



Summary of Recommended Changes and Feedback Addendum

Additional Community Feedback and Comment

The Hendersonville Corridor Study was submitted for review to the City of Asheville's Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force, Multimodal Commission, Planning and Zoning Commission as well as made publicly available at <http://frenchbroadrivermpo.org/hendersonville-road-corridor/> The specific website will change upon completion of the project but will continue to be made available at frenchbroadrivermpo.org.

Comments:

For comments made about the intersection of Overlook Road and Hendersonville Road as well as the interaction with the multiuse path, please see Page 95 (provided on the next page) for full details. The concept image was removed as it was not representative of the recommendations considered.

The Planning and Zoning commission noted that the horizontal maps were difficult to orientate.

Last amended November 15, 2021 by
John Ridout
Regional Transportation Planner
john@landofsky.org

French Broad River MPO, a program of Land of Sky Regional Council



Hendersonville Road and Overlook Road identified for additional study for improvements in this constrained area.

PUBLIC COMMENTS & COMMUNITY FEEDBACK:

Comments made during the community input process as well as feedback from NCDOT and the City of Asheville multimodal commission noted that the intersection of Hendersonville Road and Overlook required further study and attention in collaboration with NCDOT to determine how best to incorporate the multi-use path protection and barriers. The original concept image was not considered to be representative of the treatment options and was removed from the final document. However, on a general note, the protected multiuse path along the western side of Hendersonville Road is still recommended as well as improvements to transit, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity in crossing and accessing points of interest.

Additional feedback from the Multimodal commission is to consider approach angle, turning radius, and departure angles for the curb-cuts into and out of properties whereby it crosses the multiuse path to provide better protection and risk mitigation for bike and pedestrian users of the multimodal facility.

Future design considerations should look to incorporate how the multimodal facilities connect with the multimodal improvements along Hendersonville Road corridor. Specifically how bicycle facilities would connect between those identified on Overlook Road as well as Hendersonville Road. This could apply elsewhere on the corridor and these connections need to be made.

While the speed limit proposed of 35 miles per hour is included in the current recommendations, as the urban form changes and becomes more accommodating, slower speed limits such as 25 miles per hour should be considered when feasible.

Comments & Feedback added after the May 2021 publicly available document



Submitted via email by Don Kostelec to the Bike/Ped Taskforce, June 2021

Hello - I would recommend against the Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force endorsing the Hendersonville Road study without some significant changes to the contents of it.

1. There are not crosswalks shown on all legs of the signalized intersections. This is NCDOT's way to promote "safety" while requiring pedestrians to cross additional legs. I'm guessing this would mean LOS F for pedestrians based on signal timing plans prevalent at similar NCDOT intersections.

2. The recommendations for stamped concrete crosswalks are counter to what I've heard from people who use wheelchairs, as these create bumps and jarring for those who have hip or spinal injuries.

3. I don't see where it cites AASHTO's bike guide where there needs to be vertical barriers, preferably jersey barriers, to separate a sidepath from traffic when there is less than a 5-foot buffer from the top of curb. NCDOT is signatory to this AASHTO document and loves to cloak itself in other AASHTO guidelines and tell the public and elected officials they are "standards." NCDOT engineers are listed in it as being part of the guide's development and approval. The after image shown below is one where the proposed design does not comport with the AASHTO guidance. Imagine a child riding their bike in a contraflow direction immediately adjacent to this high speed traffic on Hendersonville Road where motorist level of service is a higher priority due to the dedicated right turn lane, which doesn't exist today. The 10' pathway is an AASHTO minimum, yet I don't see NCDOT accepting the AASHTO minimum of 10' travel lanes for arterials. Why the double-standard?

4. The study uses Property Damage Only crashes to justify change for motorist safety. PDOs account for more than 1,000 of the 1,400 or so crashes. This is antithetical to Vision Zero efforts, which is supposedly an NCDOT policy. Addressing reduction in PDO (i.e. motorist inconvenience crashes) generally leads to less safe conditions for people who walk and bike. That right turn lane being added, as I mentioned in #3, is how NCDOT reduces PDO crashes while exposing pedestrians to greater risk with a wider crossing.

5. It should be noted that NCDOT should time signals to allow pedestrians to cross Hendersonville Road in a single phase. NCDOT uses pedestrian refuge islands to set crosswalk signals to the absolute minimum requirements to get them only to the median and forcing them to wait an entire additional signal. I wrote about the myth of medians being a safety features because traffic engineers see it as a way to maximize motorist LOS by stranding pedestrians in the median ([link below](#)). Language in the study should say that NCDOT will not time signals as to strand pedestrians in these medians so they can't slip that in when signal are timed. If they force pedestrians to wait in the median an additional cycle, this would make almost every intersection rate at LOS F for pedestrians.

6. According to the Highway Capacity Manual, 6' sidewalks that lack a buffer from traffic results in a reduction in the effective width of the sidewalk by 18 inches. When there is a retaining wall or other vertical presence on the back side, it reduces the effective width by another 18 inches. This would mean that 6' sidewalks that lack a buffer and have a retaining wall have an effective width of only 3 feet. Again, why does NCDOT want to do a substandard or absolute minimum sidewalk in these situations, when examining what HCM says, while they never accept the AASHTO minimum for motorist lane widths at 10'.

It's really discouraging that this project shows that active transportation infrastructure is just an accessory to motorist level of service improvements on Hendersonville Road. The drawings show that NCDOT just wants to slap sidewalks and a sidepath alongside it that doesn't align with AASHTO design guidance because motorist level of service is the priority.

MPO's response to Mr. Kostelec

1: The current mapping is conceptual; it is not a full design document for construction. This should be noted for all following questions as well. There is the capacity to further add legs for signalized intersections in future discussions and actions. In some cases, the ambient land area might not have connected pedestrian infrastructure and thus many of the marking matched existing infrastructure. For example, Rock Hill Road has fragmented sidewalk access and thus crosswalks to non-existing sidewalks was not provided.

2: The main concern of pavers/stamped concrete is the size, spacing and/or frequency of the joints. Excessive number of joints (ie very small pavers, uneven pavers) or excessively large joints are the concern. Both are variable in application and are both ADA compliant would be of use in the application. The run of the joints and frequency of the joints would be noted. Current best practices are to use pavers/stamps that have fewer and/or smaller joints. However, we are not going into the fine construction details such as specific materials/treatments at this stage of the corridor study.

3: Initial response updated and corrected: A barrier was requested by NCDOT. Page 95 has been amended July 2021, August 2021.

4: This is an incorrect take, or at least misunderstood assumption. This study does take into consideration injury and severity of the crash into consideration for the changes. PDO crashes does not excluded injury, as injury might not be reported at the time of the crash report, nor does it negate the risk of a severe crash in the future or risky behavior or conditions. All crash data was considered in the recommendations and applied in context. Not incorporating PDO would have suppressed crash data as well as completely omitted any crashes from known locations with numerous crashes such as Airport Road intersection but lack documented crashes that resulted in injury.

5: That is a good note on crossing times, but adding the median still reduces conflict points throughout the corridor and would improve safety at other access points and crossings.

6: As in Question #3 (which is slightly inverse of the concerns), the MUP is requesting as wide of pathway for multimodal users in areas of constraint, even if there might require an exception due to the retrofit. There and will be areas along this corridor that due to the terrain, constrict the space available. On the east-side we are keeping with the existing sidewalk network, but new additions are not recommending the suggestions above as the base requirement although the report is recommending that there is at least a 5'+ required sidewalk for all development as terrain accommodates/constrains

Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force endorsed the Hendersonville Road Corridor Study June 17th 2021

