

**Blue Ridge Road Widening Project  
Duraleigh Road to Crabtree Valley Avenue  
Raleigh, Wake County, NC**

**Public Meeting  
Comment Summary  
(December 2017 – August 2018)**

**Overview**

The 25% Design Public Meeting was held on July 12, 2018 at the Laurel Hills Community Center in Raleigh, North Carolina. A total of 156 members of the public signed in during the 2-hour meeting. A presentation was given by Reuben Moore of the City of Raleigh and Jeff Moore of Kimley-Horn followed by an open question-and-answer session. A total of 102 sets of comments were received between December 2017 and August 2018, including comments received via mail, email, online submission, and phone. There is also a petition, a Twitter thread, a Facebook page (since removed), and a website with public comments and discussion regarding the project. All of the comments are summarized below.

Based on the comments received, improvements along Blue Ridge Road are not supported by most respondents. Many residents cite property impacts, increased traffic, and safety concerns as reasons for their opposition. The following aspects are notable and frequent topics of opposition:

- Removal of the “parking lane” along Blue Ridge Road
- Reclassifying the existing two-lane road as a three-lane road
- Bike lanes
- Increased traffic
- Removal of the oak trees
- Removal of the bus stop in front of Hillcrest Raleigh facility

Other concerns that were presented were property impacts, property value, increased noise and pollution, safety, increased speed, easements, increased stormwater run-off, poor sightlines due to landscaping, construction impacts and timeline, and the public involvement process. Many have expressed concern that the traffic studies have not accounted for nearby project impacts as well.

The following proposed improvements are generally supported, based on comments received:

- Traffic signal at Ed Drive
- Pedestrian improvements
- Roundabouts, particularly at the Homewood Banks intersection
- Pedestrian tunnel for House Creek Greenway.

Comment	Response
<b>Comments about overall project</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In favor of Blue Ridge Road improvements. (x5)</li> <li>2. Not in favor of Blue Ridge Road improvements. (x7)</li> <li>3. In favor of project if it included sidewalk continuity, pedestrian signals, and improved transit stops.</li> <li>4. Opposed to three-lane design, leave as two lanes. (x17)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted.</li> <li>3. The proposed project includes sidewalks on both sides of Blue Ridge Road from Duraleigh Road to Crabtree Valley Avenue, new and improved transit stops, and a traffic signal at Ed Drive (to be installed by NCDOT prior to this project).</li> <li>4. Blue Ridge Road is classified as a two-lane avenue, which includes a center turn lane or median according to City of Raleigh Street Design Guidelines.</li> </ol>
<b>Comments about on-street parking</b>	
<p>Against removal of parking lane (x25)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “The on-street parking lane will be gone which is used now for homeowner parking, deliveries including FedEx and UPS, lawn maintenance companies, family and friends who visit homeowners, service technicians and more.”</li> <li>2. Suggest carving out two parking spots in front of each house.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Blue Ridge Road was widened previously to one-side to setup half of the widened section proposed by this project. This extra pavement was not intended to serve as on-street parking but has been used as such since its construction. The project reclaims that pavement for its original intended purpose. The design alternative currently being developed and to be presented in March 2019 allows for parking.</li> <li>2. Additional parking may be considered at specific locations where requested but may increase impacts to existing property and the project cost, or may be infeasible due to physical constraints.</li> </ol>
<b>Comments about property impacts</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Questions about how driveways will be affected &amp; safety of entering street from driveways. (x16)</li> <li>2. Concern about how much property will be impacted/taken. (x8)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing driveway access to Blue Ridge Road will be maintained. Some construction may be necessary to tie the existing driveways into the proposed roadway.</li> <li>2. Additional property impact information will be available at the second public meeting, anticipated to be held in March, 2019. once the 65% designs have been completed.</li> </ol>

