additional analysis prepared by VHB.

13. A Council Member asked for nexus behind 2.50 spaces for 1000 square feet for corporate partners land use type.

Response: See June 3, 2009 TIA for Carolina North, Addendum 1 containing additional analysis prepared by VHB with discussion of various parking ratios.

14. A Council Member asked why detailed access analysis for bicycles and pedestrians was not included in the TIA scope.

Response: See Sections 5-4 and 5-5 of the TIA for Carolina North for analysis of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.