

**PLANNING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
TUESDAY AUGUST 26, 2014  
7:00 PM  
HOOD ROOM, MATTHEWS TOWN HALL**

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of June 24, 2014 and August 11, 2014 Meetings
- III. ZONING APPLICATION 2014-618 – Erickson Living, Text Amendment, Allow permanent Marketing Center in a CCRC
- IV. DISCUSSION ON STREET WIDENING CONCEPTS FOR E JOHN STREET
- V. ADJOURNMENT

MEMO

TO: Planning Board Members  
FROM: Kathi Ingrish  
DATE: August 19, 2014  
RE: August 26, 2014 Planning Board Meeting

I had to admit to myself that summer was coming to a close when I went out to mow after dinner and ran out of daylight. I hope you are all enjoying the last days of summer break, before local schools start up again and traffic ramps up.

We only had one public hearing this month, a text amendment to allow permanent marketing centers within a Continuing Care Retirement Community. Although proposed by Erickson Living, this text change would be able to be applied to any CCRC. Revisions to Erickson's conditional zoning will be handled separately next month. There was little discussion and no public comments at the zoning hearing earlier this month, and staff is comfortable with the draft language as it is proposed.

As you know, we currently have an online survey available to anyone on the Town website, to gauge citizens' concerns about the design for widening of East John Street. Your Board has discussed this in a previous meeting, and I will provide you a summary of survey results on Tuesday evening. We didn't really have time to schedule a public input meeting and get it advertised, especially since your meeting is the second day of the CMS school year when so many other activities are gearing up. Council will discuss their concerns and preferences with NCDOT representatives next month.

We have started the application process for a new Youth Voice member for the '14-'15 school year. We hope to have one or more applicants come to your meeting in September for a time to informally get to know each other a bit, and then your Board can determine who will join you for the coming year. I saw Brian a couple weeks ago, and he had hoped to come to the Council meeting last week, but said he was working many, many hours.

As always, please let one of us know if you find you will not be in attendance next Tuesday evening. Also, feel free to call or e-mail any of us with questions at any time.

**MINUTES  
PLANNING BOARD  
TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2014  
7:00 PM  
HOOD ROOM, MATTHEWS TOWN HALL**

**PRESENT:** Vice Chair Rob Markiewitz; Members Gary Turner, Steve Lee, David Pratt, and Eric Johnson; Alternate members Barbara Dement and Michael Ham; Town Attorneys Charles Buckley, and Craig Buie; Planning Director Kathi Ingrish, and Zoning Technician/Deputy Town Clerk Mary Jo Gollnitz.

**ABSENT:** Chairman Tom Lawing and Member Eric Welsh; Youth Voice Brian Lee.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Rob Markiewitz called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Rob Markiewitz moved and Eric Johnson seconded to bring Barbara Dement and Michael Ham as voting members for this evening's meeting. The vote carried unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Barbara Dement moved to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2014 meeting. David Pratt seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

**MOTION 2014-6 – Update to Downtown Mater Plan Design Guidelines**

Planning Director Kathi Ingrish informed the Board that Motion 2014-6 is a text amendment to the Design Guidelines for the downtown area. The guidelines are in the process of being updated and there is interest for potential development in the downtown, and staff does not want to stall any development. There are three conditional categories that could be located in the downtown; R-VS, SRN or CMF; the density limitations would not apply.

Ms. Ingrish continued stating that any development with these classifications would have to go through a rezoning. The text change is removing the limitation that was not intended to be there. Vice Chair Markiewitz asked for additional information regarding the downtown guidelines. Ms. Ingrish explained that when the guidelines were completed in 1997, the Town was not thinking about all types of development that could be beneficial for the downtown. The Downtown Master Plan did state that there should be a fourfold increase in the number of dwelling units. She continued explaining examples of high density within Matthews and how zoning affects what can be developed.

Mr. Markiewitz asked if the text change requires any development coming before the Town for a rezoning. Ms. Ingrish answered yes. Mr. Turner asked for clarification of the Board's action for this item. Ms. Ingrish stated that this is a recommendation for a text change.

Mr. Markiewitz asked if the three precincts are still allowed to operate in the new zoning ordinance. Ms. Ingrish said that the precincts have no bearing on the UDO. Precincts are how it is referenced in the design guidelines.