<p>3. Concern about decreased property value. (x11)</p> <p>4. Concern about increased noise, smoke, and dust. (x6)</p> <p>5. Concern about decreased quality of life. (x7)</p> <p>6. Concern about property impacts to Atkinson and Noremac properties. (x2)</p> <p>7. What is the standard residential verge width in Raleigh? (Distance between sidewalk and back of curb.)</p> <p>8. "I might also note that current regulations limiting the percentage of non-permeable surfaces that can comprise one's lot, compounded by costs associated with restructuring and installing new driveways (for instance a circular drive) would also make it very difficult for residents along this stretch of Blue Ridge to adapt their properties to safely allow entering and exiting onto Blue Ridge Road without a parking lane."</p> <p>9. Concern that it will be more difficult to exit driveway when there's snow. (x3)</p> <p>10. "All melted snow with salt will flood toward our house which will affect the building foundation."</p>	<p>3. Roads widened by the City of Raleigh typically are improved with the addition of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities. These improvements typically improve property values.</p> <p>4. Increased levels of noise, smoke, and dust might be evident during construction, but are not anticipated with the final configuration.</p> <p>5. The project proposes to improve the roadway with additional laneage and new bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities with the main purpose of increasing the quality of life.</p> <p>6. The property located at 3703 Blue Ridge Road is currently anticipated to have permanent right of way and temporary construction easement impacts to accommodate the widened roadway and appropriate curve radius for the design speed. Utility easements may also be necessary as the design and coordination with utilities progresses.</p> <p>7. Six feet.</p> <p>8. Stormwater design will be conducted and impervious surface will be considered in those calculations and permitting.</p> <p>9. Noted.</p> <p>10. Proper roadway drainage facilities will be designed in the upcoming stages of the process to accommodate storm water run-off.</p>
---	--

**Comments about easements**

<p>1. Concern about easements. (x2)</p> <p>2. What are your estimated costs for the proposed easements?</p>	<p>1-2 Additional property impact information will be available at the second public meeting, anticipated to be held in March, 2019. once the 65% designs have been submitted.</p>
---	--

<p>3. Concern that residents are mistaking temporary construction easements for property that will be taken from them.</p> <p>4. Why are you adding proposed easements?</p> <p>5. Why are your proposed easements so large?</p> <p>6. What happens if I refuse to sell my easement?</p> <p>7. "I am very concerned about the easement on and adjacent to my residence at 3901 Bentley Bridge Road. The survey maps show this easement coming to within 5 - 10 feet of my townhouse and there is no information about its planned use."</p> <p>8. "Please identify the purpose of the proposed easements – temporary or permanent? Specific to our property (2724 Townedge Court), the easement appears to be in our backyard on the interior side of our brick wall. Since the intent is to not disturb our brick wall, what possible purpose would an easement be need on the interior side of the brick wall?"</p>	<p>3. Proposed right of way and easement impacts will be more clearly defined at the second public meeting in March 2019 and will be detailed with property owners during the right of way process.</p> <p>4-5. Preliminary permanent and temporary easements are currently shown to accommodate utility easements and temporary construction easements.</p> <p>6. The City will make an offer for right-of-way and easements based on independent appraisals and fair market value. If an agreement cannot be made, then the matter will be provided to the City Council for further action.</p> <p>7. The proposed easement impacts to the property at 3901 Bentley Bridge Road are currently anticipated to be temporary construction easements to accommodate the construction of the proposed sidewalk connection to the existing sidewalk. Temporary easements will be returned to the property owners upon completion of construction. Additional details will be available as design progresses.</p> <p>8. The proposed easement impacts to the property at 2724 Townedge Court are currently anticipated to be temporary construction easements to accommodate the construction of the project. Temporary easements will be returned to the property owners upon completion of construction. A note has been made in the design plan to not disturb the existing brick wall. Additional details will be available as design progresses.</p>
--	--

**Comments about pedestrian improvements**

<p>1. In favor of pedestrian improvements. (x9)</p> <p>2. Opposed to sidewalks. (x3)</p> <p>3. In favor of pedestrian tunnel/culvert. (x8)</p> <p>4. Request width of proposed sidewalk be reduced. (x3)</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. NCDOT Complete Streets guidelines currently recommend a 6 to 8-foot wide sidewalk in an urban or suburban residential area.</p>
--	--

