



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

1801 Orange Road
Culpeper, Virginia 22701

Charles A. Kilpatrick, P.E.
Commissioner

December 29, 2016

County of Albemarle
Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902
Attn: William Fritz

Re: Traffic Impact Study – Woolen Mills
Review #1

Dear Mr. Wentland:

The Department of Transportation, Charlottesville Residency Transportation and Land Use Section, has reviewed the above referenced study as submitted by EPR, PC, dated November 2016, and offers the following comments:

1. The majority of the traffic impacts will be within the city of Charlottesville. The Department recommends working with city staff to evaluate the development's impacts.
2. The Department concurs with the study's recommendation for the extension of the turn lanes at several of the intersections in the study area where the storage needs exceed the available space. These improvements in most cases can be provided through elimination of some on-street parking and restriping.
3. Given the type of uses proposed, the improvement of pedestrian and bike accommodation facilities should be considered with the project to both provide and improve access for all travel modes.
4. The Department recommends that consideration be given to a partnership by the County and City in and Bike and Pedestrian only bridge across the Rivanna River.

If further information is desired please contact me at (434) 422-9782.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Adam J. Moore".

Adam J. Moore, P.E.
Area Land Use Engineer
Charlottesville Residency

Memorandum

*Neighborhood Development Services
Office of the City Engineer
City Hall Annex, 610 East Market St., Charlottesville*

To: Bill Fritz
From: Brennen Duncan
Date: January 27, 2017
Subject: Traffic Impact Study – Woolen Mills

Bill,

Please find the review comments for the above referenced study presented by EPR. Note that the below comments are for the current submission only, and future submissions may generate additional comments.

1. There was no analysis done for the pedestrian trips that this complex will create. It is anticipated that much of this pedestrian traffic will come from the city and the city infrastructure to facilitate safe travel is lacking from the intersection of Meade and Market down to the development. The city would like to see an effort for pedestrian improvements and analysis for this development.
2. The current city roadway at the end of Market St. is insufficient to currently facilitate two-way traffic and the addition of this development will compound the issue. Current pavement widths vary with a minimum width of approximately 12 feet after entering the County and several spots within the city where the width is <20 feet. Based on the traffic to be generated, we would require a minimum of 20 feet width where there is currently no on-street parking and 28 feet where there is currently on-street parking.
3. I think the analysis stating that 15% of traffic will use the Market entrance does not consider the whole picture of the development. Although the parking lot at the end of Market is small (approximately 21 spaces as drawn), it is adjacent to where the high turnover restaurant will be located according to the latest plan that the city has seen. With the restaurant contributing 58% of all of the traffic, and 105 trips in the peak hour, we have severe reservations about the proposed 15% number. Based on general consumer demand for this type of development, they will want to park as close to their destination as possible, even if there is a chance that there will be no parking by the time they get there. Not only will this create more trips down Market that will then have to turn around, but the odds are, those same vehicles will then make a left on Franklin (another pinch point with the railroad) creating more traffic congestion. The city would like to see this smaller parking lot be for employees only, or some other restricted type parking lot to obtain the 15% talked about in the study. This report also does not address traffic or parking for a proposed kayak facility at the end of Market.