

**Draft Minutes from the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board
Regular Meeting of March 13, 2007**

**(2007-0177) Traffic Controls for Country Club Village of
Rochester Hills Phase 2B**

YS-99.1 Hogan Circle Yield to Connors Drive (North Intersection)

YS-99.2 Hogan Circle Yield to Connors Drive (South Intersection)

**SS-137.1 All approaching traffic STOP from Connors Drive, Bendelow Road,
and Michelson Road at their intersection.**

Mr. Matich read the staff report. "A traffic study was recently performed for the newly constructed streets located within County Club Village of Rochester Hills – Phase 2B (and final phase). This study was initiated by the City accepting the streets for maintenance and declaring said streets open for public travel on February 2, 2007. The three (3) intersections within this final phase were reviewed to determine the type of regulatory traffic control warranted as established by Michigan Manual Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD).

The following is a recommendation for the type of regulatory traffic control device (stop/yield sign) for each intersection with available safe sight distance provided:

- 1) Intersection of Hogan Circle at Connors Drive (North Intersection):**
Intersection safe sight distance was measured for 195' northerly (roundabout) and 398' southerly (slow-point island). At this time, no permanent sight obstructions exist at the intersection quadrants that would adversely impact the intersection safe approach speeds.

Recommend **Hogan Circle yield at Connors Drive (North Intersection).**

- 2) Intersection of Hogan Circle at Connors Drive (South Intersection):**
Intersection safe sight distance was measured for 550'+ northerly and 279' southerly to Michelson Road. At this time, no permanent sight obstructions exist at the intersection quadrants that would adversely impact the intersection safe approach speeds.

Recommend **Talbert Circle yield at Connors Drive (South Intersection).**

- 3) Intersection of Connors Drive, Bendelow Road and Michelson Road:**
Prior to the construction of Connors Drive (within County Club Village Phase 2B), the intersection of Michelson Road and Bendelow Road pre-existed as a skewed "Y" intersection with no type of regulatory traffic control. With the improvement of Connors Drive, the centerline of Bendelow Road and Michelson Road relocated approximately 31' southerly as shown within the attached aerial

photograph. The current geometrics of this intersection are considered irregular. After reviewing the intersection of Connors Drive, Bendelow Road, and Michelson Road in the field, we found a potential for traffic conflicts to occur within the intersection due to intersection alignment and landscape plantings placed within the northeast intersection quadrant. The available safe sight distance for the northwest intersection quadrant was very restrictive. Trees and shrubbery impede the safe approach speed for the intersection to below 10 mph. We have reviewed the traffic crash history for a four (4) year period, from 2003-2006, and no traffic crashes were found at the intersection. The intersection was reviewed to determine the type of regulatory traffic control warranted as established by Michigan Manual Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MMUTCD). We recommend the intersection of Connors Drive, Bendelow Road, and Michelson Road be adapted to an all-way stop control, based upon the current intersection alignment, geometrics, and sight obstruction which exist within the northeast quadrant that adversely impact the intersection safe approach speeds.

Chairperson Colling clarified that the recommendation was for an all-way stop, which was confirmed by Mr. Matich. Chairperson Colling then opened the matter up for public comment.

Ms. Wenona Breazeale
836 Michelson Road
Rochester Hills, Michigan 48307-5345

Ms. Breazeale stated she lived at the intersection of Michelson and Connors. This past weekend she found tire marks in her lawn, and although this was not the first time it had happened, this time her fence was knocked down. She agreed with the all-way stop being proposed, and said she was not sure if some type of light or reflector should also be installed. She said her grass was constantly being run over, and although she was not certain what to do about it, something definitely needed to be done, and soon.

Chairperson Colling and the Board members looked at the aerial photograph included in the packet to determine from which direction the vehicles were coming into her yard. Mr. Shumejko asked if there were still a problem with the construction traffic, and Ms. Breazeale said it was mainly passenger vehicles. Last year she had called the Sherriff's Office because teenagers were drag racing through the subdivision. The police came out and addressed the issue, but something still needs to be done because now she has to replace the fence at her own expense as the responsible driver left no note. She stressed that something needed to be done.

Chairperson Colling said they could certainly address the issues of speed and signage, but unfortunately there was nothing he could do to stop student behavior. Hopefully the stop signs and enforcement will remedy the situation.

Ms. Breazeale asked if there were plans to put in a light, and Chairperson Colling said a light was really not warranted from a traffic standpoint, in fact a stop sign was not even

warranted. He explained the geometry of the intersection and sight visibility problems were what justified the stop sign. He said we have a police officer present; who he was sure would corroborate that. He felt it was more an issue of speed and losing control or overshooting that is causing the damage to her yard and property. Hopefully, when the traffic controls are put into place drivers will obey them and her problems will cease. If not, it will require some selective enforcement to control the speeds, which he felt were the largest contributor to her problem.

