



Greenville City Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
Greenville Convention Center, Room 102
4:00 PM, June 17, 2021
Meeting Notice Posted June 2, 2021

NOTICE OF MEETING: Pursuant to Section 30-4-80 of the S.C. Code of Laws, annual notice of this Commission's Meetings was provided on December 31, 2021 via the Greenville City Website. In addition, the Agenda for this Meeting was posted outside the meeting place (City Council Chambers in City Hall) and was emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice. Notice for the public hearings was published in the Greenville News, posted on the properties subject of public hearing(s), mailed to all surrounding property owners, and emailed to all persons, organizations, and news media requesting notice pursuant to Section 6-29-760 of the S.C. Code of Laws and Section 19-2.2.9 of the Code of the City of Greenville.

Minutes prepared by Sharon Key and Ross Zelenske

Commissioners Present

Diane Eldridge, Mike Martinez, Jeff Randolph, Derek Enderlin, and Meg Terry

Commissioners Absent

Trey Gardner

Staff Present

Assistant City Engineer Paul Dow, Assistant City Engineer Valerie Holmes, Assistant City Manager Shannon Lavrin, City Attorney Mike Pitts, Community Planner Monique Mattison (virtual), Development Planner Austin Rutherford, Development Planner Harold Evangelista, Development Planner Matt Lonnerstater, Development Planner Ross Zelenske, Economic Development Intern Andrew Hall (virtual), Interim City Engineer Clint Link, Landscape Architect Hannah Slyce, Planning Administrator Courtney Powell, Planning and Development Services Director Jonathan B. Graham, Planning Coordinator Sharon Key, Principal Development Planner Kristopher Kurjiaka, Principal Landscape Architect Edward Kinney, Real Estate Development Manager Mary Douglas Hirsch (virtual), Strategic Communications Administrator MJ Simpson (virtual), and Technical Services Manager Mike Blizzard

Public Present

Austin Allen, Bob Llyod, Dorothy Dowe (virtual), Erin Sutherland (virtual), S Limbaker (virtual), Sherry Barrett (virtual), Stephanie Gates (virtual), and Susan McLarty (virtual)

Call to Order

Chairwoman Meg Terry called the meeting to order at 4:01 PM. Chairwoman Terry provided normal beginning procedures for Commission meeting. She explained the agenda of the Planning Commission, outlined the rules for procedure, and invited the other commissioners to introduce themselves.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Jeff Randolph moved to approve minutes as proposed for the following meetings. Commissioner Diane Eldridge seconded the motion, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

- May 7, 2021 Special Called Workshop
- May 12, 2021 Special Called Workshop
- May 18, 2021 Workshop
- May 20, 2021 Public Hearing
- May 24, 2021 Special Called Workshop

Call for Affidavits from Applicants

Staff reported that all public notice affidavits were received.

Acceptance of Agenda

Commissioner Jeff Randolph motioned to approve the agenda as presented, Commissioner Mike Martinez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Conflicts of Interest

- None

OLD BUSINESS

A. Z-6-2021

Application by City of Greenville for a **TEXT AMENDMENT** to Section(s) 19-2.3, 19-5.2, 19-6.1 of the City's Land Management Ordinance to create affordable and workforce housing incentives

Staff report presented by Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka

- Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

- None

Public comments

- None

Commission Discussion

- Commissioner Jeff Randolph asks about the definition of affordable housing and what is included in that definition. Also 19-2.3.21(G)(3) is about the process for affordable units and 4 is regarding all sales; if I am a developer, I don't have to do number 3? Were incentives considered?
- Commissioner Derek Enderlin asks if we have specific districts for household incomes for metropolitan areas?
 - Kris Kurjiaka responds that those are determined by Census information and that he would have to defer to the Community Development Division for specifics.
- Commissioner Diane Eldridge has reservations on the use of the word "substantially" and thinks it should be removed to ensure that affordable housing constructed under this provision is the same as the market rate. She also expresses concerns that the provisions do not address the interior of these affordable units and only address the

exterior. She also questions if that means the city doesn't care about the quality of materials used in interior finishes.

