# **Public Comment Summary**

Below are public comments regarding Table 407.141.1 proposed updates, sectioned by when they were received.

#### Received at the Table 407.141.1 ULDC Workshop held on 01/30/2024:

Note: Responses in this section were delivered verbally at the meeting.

Who has priority on raised paths on roads with multiple driveway connections (referenced SE 4<sup>th</sup> street) to avoid the constant up and down that riders experience.

Response: It's best handled on a case-by-case basis, some high-volume driveways may need priority.

Where does pedestrian scaled lighting get placed?

Response: Section 407.148 dictates standards for pedestrian scale lighting, but not where it shall be placed. This is handled on a case-by-case basis.

Would there be raised crossings for MUPs at intersections?

Response: This is not addressed in the code, at higher volume roads the MUP would be second priority and couldn't have raised crossings everywhere.

Reason for 12' wide vs 10' wide pathways and how to avoid some trees?

Response: 12' wide would only be appropriate in the highest volume situation but that if a range is provided we will likely only see the minimum required.

Suggested raised bike lane have buffer distance between on street parking for autos door clearances.

Response: We have updated the error in the graphic during presentation, there should always be a buffer between bike lane and on street parking.

Where does MUP cross a roadway in less urban contexts? At intersection or setback from intersection?

Response: Setback at depicted distance to allow driver to cross the path perpendicular to the path as this improves sight lines.

Concerns around making ROWs wider and conflicting with other requirements (stormwater, tree preservation). Utilizing more land for ROWs impacts what can actually be used for the development. Utility clearance is also an issue.

Response: A meeting was held with GRU on March 6, 2025 where it was determined that the proposed sections would accommodate utilities. As per the comparison, the ROWs utilize the same or less width as the current table.

Ranges for daily trips could be broken down morel: 150 – 1500 is narrow but 1500 – 6000 is wide. Later in comments suggested 3000 has break point for residential.

Response: The 1,500-6,000 Trips Mixed Use/Commercial category was broken down to 1,500-3,000 trips and 3,000 to 6,000 trips.

Concerns about note 16 of proposed table. ROW + 2 additional feet to accommodate maintenance on publicly dedicated streets, when considered in the context of TND build to line requirements.

Response: Public Works requires 2' of ROW on either side of the section to dedicate a public road, this is a requirement for maintenance.

Is 10-foot MUP on both sides or one side, concerns about width compared to current requirements. Alison stated default is symmetrical with table update unless otherwise noted but also pointed out that it is in lieu of sidewalks and onstreet bike lanes. Ramon suggested an allowance/note on table for variations in some cases where intent is still met or where an MUP is adjacent to but outside ROW.

Response: MUP on both sides except where indicated otherwise. See width comparisons. In the code, a note exists to allow MUP outside of ROW within 200' of the ROW where limitations occur.

Asked if guidance on corner radius can be provided in this update, prefers narrower radiuses to slow vehicles.

Response: Radius design is not part of this table or update.

Requested an additional break for smaller scale commercial daily trips as suggested by Sergio/Claudia for residential to create more intimate commercial areas in some locations. Also asked if this is applied development wide or based on specific segment. Alison said specific segment.

Response: The 1,500-6,000 Trips Mixed Use/Commercial category was broken down to 1,500-3,000 trips and 3,000 to 6,000 trips.

# Received from Chris Mallinson on 02/20/2025:

I think the proposed code updates to table 407.141.1 will help provide a safety buffer for cyclists and peds. I do have a concern with any danger of deleting a bike lane in favor of a

multi use lane because many of our local cyclists travel for sport rather than commuting and their speeds are 18 to 25 mph. That's very fast on the multi path with pedestrians, strollers, etc. I did not see any of that specific language in the propose changes, but it was worth a mention. For those recreational and sport cyclists, bike lines are much better because of the speed they are traveling. Everything else is real solid and I really appreciate the trees and foliage barriers between traffic on the larger roads and the cycling/pedestrian travel area.

Response: Thank you for providing input, Chris.

