

Notes for the Roeland Park Ad Hoc Sidewalk Committee of

March 1, 2010

No Quorum

Present: Bill Art, Megan England, Betsy Mellor, Debbie Mootz

We discussed some of the issues regarding the potential for problems with what is called “Highest Priority”, “Medium Priority”, and “Lowest Priority”. To prioritize a street into a particular category it makes more sense that given streets meet at least two or three points under one of the designations to be categorized.

This gave cause to review the points under “Considerations include:” and combine this into “Priority Rankings” since they appear to duplicate some of what has been mentioned under “Priority Rankings”, so no need to state it twice.

Finally, to clarify “Sidewalk Requirement” we talked about adding three more items were added. 10) A sidewalk, where none exist, shall be constructed as part of major storm water projects or street reconstruction projects. 11) Streets where sidewalks are requested by more than 50% of the property owners (by petition, as an assessment to those property owners). 12) Cul-de-Sacs shall be constructed last in the low priority rating.

It was also suggested that High Priority streets have traffic counts above 850 vehicles in any 24 hr period. Those sidewalks are on one side of the street within 1/8 mile of designated generators of pedestrian traffic. That on the Medium Priority is streets of ¼ mile of designated generators of pedestrian traffic. That traffic counts between 650 to 849 vehicles in any 24 hour period for the Medium Priority Street.

Note: Applying the rankings to the actual map gives cause to make adjustments to the draft that the committee is working on.