

**Summary of Written Comments from  
Public Meeting for  
US 17 / SC 61 Improvements Project  
March 22, 2007**

1. If you consider 2300 cars “not a lot of cars” then leave Wesley Drive alone. Don’t sacrifice the property and the trees on Wesley. Spend the money on 526 to hopefully alleviate the traffic. I am opposed to any change to Wesley Drive.
2. Start the Mark Clark first and make it a completion priority like the new bridge (Mt. Pleasant) was. If you use any alternative only Modified Alternative C will allow us to be able to continue to live in our home without major property loss, devaluation, and severe impact on the livability in the house. Add little bumps on the roads to all the approaching intersections to slow them (vehicles) down. The type the state uses on rural highways at 4 way intersections to alert drivers to slow down.
3. Widening Wesley Drive will be too grave a sacrifice for all the neighborhoods surrounding the area. Not only will the homeowners on Wesley Drive lose much of their property, we will lose the beautiful trees, etc. I support “modified alternate c”.
4. We were asked to vote on it, the ½ cent Sales Tax money was there, now the money is not there and the Flyover has been shelved. Then it was stated that a real Traffic Count was never conducted. They thought that about 2,300 cars traveled Hwy. 61. No way.
5. Do not widen Wesley Drive Hurry up and finish 526 as planned. H/up @ James Island Connector will decrease pressure here.
6. Our goal as a community is to reduce traffic deter it get rid of it not invite more. If we can’t downsize the traffic with these alternatives then let’s just leave things the way they are.
7. Please consider moving the right of way over only on the side of Windermere shopping center rather than taking part of the very little yard between my house and a very busy road-way. Or don’t add the lane on Folly Rd. at all.
8. Make push button walk controls.
9. Do nothing – 526 will take care of the problem.
10. Don’t build - Do nothing
11. The easier we make it for more travel, the harder it will be to control. Leave it alone please.
12. It is next to impossible to turn left from W. Harrison onto 61.

13. No one has visited or advised us how much of our property will be taken. No improvement is made by a lane added to Wesley. Please do not create a divide of old Windermere.
14. Those of us who live here and walk would prefer to leave the roads as they are but to improve the pedestrian traffic conditions-better sidewalks, safe crossings at the median intersections and more traffic lights to slow vehicle travel.
15. Where is the option "None of the above"? Most of my neighbors are willing to accept the traffic increase and let this money be used for a new 526 Bridge. Not in favor of this plan –
16. It is presently impossible for a bicyclist to negotiate this crossing without putting his/her life at risk. A light weight over head crossing is the only reasonable solution. It should be addressed in this study-even though not specifically covered by the mandate.
17. Is it possible to take Alt. C & instead of adding paving to both sides of Wesley, add the entire amount of paving to the Fenwick side-same road width and number of lanes, just no impact to one side of Wesley. This would save (3) grand trees & not decrease value of several houses. The city could purchase the (6) business, demo & replant street trees. This would create a better buffer for the houses off of Fenwick, & they would not be adversely affected.
18. I have been assured by Jim Armstrong and Christopher Morgan (City Staff) that the first left turn into the Exxon convenience store at Wesley & Highway 17 while driving north/east along Hwy 17 would NOT be blocked by the new median. The pictures provided are cut off at that midpoint, showing the second curb cut's being blocked, which we understand is to be blocked. Recommendation: do not create new street near Hay Tire & do not eliminate left turn lane at Wesley Drive Eastbound and do not block left into the Exxon w/ a new median.
19. I like the modified C option. Sorry that it seems the 'know it all' members of our neighborhood think they know everything and have now become cry babies because they aren't getting their way.
20. Alternative C: This alternative results in too much impact to the Windermere neighborhood. Our hope was to reroute traffic away from the neighborhood with the connector ramp. Given that the ramp is no longer on the alternative list of our goal would be to calm traffic and make the roadways more pedestrian friendly. I believe this objective could be with attained with Modified Alt C- if all the improvements that were shown could be accomplished. It would be most important to get this project finished with such a budget to allow for the extensive landscaping, sidewalk repair, mast arm lights, and other improvements that were proposed. The "coup" would be to get the pedestrian bridge to link the Greenway across Wesley/Folly.
21. The Bike/pedestrian bridge over Folly Road should not be an afterthought to be done at a future time, it should be included in the project scope and funding NOW.

