

## SDP2020-005 Primrose School

As a city we have the choice to decide how we manage development and transportation policy. These policies dictate our built environment. For these policies to work congruously, the goals, objectives and understandings of the departments that implement these policies (namely Planning and Zoning and Public Works) must be shared.

Without comment on the actual use, what has been proposed here is a mismatch of land use and transportation policy. In this area - one of the busiest intersections in the city - the city has through its code made choices in land use and transportation that prioritize unconnected islands of development serviced mainly by automobile and a hierarchical road network. This is essentially all of the apartment/condo complexes and commercial establishments that abut the Hilltop/Spa intersection. Furthermore, our transportation policy (APF) that hyper focuses on Level of Service requires a street design that prioritizes vehicle speed and throughput over safety of people outside cars. In this context, additional curb cuts and ingress/egress so close to this intersection are problematical. For example we have the right "slipturn" that allows for fast turns from Hilltop to Spa and makes an egress point from the development on Spa unsafe. Because of the lack of connections, there are limited alternate routes to position a vehicle for the right into the development and thus little flexibility to accommodate a development such as on this parcel without creating new problems. Additionally, the city will have more road furniture to maintain because of the left turn burm and based on experience, this will need maintenance as people will hit it in this context.

While I appreciate the effort to establish conditions on the special exception that prevent the single problem of queuing on Hilltop, it does not address the lack of access issue from any direction except traveling SE on Hilltop. Furthermore, this condition as written (two official warnings etc) would likely take a lengthy review, debate and likely litigation to enforce. Ultimately, it is a band aid on the larger development pattern problem identified above and not a sufficient solution.

The provided additional traffic impact study modeling shows little effect on Level of Service, but this does not bear out the negative consequences of driver behavior if they are approaching from Forest Drive or Spa Rd. People in a hurry making u-turns on Hilltop or neighboring streets will have a very negative impact on *people outside of cars* because the driver behavior will be unpredictable. This is again a result of the hyper focus on Level of Service above all which negates the safety of those outside of cars.

Had the development pattern in this area been a more traditional one, where streets all connect into a grid - there is no reason why Gentry, Enclave, Silopanna, Chatham, Farragut and Boxwood could not have been a street grid other than perhaps clinging to 1960s planning dogma - this development would have been fine. There would be ample redundancy and convenient paths to reach the proposed "right in, right out" without resorting to u-turns or highly circuitous routes that just perpetuate the existing traffic issues.

It is truly unfortunate that these prior choices made by the city prior to this application have essentially rendered this property of little value if automobile access is needed from Hilltop, It is a loss for the property owner, the developer providing a needed service to the community and to the city for lost revenue on a parcel with little potential value. But we can not continue to make these choices and ignore the consequences. We can't have it both ways; we either have to change (in the future or retroactively) the development patterns that will allow for reasonable infil without these autocentric problems or we have to accept that there will be "non-places" that can not be reasonable developed because they do not work in the autocentric development pattern we have established. Why do we continue to do the same thing - Enclave at Spa is the latest example here - and think the result will be different? In my opinion, this is just the result of outdated planning policy for Annapolis and we are suffering from that all around.

Given all of this I can not support this development. There have been a number of attempted developments for this parcel and none of them have succeeded for these same reasons. At this point all I can really suggest for this parcel is something that does not require access via automobile or alternatively, an extension of one of the existing "island developments" using their ingress/egress points, or even to sell spaces to other developers for "offsite tree replanting/mitigation turning it into forested area.

Respectfully Submitted for the record for the Planning Commission meeting held on 10/21/2021.

Alex Pline  
Planning Commission Member