- Chairwoman Meg Terry asks if the Land Management Ordinance address any interior specifics?
- Staff responds that no, there is a base spec so if you want more you pay for it, but everyone starts out with basic specs.
- Chairwoman Meg Terry clarifies that regulating the interior is not in the bounds of the LMO.
- Staff confirms that is correct.
- Commissioner Jeff Randolph discusses the criteria for affordable housing incentives. He expresses concerns about the eligible requirement that a development be within 0.25 miles of a transit stop. He mentions a recent project on Wilkins Street in the Greater Sullivan neighborhood and asks about future plans for Greenlink. He suggests a change to add an exception for developments in the city's special emphasis neighborhoods.
- Commissioner Derek Enderlin discusses if it's not within the 0.25 miles then would it knock them out from incentives?
- Staff agrees the way it is written, these would be good modifications

***Motion: Commissioner Jeff Randolph moved to approve Z-6-2021 with staff comments and conditions, and with modifications to remove the word substantial and modify the language to ensure affordable developments are held to the same design standard as market rate developments, as well as, to exempt developments in special emphasis neighborhoods from the transit stop distance requirements. Seconded by Commissioner Diane Eldridge. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0**

NEW BUSINESS

A. SD-21-051M

Application by Arbor Engineering for a **SUBDIVISION MAJOR MODIFICATION** of 1.29 total acre located at **317 WILKINS ST** from 2 LOTS to 5 LOTS (TM# 009500-08-00500, 010600-02-00300)

Staff report presented by Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka

- Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

- None

Applicant Presentation

- Austin Allen, 10 William Street, with Arbor Engineering spoke as the applicant. He explains the reasoning for this latest plan change. He offers to answer any questions.

Public comments

- None

Commission Discussion

- None

***Motion: Commissioner Mike Martinez moved to approval with staff comments for**

SD-21-2021. Seconded by Commissioner Jeff Randolph. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0 vote.

B. Z-22-2021

Application by City of Greenville for a **TEXT AMENDMENT** to Section(s) 19-6.10 of the City's Land Management Ordinance to amend the requirements for a traffic impact analysis

Staff report presented by Principal Planner Kris Kurjiaka

- Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

- None

Public comments

- Mr. Bob Lloyd, representing the Hampton Pickney neighborhood, spoke in favor and approval for this amendment and how it will help traffic impact analysis earlier in the process.

Commission Discussion

- None

***Motion: Commissioner Jeff Randolph moved to approve Z-22-2021 with staff comments and conditions. Seconded by Commissioner Derek Enderlin. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0.**

C. Z-23-2021

Application by City of Greenville for a **TEXT AMENDMENT** to Section 19-6.1.3 and Table 19-6.1-1 of the City's Land Management Ordinance to modify off-street parking requirements for restaurants and bars/nightclubs and to add parking standards for breweries, wineries and distilleries

Staff report presented by Principal Planner Kris Kurjiaka

- Principal Planner Kris Kurjiaka read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

- Commissioner Mike Martinez questions potential consequences for establishments short on parking causing issues in neighborhoods
 - Staff clarifies no formal study has been done. This is a temporary measure and not intended as permanent change.
- Commissioner Diane Eldridge asks what would a developer have to do to get an exception?
 - Staff responded that a developer could go through alternative equivalent compliance process, so it doesn't bleed into neighborhoods.
- Commissioner Derek Eldridge discusses a walkable city versus parking downtown and on neighborhood streets.
 - Planning and Development Services Director Jay Graham responds that a parking plan is actually required in the downtown zone. Off site parking, such as in nearby parking decks, can be used in that plan.

Public comments

- None

Commission Discussion

- None

***Motion: Commissioner Derek Enderlin moved to recommend Z-23-2021 for approval with staff comments and conditions. Seconded by Commissioner Jeff Randolph. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0.**

D. Z-24-2021

Application by City of Greenville for a **TEXT AMENDMENT** to Section(s) 19-1.11, 19-4.1.2, and Table 19-4.1-2 of the City's Land Management Ordinance modifying the Table of Uses to promote land use compatibility between certain nonresidential uses and existing residential

Staff report presented by Principal Planner Kris Kurjiaka

- Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka read through the staff report.
- He notes that staff is also recommending a late change to the text amendment to allow check cashing businesses as a special exception in the C-3 zone. Currently the ordinance regulates them as a conditional use and the text amendment as initial provided to the Commission would prohibit them in the C-3.