Rob Markiewitz recommended approval of Motion # 2014-6 as presented, it is consistent with the policies for development as outlined by the Matthews Land Use Plan, and Town's long-range Vision Statements, and adopted policies. Gary Turner seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

**STREET WIDENING CONCEPTS FOR E. JOHN STREET**

Planning Director Kathi Ingrish showed the Board several conceptual plans of widening of E. John Street. She explained the proposed new interchange at I-485. There would be signals at both sides with no left turning movements from John Street. It would reduce wait time at the intersections. Additionally, there would not be a

need to widen the over pass the bridge which would be costly. She described the area surrounding the intersection and potential impact to that area.

Steve Lee asked what the schedule of the widening along I-485 from Providence Road to this intersection is. Ms. Ingrish said she is not sure. She did note that NCDOT has not determined if this improvement will be part of Section A or B of the John Street widening project. Section B goes towards Union County and is scheduled for construction first. Section A is from I-485 to downtown Matthews and has not been scheduled for construction yet. She noted that Section B is scheduled for construction in 2018.

Mr. Turner asked if this ranked ahead of the Weddington Road and I 485 interchange. Ms. Ingrish said that NCDOT is doing an environmental assessment of the entire corridor. Mr. Turner stated that he is opposed to the entire project. He feels it is an Independence Blvd. bypass and that it will bisect Matthews' downtown. Ms. Ingrish said that the environmental assessment is a federal mandate. NCDOT is providing design work ahead of time. The consultants were asked to look at several options for the road. She continued noting that some options have been removed and that four lane options are still being reviewed. Staff has provided comments to the consultants regarding the width of the street in the downtown area. These are initial concepts. Mr. Turner said that the interchange at I-485 is not a real problem.

Mr. Lee said that this may be a help with the traffic. When he comes into downtown in the morning there is a traffic back up. Widening Section B with combination of the new ramps, it probably would make easier travel from the south and may make downtown traffic flow better. Ms. Ingrish said that there needs to be an alternative street going into Matthews' downtown. Independence Pointe Parkway ideally would cross over or under I-485, which is costly. In the meantime a road through Lat Purser's development across railroad tracks will help with local traffic.

Steve Lee asked if NCDOT charts where the traffic is going during peak times. Town Attorney Charlie Buckley said that 45 years ago they did find out where traffic was coming from and where they were going. He does not believe they do this anymore.

Ms. Dement asked what the status of Buckley Way construction is. Ms. Ingrish said that hopefully this summer it will be constructed. Ms. Ingrish explained where the location of Buckley Way will be located. Ms. Dement asked if eliminating left turns on John Street would help with the traffic. Ms. Ingrish showed NCDOT's proposal for the super street alternatives, traffic patterns, and the impact on the properties along John Street. Staff has already told NCDOT that the proposed center median width needs to be reduced.

Eric Johnson said that he feels that widening John Street would kill Matthews. He feels that there should be an economic impact assessment completed for the downtown. Ms. Ingrish said that it is not part of the environmental assessment. Mr. Johnson continued noting that when traffic engineers get involved that they should not be the ones determining the destiny of the community. Mr. Ham said that historically when the interstates were built, they killed small towns. The state is looking at moving traffic and nothing beyond that and they should be looking at this in the DEIS. Ms. Ingrish stated that they are not doing a DEIS, they are conducting an EA. She said that she agrees with what the Board is saying.

Ms. Dement said that we need to keep downtown and make it better. We need to find ways around downtown for the traffic that is just passing through. Mr. Ham said that traffic coming to and from downtown could possibly be diverted to Hwy 51, then onto US 74 and to I-485. Steve Lee said that there is no good option. What can citizens do to voice their opinions? Ms. Ingrish said that all the comments tonight will be seen by Council. Staff has met with the consultants and they did promise they will be reviewing options for the road. Mr. Lee asked if a neighborhood petition was signed if that would help. Ms. Ingrish said that she hoped to have something new back from the consultants soon. Mr. Ham asked if there will be a public hearing. Ms. Ingrish said that she is not sure of NCDOT's schedule on this. David Pratt asked if the Town could schedule a meeting in order to have citizens voice their opinions. Ms. Ingrish said yes they could do that, but staff is hoping to get some newer concepts that will not be as extreme as what is currently proposed before any public input meetings.

