



Rochester Hills Master Report

1000 Rochester Hills
Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
(248) 656-4660
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

File Number: 2004-0924

File Number: 2004-0924	File Type: Roads	Status: Consent Agenda
Version: 1	Reference:	Controlling Body: City Council
Requester:	Cost:	Introduced: 10/29/2004
File Name: PK-83 "No Parking Signs		Final Action:

Title: Traffic Control Order PK-83 - Hampton Office Park Subdivision No. 2, Section #26: No-Parking within the right-of-way of north side of Hampton Circle from Barclay Circle (at their south intersection) to a point Twelve Hundred Fifty (1,250) feet easterly thereof.

Notes:

Code Sections:

Agenda Date:

Indexes:

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Agenda Summary.pdf, Traffic Control Order.pdf, Map.pdf, Minutes 030904 ATSB.pdf, DPS Summary.pdf

Enactment Number:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Advisory Traffic and Safety Board	11/09/2004	Recommended for Approval	City Council			Pass
	Verbose Action:	Traffic Control No-Parking within the right-of-way of north side of Hampton Circle from Barclay Circle (at their south intersection) to a point Twelve Hundred Fifty (1,250) feet easterly thereof.					
	Notes:	<p><i>Mr. Match explained that on Tuesday, March 9, 2004 the Traffic and Safety Advisory Board approved a TCO for extending the restriction of parking within Hampton Circle east of Barclay Circle in regard to the medical facility that was having overflow parking onto Hampton Circle. At that time a gap of 120 feet east of their driveway access onto Hampton Circle was reserved for about five parking spaces for that facility. Recently the City reconstructed Hampton Circle. New pavement was put down with new striping, and a continuous center left-hand turn lane was provided through Hampton Circle all the way back to Barclay Circle. Since that work has been done it doesn't leave room for the 120' gap where parking was allowed previously. He said that the City was now recommending that the 120' of parking be removed, and parking prohibited on the north side of Hampton Circle from Barclay to 950' easterly.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Colling asked if traffic counts were requested the last time this was before the Board. Mr. Match said although the information was not provided in the packet, a traffic study was done on March 17, 1993. At that time there were 2,500 vehicles using Hampton Circle east of Barclay Circle. Another count was done November 1, 2004, and the count was now 2,936, or about a 20% increase in traffic in the period of a year. Mr. Match speculated that the new courthouse and sheriff's building could be contributing to an increase in traffic.</i></p> <p><i>Mr. Colling clarified the recommendation was made to take the parking off the 120' strip because there is not enough room for parking, which Mr. Match agreed was correct. He referenced photographs he had brought for the Board showing potential conflicts due to the cars parked in the area in question,</i></p>					

and the lack of width available for parking after the new pavement striping.

Mr. Brown commented that since he had been on the Traffic Board they had dealt with this issue three or four times. He was sure that after parking was removed from that 120' representatives from the medical facility would be present at a meeting in the near future to talk to the Board. However it was his recollection that at the meeting in March the recommendation was made to leave that 120' for parking, but they warned the representative that it was a temporary situation pending the restriping of the road. He asked if other members remembered this issue the same way.

Mr. Colling agreed, but said that they did ask for further studies and traffic counts. The parking was left temporarily to allow the business owner a chance to look for other parking options, but he added that the pictures that had been shown didn't leave the Board with much choice.

Mr. Moore asked since the restriping was done, how many vehicles have been using the 120'? Mr. Match responded that he had reports that one or two vehicles that were familiar with the area were parking there, perhaps not noticing the sign change.

Mr. Moore commented that there are other places in the City that have the same problem with road width, but parking is still allowed there. He asked why parking is being restricted in this case.

Mr. Matich explained there were five or six doctors in the business, creating a lot of trip turnovers. The employees were parking in the street, reserving the parking lot for use by the patients. There was a facility further down the road where the employees could park. They had made accommodations and agreements with the Golf Course. Mr. Moore said it appeared from the information included in the packet that the arrangement was not going very well.

Mr. Matich said this was a different scenario from other examples in the City with narrow road widths as had been mentioned. He explained that the reason Hampton Circle was striped with a center left-hand turn lane was because it carried more traffic, giving it a higher designation than local road status. He said it was operating as a local collector street, which feeds to arterial streets.

