

Excerpt form the Draft Minutes of the Regular
Advisory Traffic and Safety Board Meeting
June 10, 2008

2008-0276 MARKETPLACE CIRCLE TRAFFIC CONTROLS (Section 30)

Mr. Shumejko summarized the staff report: “A traffic study was recently performed along Marketplace Circle to determine the type of regulatory traffic control warranted, as established by the *Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MMUTCD). This study was initiated after the road had been open to public travel and after adequate development had occurred to allow for an accurate speed count sample.

Marketplace Circle has been designed to be a collector road to accommodate a commercial type land use that serves as a “ring road” for multiple shops and restaurants. Traffic speed counts were obtained to identify the 85th percentile speed. Three counts were taken, the first being at the eastern end of the ring road, Marketplace Circle. Based on that count the 85th percentile speed was 29 mph. A second count was taken at the midpoint of the ring road, where the 85th percentile was 35 mph, and the third count was taken at the western intersection, where the 85th was 33 mph.

Due to the higher volumes of traffic at the eastern intersection because currently that is where the majority of the development stands (the Wal-Mart site and restaurants), we decided to do the 85th on a pro rata basis, based on the vehicle counts with the speed. That analysis came out to be almost 31 mph, so based on this study we are recommending establishing a speed limit of 30 mph for Marketplace Circle. We also recommend that the established speed limit for Marketplace Circle be reassessed in a few years, after all the properties along the road have been fully developed. We should also note that since this road only opened in November of last year, there is no crash data available to date to analyze along this roadway.

Staff requests that the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board support having TCO No. SL-15 issued, and that the ATSB recommend that the City Council approve this TCO until it is rescinded or superseded.”

Mr. Shumejko reminded them that back at the February meeting this road came before the Board for “No Parking” signage. At that point they didn’t want to recommend a speed limit because there were very few businesses open, so they gave it a little more time to do the study.

Chairperson Colling asked if there were any members of the public who wanted to make a comment, and hearing none he closed Public Comment and opened the matter up to discussion by the Board.

Mr. Franklin asked if currently there was construction going on just west of Chili’s on the outside of the ring, or are there businesses planned for that area? Mr. Shumejko responded he believed that it was still undeveloped, but various proposals had come and

gone for that area. He thought at one point they were talking about putting in anywhere from a JC Penney to a Meijer's store, but it was still up in the air. It will be the outside loop in that location that is developed. The inside with the wooded area will remain a preserved wetlands area. The whole outer perimeter will also be developed at some point. Right now we just have the area along Adams with the Wal-Mart and Chili's.

Mr. Franklin moved that TCO SL-15 be approved with the provision that within six months of any development opening a traffic study be redone to reevaluate.

Mr. Shumejko asked if he wanted the study to be done within six months, or once the property is fully developed. Mr. Franklin clarified that he meant six months after it is developed.

Chairperson Colling asked if there were any further discussion on the matter. Mr. Cardimen asked if the businesses along the ring road had given input on this, and if they had any concerns or issues. Mr. Shumejko said they had not contacted them, and had not heard any opinions either way from them.

Mr. Webber said he had been over in that area recently, and told Mr. Shumejko he knew there were the No Parking signs that were approved in February, but asked if there were other signs there, such as Stop signs. Mr. Shumejko said there were Stop signs leaving the approaches, such as at Wal-Mart, and there should be a stop sign as you go from the ring road to Adams Road at both legs. Mr. Webber said he was asking about signs in the actual complex, and Mr. Shumejko responded that there were not. He thought that some of the signs might say "No Parking" and also "Fire Lane."

Mr. Webber thought there were other fully developed spots in the City with much lower speed limits, such as 10 to 15 mph. Mr. Shumejko said as far as public roads, Barclay Circle's speed limit was 35, and Hampton Boulevard, which is more residential, is 25. He explained that a public street couldn't be posted with a speed limit less than 25 mph.

Chairperson Colling said he might agree with a lower speed if the businesses were right along the roadway, but the businesses are going to sit back, and this is abutting a parking lot. He had a concern which he didn't feel was likely, but at some point we might see crosswalks for pedestrian traffic. In that case we will have to revisit this speed limit and develop some type of control, because what he wanted to avoid in this area is the problem we have at the Target shopping center on Rochester Road. When you have a high concentration of stores with a ring road in front of the stores, people step off the curb at any point in front of cars. It's an accident looking for a place to happen. If we get any type of pedestrian walkway there he would want it signalized with a pedestrian control.

Mr. Webber thought that made sense, and said he was not questioning Mr. Shumejko's expertise, but was just asking the question.

Mr. Shumejko projected an aerial photograph of the site and explained that regarding pedestrians, when built out the proposal for the development showed an eight-foot wide

pathway along Adams, and a five-foot concrete sidewalk around the entire outer perimeter. He indicated where a five-foot wide sidewalk would run along the frontage. He said there would be no sidewalks in the wetland area in the interior, and pointed out future crossing points. He said they did not anticipate any mid-block crossings at this time.

Chairperson Colling said because of the nature of the roadway, if that does occur he did not want an uncontrolled pedestrian crosswalk where people just step out in front of cars. What he wanted was a pedestrian signal, with a "Walk/Don't Walk" control, and the cars stop for pedestrians. He advised that this is not an interior parking lot; pedestrians are actually crossing a roadway. He felt it would be much safer to approach it from that standpoint. He requested that in their engineering for this that they plan for that eventuality, because he had the feeling that with the gas prices they would see more pedestrians and bicyclists crossing the road.

Mr. Webber felt that made a lot of sense. As they saw at the Village of Rochester Hills, often on a Saturday or Sunday you park your car and walk a lot further in that complex than you really want to, instead of moving your car. He could see the same thing happening here as more stores open up.

Chairperson Colling asked Mr. Franklin if he would agree to amend his motion to add his suggestion about the pedestrian signal, and he responded that he would do so. Chairperson Colling asked if there were any further discussion, or if someone would like to second the motion.

Mr. Hunter seconded the motion.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: Thomas Blackstone

Allan Schneck

The motion carried.