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. In favor of having sidewalk on one side of the street if property impacts could be reduced. (x2)</li> <li>6. Why do you need two sidewalks?</li> <li>7. City should not use community boardwalk as its sidewalk. (x5)</li> <li>8. Existing boardwalk is 5 feet wide, not 6 feet as specified by City project, not ADA compliant, subject to repair each year (currently paid by HOA), does not have lighting, and very little privacy for property owners. (x4)</li> <li>9. Request that sidewalk on the north corner of Glen Iris and Blue Ridge toward Noremac join the proposed sidewalk at the bus stop.</li> <li>10. "We certainly prefer the Sidewalk Alternative at the street offered behind our property at 4106 English Garden Way and hope you can figure out something similar for the section of Blue Ridge from Glen Iris to the new Bus stop area near Noremac. "</li> <li>11. Request that sidewalk on Glen Lake South road be moved up next to the curb. (x2)</li> <li>12. Concern that property owners will be subject to suit if someone gets injured on the boardwalk. (x2)</li> <li>13. Support sidewalk alternative on Roll 3. (x4)</li> <li>14. Support placement of sidewalk between Glen Iris and Normac. (x3)</li> <li>15. Concern that proposed improvements will make it dangerous for pedestrians.</li> <li>16. Suggest more crosswalks.</li> <li>17. Request sidewalk continuity.</li> <li>18. In favor of 6' sidewalks.</li> <li>19. Support extending current sidewalk to Morningside Drive.</li> <li>20. Request sidewalks at all four corners of the intersection of Blue Ridge and Glen Eden. The sidewalk needs to extend to Morningside.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5-6. Sidewalks were proposed on both sides of Blue Ridge Road to accommodate pedestrian and transit needs for residences and businesses on both sides of the road. The design team will consider this suggestion.</li> <li>7-10. The City is evaluating two alternative sidewalk proposals on the west side of Blue Ridge Road near Glen Iris Lane. One alternative proposes removing the existing boardwalk and replacing it with a sidewalk on the back of curb. The second alternative proposes retaining the existing boardwalk with sidewalk connections to Glen Iris Lane.</li> <li>11. This will be considered during design.</li> <li>12. New Boardwalk is not proposed.</li> <li>13. Noted.</li> <li>14. Noted.</li> <li>15. One of the purposes of the project is to improve safety. It is anticipated that the proposed pedestrian facilities will improve safety.</li> <li>16. Crosswalk locations will be evaluated during final design.</li> <li>17. Continuous sidewalks are proposed on both sides of Blue Ridge Road for the entirety of the project corridor.</li> <li>18. Noted.</li> <li>19. Noted.</li> <li>20. The current design proposes sidewalks on all four corners of Glen Eden Drive and a sidewalk continuing to the existing sidewalk on Morningside Drive.</li> </ol>
--	--

<p>21. Suggest eliminating crosswalk near Edgemont. Suggest placing it closer to the flat part of the road.</p> <p>22. What is the standard residential sidewalk width in Raleigh?</p> <p>23. Support repositioning House Creek Trail to create an underpass under Blue Ridge Road.</p> <p>24. "Proposed new transit stop located between Glen Iris and Noremac will require transit users to take an awkward detour along a path...likely lead to jaywalking or dangerous use of the bike lane to walk towards Glen Iris Lane."</p>	<p>21. This will be considered during design.</p> <p>22. Six feet.</p> <p>23. Noted.</p> <p>24. A crosswalk between Glen Iris Lane and Noremac Drive is currently proposed. The City is evaluating two alternatives for a sidewalk along the west side of Blue Ridge Road at this location. See response number 7-10.</p>
--	---

**Comments about bike lanes**

<p>1. Opposed to bike lanes (x15)</p> <p>2. In favor of bike lanes (x4)</p> <p>3. Opposed to bike lanes between Glen Eden and Crabtree Boulevard (x4)</p> <p>4. In favor of multiuse path instead (x2)</p> <p>5. Suggest bike lanes be placed above curb (x7)</p> <p>6. In favor of diverting bike lanes to greenway (x3)</p> <p>7. Suggest bike lane be wide enough to accommodate parking (x5)</p> <p>8. Not in favor of ending bike lane at Crabtree Boulevard (x2)</p> <p>9. Suggest studies be done for bicycle needs between Arbor Drive and Crabtree Boulevard.</p> <p>10. Request connecting House Creek Trail with Crabtree Trail.</p> <p>11. Suggest making bike lanes flow continuously through each intersection with cars, with clear expectations for each point of potential conflict.</p> <p>12. Why are bike lanes needed?</p> <p>13. How many bicycles to you anticipate using the bicycle lanes in a 24-hour/1-month period?</p> <p>14. Support 5' bike lanes.</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5-6. Current NCDOT Complete Street guidance for an urban or suburban Avenue recommend bike lanes be placed within the curbs.</p> <p>7. Parking and bicycle lanes should not be located together. Ideally there is a buffer between these two elements.</p> <p>8. Proposed bike lane improvements end at Crabtree Valley Avenue since this is the limit of the project.</p> <p>9. A bicycle projection study has not been conducted.</p> <p>10. This connection will be made if the pedestrian culvert alternative is selected.</p> <p>11. The current design proposes that bike lanes continue straight through the intersection on the furthest right-hand side of the paved surface, except for intersections which have an exclusive right-turn lane in which case the bike lane is proposed to the left of this lane.</p> <p>12. Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are recommended to meet the Complete Street guidance provided by NCDOT and set as a purpose of this project.</p> <p>13. A bicycle projection study has not been conducted.</p> <p>14. Noted.</p>
---	--

