

## **TOWER TERRACE ROAD STAKEHOLDER MEETING SUMMARY**

---

**Date:**

March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2008: 6:30 – 8:00pm at Lowe Park Arts & Environment Center, Oaks Room

**Meeting Attendees:** adjacent property owners, developers, business owners, and other interested citizens.

**Corridor MPO staff present:** Drew Westberg (Corridor MPO); Sushil Nepal (Corridor MPO); Adam Lindenlaub (Corridor MPO)

Over 30 metro-area residents attended the meeting to discuss the future of the Tower Terrace Road Corridor. Staff began the meeting with a brief presentation regarding the Corridor Metropolitan Planning Organization and its role of in creating the Corridor Management Plan. The presentation also addressed the issues of anticipated growth in the area, the need for improved road connectivity, and the need for a Corridor Management Plan. Staff addressed a re-occurring question regarding the use of County Home Road as an alternative to Tower Terrace. Staff noted that the two roads act as complements to one another rather than substitutes. Staff also clarified their role is to accumulate and provide necessary data to inform policy-makers who ultimately will make the final decision regarding the roadway's development. This presentation lasted for approximately 30 minutes.

At approximately 7:05pm, staff asked meeting attendees to break into three (3) small groups and address two specific questions.

1. What don't you like about the way roads are built today?
2. If you had the power to build a new road, what would it look like?

Each group member was given a notecard and asked to list the things they did not like about contemporary roads. Corridor MPO staff then recorded each group's findings on large paper sheets which were then posted on the wall. The groups spent about ten minutes on question 1. The format for question 2 was more of a discussion. Corridor MPO staff asked each group to brainstorm how their road would look based on the issues raised in question 1. See "Responses" section below for a complete listing of group findings.

At 7:30pm, the groups came back together to continue the discussion on roadway design. Corridor MPO staff presented 18 different images of roadways. The images ranged from 2-lane rural roadways to 5-lane urban streets. Meeting participants were asked to indicate how much they liked/disliked each by giving each image a score of 1-10, with 10 being ideal. This exercise took about five (5) minutes. Following the rating session, staff asked the group members several questions regarding the images, including their score, positive aspects, negative aspects, and others. The group discussed these images and provided important feedback to staff.

The top three images were #6, #11, and #10. They are listed in the Appendix of this summary.

The meeting concluded at 8:00pm.

## **TOWER TERRACE ROAD STAKEHOLDER MEETING: RESPONSES**

---

Group 1:

### ***Contemporary Roadway Design Dislikes:***

- ❖ Runoff
- ❖ Congestion
- ❖ Not attractive
- ❖ Noise
- ❖ No pedestrian/bike features
- ❖ Stop signs where there should be stop lights
- ❖ Usually not consistent
- ❖ Poor access management
- ❖ Discontinuous routes
- ❖ Don't anticipate future needs
- ❖ Impact wildlife
- ❖ Higher security risk/lack of privacy
- ❖ Don't account for stormwater detention/retention
- ❖ Negative impact to adjacent houses
  - Particularly the impact of large roadways

### ***What would your road look like?***

- ❖ Pothole proof
- ❖ Don't make it look like Blairs Ferry or Collins Rd.
- ❖ Butterfly habitat
- ❖ Grass medians/planted medians
- ❖ Low maintenance
- ❖ Attractive retention ponds
- ❖ Porous paving where appropriate
- ❖ "If we're gonna do this, we're gonna do it right."
- ❖ Bus pullouts
- ❖ Hire an expert
- ❖ Include open space within the buffer
- ❖ Mature trees
- ❖ Sidewalks & bike trails
- ❖ Lower Speeds
- ❖ Intersection enhancements for kids to cross safely
- ❖ No commercial within 500' of an intersection
- ❖ Downcast lighting/reduce glare
- ❖ Follow terrain/have curves
- ❖ Weight limits
- ❖ Noise control

## **TOWER TERRACE ROAD STAKEHOLDER MEETING: RESPONSES**

---

Group 2:

### ***Contemporary Roadway Design Dislikes:***

- ❖ Too many stop lights
- ❖ Too narrow roads
- ❖ Too wide roads
- ❖ Maintenance issues
- ❖ Negative impact on surrounding land
- ❖ Noise, safety, pollution
- ❖ Negative atmosphere like Blairs Ferry or Collins Road
- ❖ Impact on property values
- ❖ Lack of different travel modes (sidewalks, bike lanes, etc.)
- ❖ Too close to my backyard (safety)
- ❖ Non-enjoyable drive (don't let people enjoy the trip, instead the focus is on getting from point A to point B)

### ***What would your road look like?***

- ❖ Boulevard look (green)
- ❖ No more than 2 lanes (prefer median)
- ❖ Low speed & multi-modal (all modes)
- ❖ Trails / Sidewalks
- ❖ No rezoning to meet "Commercial" needs
- ❖ Buffer/Signs/Lights – protect property values
- ❖ Meandering roads
- ❖ Mix of land use (focus intense commercial at major intersections)
- ❖ Put Tower Terrace completely underground

Group 3:

### ***Contemporary Roadway Design Dislikes:***

- ❖ Neighbors
- ❖ Wider than necessary
- ❖ Sterility – lacks aesthetics
- ❖ Cul-de-sacs
- ❖ Safety
- ❖ Traffic
- ❖ Environment
- ❖ Too many stops
- ❖ Litter / Lack of maintenance
- ❖ Noise
- ❖ ROW required
- ❖ Lack of bicycle accommodation

### ***What would your road look like?***

- ❖ Boulevards
- ❖ Sidewalks
- ❖ Bike lanes/signage
- ❖ Center islands/ boulevard trees
- ❖ Better maintenance
- ❖ Sidewalks

## **TOWER TERRACE ROAD STAKEHOLDER MEETING: OTHER RESPONSES**

---

### ***Other Dislikes:***

- ❖ Too many stoplights
- ❖ Not easily accessible / cannot easily get on/off
- ❖ Poor signage
- ❖ Poorly maintained
- ❖ Too narrow
- ❖ Roads not built for future/expanding traffic
- ❖ Congestion of more lanes
- ❖ Congestion of people and traffic
- ❖ Noise & Pollution
- ❖ Too close to established residential areas
- ❖ Road changes, or alters land in a negative way. Unless they are underground or elevated, hard to cross, noisy, can be unsafe near residential property
- ❖ Discontinuous roads (i.e. zig-zags, missing links)
- ❖ Not planned to anticipate future needs
- ❖ Poor access management – driveways & local streets
- ❖ No pedestrian / bicycle features
- ❖ Aesthetics are non-existent or ugly
- ❖ Poorly maintained
- ❖ No turn lanes or other features that impact traffic flow
- ❖ No need for 5 lanes. Would not object to a 2-lane residential road

### ***Other Design Comments:***

- ❖ Two-lane road only
- ❖ Variety of land uses adjacent to ROW
- ❖ Commercial Development at major intersections
- ❖ Pervious surface blvds/medians
- ❖ Landscaped medians
- ❖ Trails/sidewalks
- ❖ Controlled speed to best meet the needs of the road
- ❖ A lot of green space on both sides
- ❖ Boulevard look
- ❖ Bike & pedestrian ways
- ❖ Berms along road (medians)
- ❖ Plants & Trees
- ❖ No larger than 2 lanes
- ❖ No commercial property
- ❖ Buffer zone to protect lighting , Signage, Property Values
- ❖ Low noise surface
- ❖ Boulevard look
- ❖ Low speed
- ❖ Multi-modal
- ❖ Tower Terrace Road should be put under ground. It should have a few exit points from I-13 to I-380. This way it would not impact the areas negatively.
- ❖ Dead end E. Robins Rd. Don't connect to Tower Terrace Road

## TOWER TERRACE ROAD STAKEHOLDER MEETING: PREFERRED IMAGES

---

Meeting attendees participated in a preferred image survey. The group was asked to rate 18 images separately on a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the highest score. The results are summarized in Table A-1 below.

Table A-1: Tower Terrace  
Image Preference Survey  
Results

Image	Avg. Score	Rank
10	6.2	1
6	5.7	2
12	5.4	3
2	4.7	4
8	4.7	4
14	4.6	6
11	4.5	7
13	4.2	8
1	3.7	9
3	3.7	9
15	3.5	11
18	3.4	12
16	2.3	13
7	2.2	14
9	1.7	15
5	1.6	16
17	1.6	16
4	1.4	18

The top rated picture was image #10, seen below.

This image represents a 2-lane roadway divided by a planted median. The roadway also includes large bike lanes, bus pull-outs, and sidewalk.



Respondents did note that the median was perhaps too narrow. Many liked the total distance separating the sidewalk from the roadway. In addition, several respondents favored the two-lane design.

## TOWER TERRACE ROAD STAKEHOLDER MEETING: PREFERRED IMAGES

---

The picture receiving the second highest rating was image #6, seen at right.

This image is a 4-lane roadway with a substantial, planted median. A standard sidewalk exists along both sides of the roadway. There are no bike lanes visible.

Respondents particularly appreciated the curve, or meander of the roadway. It was pointed out that this roadway may encourage speeding.



Finally, the picture coming in third was image #12, seen below.



This image is a 2-lane facility with an extra-wide, multi-use pathway located adjacent to the roadway.

Respondents particularly liked the green strip separating the road from the multi-purpose pathway.

The image receiving the worst rating, image #4, is seen below.

This image received an average score of 1.4.