Mr. Matich said the safe speed for the turning movement was probably about ten mph if it were a curve rather than an intersection. Chairperson Colling said he had been through there, it was a tight corner, and if drivers obey the stop sign it will force them to take it at a safer speed. If they don't, they will put some enforcement out there to see that they do. Mr. Shumejko said in the future if the streets in the subdivision were paved, at that time they would try to correct the irregular configuration of the intersection.

Ms. Breazeale asked if they were also going to install another sign for the dead end, because a lot of traffic goes down there thinking you can get through on Michelson, and ends up turning around. There used to be a sign, but it is gone. Mr. Shumejko speculated that it got knocked down.

Seeing no one else present wishing to speak, Chairperson Colling closed the Public Comment. He then opened up the matter for questions from the Board.

Mr. Brown said that in the report read by Mr. Matich it specified that they had reviewed the traffic crash history for a four-year period, and there had been no accidents. He asked if it were reasonable to assume that part of the reason for that was simply because there was not much traffic, and as the subdivision is built up the traffic will increase.

Mr. Matich said the road was opened up to public travel by the City on February 2nd and construction traffic was coming through, but there was no question but that would be the case. When the traffic engineer for the development did their Traffic Impact Study he weighed how much traffic would use each access point to the subdivision. The majority of trips were coming off Nawakwa. Sergeant Walker has pointed out to the City that he has concerns about the access point of Nawakwa at Rochester Road, and to look at restricting left turns out there. That is a future possibility, which would push more traffic over to Auburn. The City has also had a resident come in and complain about the difficulty of making left turns onto Auburn Road. Once they finish with the improvements to John R this year, more traffic will be pushed to that access point.

Mr. Brown said in regard to Ms. Breazeale's yard concerns, he could easily envision a vehicle speeding southbound on Connors, coming up to the intersection and realizing too late that it doesn't go on through. It's late at night, it's dark, perhaps it's an inexperienced driver, and they end up on her lawn. Did they think that that the stop sign would provide enough warning to deal with the situation?

Mr. Matich offered that speeds would be governed by the stop sign. At present he thought they might be going too fast to react to the curve if it is nighttime. He said they also had reflectors that could possibly be put at the back of the intersection if they wanted to delineate the end of the road before the ditch. He thought that was something they could look at doing, and an intersection streetlight could possibly be addressed at some point in the future, either by the Country Club Village Home Owners Association or the developer.

Chairperson Colling asked if anyone else had questions or comments.

Mr. Schneck asked if the streets of the subdivision had been conveyed to the City and were public streets, and was told that they were. He asked if the development had been approved, and whether there was any responsibility left for the developer. Mr. Shumejko said he had some sidewalks to complete along the west side of Bendelow. Mr. Schneck was curious about the traffic controls, street signs, guide signs, and regulatory signs. Were they the developer's responsibility, or the City's?

Mr. Shumejko explained that the City takes the fees in escrow and then installs the signs. In this particular subdivision there was a lot of signage due to the traffic circle and splitter islands. As the signs are installed, they back charge the account.

Chairperson Colling said he remembered this development coming before ZBA because there were issues with stub points joining into Bendelow. Shumejko said Graham is now where Bendelow used to be up at Auburn Road. Mr. Matich said ideally they would have clipped the corner of the existing subdivision plat and realigned Michelson to give it a better alignment with Connors. Mr. Shumejko said that a traffic circle would have worked well there.

Mr. Schneck said that was what he was getting at. From a design perspective based on the design manuals he has used there is a certain degree of deflection you try to achieve when two roadways meet. He was sure that they understood that normally you want to achieve a 90-degree intersection.

Mr. Matich said if you look at the intersection now in the wintertime, the snowplow operations are actually treating it like two different T-intersections. Chairperson Colling added it was a bad design, but he thought it was done to get as many houses in as they could, verses curving old Bendelow around a bit more and moving Connors further to the west. Mr. Schneck said that understandably a lot of times in traffic and safety you are trying to mitigate issues. You are being more reactive, although you try to be as proactive as possible. He asked if in this particular instance if people continue to slide across the intersection, is there any value for putting guardrail within the right of way? He was not sure if it would be just one more roadside hazard. Mr. Shumejko said that was something they tried to avoid.

Chairperson Colling said the only time they had put in any barricading was when they blocked one street several years ago. Any time you do that you open up a liability issue,

and quite frankly he didn't think that even if they recommended that action that City Council would follow the recommendation.

