

My comments on the proposed zone change are following the Rezoning Report, (and with Addendum below to incorporate Applicant Correspondence) which clarify points made specifically on traffic impacts. I strongly echo their conclusion to deny the zoning change to 5 du/ac for reasons I will detail as follows:

I am direct stakeholder, with a corner adjacent lot to the easement access on Triplett Lane. I also speak from having directly worked in the transportation industry doing modeling and simulation of traffic for many projects, including the 2002 Winter Olympic Games.

To put the results of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) benchmark in perspective, a 2267 trip count is an average statistic of a vehicle every 38.2 seconds, all day and night. The current 241 dwelling estimate is almost a 300% addition to existing dwelling count that Triplett Lane is currently servicing. The more realistic projection and impact is that the ITE count is conservatively low, disregarding affluent areas having more home deliveries (package, food, etc.)

The majority of traffic flow is concentrated in morning and evening. The apex of the hill on Triplett Lane approaches the easement access blind to uphill, oncoming traffic, without safe line-of-sight for our limited current flow, much less a multi-hundred car pileup that would ensue every morning and evening.

Feeding an additional triple average (not peak) volume into Kingston Pike is a recipe for disaster given there is no way to mitigate queue depth with a signal (because direct adjacent signals exist for the commercial plaza to the west and east.) This also places significant financial burden on both commercial plazas off Triplett, making them all but inaccessible to patrons.

Safe operational line-of-site access at the top of Triplett isn't possible without significant county expense to regrade the hill, loss of trees, moving utilities infrastructure, and constructing a wide thoroughfare on the easement without neighbor buy-in, which would be impossible given these statistics.

From a traffic perspective, it's a "no-brainer" to use a major collector like George Williams Road. I'm also of the opinion that specific load, even with a major collector, places a fair burden on intersection with Fox Road without county intervention. As discussed in the report, that access has its own issues, none of which are easy, but it's orders of magnitude more capable than access from Triplett Lane.

Given the overwhelming loads imposed by such a change, the staff recommendation to deny this rezoning is the only logical option.

Addendum:

This commentary was written on my flight across country today without any access to Applicant Correspondence. With the greater clarity regarding the developer reducing the rezoning effort to 3 du/ac, and more importantly that Triplett Lane will not be an access point for traffic, I would concur it could be viable and ask the committee to make any rezoning contingent on the assertion of no traffic access to Triplett Lane citing my prior analysis.

Furthermore, after doing some "cocktail-napkin" math on the new acreage and dwelling unit value, the proposed development is 33.24 acres (removing the existing home/barn), reducing to 100 du and thereby yielding a vehicular trip count of roughly 937. As a major collector, George Williams Road could handle that with dedicated left turn and right turn bays, to not impede thru traffic. My only point of concern would be the traffic load on the intersection of Fox Road and George Williams Road, which is a debate for the county to have given less than half the original vehicle count.