Public comments

- None

Commission Discussion

- Chairwoman Meg Terry confirms that staff is now recommending the check cashing and similar uses be considered a special exception in the C-3 zoning district.
 - City Attorney Michael Pitts explains the motivation for the recommendation. Specifically, the amount of existing businesses in the C-3 zone and the challenges if that use was prohibited in that zone.

***Motion: Commissioner Jeff Randolph moved to recommend Z-24-2021 for approval with staff comments and conditions and with an amendment to change check cashing uses to a special exception in the C-3 zoning district. Seconded by Commissioner Diane Eldridge. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0.**

E. Z-25-2021

Application by City of Greenville for a **TEXT AMENDMENT** to Section(s) 19-7.5 and 19.7.6.2 of the City's Land Management Ordinance to create additional stormwater control standards for commercial and multifamily developments that abut and drain to a single-family detached use

Staff report presented by Principal Planner Kris Kurjiaka

- Principal Development Planner Kris Kurjiaka read through the staff report.

Commission Questions to Staff

- Commissioner Jeff Randolph provides a hypothetical example to ensure his understanding of the ordinance.

- Assistant City Engineer Paul Dow confirms that his understanding is correct.

Public comments

- None

Commission Discussion

- None

***Motion: Commissioner Derek Enderlin moved to recommend Z-25-2021 for approval with staff comments and conditions. Seconded by Commissioner Diane Eldridge. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0.**

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Upcoming Dates

- 12:00pm Tuesday, July 13- PC Workshop
- 4:00pm Thursday, July 15- Regular Meeting

Adjourned at 4:53 PM

Land Management Ordinance Round 2 Text Amendments

Affordable Housing Incentives

Project Engagement

VIEWS

22

PARTICIPANTS

9

RESPONSES

0

COMMENTS

12

Please share your questions or comments on this proposal.

I like the 30 year covenants restricting resale at profit. I read it closely but want to make sure it allows for deed transfers within family that doesn't restart the clock. If you get push back on 30 years, you can point out that Chicago is putting in 99 yr restrictions <https://groundedsolutions.org/tools-for-success/resource-library/inclusionary-housing-united-states>

2 days ago

You might want to consider adopting some of the language from Austin, TX's density bonus program <http://www.austintexas.gov/edims/document.cfm?id=206958>

I think making UPNDCC a model for the city is a start, but needs to go further to allow more multifamily units, smaller lots. Keeping lots small is best way to keep values down. Single family housing ordinances are notorious for gentrification.

2 days ago

B (10) indicates you'll get median household income data from Housing and Urban Development. I would suggest using American Community Survey data, 5 yr estimates, from the US Census. This would better enable you to divide city by census tracts rather than rely on city Median Household Income as a whole

2 days ago

I support this proposal but I don't think it goes far enough. Just offering incentives does little to change the course of monolith apartment developments funded by unknown investors and banks from who-knows-where who have no interest in the health or managed development of our city. If they choose not to take up the incentives then they could be made to commit to investing in a city fund to support affordable housing and transport.

2 days ago

As per B(2), there is provision for 25% of dwellings to be affordable housing. This is far to high and will result in the propagation of poor neighborhoods for a period in excess of 30 years. Where did this 25% threshold come from? Was this a city / state / county referendum or some other study?

There are existing neighborhoods around Greenville that are perfectly suited for such "affordable housing" development and prime land for development in and around the city and existing non-subsidized housing neighborhoods, should be reserved for such style development that results in the increasing value of prime property and not be hampered by any affordable housing criteria. Any form of subsidy, fixed rental or non-market driven valuations for housing will not encourage the development of Greenville to attract higher salaried jobs and workforce. It will result in the stagnation of values and therefore taxes of neighborhoods and require the existing tax base of Greenville to pay for these areas.

Per (C), the reference is made to 1 in 4 or 25% is made for affordable housing. Areas in and around Greenville should maintain their existing character and house prices and the city should not divert its attention from running the city and keeping it safe and secure, crime free, financially secure and properly managed instead of becoming a housing rent / affordability control authority. All this will require more management and enforcement which has very little to do with maintaining and growing Greenville to attract growth and development. Increased city payroll, with very little of this expenditure going to improve the city.

Section (D) just adds details to my description of more local government employment, not serving the betterment of the city but to keep control of housing in prime locations around the city. A "no benefit" cost to the existing neighborhoods in the city.