<b>Comments about roundabouts/intersections</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In favor of roundabouts. (x5)</li> <li>2. Against roundabouts. (x2)</li> <li>3. Suggest another roundabout at Morningside and Edgemont Drive. (x3)</li>   <li>4. In favor of Homewood Banks roundabout (x7)</li> <li>5. Opposed to Homewood Banks roundabout.</li> <li>6. In favor of Homewood Banks roundabout if it would slow traffic toward Townedge Court.</li> <li>7. Would prefer stoplight at Homewood Banks over roundabout (x2)</li> <li>8. In favor of Crabtree Valley roundabout.</li> <li>9. In favor of Crabtree Valley intersection improvements.</li> <li>10. Suggest roundabout at Ed Drive intersection.</li> <li>11. "We would like to see additional information regarding the roundabout proposal. Specifically, how this would slow the traffic flow onto Blue Ridge toward Glen Eden Drive?"</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Noted.</li> <li>3. Due to the proximity of Edgemont Drive and Morningside Drive, two adjacent roundabouts would not be recommended. A realignment of the two roads to create a single roundabout intersection would be more ideal, but would have significant property impacts.</li>   <li>4-10. Noted</li> <li>11. One of the characteristics that road designers choose roundabouts for is the combination of slower traffic speeds with intersection capacity. Traffic at a "Yield" sign can enter a smaller distance gap in traffic than when an opposing vehicle is approaching at a high speed. Roundabouts are designed to keep internal traffic at about 20 mph so that yielding traffic can slip into short gaps. This allows a lot of traffic to simultaneously use an intersection. Traffic leaving a roundabout typically speeds up as conditions allow as it has the right-of-way and is proceeding on the through road.</li> </ol>
<b>Comments about traffic</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern about increased traffic and safety (x25)</li>   <li>2. Concern that traffic studies have not included effects of nearby projects (x8)</li> <li>3. Concern about increased traffic on Eden Croft Drive and Arbor as drivers use these streets to avoid traffic light intersection at Blue Ridge and Glen Eden (x3)</li>   <li>4. Concern that traffic counts are low (x2)</li>   <li>5. Request for traffic study calculations regarding increase flow of traffic from Ridge Road interchange study.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed project is designed to accommodate the traffic levels which are estimated for the 2040 design year. One of the purposes of the project is to improve safety. The proposed improvements are anticipated to improve safety.</li> <li>2. Traffic Capacity Analysis factored in adjacent projects.</li> <li>3. Traffic Capacity Analysis estimates a LOS F and E in AM and PM at this intersection. This is a possibility, but cut-through traffic would then be faced with entering Glen Eden or Blue Ridge at a stop sign while there is heavy traffic.</li> <li>4. Traffic volumes do vary daily and seasonally, but the volumes analyzed are considered accurate for planning purposes.</li> <li>5. Traffic Capacity Analysis is available on the City's website.</li> </ol>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Request for clarification on traffic projections/year (x2)</li> <li>7. Request for better speeding control (x5)</li> <li>8. "Have your traffic studies shown where new traffic lights must be placed to service large developments?... At Peak times, the traffic light at Glen Eden will back up past our development exit"</li> <li>9. Request to know if studies have been done on residential section of Blue Ridge Road (not including commercial).</li> <li>10. "Glen Eden &amp; Edwards Mill Rd are designed to handle significantly more traffic with the same destinations only a short distance away. Have studies shown these to be inadequate?"</li> <li>11. "Have any studies been done or considerations made on the increased noise levels along this corridor with the three-lane proposal? "</li> <li>12. "Situation at Blue Ridge and Glenwood would be exacerbated with these proposed changes."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Based on traffic counts for Blue Ridge Road collected between 2005 and 2015, a yearly growth rate of 1.59% was used for the time period of 2013-2045 to project traffic volumes in the design year of 2040.</li> <li>7. The road has been designed geometrically to meet the requirements of a roadway with a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour. The proposed landscaping and median are intended to help encourage speeds at this level.</li> <li>8. The traffic capacity analysis estimates that the delays during the AM peak hour will be around the same level as today, but will be reduced in the PM peak hour at the Glen Eden Drive intersection with a traffic signal.</li> <li>9. The traffic capacity analysis performed for this project covered the entire project corridor on Blue Ridge Road from Duraleigh Road to Crabtree Valley Avenue.</li> <li>10. No studies show Glen Eden or Edwards Mill Road to be "inadequate".</li> <li>11. A noise study has not been completed as part of this project.</li> <li>12. The intersection of Blue Ridge Road and Glenwood Avenue (U.S. 70) was not included in the traffic analysis for this project.</li> </ul>
<b>Comments about landscaping/aesthetics</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In favor of preserving oak trees (x13)</li> <li>2. Make sure plants don't obstruct view of drivers (x3)</li> <li>3. Request for detailed planting schedule of proposed landscape island.</li> <li>4. Not in favor of crape myrtles.</li> <li>5. In favor of preserving neighborhood walls and entranceways at Bentley Brook Drive and Bentley Bridge Drive.</li> <li>6. Request additional landscaping.</li> <li>7. "I don't want crape myrtles in my yard; they make it hard to grow grass under them...I will</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The City is endeavoring to leave as many oak trees as possible untouched.</li> <li>2. Current NCDOT guidance requires a 5-foot distance between the edge of the travel lanes and proposed tree trunks.</li> <li>3. More detailed designs will be presented at the next public meeting.</li> <li>4. Noted.</li> <li>5. Notes have been made in the design plans to preserve existing brick walls.</li> <li>6. Additional landscaping will depend on funding and potential design changes.</li> <li>7. These comments will be considered during final design.</li> </ul>