Mr. Markiewitz asked about no left turn on John Street. He stated that there are travel lanes that have no left turn at certain times of day to keep traffic flowing in other communities. Ms. Dement said that a lot of communities place hour restrictions on turn lanes. Mr. Markiewitz said the lights restricting access of reversible

lanes on Monroe Road/Seventh Street into Charlotte work well. Mr. Ham said that the Monroe Road lights work efficiently. Discussion continued on how the left turn lighting works in other locations.

Ms. Dement asked what other small towns have done that have been faced with this type of dilemma. Ms. Ingrish said that it depends on the money and timing. NCDOT is driving this project. We are not saying how and when this will be completed. Mr. Markiewitz asked if we have the ability to slow down or stop a project the community does not like. Ms. Ingrish said NCDOT generally will not spend money on a project that the community will not support. Mr. Markiewitz asked if slowing the project down would hurt the town on other locations where we need money. Ms. Ingrish said it could. She discussed the Weddington Road and I-485 interchange delays.

Mr. Ham said that it would be in the Town's interest to let the public of Matthews know what is going on. Maybe the Planning Board could take the driver's seat on letting NCDOT know how the community feels about the project. Ms. Ingrish said that staff is addressing only what is in Matthews jurisdiction. The consultants have provided options for Stalling and Indian Trail and they are reviewing the proposals for their respective communities. NCDOT would like to have all three towns come up with something similar along the corridor. Ms. Ingrish continued explaining that the proposals are for 2035 traffic. However, recent trends show that if we change our development standards, there may not be that type of increase in traffic. Discussion continued about mixed use development, cost of gasoline in the upcoming years, working from home, and alternative means of travel.

Mr. Pratt asked if there is a meeting between Matthews and the other towns. Ms. Ingrish said that there has been a meeting of staff members. All three towns are going to different recommending bodies from their respective communities to receive input. Staff does expect to see alternatives brought back to the communities.

Mr. Ham asked if the planning department is providing alternatives to NCDOT. Ms. Ingrish said it is ok to slow traffic downtown and it needs to be pedestrian friendly. Mr. Buckley said that this was provided just two weeks ago to the Town.

Mr. Lee said that any widening does not benefit the town and he believes that the road is at the limits of what you could safely cross. Mr. Johnson asked if it would be appropriate to ask for an economic impact study. He continued stating that he feels this will kill the downtown and benefit the Lat Purser development. The economic analysis would show how it could benefit properties near I-485 and how it would affect downtown. Ms. Ingrish said it is appropriate to make suggestion to Council, EDAC or NCDOT. Mr. Markiewitz asked if this is the last time that the Board will see the proposals. Ms. Ingrish said that this is for environmental assessment only. NCDOT has a time limit to meet and complete the assessment in order to start construction. Ms. Ingrish explained the time schedule.

Mr. Ham asked if a portion of the construction area was in the National Historic Register. Ms. Ingrish said that it is one block outside of the register. Discussion continued about possible local historic designation. Ms. Dement asked about extending Crestdale Road to John Street. Discussion was held about alignment, railroad crossing issues and other alternative connections.

Mr. Markiewitz restated concerns the Board had expressed about the proposed E. John Street widening:

- public meetings to review proposal and receive input from the community,
- revisit with other towns,
- economic input study,
- preserving the town in what it stands for along with the history and atmosphere

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Markiewitz moved to adjourn the meeting. David Pratt seconded and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Gollnitz  
Zoning Technician/ Deputy Town Clerk

DRAFT

**MINUTES  
PLANNING BOARD  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2014  
6:50 PM  
HOOD ROOM, MATTHEWS TOWN HALL**

**PRESENT:** Chair Tom Lawing; Members Rob Markiewitz, Steve Lee, David Pratt, Gary Turner, Eric Welsh, Eric Johnson; Alternate Member Barbara Dement; Planning Director Kathi Ingrish.