Section (E) 3, specifies that affordable housing be constructed with similar quality and cost of materials as the non-affordable housing units. Who is to pay for these "above affordability" costs for materials, finishes and quality? Is this going to be the remaining 75% of the development? There is no such system where those that can afford to live in a market driven economy pay for the 25% of the development that is deemed to be "affordable" - that's why I question the 25% criteria.

Sections (F) and (G) again converts the city to manage house prices, rent and finances for these properties. Free market should govern the development in and around the city - not the city. The city should have suitable building regulations, law enforcement and other such management requirements and stay out of managing and controlling affordability in the city.

3 days ago

Correction to comments I just submitted: "...America has privatized transportation costs..."

4 days ago

One hundred years ago, the average American household allocated about 2% of its household budget to transportation. Today, households are allocating about 21% of its budget (a number that keeps rising) because American has privatized transportation costs. Households now own 3 or 4 cars each, rather than zero to two cars in the past. Each car a household owns costs -- each year -- about \$10,000 to own, operate, and maintain. If Greenville's neighborhoods are compact, walkable, mixed-use, and higher density, households can shed the number of cars they own (three instead of four, or two instead of three, or one instead of two) because more trips can be made by walking or bicycling or transit. Each car shed by a household is an additional \$10,000 per year that a household can allocate to housing or education or food or medical. Compact, mixed-use neighborhood design, therefore, is a powerful way to promote affordable housing in Greenville.

4 days ago

As someone that lives in an RM-2 zoned neighborhood, I know that it is crucial that these sort of incentives apply to low-income owner occupied affordable housing, not workforce housing (which is fake given today's building costs). Properties for sale at least give a family a chance at establishing family assets and security. Owners are also more invested in their communities.

4 days ago

Your proposals, although coming from good intent, I'm sure, will go a long way to dumb down years of wonderful steps that were taken to beautify Greenville. Where have you ever seen affordable housing areas that are vibrant contributors to a city's positive growth? You haven't.

4 days ago

Don't provide incentives. Let the market handle this.

5 days ago

If you care about affordable housing, abolish zoning.

6 days ago

I object to there not being any height restrictions (stories). The only restriction is 40 feet in height, and that easily could mean a 4-story complex in a cottage-bungalow type neighborhood. Plus, the density per lot has increased from your current standards, which I object to. I also think there should be rent-to-own incentives, as people who own their homes are more likely to be invested in the neighborhood/community.

6 days ago

Traffic Impact Analysis

Project Engagement

VIEWS

11

PARTICIPANTS

3

RESPONSES

0

COMMENTS

3

Please share your questions or comments on this proposal.

The City needs to eliminate parking requirements or convert minimum parking requirements to maximum allowable parking. The City also needs to require parking cash-out for employers, and require developers to unbundle the cost of parking from the cost of housing. Many roads in the city need to be made much safer, slower, and quieter with low-cost tactics such as the installment of on-street parking, and the use of landscaped bulb-outs to reduce the curb width of overly wide roads. Development plans need to show how per capita car trips will go down as a result of the development -- primarily thru the installment of compact, mixed-use, human-scaled development. The City needs to adopt an urban transect because urban design is far different than suburban, car-oriented design. To promote urban, compact infill, the City should exempt compact, mixed-use development in the urban area from being required to submit a traffic impact analysis. Traffic delays (or transportation level of service) is a problem for suburbs. Traffic delays are, in many ways, a solution for town centers. The last thing Greenville should do is to reduce development densities/intensities or add roadway or parking capacity to reduce delays in the urban area. One size does not fit all, in other words. See one of my many essays on this topic: <https://domcontroversial.wordpress.com/2014/04/21/should-a-city-transportation-plan-look-to-reduce-traffic-congestion/>

Most importantly, the City needs to adopt a citywide plan for putting its many oversized roads on a road diet, as was so successfully done on Main Street.

<https://domz60.wordpress.com/dom-nozzi-bio/>

4 days ago

I would not want new construction that could create more than 100 trips per peak to be allowed without a traffic analysis. The last thing we need is to become Atlanta.

5 days ago

Traffic impact analyses are a NIMBY's best friend. Get rid of them completely.

6 days ago

Parking

Project Engagement

VIEWS	PARTICIPANTS	RESPONSES	COMMENTS
7	2	0	2

Please share your questions or comments on this proposal.