22. While we understand change is inevitable in a growing city, we are not in favor of the New Proposed Right Of Way indicated on your map with an Orange Line. We are in favor of pedestrian walkways, sidewalks, green spaces, turning lanes, and traffic speed reduction, insuring the safety of children, and historic residences along Folly Road Blvd., but, we are not in favor of the New Proposed Right of Way concerning our 81 year old Residentially Zoned Property.
23. The current Zig Zag bike/ped crossing over Folly is unsafe and impractical. This crossing should be redone with the understanding that the bik/ped bridge will be done over Folly Road.
24. No grand trees removed
25. Complete sidewalk Improvements as noted in the design.
26. Focus should be on context sensitive design maintaining public safety for all transportation users-not just cars!!!!
27. The proposed new roadway located between Hwy 17 and Hwy 61 offered in "Alternative C" and the "modified Alternative C" will negatively impact the operations of Sherwin-Williams and Hay Tire Company and physically divide the Moreland Shopping Center. Additionally, the proposed widening of Wesley Drive offered in "Alternative C" will hinder the ingress/ egress of the shopping center. Thus the owners are opposed to the widening of Wesley Drive and the proposed road that would bisect the Moreland Shopping Center.
28. We are against any road modifications/additions on the US17/SC61 project. It appears that you are trying to put a small bandaid on a much larger problem... the need for the completion of I526.
29. We feel that removing the left turn at the intersection of Wesley and US 17 will not resolve delays but rather increase confusion and congestion at the proposed new road. If more than six or eight cars want to turn left onto the new proposed road through Moreland Shopping Center, those cars will be backed up into the Wesley intersection. Additionally, placing landscaping on US 17 will prevent south bound access to 507 Savannah Hwy.
30. The cost, the construction complications, and traffic delays caused by the construction hardly seem worth the minor benefits (if any). I would think it is(would) be more important to address the larger need, which is the completion of I526.....which would more significantly reduce the traffic burden you are trying to address.
31. Everything from completion of the Mark Clark, repair or replacement of marginal bridges, and special attention on lifesaving improvements on some of our deadliest intersections should be high priorities. Additionally, potholes, inadequate road signs, and damaged curbs and drains could be added to a host of other reasonable projects all over the county.

32. The question now becomes----How do concerned residents prevent this unnecessary project from going forward when it appears that Roadwise has already made up their minds? Please join the taxpayers of West Ashley in asking Roadwise to reexamine their priorities and not to move forward on the proposed US16/SC61 project.
33. The widening of Wesley Dr., the results of which would make it physically unsafe for residents and commuters alike, would do nothing to ease the flow of traffic in this area. Thru traffic needs to be diverted from this area before it even gets here by completing I-526 and building other such highways on the outskirts of the city.
34. While we agree that the Modified Alternative C offers the most pragmatic approach to addressing the major concern to connect US 17 to SC 61 by the Fielding Connector, we would strongly urge you to do more to preserve the residential character of our entire district.
35. As Crescent residents, we appreciate the new left-turn at Folly and Yeamans Roads into Windermere Shopping Center. Although some of us advocated facilitating turning left there, the tradeoff of making an additional left lane is unacceptable.
36. It would be better to preserve green space in the current right-of-way than to lose it for more “green” time at the Folly traffic signal. Our acceptance of Alternative C is, thus, conditional upon this additional modification to Alternative C.
37. We also advocate additional traffic calming techniques to Folly as a major artery. We urge removing as many concrete medians as possible and making ones landscaped with (mondo) grass as a minimum, maintenance-free means of calming traffic throughout our district.
38. We want the ugly, cracked, weedy concrete medians in front of Holy Trinity Church removed.
39. Use the median between the Wappoo Cut Bridge and this area to separate better the traffic continuing on Folly towards Ashley River Bridge from the traffic needing to be in lanes leading to Wesley Drive.
40. To promote more children riding their bikes and walking safely across Folly Road from The Crescent, we ask for a commitment to find seed money for a matching grant to build the proposed bicycle/pedestrian bridge across Folly Road. Modifying the signal timing plus installing pedestrian heads is only one step in the right direction. Thus the modification of Alternative C should include some funding for an aerial bridge for pedestrians and bicyclists.