<p>put up with your trees if you put two parking spaces between them.”</p>	
<p><b>Comments about bus stops</b></p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In favor of transit stops (x2)</li> <li>2. Opposed to removing bus stops at the Hillcrest Raleigh facility (x3)</li>   <li>3. Suggest placing transit stops farther from intersection at Glen Eden and Blue Ridge Road.</li> <li>4. Opposed to transit stop near Normac and Blue Ridge.</li> <li>5. What is the average cost of an enhanced bus stop shelter?</li>   <li>6. What justification is there to support an enhanced bus stop shelter across from 3603 Blue Ridge Road?</li> <li>7. The safety of people waiting for buses and the ability to cross 3 lanes of traffic if on foot also needs to be considered.</li> <li>8. In favor of relocating bus stops close to intersections and provide shelter for bus users.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noted.</li> <li>2. Through coordination with GoRaleigh Transit, the existing bus stop at Hillcrest Raleigh has been proposed to be removed. Based on comments received following the public meeting, the City will continue to coordinate with GoRaleigh to determine if this existing stop will be retained.</li> <li>3. The transit stop placement will be coordinated with GoRaleigh Transit.</li> <li>4. Noted.</li> <li>5. GoRaleigh uses “enhanced” to refer to transfer stations such as called for in the Wake County Transit Plan. There are none on this project. A standard bus shelter can cost up to \$30,000 depending on right-of-way easements needed, possible retaining walls, and the concrete pad and shelter structure.</li> <li>6. Not all stops will receive a shelter, but all stops will be made ADA compliant by having a concrete landing pad. A bench and trash can may also be included.</li> <li>7. The proposed additional crosswalks, sidewalks, and bus stop shelters are anticipated to improve safety for transit users.</li> <li>8. Noted.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Comments about Ed Drive</b></p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In favor of traffic signal on Ed Drive. (x10)</li> <li>2. Suggest left turn lanes at Ed Drive. (x2)</li>   <li>3. Proposed traffic signal at Ed Drive and Blue Ridge Road will back up traffic during rush hour, making it difficult to exit driveways.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The traffic signal at Ed Drive will be installed prior to this project.</li> <li>2. Exclusive left-turn lanes on Blue Ridge Road to access Ed Drive are currently proposed in the design. A shared through and left-turn lane is proposed on Ed Drive to access Blue Ridge Road.</li> <li>3. The existing unsignalized Ed Drive intersection currently operates at a level of service (LOS) F for the Ed Drive approaches and a LOS of A for the Blue Ridge Road approaches. The proposed signalized intersection design is anticipated to operate</li> </ol>