We have a small cafe on Main Street with no land adjacent to make parking spaces. Our business is supported by walking traffic. Public parking spaces are on both sides of the street up and down our block. I am assuming a new rule would not compromise the existence of an existing business ?

4 days ago

Parking minimums are literally the bane of American cities. Do you want Gville to be walkable? Get rid of parking minimums. Do you want public transport to actually work? Get rid of parking minimums. Do you care about the environment? Get rid of parking minimums.

6 days ago

Table of Uses

Project Engagement

VIEWS	PARTICIPANTS	RESPONSES	COMMENTS
4	1	0	1

Please share your questions or comments on this proposal.

Abolish zoning and let people do what they want.

6 days ago

Stormwater

Project Engagement

VIEWS

12

PARTICIPANTS

4

RESPONSES

0

COMMENTS

4

Loading more report objects...

Ross Zelenske

From: Courtney Powell
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 4:49 PM
To: Ross Zelenske
Subject: FW: Text Amendment Comments

KYITL



Courtney D. Powell, AICP

Planning Administrator | Planning & Development
cdpowell@greenvilleesc.gov | www.greenvilleesc.gov | www.gvl2040.com
Phone: 864-467-4482 | Fax: 864-467-4510

From: Lynn Solesbee <lynn@bluewatercivil.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2021 4:30 PM
To: Shannon Lavrin <slavrin@greenvilleesc.gov>; Jonathan B. Graham <jbgraham@greenvilleesc.gov>; Courtney Powell <cdpowell@greenvilleesc.gov>; Kris Kurjiaka <kkurjiaka@greenvilleesc.gov>
Subject: RE: Text Amendment Comments

CAUTION: This email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or opening attachments.

All:
I don't see any major issues with the text amendments as proposed. However, I personally would like to see some flexibility in parking requirements for restaurants/breweries. Ideally, there would be range (min/max) you could provide without LIDs/fee-in-lieu (say 1/125 min and 1/100 max without LID/FILO). I think it would be much better for restaurants /breweries to have ability to have more parking near neighborhoods if they believe they need the parking. Otherwise, customers will park in streets, block driveways, etc. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

Lynn A. Solesbee, P.E.

Bluewater Civil Design, LLC - Partner
718 Lowndes Hill Road Greenville, SC 29607
Office Direct: 864-326-4207 - Cell: 864-735-5453
Office: 864-326-4202 - Email: lynn@bluewatercivil.com
Please visit our website at: www.bluewatercivil.com

Please forgive any delays in responses during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Our firm is still operating, however, with limited person to person interactions as recommended by our local, state, and federal government. We will update you if there are any long term interruptions to service as a result of this pandemic or direction from governmental agencies. Thanks for your understanding.

NOTICE: This message is directed to and is for the use of the above-noted addressee only, and its contents may be legally privileged or confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any distribution, dissemination, or copy of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender. This message is not intended to be an electronic signature nor to constitute an agreement of any kind under applicable law unless otherwise expressly indicated hereon.

Bluewater Civil Design, LLC has Professionals Licensed in SC, NC, GA, AL, TN, FL, KY, ID, MT, WA, LA, VA, KS, OK, MS, NV

From: Shannon Lavrin <slavrin@greenvillesc.gov>

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 9:34 PM

To: Lynn Solesbee <lynn@bluewatercivil.com>; Jonathan B. Graham <jbgraham@greenvillesc.gov>; Courtney Powell <cdpowell@greenvillesc.gov>; Kris Kurjiaka <kkurjiaka@greenvillesc.gov>

Subject: RE: Text Amendment Comments

Lynn, good evening. I just wanted to let you know that the text amendments passed yesterday, relatively unscathed :). On behalf of the planning staff, we so appreciate your help on these and your work to make them better. In addition, round two of the text amendments are now posted, and you may be interested in stormwater and traffic impact analysis. If you have a chance to review, please send your comments along to Jay, Courtney, Kris, or me.

Thank you , Shannon

From: Lynn Solesbee <lynn@bluewatercivil.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2021 1:59 PM

To: Shannon Lavrin <slavrin@greenvillesc.gov>; Jonathan B. Graham <jbgraham@greenvillesc.gov>; Courtney Powell <cdpowell@greenvillesc.gov>; Kris Kurjiaka <kkurjiaka@greenvillesc.gov>

Subject: Text Amendment Comments

CAUTION: This email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or opening attachments.