I understand that you probably see a lot of faster recreational bicyclists using the painted bike lanes. And perhaps you are one of these cyclists. Painted bike lanes are, however, no longer consistent with best practices in bicycle planning and design. The primary reason is that they feel less safe and comfortable to the majority of the population, including current **and would-be** bike riders. Most people prefer physical separation from motor vehicle traffic. This is borne out by the in-person and (1,758) web-based survey responses received for the Countywide Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan (See table at bottom right where 70% and 75% of respondents prefer shared use paths and trails, whereas 25% prefer painted bike lanes). The trend towards physical separation is also supported by crash data, which reveal large numbers of 'run-off-the-road' crashes and distracted driving.

Your point about potential conflicts between faster and slower path/trail users is well taken. The general approach to this issue is to separate users where anticipated volumes are high, providing both sidewalks and **separated** bike lanes, in busier ("mixed-use/commercial") areas and shared use paths along lower volume residential corridors. This is what we've tried to do in our draft, revised Table 407.141.1. We will consider your input as we continue to refine the table and see if there are additional contexts in which we should provide separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Thank you, again, for your input.

# Received from Seth Wood on 02/21/2025:

We suggest a minimum 11' width for all arterials and collectors, rather than the 10' sometimes shown, to accommodate future expansion of transit.

Response: 10' was retained, however note 6 was added allowing 11' as needed: 6. If transit or heavy freight are projected to run on general purpose travel lanes, then the lane width shall be eleven (11) feet.

We suggest a uniform 8' minimum width for on-street parking, rather than the 7' width sometimes shown.

# Response: All parking widths were made 8' within the table.

The code changes speak to street tree requirements; also seeing bike parking requirements of some sort would be nice. Not sure if those are already addressed in another portion of the ULDC.

Response: Section 407.15 of the ULDC require bicycle parking for commercial and multi-family development.

# Received from EDA on 03/06/2025:

EDA would like to share the following general feedback on the proposed revisions to the Street Design Specifications.

# **Trees and Canopy Coverage Requirements**

There is some inconsistency in the cross section examples shown and the required widths for tree islands. It would be helpful to show the range of widths in the table to be able to properly calculate the total minimum ROW.

Generally, to meet the county's shading requirements, Live Oaks are used as street trees to provide maximum canopy coverage. Unfortunately, the planting strip width required for live oaks doesn't align with the width of on-street parking. I realize that the landscaping code was recently adopted, but we suggest review and coordination on the requirements for street tree planting areas for consistency with the street parking widths in this table. We encourage a closer look at the tree shading requirements and the newly adopted planting strip sizes for consistency.

Additionally, in cases where a bike lane and a sidewalk are required, it may be necessary to have two rows of street trees to provide the shading coverage required by the landscaping code, expanding the right-of-way and additional 10'-24'. This is not shown in your example cross section, but would increase the required right-of-way to meet all code requirements. In the case another planting strip is provided between the bike land and sidewalk, could it take the place of the 2' buffer between? Is there flexibility in the width of the buffer with 2' minimum?

We encourage a closer look at the tree shading requirements and the newly adopted planting strip sizes for consistency with the changes to the Street Design Specifications.

# Sidewalk Widths

The change to 10' wide sidewalks, especially when a 7' bike lane is required is going to create a very wide paved area. Perhaps the sidewalk width could be reduced to 6-8' on each side when a bike lane is also provided (*especially* on local roads- but preferably in all cases)? This change would still provide a very large total area for bike/ped use on each side of the street.

# **Cross Section Updates and Overall ROW widths**

It would be helpful to include a minimum width for the Local Roads on the table based on the minimum requirements – (i.e. 1500 to 6000 Mixed-Use/Commercial adds up to 78' *minimum*- that is without an optional median, additional area likely needed for the tree planting strip, and maintenance space required for public streets). This cross section could easily become 90' with all of those items.

A number of the cross sections don't include the proper widths from the revised table (i.e. 6' bike lanes shown instead of 7' and 8' parking without the additional 2' curb and gutter on Slide 22 – Local 2 Lane) See additional markups below-





We would also like clarification on note 16 under the table – is an additional 2' required on each side of the road? Should this requirement be added to the table as "Public road maintenance area" so it's easier to calculate the total width required from the table in the case of public streets?

Response: A meeting was held with EDA in response to these comments where the questions were answered. It was determined that bike lane and sidewalk/parking buffers would be required and could be widened to meet Live Oak planting width requirements. Sidewalk width requirements will not be reduced to 6-8' as this is not sufficient per national standards. Minimum width requirements for local roads were incorporated into the table and the cross sections updated to match.