

**1. Does the City of Brookhaven's traffic calming policy include any minimum spacing between speed humps/tables? Some of the proposed humps seem to be very close to up/down stream speed humps.**

A. We look to get humps spaced between 200-400' apart and 100-150' from intersections. The spacing we inherited from DeKalb left gaps in this spacing so many of the additional humps are temporary locations using temporary speed cushions instead of asphalt humps. The intent is that when the road are paved (next 1-5 years) we will respace the humps (and reduce the total number) as part of the resurfacing project since the existing humps will need to be removed to repave.

**2. Does the policy include a minimum distance between a speed hump and an intersection boundary? At least an existing one (Colonial) seems very close to the intersection at Pine Grove Avenue.**

A. [A resident] mentioned that in the original plan approved by the county, the plan was to have raised intersections. However, the county did not know how to design the drainage for these so instead they put some speed humps close to intersections (less than the minimum we would use) instead. As mentioned above, this will be corrected when roads repaved.

**3. Due to the right in/out at Oglethorpe, and the right in only on Standard and Thornwell, an increase in traffic utilizing Colonial south of Oglethorpe and Pine Grove may occur.**

A. We anticipate that. If the restrictions are implemented, we will be re-evaluating 3-6 months after to quantify how much change there will be. We don't have enough info to model accurately now, but since the observed pattern for much of the Standard/Thornwell cut-through is to turn left on Briarwood, it is felt that those making that movement will not use Pine Grove/Colonial as they would need to turn left onto North Druid Hills and fight their way back to Briarwood with northbound traffic.

**4. Have the emergency response providers (fire, police, and ambulance) been contacted and asked their opinions or needs? Approval?**

A. The design we will implement will be emergency vehicle accessible (mountable curb, paved or reinforced turf on the islands).

**5. With the right in/out on Oglethorpe, is the roundabout needed at Colonial? Would narrowing the throat of the Oglethorpe approach be more cost effective? Also making the intersection more 90 degrees would slow traffic and provide an opportunity for better sight distances for all approaches.**

**A.** The roundabout is needed for safety reasons due to the wide throat and sight distance restrictions. Realignment is not an option since this is a residential neighborhood and that would take out a house or a large chunk of yard (i.e. need to buy right-of-way). A neighborhood roundabout can be installed with no right-of-way needs and minimal impact to yards. Including the roundabout in the petition was a formality as we would do this as a safety improvement even if the traffic calming is not approved.

**6. Why wasn't a roundabout proposed at Thornwell, Standard and Colonial to reduce the size of that intersection? Again a narrowing of that intersection by making it more 90 degrees may benefit sight distances and reduce speeds.**

**A.** Making more than 90 would impact existing homes/yards which is not something we would do in a residential neighborhood.

**7. At the right-in only intersections (Standard and Thornwell) how do motorists know that full access leaving the neighborhood is restricted? Signs shown in the report are too far away from North Druid Hills Road and there are no informational signs on the last intersection before NDHR to inform drivers of the restricted access.**

**A.** In addition to the permanent standard "Dead End" and "No Outlet" signs, I envision some initial temporary measures including variable message signs on Colonial at the bridge and on Standard before Thornwell and also possibly the use of temporary type 2 barricades on both roads at Matthews for a period of time. I know some will still ignore, but these measures should catch most of them. We would have a detailed plan as part of the implementation.

**8. In light of No. 7 above, do residents on these two streets know and will allow u-turns to be made in their driveways? How else would a car that goes too far toward NDHR know of the restriction? Should on-street parking be restricted near NDHR to allow for these u-Turns/3 point turns (no parking restrictions are already in place at the throat of one of the streets? Also garbage trucks already back down these streets to pick up.**

**A.** Residents know. "No parking" restrictions are already in place at the throat of one of the streets? Also garbage trucks already back down these streets to pick up.

**9. Tubes or turtles proposed on NDHR at Oglethorpe will be a maintenance problem whether they are placed between the SB left turn lane and the SB through lane or the NB through lane.**

**A.** This would need to be detailed as part of implementation, but if we used the tubes, in the short term, we would use these in conjunction with a "tough Curb" median. This has been used in other places and cuts down on the tubes being taken out. Long term, as part of an intersection improvement project at Briarwood we would install a permanent median. The big issue with either will be to design for the MARTA busses that turn right from Briarwood to NDH.

Because of the existing tight radius, they need to turn wide into the left turn lane some to complete the turn.

**10. Was a traffic table considered at Colonial and Standard? At Oglethorpe?**

A. DeKalb may have in their original design but never implemented it due to drainage concerns. The addition of the sidewalks and painted crosswalks on all quadrants have improved the obedience of drivers at this location.

**11. What was the purpose of the traffic flow diagram, because it does not represent all movements or volumes?**

A. It was for illustration to highlight the major movements of cut through, not to depict all turning movements.

**12. The Brookhaven Fields (BF) comments included in the City Council package included comments concerning the possible diversion of traffic to BF due to the restrictions proposed in the study. I doubt that would happen. The restrictions in BH at Standard and at Oglethorpe would not direct any traffic toward BF. Besides, a left turn out of Standard is difficult if not possible during rush hour since NB traffic is stored and backs up blocking access to the NDHR and Apple Valley intersection, as does the major flow of traffic from P'tree causing conflicts.**

A. We agree, the "cut over" would be reduced, certainly in the PM.

**13. Has a substantial right turn only lane on NB P'tree to NDHR been discussed that may reduce the need to cut through BH, especially during less than peak times. Perhaps this could be considered in the P'tree corridor improvements along with redefining the geometrics there? As a note. Exclusive right turn lanes in urban, pedestrian areas are not desired; they cause pedestrians (esp blind) to deflect their trips next to the through lanes.**

A. I agree it is needed and would help. It is something that I will be working to get incorporated either in to the TOD improvements or as a separate GDOT Safety improvement project.

**14. Since there were no peak hour or average daily traffic diagrams including present turning volumes in the report I reviewed, it is difficult to examine absolute impacts of this plan. Taking weekly counts in lieu of hourly/turning counts does not allow for true volumes to be analyzed. Also no origin and destination study was conducted to clearly define vehicle paths within the neighborhood. No segregation of trips by residents, visitors or others was furnished.**

A. An origin/destination study is beyond the scope of what we usually do for studies of this type. However, based on standard trip generation for 400 homes, there is about twice as much traffic entering/exiting the neighborhood as would be normally expected from that many homes.

**15. At the MARTA CRB meeting, I thought I heard of a suggestion to restrict access to/from P'tree on Colonial based on time of day. This would be extremely difficult to do, manage, and enforce without restricting access to all. It is a city street which is a part of the street grid in this area....and not a private drive.**

**A. We agree as well and recommend against this.**