



Interoffice Memorandum

Minutes

Village F Cross Section

Special Roadway Agreement Committee

September 16, 2008

Members Present: Diana Almodovar – Development Engineering Division

County Staff Present: Brian Sanders – Transportation Planning Division
Heather Brownlie – Transportation Planning Division
Ghulam Qadir - Public Works Engineering Division
Frank Yokiell - Public Works Engineering Division
Juan Curi - Public Works Engineering Division
Dann McKee - Public Works Engineering Division
John Klimovitch – Traffic Engineering Division
Krista Barber - Traffic Engineering Division
David Pearce – Development Engineering Division
Hector Bertran – Traffic Engineering Division

For Applicant: Eric Warren - MSCW Inc.
Daniel O’Keefe - Shutts & Bowen
Joe Tramell -Tramell Webb Partners, Inc.

Village F Cross Section

The meeting was called to order at 11:07 a.m. and is a follow-up meeting to the 9/4/2008 meeting.

Mr. Warren opened the discussion stating that there were still decisions to be made on the cross-sections in relation to:

- * The size of the Multi-purpose paths on either side
- * The width of the on-street parking spaces needed

At the last meeting clear zones were discussed. A note has been added to the typical section that sight distances must be maintained through the final design process.

At the last meeting fill slope easements were discussed. A note has been added to the typical section that fill slope easements must be provided as necessary through the final design process.

MSCW has requested written approval from Gean Olin at Orange County Fire Rescue to confirm that OCFR is okay with the typical sections.

An outstanding issue to be discussed is the size of the paths and how large they need to be on either side of the roadway. At the last meeting we had discussed 10 feet on either side or 10 feet on one side and five feet on the other side.

Mr. Sanders stated that this was a fairly lengthy corridor and signalization had not yet been determined to see where pedestrians might cross the road in the future.

The County had originally looked at requesting a 10-foot sidewalk on either side of the roadway. This could be reduced to 10 feet on one side and 8 feet on the other side if this works within the existing right of way.

Mr. Tramell agreed to 10 feet on one side and 8 feet on the other side but did not think the original request of 10 feet on either side would have been feasible.

Mr. Warren stated that Horizon West has a tree-planting requirement and this will need to be looked at to see if the sidewalks could be accommodated at these widths.

Mr. Tramell wanted to finalize the cross-sections so the APF figures can be finalized for the APF agreements going before the Roadway Agreement Committee.

Mr. Tramell asked about the parking lane widths and if there was sufficient right of way to provide for on-street parking.

Mr. Klimovitch asked if the on-street parking was part of the parking requirements and Mr. Warren answered no, that it was additional.

Ms. Almodovar asked what the speed limit would be on such a road and Mr. Klimovitch answered 25 m.p.h.

Mr. Pearce stated that the gutter cannot be counted as part of the parking area.

Mr. Klimovitch raised the issue of school buses traveling on these APF Roads where on-street parking exists.

Mr. Tramell said that the area is restricted so that no driveway cuts are allowed in front of the houses and that residential parking is provided in the rear of each home.

Mr. Tramell said that a 7-foot clear asphalt to concrete parking width makes more sense on the major roads.

Mr. Warren asked if the typical sections show 7-foot asphalt to concrete would that be sufficient for the County?

Ms. Almodovar responded that it would be better than five or five-and-a-half feet for parking.

Mr. Klimovitch asked that the on-street parking spaces near the school site be removed.

Mr. Tramell explained that the original design was for a neighborhood school, however, that could become a much larger school in the future.

Mr. O'Keefe asked if the 7-foot parking width was shown on the typical section could they move forward with the APF agreements.

Ms. Almodovar stated that the classification of the roads would be reviewed by DRC as they come in, but that 7-foot on-street parking should suffice.

Mr. Warren asked if putting a bike lane between the parking and the travel lanes would be feasible. Mr. Sanders responded in that case the bike-lane would need to be 5-feet in width rather than 4 feet.

Mr. Klimovitch requested 12-foot travel lanes throughout.

Mr. McKee asked the developers to start checking now as to the ownership of the underlying right of way for these roads so there would be no issues later on when the plat is prepared.

Mr. Tramell explained that they will be realigning Seidel Road as a 4-lane road and design it for four lanes and then build two lanes initially.

The APF Agreements will be reviewed at the Roadway Agreement Committee on October 1, 2008 for the two types of agreements. Thereafter the ten original agreements with all APF acreages will be reviewed at a subsequent RAC meeting.

Mr. Klimovitch asked about the Roundabout feature and what standards it was being built to.

Ms. Almodovar added that she also would like to know how this is going to function.

Mr. Sanders raised connectivity issues and conflict potential and encouraged more spacing for a weave movement to occur.

Mr. Warren explained these issues would be addressed at DRC during the PSP review process.

Mr. Tramell stated that the objective is to create an entrance feature which is not a four-way stop and that each of the movements was a one-way movement and that it should work.

Mr. Curi asked if the design speeds would be placed on the typical sections.

Ms. Almodovar said that these would be determined later according to standards.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.