**ABSENT:** Alternate Member Michael Ham; Youth Voice Brian Lee.

Chairman Tom Lawing called the meeting to order at 6:55 p.m.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT REQUEST FROM ACTS**

Three members explained their specific conflicts of interest, and were excused from participating in discussion and voting on this item. Gary Turner owns and lives adjacent to the land where the proposed new street connection would be built. Eric Welsh stated that ACTS is a current client of the law firm that he works for. Barbara Dement is employed by ACTS.

The remaining Planning Board members considered the Administrative Amendment request from ACTS for additional language to be added to Conditional Note #34 for the Village at Plantation Estates. Note #34 explains the commitments for a street extension in Hampton Green subdivision to Fullwood Lane, to be constructed by the Petitioner (ACTS). The proposed additional language reads:

*"The deadline for the Petitioner to install the connector road (prior to issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for the Village at Plantation Estates) will be postponed if a legal action is commenced that seeks to enjoin installation or use of the connector road. If such legal action is resolved (through a condemnation or otherwise) so as to allow for installation and use of the connector road, then the Petitioner must thereafter complete installation of the connector road as soon as reasonably possible. "*

Members were unsure how the phrase "reasonably possible" might be construed and felt it could be reworded.

Because this note involves a new street connection for the neighborhood of Hampton Green, Planning Board understands the need to allow Town Board to participate in any revisions. Planning Board therefore prefers to refer this request to Town Board, as provided for in the UDO at §155.401.5.

Rob Markiewitz moved to refer the Administrative Amendment to Town Board. The motion was seconded by David Pratt and the motion passed unanimously 5-0.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn was made by David Pratt, seconded by Tom Lawing. The motion was unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Gollnitz  
Zoning Technician/Deputy Town Clerk

## **155.506.16 Continuing Care Retirement Communities (CCRC).**

---

- A. A Continuing Care Retirement Community is a planned residential development for senior citizens seeking a secure living environment among their peers, where they are not dependent on themselves for daily necessities. These developments may be located within the R/I district subject to the criteria list here.
- B. STANDARDS
1. A continuing care retirement community may include up to twenty (20) independent living units per gross acre and up to five (5) assisted living units per gross acre and may also include skilled nursing facilities, community buildings and ancillary services.
  2. The lot upon which a CCRC is located must have frontage upon a Class IV or higher street and the main entrance must be from this thoroughfare.
  3. All building forming a part of a CCRC site shall be compatible in appearance and quality through the use of similar building materials, colors, architectural features and styles.
  4. Signage shall comply with the provisions of § 155.608 and landscaping shall comply with the requirements of § 155.606.
  5. The total floor area devoted to accessory uses shall not exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total floor area on the site. The following uses shall be permitted as accessory uses in any structure to so long as such uses are ancillary to the CCRC's use (i.e. meaning they may be used by the residents, employees, business invitees, and guests of the facility but shall not be open to or marketed for use by those outside the community):
    - a. Medical and dental offices and medical and dental laboratories.
    - b. Health and allied services.
    - c. Healthcare facilities, medical offices and ancillary services.
    - d. Photographic studios, including commercial photography.
    - e. Health club, fitness center, physical therapy and spas.
    - f. Banks.
    - g. Retirement community management and maintenance facilities and marketing centers.
    - h. Eating and drinking places, pubs and taverns, retail bakeries, cafeteria services, candy, nut and confectionary stores and miscellaneous food stores.
    - i. Educational services, libraries, book and stationary stores, news dealers and newsstands.

- j. Men's and women's clothing and/or accessory stores, shoe stores, miscellaneous apparel and accessory stores.
  - k. Miscellaneous general merchandise stores, pharmacies, florists, gift, novelty, and souvenir shops, and camera and photographic supply stores.
  - l. Pressing, alterations, garment repair and custom tailors.
  - m. Barbershops and beauty shops.
  - n. Indoor and outdoor swimming pools, putting greens, parks and open space, bowling, billiards and pool.
  - o. Places of worship.
  - p. Motion picture theaters, dance halls and studios, dance schools, theaters and auditoriums.
  - q. Radio and television production and broadcasting facilities.
  - r. Woodshops and arts and crafts studios.
6. Streets located within the interior of a CCRC may be either public or private. In the event the community is accessed by private streets, such access may be limited by means of a gate or other device subject to the Town ordinance on gated accessways. In addition, all private streets shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the standards for private streets adopted by the Town of Matthews.
7. The minimum lot area for a CCRC shall be five (5) acres. The minimum front setback, side yard and rear yard shall be fifty feet (50'). The maximum building height within a CCRC shall be sixty feet (60').
8. A temporary marketing/sales center may be located in a modular or manufactured structure, or site built, so long as all applicable building codes are followed, and the structure is removed from the site no later than one (1) month after the date on which the first Certificate of Occupancy for any building constructed on the site is issued. Alternately, permanent marketing/sales centers may be allowed as long as they meet the parking requirements of the UDO and are architecturally consistent with other components of the CCRC. [formerly 153.195; 153.056(B)(23)]