Mr. Moore felt the doctors in this business could come back to the Board and cite similar intersections. Mr. Colling said it was similar to locations in Tan Industrial Park where it got to the point that parking on the streets was a hazard. Tan Industrial Park is off of Crooks Road south of M-59, and includes Webasto, Henry Ford Health Care Computer Systems, and other businesses. They had to sign most of the industrial park "No Parking" even though these are wide boulevard-like concrete roadways, because it got to the point they were parking on both sides of the road and emergency vehicles could not get through. It was an accident hazard, and he can see the same situation here. He stated there are precedents for doing taking this action.

Mr. Matich said that they look at each situation individually, to see if there are conflicts that can be corrected by putting in "No Parking" signs, and to determine if the signs will make it safer. He added that this matter was brought about by complaints from homeowners in the Barclay Condominiums.

Mr. Colling added that in driving it himself he felt that with the addition of the center turn lane there is a safety hazard for pedestrians with people parking and opening up their car doors to get in and out.

Ms. Raschke offered that the building has exceeded its usage. In the beginning it was only used by one or two doctors, but now there are five doctors with their practices. They have exceeded the parking available for the building, and perhaps they need to look for a larger place. She added that she travels the road, and the pictures presented are very real.

Mr. Hunter agreed, and considered other parking options for the business. He wondered if they could use the parking at the courthouse across the road, and if crosswalks could be added.

Mr. Matich said there was a cross walk on the south side of Barclay, and also on Hampton Circle at the intersection. He said there was a possibility that the intersection could have a flashing amber and red signal in the future, once it meets traffic warrants.

Mr. Buiteweg said he distinctly remembered the meeting at which this temporary parking was allowed. He felt the burden to find a solution for their parking problems should not be on the Board, and wanted to make a motion to approve the matter.

xxxx

Mr. Brown said he wished to make a comment in support of Mr. Buiteweg's statement. They had met with representatives from the medical office on at least two if not three occasions. They had given

them reasonable suggestions, and he felt it was time they worked the situation out. He didn't feel it was the Board's place to suggest their employees park across the street or down the block. They outgrew their facility very rapidly, which shows they are doing well, and should devise how to handle their parking.

Mr. Colling said he also serves on the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and would like to take a page from the ZBA handbook by saying that it is not up to this Board, or any other board in the City, to find a solution for a business. It is the Board's responsibility to look out for the general welfare, health, and safety of the people in the Community. As much as he understands their need as a business, the Board can offer some suggestions, but it is not up to them to find a solution. That would shift the burden to the City, which does not have enough funds to handle that role, nor to take the responsibility or liability to do so. This has been set as a precedent within the City, and is a matter of public record.

Aye: Brown, Buiteweg, Colling, Hunter, Moore, Zendel, Blackstone and Raschke

Text of Legislative File 2004-0924

..title

Traffic Control Order PK-83 - Hampton Office Park Subdivision No. 2, Section #26: No-Parking within the right-of-way of north side of Hampton Circle from Barclay Circle (at their south intersection) to a point Twelve Hundred Fifty (1,250) feet easterly thereof.

..body

Whereas, Traffic Control Order No.PK-83 has been issued by the Acting City Traffic Engineer under the provisions of Chapter 98 of the Rochester Hills Code of Ordinances, Michigan Vehicle Code, MCL 257.1 et seq.; and

Whereas, said Traffic Control Order covers:

PK-83.1 No Parking withing the right-of-way of north side of Hampton Circle from Barclay Circle (at their south intersection to a point Twelve Hundred Fifty (1,250) feet easterly thereof.

Whereas, said Traffic Control Order shall not be effective after the expiration of ninety (90) days from the date of issuance, except upon approval by this Council; and

Whereas, the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board has considered the issues pertaining to the Traffic Control Order and recommends that the Order be approved;

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council approves the issuance of Traffic Control Order No. PK-83 to be in effect until rescinded or superseded by subsequent order; and

Be It Further Resolved, that a certified copy of this Resolution be filed together with the Traffic Control Order, with the City Clerk of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan.