

From: Wicks Carolann (DeIDOT) [mailto:Carolann.Wicks@state.de.us]
Sent: Friday, April 03, 2009 10:32 AM
To: 'bob@bobweiner.com'
Subject: 2nd Ltr from Councilman Weiner REF: Buck Rd Entrance into Greenville Ctr

Dear Councilman Weiner;

Thank you for following up with me directly on this matter. I have reviewed your comments and other information with my Planning staff. But prior to addressing specific points, I want to reiterate my commitment that DeIDOT's Planning staff will continue to provide information and expertise to the New Castle County Council to assist them in making the most informed land use decisions they can.

To your first point, let me clarify that yes, the traffic study you reference is being done by the developer's engineer as required by the County.

I'd like to address the March 2, 2009 Orth-Rodgers & Associates letter in the order of the seven numbered paragraphs they documented.

1. From our perspective, Orth-Rodgers' concerns about traffic counts and trip generation appear to be based on a misunderstanding of the existing center's use. Presently about half the floor space in Greenville Center is office space, which generates traffic on weekdays but not Saturdays. We believe this fact explains the traffic counts. If the existing development were all in retail use, we would have had comments similar to theirs. Also, we should point out that the weekday counts were done on a Tuesday, not a Friday. We generally do not require or allow Monday or Friday traffic counts because they are prone to being lower than Tuesday through Thursday. Importantly, Apex **had incorrectly entered Friday** as the day of their counts, but a check of the date on the counts shows that the day was actually a Tuesday.
2. The concerns about the Buck Road access may be valid. We will evaluate the entrances initially in our review of the traffic impact study and in more detail in our review of the land development plan.
3. We would expect County staff to resolve issues regarding truck loading in their review of the land development plan.
4. We would expect County staff to resolve issues regarding the post office in their review of the land development plan.
5. County staff would review parking concerns in their review of the land development plan.
6. The concerns about the Route 52 access may be valid. We will evaluate the entrances initially in our review of the traffic impact study and in more detail in our review of the land development plan.
7. We agree with Orth-Rodgers' summary statement.

Going back to comments made by you, let me summarize my responses:

- We don't know at present what right-of-way Stoltz might need to acquire. If the County approves a plan on the basis that Stoltz will make certain improvements and they need additional rights-of-way to make them, there is a process by which DeIDOT can acquire the rights-of-way for them at their expense. DeIDOT is not obligated to do that and we make no commitments in that regard now.
- After a lapse of about six months, DeIDOT received a preliminary traffic impact study (projected traffic volumes without analysis or recommendations) for review on March 26, 2009. Thus while Stoltz may have directed Apex to stop working temporarily, work on the development appears to be continuing now.

- I have directed our Traffic Section to review the sign concerns on Ardleigh Drive.
- Regarding the modeling effort we have “agreed to undertake,” the term “subregional traffic study” may suggest something grander than what we’re actually going to do. What this effort means for the community is that County Council will be provided with a look at what would happen to traffic congestion if all four of the presently proposed Stoltz developments were built. Presently, we intend to begin this effort once we have received the traffic impact studies and traffic operational analyses from the developer.
- The most immediate impacts of the proposed developments should be identified in their traffic studies and it should be the developer’s obligation to address those impacts. Certainly the effort would identify existing problem areas, such as the Tyler McConnell Bridge, and the developer should have some responsibility to contribute to solutions to these problems. Ultimate responsibility for fixing those existing problems lies with the State and we will work to address them through our Capital Transportation Program.

I hope this has provided some clarification as to the process we are currently involved with.

Thank you,
Carolann Wicks