Q1:

## Tell us your opinions about the corner of Trade and John Street today: (mark all that apply)

- Answered: 63
- Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
— It is difficult or uncomfortable to walk across the John and Trade intersection today because there are so many turning vehicles.	<b>41.27%</b> 26
— The addition of flashing yellow left-turn signals at this intersection has improved how traffic moves through it.	<b>49.21%</b> 31
— The addition of flashing yellow left-turn signals at this intersection has made it more difficult for me to walk across this intersection.	<b>22.22%</b> 14
— The addition of flashing left-turn signals at this intersection has not made a significant difference in my ability to walk across this intersection.	<b>17.46%</b> 11
— I feel safe walking across this intersection.	<b>14.29%</b> 9
— I would walk across this intersection more often if I felt it was safe.	<b>19.05%</b> 12
— I do not walk through this intersection.	<b>31.75%</b> 20

Total Respondents: 63

### Comments(15)

- Remove the insane speed bumps
- Only during festivals when PD is out and traffic is slowed do I walk this intersection
- I have no need to walk across.
- The south side of the street needs to have the corners eased as was done on the north side so cars stop running over the curb
- We need to be concerned with more than pedestrian traffic. It is a nightmare to drive through the intersection at Trade and John ... forget walking through it. We need to eliminate left had turns and find a way to take vehicles that are just passing through Matthews around Matthews.
- Flashing Yellow L-turn arrows help during non-peak periods but seem to cause people to get trapped half way into the intersection.
- I think the turn signals should be full on green for both north and south for a set amount of time. Then go to the flashing yellow for left turns.
- I walk across this intersection frequently and do not have a problem getting across the street.
- The yellow flashing lights have made it very difficult to turn.
- I feel safe but there have been times, mostly during non rush hour, that I have waited for the cycle to complete twice before a walk signal is given. And with traffic enforcement being all but non existent, you cannot rely on traffic to stop on red before turning.
- I only walk thru the intersection on special events- really no other reason to cross that street otherwise. Everything is on the town hall suide
- There is not a ton of pedestrians I see there. Having the crosswalks more responsive to button could help timing. It's the folks who go in the left turn lane and then cut over to the right at the last minute is so so dangerous
- John Street bisects the town. I would like for North and South Trade to feel more connected.

-I know we are about "walkability" but we need to move traffic FIRST!!!!

-I dont cross it alot but when I do I am extra careful (probably more so than other intersections) because of all the turning traffic.

Q2:

**Which statements below most represent your opinion regarding any changes at the intersection of Trade and John Streets in downtown Matthews: (mark all that apply)**

- Answered: 61
- Skipped: 2

Answer Choices	Responses
— John Street should be widened on both sides of Trade Street through the downtown area to allow more vehicular traffic to get through the intersection on a green light.	27.87% 17
— John Street could be widened on both sides of Trade Street through the downtown area to allow more vehicular traffic to get through the intersection on a green light, but only if it did not require removal of any existing homes or businesses.	36.07% 22
— To improve traffic flow on N Trade Street as it crosses the railroad track and heads toward the signal at John Street, reconfigure for 2 left turn lanes from Trade John Street.	21.31% 13
— To improve traffic flow on N Trade Street as it crosses the railroad track and heads toward the signal at John Street, reconfigure for 2 left turn lanes from Trade John Street only if it does not take away any on-street parking spaces there today.	18.03% 11
— Keep the existing left turn lane, through lane, and right turn lane configuration with on-street parking on N Trade Street.	37.70% 23
— Eliminate all left turns from John Street onto Trade Street in either direction, which would require driving straight through the intersection to a turn-around point some distance beyond the signalized intersection, then waiting for a green light there to make a U-turn to go back to the Trade/John corner and making a right turn.	4.92% 3
— Keep a left turn lane on John Street in both directions at Trade Street.	55.74% 34
— Add a second straight through lane on John Street for traffic heading toward I-485 and Union County.	39.34% 24
— Add a second straight through lane on John Street heading toward I-485 and Union County only if businesses close to the street are not substantially impacted (restaurants, gas stations, etc.).	34.43% 21
— Add a right turn lane on John Street for traffic turning onto S Trade Street (toward Matthews Elementary School), recognizing it may substantially impact businesses near the corner.	24.59% 15