Shannon:

Please see my comments on the text amendments and let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

Lynn A. Solesbee, P.E.

Bluewater Civil Design, LLC - Partner

718 Lowndes Hill Road Greenville, SC 29607

Office Direct: 864-326-4207 - Cell: 864-735-5453

Office: 864-326-4202 - Email: lynn@bluewatercivil.com

Please visit our website at: www.bluewatercivil.com

Please forgive any delays in responses during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Our firm is still operating, however, with limited person to person interactions as recommended by our local, state, and federal government. We will update you if there are any long term interruptions to service as a result of this pandemic or direction from governmental agencies. Thanks for your understanding.

NOTICE: This message is directed to and is for the use of the above-noted addressee only, and its contents may be legally privileged or confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any distribution, dissemination, or copy of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender. This message is not intended to be an electronic signature nor to constitute an agreement of any kind under applicable law unless otherwise expressly indicated hereon.

Bluewater Civil Design, LLC has Professionals Licensed in SC, NC, GA, AL, TN, FL, KY, ID, MT, WA, LA, VA, KS, OK, MS, NV

BRUCE FITZGERALD
11 AUGUSTA WALK AVENUE
GREENVILLE, SC 29605

JUNE 3, 2021

Ms. Meg Terry, Chair
Greenville Planning Commission
206 South Main Street
Greenville, SC 29601

RE: West End Small Area Plan – Pedestrian Hazard at Vardry and Augusta Streets
Intersection

We recently moved from Charleston to a new home in the Augusta Walk development. We were driven from Charleston only by the flooding and were attracted to Greenville by many features, one of which was the walkable, downtown environment.

The walk down Augusta Street toward the Park is rather unsightly until we reach Smiley's Acoustic Café. But we are fearful when we approach the intersection of Vardry and Augusta Street which is at the edge of the West End Small Area Plan area. The Plan should rethink this intersection to achieve its priority of "walkability/livability."

Right now there are no clearly designated pedestrian walkways across either Vardry or Augusta.

- On Augusta there are two lines which have been worn down by traffic so their purpose is unclear. There was never any crosshatching or other designation that they are a crosswalk. This is better than Vardry where there is only a long, single line with no distinguishable purpose, a stopping line for traffic.
- Where are pedestrians supposed to cross Vardry? At the top of the hill in the railroad tracks or the bottom of the hill? There is no marked walkway at the top and the walkway at the bottom is sloped. One misstep or slip would put a pedestrian in the traffic lane.
- There is never a time when traffic is stopped by lights in all directions to favor pedestrians.
- There are insufficient buttons for pedestrians to push to signal the lights. There is none at the north end of Vardry.
- Vardry enters Augusta at an oblique angle and it takes a long time to cross Vardry. It can be done while the pedestrian light is flashing, but that light is useless in terms of protecting pedestrians from motorized vehicles. Pedestrians see the light, but vehicles ignore it.
- Drivers in all directions at this intersection are not focused on pedestrians. When turning onto Vardry from Augusta they are focused first on oncoming traffic. After

they are turning, they look to see a pedestrian in their way and swerve to avoid the pedestrian. Crossing Augusta Street, there is traffic from three directions and vehicles turning from Vardry have a green light while pedestrians are in the crosswalk. They are focused on the dangerous slope coming down from the railroad tracks and the sharp angle of approaching traffic.

- The dangers are aggravated by never-ending construction which at times forces pedestrians to cross Augusta Street (without a crosswalk) or to take their chances walking into an active traffic lane.

I doubt that current standards for roadways would permit construction of such a hazardous intersection as this one.

I hope the Small Area Plan will find a solution to these problems to make this stretch of Augusta Street more walkable. But in the interim, I think the City could at least ameliorate them by (1) painting clearly designated pedestrian walkways and (2) timing the lights to give pedestrians better odds against motor vehicles. I am copying the Assistant City Engineer for traffic in hopes that she can improve this intersection at an early date.

Thanks for your consideration, and I request you to share this letter with appropriate personnel involved with the Plan and to enter it as part of the official record as the Planning Commission continues to develop it.

Best wishes,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bruce Fitzgerald". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Bruce Fitzgerald

Copy: Valerie Holmes