From: Thomas Davis
To: Council Clerk
Subject: Resolution 26-07 (Northwood 7 Area B) Traffic & Bixby Parkway Extension Concern
Date: Sunday, January 25, 2026 5:06:55 PM

You don't often get email from tdavis2061@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Resolution 26-07 (Northwood 7 Area B) Traffic & Bixby Parkway Extension Concern

Subject: Infrastructure & Traffic Concerns – Resolution 26-07 / Northwood 7 Area B (251 Additional Homes)

Mayor and City Council Members,
City Staff.

I am writing regarding **Resolution 26-07**, involving the **addition of Northwood 7 – Area B**, including the proposed 251 additional single-family homes as part of the second phase of the development.

To be clear, I do not have an issue with additional single-family homes being built. My concern is the timing of road and traffic infrastructure relative to the pace and scale of development.

Primary Concern: Bixby Parkway Extension to SR 36/37

With the addition of these homes—and with the County's new building also being located on Bixby Parkway—there will be a significant increase in traffic volume. If Bixby Parkway is not extended and connected to the SR 36/37 intersection in a timely manner, much of this traffic will be forced onto existing routes, especially US 521 and SR 36/37, which are already becoming overloaded.

Likely Traffic Pattern Without the Connection

My concern is that many residents from the proposed development will not travel all the way through the future Bixby corridor if it remains incomplete. Instead, they will likely continue using existing neighborhood exits and routes that funnel traffic toward US 521 and SR 36/37, increasing congestion and safety concerns.

In short: If Bixby Parkway is not connected to SR 36/37 before or during the buildout, the burden will fall onto roadways that are already under strain.

Request for City/County Clarification

Before this phase moves forward, I would like the City to clarify:

1. What is the planned timeline for extending Bixby Parkway to SR 36/37?
2. Is this connection guaranteed, or contingent on future funding/conditions?
3. What traffic studies or projections support adding 251 more homes without the Bixby Parkway extension already in place?
4. What steps will be taken to prevent traffic from being pushed onto US 521 and SR 36/37 in the interim?

I respectfully ask that the infrastructure timing—especially the Bixby Parkway extension and SR 36/37 connection—be addressed as a priority alongside approval of this additional phase.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Thomas Davis
Elm Valley Farms
740-816-5628
tdavis2061@gmail.com

--