Total Respondents: 61

[Comments\(15\)](#)

- Complete the Independence Pointe Pkwy around Matthews
- dont make it easier to head south on john to 485. only widen to make it easier to move north from 485
- This issue has been ignored for many decades, and there are no easy solutions, but to improve the Kangaroo Express side of East John Street without correcting the Matthews Exxon absurdity would be sheer folly. Time to wake up and make something happen, even if it involves rebuilding the existing stations and relocating them further away from the overworked intersection. C;mon people -- it's not 1957 any longer !!
- A lot of people get into the left turn lane (John St towards Union county) and cut back over at the last minute. I witness this on almost a daily basis. Unsure if that many people do not know it is a left turn only or if they are just risking an accident to cut traffic at the light.
- Find another way around Matthews 51,74, and Matthews- Mint hill Rd. Reduce the traffic through downtown, the majority of the traffic is cutting through to stay off of 74.
- Extra land should have been taken before approving the new vet clinic. What were you thinking Matthews?
- alternating lanes in and out for rush hour like Monroe Road into Charlotte
- The intersection should be rebuilt as a fully functional 4 way cloverleaf. All right hand turns only.
- Remove those damned speed bumps through downtown Matthews. Those things cause a lot of traffic congestion at the John St - Trade St red light.
- need to build parking deck in downtown and get rid of on street parking. It is hard for vehicles to back out. Land on E. Charles St, could have parking with shuttle service to Matthews business'
- Get rid of those horrible speed bumps on Trade Street. Those things cause terrible traffic backups through the traffic signal at Trade and John
- Though traffic is heavy, I worry about additional lanes being more dangerous for our blind pedestrian residents who also have young children. Also, I have seen large trucks have great difficulty turning at that intersection. More lanes would be more difficulty.
- this is a poorly developed questionnaire, your asking people to visualize something from your text comments. Diagrams should have been provided
- 5 lanes wide ONLY on John at intersection. Remove from 2 Gas Stations ONLY.
- left turn not allowed during certain hours with reversable lane and overhead lights (like 7th street) with Red X or Green Arrow.

Q3:

### Which statements below best represent your opinion regarding any changes at the East John Street/I-485 interchange: (mark all that apply)

- Answered: 59
- Skipped: 4

Answer Choices	Responses
– The interchange should be rebuilt to eliminate left turns from John Street onto I-485 in both directions.	15.25% 9
– The interchange off-ramps should be rebuilt to reduce traffic backups waiting to exit I-485.	28.81% 17
– Rebuilding the interchange can be delayed until sometime after Segment B widening (from Union County to I-485) is completed.	30.51% 18
– Rebuilding the ramps should be done at the same time as Segment B widening if East John Street from downtown Matthews to I-485 is not yet widened.	42.37% 25
– No improvements are needed to the interchange at East John Street and I-485.	23.73% 14

Total Respondents: 59

[Comments\(9\)](#)

