

Kristen Mueller

From: Anthony Schneider Jr <universalcity.shbw@gkhr.mailwarden.net>
Sent: Friday, December 2, 2022 2:50 AM
To: jsbrown110@gmail.com
Cc: publicworksdirector; 'Jeffrey Brown'
Subject: Re: Kitty Hawk

Mr. Brown,

I have been informed that you had retired from the firm formally known as Jones Carter. Thank you for, while in retirement, responding to Mr. Luensmann's inquiry to review the location's visibility triangle at the intersection of KITTY HAWK RD, MILLRIDGE RD and SUNRISE CANYON DR. As well as, extending the open invitation to meet with me and any others having concerns to discuss the matter.

First, it is my hope at this time that communications by email should be in order to resolve any concerns of the matter that others and I have currently. Then, if not, I would like to request an in-person meeting with you and any others that are deemed necessary. To resolve the concerns and issues that I have currently with the gargantuan cinder block and native rock monument sign placement and installation within the curb enclosed channelized traffic island.

I would first like to segmentally correspond with you on several individual statements you made in that response to Mr. Luensmann.

With respect to your in statement of , "We found that the intersection is in compliance with the ordinance."

I understand that the statement is based only on the two paragraphs, (9) Visibility Triangle, and (5) Visibility Triangle. Respectfully found in the sections of the current City of Universal City TX ordinances of, PART IV - PROPERTY AND STRUCTURES, Chapter 4-2 PLANNING, ARTICLE II. SUBDIVISIONS, Sec. 4-2-23. Definitions., and Sec. 4-2-30. Standards and specifications., and nothing else.

Both these paragraphs are worded identical and are fundamentally the same, with the only exception of the latter is missing the characters of "(2)." Which is a negatable difference in either of their applicability, meaning and effectiveness.

In your summary statement, "...the ordinance calls for a triangle with 30' lengths along the face of curb for traffic entering an intersection and traffic exiting an intersection."

Others and I concur with that summary statement of yours, wholeheartedly.

Yet, in another statement of yours, "The site visibility triangle for traffic leaving the intersection and turning left onto Kitty Hawk, is measured from the edge of the turning lane and the edge of the curb line of Kitty Hawk."

Could you enlighten me where you sourced that portion of your statement above from these identical paragraphs. Where in fact, that any visibility triangle is measured from the edge of the "turning lane" and the edge of the curb line? For the life of others and I, it isn't clearly seen nor found "anywhere."

The stated and applied difference of your more conservative application of 35 foot triangle legs verses the City ordinance stated 30 foot legs. Is not actually of any concern in this specific case.

Of a correctly applied visibility triangle with its legs along each curb line of the channelized traffic island. Still finds the majority (50% - 75%) of the gargantuan cinder block and native rock monument sign placement and installation clearly in the area contained by the three (3) sides of the visibility triangle of the channelized traffic island. Either Isosceles Right Triangle covers 50% - 60 % of the current channelized traffic island area with the existing curbs.

Thus, your statement of, "The 30' triangle barely encroaches into the island." Appears to others and I to be grossly incorrect. For when either a 30' or 35' foot legged visibility triangle includes a majority of the current total striped and curbed channelized traffic island area.

I eagerly await your answers to my specific questions pointed out and based on those answers may have some more not addressed in this message.

Respectfully,
Anthony Schneider

On 11/18/22 11:10, jsbrown110@gmail.com wrote:

> Randy,

>

> We reviewed the site visibility triangle at the intersection of Kitty
> Hawk, per your request to confirm compliance with the site visibility
> section of the Universal City Ordinance (Section 4-2-23 and 4-2-30).
> We found that the intersection is in compliance with the ordinance.

> In summary, the ordinance calls for a triangle with 30' lengths along the face of curb for traffic entering an intersection and traffic exiting an intersection.

>

> In this case, the site visibility triangle for traffic turning onto
> the newly constructed street from the existing Kitty Hawk would not
> apply since this traffic proceeds around a radius turn.

>

> The site visibility triangle for traffic leaving the intersection and
> turning left onto Kitty Hawk, is measured from the edge of the turning
> lane and the edge of the curb line of Kitty Hawk. The 30' triangle barely encroaches into the island. A more conservative 35'
> triangle is shown on the attached pdf for reference.

>

> The site visibility triangle for traffic leaving the intersection and
> turning right onto Sunrise Canyon also appears to be in compliance
> with the ordinance, however this area was part of an existing street which was not modified under these plans.

>

> I am available to meet with you or any citizen having concerns to discuss the matter.

>

> J. Steven Brown, P.E.