From:	Aaron Wilson
To:	Emily Gluckin; Dave DeGrandpre
Cc:	Ben Weiss; Jon Sand; Jeremy Keene; Mary McCrea; Laval Means; Neil Miner
Subject:	McNett Flats
Date:	Friday, September 25, 2020 9:41:57 AM

Good morning,

I apologize for the somewhat late reply on this subdivision, but I did want to make sure you had comments from the Transportation Division.

Sufficiency/general comment items:

- The applicant is requesting a variance to subdivision design standards for all roads in the subdivision, however there is not sufficient evidence provided to ensure compliance with the intent and standards of subdivision regulations. In particular, the traffic impact analysis does not provided sufficient detail on internal subdivision roads. The following items need additional analysis for us to be able to support the proposed variance requests:
    - Does the 80' ROW support current BUILD roadway designs for George Elmer Drive, including all transportation and utility services?
    - What are the projected volumes for internal roads such as Abby Lane, and do those volumes support designation as a urban local street? Per the subdivision standards, volumes over 1,000 trips/day could elevate the street to a collector status and require additional facilities such as bike lanes. We suspect volumes will exceed those levels on both sides of George Elmer Drive due to the density of development, and—related to the other variance request—the lack of roadway network redundancy. For instance, the Remington Flats traffic impact study noted that 70% of the subdivision traffic would travel via George Elmer drive. Due to the variance request of this subdivision (McNett Flats) and subsequent reduction from two to one east/west roadway connections, at least 1,000 trips/day would be coming from that adjacent development. With the addition of the proposed McNett Flats develop, estimated at 50% of the trip generation or 1,795, would be assumed to use Abby Lane for access on each side of George Elmer. Therefore, it appears that Abby Lane would nearly exceed the upper limits of an urban local street and extends well into collector volumes. In addition, volumes nearing 3,000 trips per day more than exceeds the limits to provide safe, accessible bicycle access. There will likely be a need for bike lanes along these roads, so any street design should consider those improvements.
    - What is the impact of this development in conjunction with Remington Flats on the George Elmer/Abby Lane intersection? Is the intersection design sufficient for 3,000-4,000 trips per day on Abby Lane and the additional traffic projected for George Elmer? Is additional intersection control warranted? Turn lanes? What about safe pedestrian crossings?
    - How does the large block size impact bicycle and pedestrian traffic? We would anticipate the much higher volumes due to lack of roadway network density to negatively impact the safety and accessibility of non-motorized travel, further increasing the rate of motor vehicle trips.

Regarding the variance request for block length, as noted above we believe this variance will negatively impact both traffic patterns and increase the need for collector-level improvements due to concentration of trips onto a single roadway. In addition, the block length variance perpetuates and appears to increase the impact of existing variation from the required maximum block size. In addition, there currently appears to be no consideration or provision of non-motorized connectivity to offset the increase in block size. It is unclear how this request meets the intent of the subdivision regulations. In addition, it is unclear what the hardship is – the property has sufficient area and topography to easily support block sizes that meet the subdivision regulations.

- The ROW width for Pious Way does not meet subdivision standards, and is an adjacent roadway serving this subdivision. Although existing roadway improvements fit within the existing ROW width of 54', planned non-motorized connections within the area include a shared-use path connection from George Elmer to Hellgate Elementary School via a route adjacent to this street. The existing ROW width would not accommodate that connect, which will be funded through the BUILD grant. The future trail connection will be a critical transportation improvement that will mitigate potential traffic impacts from this subdivision. The intensity of uses, and likely concentration of school-aged children in the development creates the need to provide safe routes to school. Without the trail connection, additional vehicle trips will be necessary and will require longer trip lengths and impacts on England Blvd, George Elmer, and Flynn Lane. In order to mitigate these impacts, we would request that addition ROW be dedicated to bring the ROW width up to 80', or at a minimum the addition of 13' to bring this property's ROW share up to 40' (half-street requirement).

Additional comments on the roadway design:

Some additional design recommendations we have are to 1) compare curb radii at all intersections to the BUILD Grant designs and the MAMP Street Atlas and align, 2) incorporate curb extensions at all local street intersections (as per the development to the west), and 3) extend the curb through the T-intersections to prevent parking within the intersections and crosswalks.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

-Aaron