Mr. Shumejko suggested they see how the stop signs work, and if there still continues to be a problem their second step would be to use Carsonite Reflectors, which are flexible delineators with a reflector on top. They could possibly place them on each side of the driveway to provide reflection when a vehicle's headlights hit them.

Chairperson Colling said he would also like to recommend that when the stop signs are put in to have selective enforcement done, or even zero tolerance enforcement for a while. Sergeant Walker responded they could definitely do that.

Mr. Shumejko added on the southern part of Connors the parcels are still vacant, so people may be driving faster because it is a big, wide-open area. He thought once those homes were constructed it might help slow the speeds.

Mr. Hunter asked if there were enough in escrow to put a speed bump south of Hogan. Mr. Shumejko thought that would be too close to the intersection. Mr. Matich offered that right now people are used to there being no traffic control at the intersection.

Chairperson Colling consulted the aerial photograph and determined which portion of the road was paved and which part was dirt. He suggested something else to consider were rumble strips like those used on a freeway to catch your attention. He felt there was enough room on the road to cut something into the pavement. Mr. Shumejko said that had been tried, he thought at North Fairview Farms. Chairperson Colling said that was a different situation. They had tried it in North Fairview Farms and further down the road as a speed reduction tactic, but in this particular case with a stop sign right there, you can couple it with a "Stop Ahead" sign, although the distance is quite short. In other areas he has seen rumble strips cut into the pavement to let you know there is a stop ahead. Although it may not make a great deal of difference, at least it will get their attention. Mr. Shumejko said they could look into that and consider it. He suggested that they first install the Stop signs and see how it plays out after 90 days. Chairperson Colling said he agreed that step number one should be to put the signage in, and step two would be to let the police officers work some magic for us, and see what the compliance rate is.

Mr. Matich said they usually wait to put the signs up until after approval by City Council, but asked if they wanted to make a motion to put the signs up with a temporary Traffic Control Order right now. Chairperson Colling clarified that if the Board recommended them to do so, they could put up the signs up for 90 days. Mr. Matich said that would give them enough time to take the matter to City Council to make them permanent.

MOTION by Schneck, seconded by Hunter, in the matter of YS-99.1, YS-99.2, and SS-137, the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board **supports** having these TCOs issued, and **recommends** that the City Council approve the TCOs until rescinded or superseded.

Mr. Sneck asked that since the intersection is at a skewed angle, would they add supplemental plaques on the signs saying “four-way stop”? Mr. Matich confirmed they would add “All-Way” plaques.

Chairperson Colling asked if there were any further discussion, and Mr. Matich asked Sergeant Walker how long it would take for them to start doing enforcement after the signs were put up. He inquired whether there is a grace period. Sergeant Walker responded that he would have his traffic guys go out there and give warnings for the first couple weeks. They would keep track of how many warnings were given, and after a certain point they would start issuing tickets.

Chairperson Colling explained the procedure at the City is that there is a time limit for the City Council to act to make the TCO permanent. He suggested that Staff work with Sergeant Walker so they would know if and when the TCO became permanent, so tickets would not backfire on them. Sergeant Walker reiterated he would give them a couple of weeks, and usually just the police presence in the area helps. Chairperson Colling asked how long it took to get a TCO in front of City Council, and Mr. Matich responded that it would usually be four to six weeks. Mr. Shumejko said it is set up now that City Council alternates between scheduling a work session, then the next meeting is a regular meeting. He thought a TCO would go straight to a regular City Council meeting, which are on the second and fourth Wednesdays of the month. Chairperson Colling speculated that if the TCO were recommended for approval tonight, there would be plenty of time to get it before City Council and meet the 90 day deadline.

Mr. Brown commented to Sergeant Walker that when you ask your people to go out and enforce this, his guess was that it is an 11:00 p.m. problem, not an 11:00 a.m. problem. In terms of scheduling police officers out there, he envisioned that it was a 16-year-old-after-a-school-event-out-cruising type of situation. Sergeant Walker assured him they had 24/7 coverage. They would have officers out there at all different hours; during the day, during the afternoon, and some of the midnight cars would go out there as well. He explained they kept a good, extensive record by filling out a traffic sheet with where they were working and how many cars they stopped, how many people came through, and they will run radar and record the speeds. He explained this helps them when people call in and say, “You’re never there.” He added, “You never know when we will show up, because we will show up in the middle of the night, early in the morning while people are just getting up, and during lunch while they are having a sandwich.”

Chairperson Colling said there was a motion and second on the floor, and asked if there were any further discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: Buiteweg

MOTION CARRIED