	at a LOS of B for the entire intersection in the year 2040.
<b>Comments about traffic signals</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Opposed to additional traffic signals along Blue Ridge Road. (x3)</li> <li>2. Suggest traffic signal at east Morningside Drive. (x3)</li> <li>3. In favor of traffic signal at Townedge Court.</li> <li>4. Suggest eastbound left turn lane onto Crabtree Boulevard with protected left turn signal.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The traffic signal at Ed Drive will be installed as part of a separate project prior to the proposed Blue Ridge Road improvements.</li> <li>2. A traffic signal at Morningside Drive does not meet NCDOT traffic signal warrants.</li> <li>3. A traffic signal at Townedge Court is currently not warranted based on traffic volumes.</li> <li>4. The current design proposes an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Blue Ridge Road onto Crabtree Valley Avenue.</li> </ol>
<b>Comments about medians</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Request medians be painted in reflective yellow.</li> <li>2. Opposed to medians.</li> <li>3. Request for a median at Glen Iris and Blue Ridge.</li> <li>4. "The current painted median just south of the intersection requires a much too tight left-hand turn from Marshall Park Lane to get onto south Blue Ridge Road."</li> <li>5. Concern that median partially blocks left turn out of Townedge Court.</li> <li>6. Request to shorten left turn median towards Glen Eden.</li> <li>7. Suggest adding additional medians in the turning lane.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retro-reflective lane striping will be used in this project per City of Raleigh and NCDOT specifications.</li> <li>2. Medians are proposed in sections of the corridor to improve safety, one of the purposes of the project.</li> <li>3. A median is not currently proposed on Blue Ridge Road at Glen Iris Lane so that left turn movements may be allowed.</li> <li>4. The roadway geometry at the intersection of Blue Ridge Road and Marshall Park Lane is proposed to be improved to meet current standards.</li> <li>5. The proposed median on Blue Ridge Road will be designed to allow left-turns out of Townedge Court.</li> <li>6. A median is currently not proposed near Glen Eden Drive on Blue Ridge Road. Exclusive left-turn lanes are currently proposed on Blue Ridge Road to access Glen Eden Drive.</li> <li>7. The median locations in the proposed design were selected to maintain access to properties. Also, adding more medians would result in additional right of way impacts.</li> </ol>
<b>Comments about stormwater run-off</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern about increased run-off (x2)</li> <li>2. Concern about flooding near proposed tunnel.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drainage design will manage run-off.</li> <li>2. The proposed tunnel would flood at some point but not before the surrounding existing greenway would already be flooded.</li> </ol>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The road side drainage ditch should be left to help manage storm water run-off.</li> <li>4. "Storm water: if the city is determining to put in the curb and gutter where is the storm water going? Please let the property see the plans."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Stormwater run-off will be managed through a curb &amp; gutter collection system.</li> <li>4. Stormwater plans are being developed for the next public meeting.</li> </ul>
<b>Comments about construction</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Questions about working days/hours of construction (x2)</li> <li>2. Suggest contacting Summit Church to procure their overflow parking lot to store construction equipment.</li> <li>3. Concern about equipment and parking from construction workers.</li> <li>4. Request measures be taken to reduce project duration.</li> <li>5. "Construction Staging: It was stated by staff that staging would be up to the contractor once the work had been awarded. This should be part of the scope of the work and part of the discussion with the citizens."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.-4. Construction schedules and details will be determined when the contractor is awarded the project (anticipated beginning of 2020). Construction schedule restrictions may also be included in the final design and bidding process. Note that the more restrictive that the City makes the working hours (time of day restrictions, day of week restrictions, et cetera), the longer it will take to build the project.</li> <li>5. The City will consider including staging area restrictions in the final design and bid process.</li> </ul>
<b>Comments about public involvement process</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Two-week comment period too short. (x2)</li> <li>2. Request that there be another public meeting scheduled in near future before planned fall meeting. (x2)</li> <li>3. "Major transit projects should not introduce high volume traffic to a residential area and should include pre-design feedback from the whole community and not just the commercial and retail destination areas that surround them."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A minimum of two-weeks for comments was guaranteed; comments received after the July 26<sup>th</sup> date have also been included in this comment summary and considered.</li> <li>2. Another public meeting is not anticipated before the 65% Design Plan Public Meeting. However, if you would like to set up a meeting with City of Raleigh project staff, you may do so by contacting Reuben Moore at <a href="mailto:reuben.moore@raleighnc.gov">reuben.moore@raleighnc.gov</a> or 919-996-4171. A stakeholder meeting for residents who park on-street was held October 16, 2018.</li> <li>3. The City of Raleigh is open to receiving public feedback during the public involvement process and will use this feedback during the ongoing design process.</li> </ul>