- Get rid of those damnable, utterly dysfunctional flashing yellow arrows and restore the protected (green arrow) left turn in both directions on East John Street. What DOT nutcase came up with those unprotected yellow arrows to begin with?
- I don't use that intersection very often and when I do I haven't run into problems. But I don't typically drive during peak traffic times.
- Going into Matthews on E. John @ 485, the right lane should be eliminated until widened. This is a hazard and someone is going to get hurt.
- Don't use this at peak traffic times so do not have an opinion.
- Make the left turn signals a full green arrow for access to I-485 for a set time, then go to the flashing yellow arrow.
- I do not use this interchange during heavy traffic. I use Independence
- Yield signs need to be installed on John Street at the I485 exchange in both directions at the end of the right lanes, because many drivers ignore the painted arrows or think that the arrows painted on the pavement give them the right of way to force their way into the through lanes.
- When improvements are done to East John all new R/W should be taken from the left side (heading east bound) so homes on both sides will not be impacted and new development can take place on the left side.
- waste of money

Q4:

## Tell us about your connection to this roadway corridor: (mark all that apply)

- Answered: 63
- Skipped: 0

Answer Choices	Responses
I live along the E John Street corridor.	14.29% 9
I have friends or family members who live there.	11.11% 7
I work along this roadway corridor.	17.46% 11
I occasionally drive this section of roadway between Downtown Matthews and the Mecklenburg/Union County line.	46.03% 29
I regularly commute along this roadway corridor.	49.21% 31
I access or exit I-485 from East John Street.	80.95% 51
This street would be convenient for me if it didn't back up so much.	47.62% 30
I avoid running to the Matthews Post Office or coming into Downtown Matthews at certain times because I have to drive on East John Street to get there.	53.97% 34
I have a convenient alternative to this roadway.	17.46% 11
I use East John Street to get to the Matthews Greenway.	7.94% 5
I would ride a bicycle along this corridor, but not in the street with cars and trucks.	23.81% 15

Total Respondents: 63

Answer Choices	Responses
----------------	-----------

Comments(4)

-downtown to 485 is a key gateway and very poor representation of matthews. fixing would benefit economic development. perhaps a three lane config could benefit town and future development at 485. Tying the town and this corridor together

-Alternatives to discourage traffic from this part of town may be the right option. Better through roads will just encourage more traffic.

-I commute on this road at "off hours" going in early and getting home early to avoid the traffic.

-I would use the Greenway on John St if there was better parking.

Q5:

## If there was a wide sidewalk along East John Street between downtown and I-485, would you use it?

- Answered: 62
- Skipped: 1

Answer Choices	Responses
– Daily.	4.84% 3
– At least once a week.	16.13% 10
– At least once a month.	9.68% 6
– Occasionally, such as during festivals or to get between the greenway and downtown.	53.23% 33
– It is unlikely I would use it.	29.03% 18

Total Respondents: 62

Comments(7)

-Complete the sidewalks on north side of Hwy 51 between Sardis Rd and Monroe Rd.

-While I don't walk along E John Street I do need to contend with pedestrians on this stretch of highway. It is always dangerous for anyone to walk along this stretch of road.

-If the sidewalk would go all the way and connect in Stallings, I would consider riding my bike on it.

-I would use it daily if there was a connection from E. Charles St to John St.

-if the proposed sidewalk paralleled a linear park and connected all future development along John to downtown, that would be a huge asset.

-How about a bike lane on John and Trade St that would allow people to make a circuit by riding those two streets and the greenway.

-we already bike through greenway and come out @ 485 and coming back to town is a bit scary

Q6:

## Are there other places along John Street you would like to have a crosswalk?

- Answered: 37
- Skipped: 26

Answer Choices	Responses
–	32.43%

Answer Choices	Responses
At West John Street and Ames Street (by Matthews Presbyterian Church).	12
– At West John Street and Library Lane.	<b>13.51%</b> 5
– On East John Street by the Post Office.	<b>70.27%</b> 26
– On East John Street where a new street (Buckley Way) will be built next to the older industrial building and Matthews Church of God.	<b>29.73%</b> 11
– On East John Street at Greylock Ridge Road.	<b>18.92%</b> 7

Total Respondents: 37

Comments(9)

- There are plenty of crosswalks in this area. The worry is the backup of traffic
- n/a
- With the high volume of traffic, fewer crosswalks would be better.
- Don't put any more crosswalks in on John Street. They will slow traffic and cause more congestion.
- Do not put crosswalks across the very busy John Street. Doing so is asking for a pedestrian fatality.
- no
- Greenway
- At Ames Street only or you continue the congestion downtown
- no others yet. foot traffic further down does not suggest a need.

E John survey summary (63)