<p>4. Request delay of project due to lack of trust in public involvement process.</p> <p>5. Study the purpose impact of the Ridge Road project on Blue Ridge before either project is started and get feedback from property owners.</p> <p>6. “Will all comments provided be made public and if so when and how will this information be available? (names redacted)?”</p> <p>7. Suggest revised 65% plans be made public a minimum of three weeks prior to next public meeting.</p>	<p>4. The project is currently behind the original schedule because the designers took additional time to use the public input to develop new options that are responsive to comments received. The City is committed to completing the intended improvements in this project.</p> <p>5. The City is aware of the ongoing NCDOT Ridge Road project and will continue to coordinate with NCDOT.</p> <p>6. This comment summary will be made public to share the responses with involved parties.</p> <p>7. The City will strive to post a copy of the public meeting maps to the project website prior to the next public meeting.</p>
<b>Comments about utilities</b>	
<p>1. In favor of putting all utilities underground. (x2)</p> <p>2. Suggest relocation of utility boxes at the corner of Noremac Drive and Blue Ridge Road to improve sight lines. (x2)</p> <p>3. “The Glenlake South community owns a cluster of utility boxes at the corner of Blue Ridge Road and Normac Drive. How will this area be affected?”</p> <p>4. Request that an updated map showing existing and proposed utility locations be distributed well in advance of next public meeting.</p>	<p>1-4. Utility coordination will begin soon and these comments will be considered.</p>
<b>Other comments/suggestions</b>	
<p>1. Concerned that proposed improvements will be an inconvenience for the school bus/public bus stops. (x2)</p> <p>2. In favor of center turn lane.</p> <p>3. Support right turn lane on Blue Ridge Road to Glen Eden.</p> <p>4. Request for more details on turns from Townedge Court onto Blue Ridge Road.</p> <p>5. Turning lane between Glen Eden and Duraleigh prioritizes non-residential traffic at the expense of safety of locals.</p>	<p>1. The project team will coordinate with the public school and local transit authorities regarding construction activities.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. Left and right turns will be permitted from Townedge Court onto Blue Ridge Road. Additional design details will be provided at the 65% design public meeting.</p> <p>5. A median was not proposed in this portion of the project to maintain access to the residences along this portion of the corridor. Residences will benefit from the center turn lane as well.</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Concern about sight distances (x5)</li> <li>7. Request for plans to include site distance triangle with measurements.</li> <li>8. In favor of reducing curves (x6)</li> <li>9. "As people crest the hill at that point, heading toward Crabtree Valley Mall, that is a typical place of acceleration and is sometimes challenging to pull out, especially making a left-hand turn."</li> <li>10. In favor of extending existing center turn lane beyond Carovel Court but with an alternative cross-section that accommodates residents needs and other roadway users.</li> <li>11. Request Duraleigh to Glen Eden cross-section include center turn lane, sharrows and curb-and-gutter in travel lanes, planted median separating travel lane from a parking lane, and then a sidewalk (no parking lane on north-west side and no bike lanes).</li> <li>12. Not in favor of reducing curves (slows drivers down).</li> <li>13. Request to reduce project impacts (x2)</li> <li>14. Suggest eliminating left-turn at Morningside Drive and Blue Ridge entrance.</li> <li>15. "I would like to see a two-lane proposal with an emphasis on safety for pedestrians, bus users and cyclists (in that order)."</li> <li>16. Current wide lanes allow wiggle room during snow and ice.</li> <li>17. Support 11' lanes.</li> <li>18. What is the intent of designing the road for 40 mph speed when the residential speed limit in Raleigh is 35 mph?</li> <li>19. Concerned about emergency vehicle access.</li> <li>20. Consider this project to be an inappropriate use of city funds. (x8)</li> <li>21. In favor of left turn signal from Glen Eden to Blue Ridge Road. (x3)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6-9. The proposed improvements include bringing the horizontal and vertical curves up to the current standards for sight distances. Proposed landscaping will also be placed sufficiently far away from the travel lanes to maintain sight distances. Sight distance triangles will be completed as the design progresses.</li> <li>10-11. The project team will consider these recommendations.</li> <li>12. Some of the curves on Blue Ridge Road are proposed to be increased in radius to meet the current standards.</li> <li>13. Project impacts will be minimized and avoided where feasible as design progresses.</li> <li>14. A left turn-lane onto Morningside drive is currently included in the proposed design to allow access to Morningside Drive and allow flow of traffic on Blue Ridge Road.</li> <li>15. Blue Ridge Road is classified as a two-lane avenue, which includes a center turn lane or median according to City of Raleigh Street Design Guidelines.</li> <li>16. Noted.</li> <li>17. Noted.</li> <li>18. The AASHTO design manual and NCDOT design guidelines require a roadway be designed for speeds 5 miles per hour above the posted speed.</li> <li>19. The project team will coordinate with local emergency services.</li> <li>20. Noted.</li> <li>21. A protected left-turn signal phase for the northbound left-turn movement on Glen Eden Drive is proposed with this project.</li> </ol>
---	---

<p>22. Are developers behind this proposal?</p> <p>23. When is project expected to be completed?</p> <p>24. How much money does the City of Raleigh expect to get from Crabtree Valley Mall if they approve their project to increase traffic on Blue Ridge Road?</p> <p>25. Concern that taxes will be increased.</p> <p>26. Request Blue Ridge Road be renamed. (x2)</p> <p>27. What is the anticipated PSF cost to purchase the necessary land for this project?</p> <p>28. What is the end result expected of this project?</p> <p>29. "Have you considered public transportation? Perhaps, an elevated train from downtown, with a few intermediate stops, to Brier Creek with a large (free) parking lot?"</p>	<p>22. The proposed project is proposed by the City of Raleigh and was included in the Capital Area MPO 2040 and 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.</p> <p>23. Construction is anticipated to begin in Spring 2020 and run to the fall of 2022. A more precise construction duration is not known at this time.</p> <p>24. Normal growth rather than the building of the project is expected to increase traffic volumes.</p> <p>25. Voters chose to approve a bond to accelerate the construction of projects already planned.</p> <p>26. The City doesn't currently have a plan to change the name of Blue Ridge Road.</p> <p>27. Right of way cost estimates will be generated once 65% designs are complete.</p> <p>28. The purpose of this project is to re-classify the road as a three-lane complete street, accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians, upgrade transit facilities, and improve safety.</p> <p>29. An elevated train was not considered as part of this project. Planning for this mode would be part of the Wake County Transit Plan.</p>
--	--

- A petition was submitted and signed by 29 people asking that the project be scaled back, in addition to the following requests:
  1. Request classification of Blue Ridge Road NOT be changed to a three-lane road.
  2. Request current sidewalk width on the east side of Blue Ridge Rd remain in place, as this is a residential neighborhood.
  3. Request at next meeting that an alternate plan be proposed that considers items 1 and 2 above and MAINTAINING THE PARKING LANE ON EAST SIDE OF BLUE RIDGE. This parking lane is necessary to residents in maintaining daily activities, service vehicles, families with multiple vehicles, etc.
  4. Request a safe 25 to 35 mph speed limit be maintained on Blue Ridge Rd between Crabtree Mall and Duraleigh Rd.
  5. Request any alterations NOT be moved closer to homes on East side of Blue Ridge, due to current proximity of homes to existing road. Noise, odors, safety and property values, being the most important to quality of life for existing and newly built homes along this residential street.