

acceptable for them to get a free pass if they already had been given several Extensions. She wondered how many properties would be required to make major revisions due to changes in the Ordinance.

Mr. Anzek responded that it would be difficult to answer without looking more extensively at the plans, but he felt that about 50% would have changes. A Final Preliminary Plat had to be consistent with the Preliminary, and there could be changes from one to the other. He related that after several Extensions, some projects did fall off. Staff contacted applicants prior to a project expiring and asked them to submit a letter requesting an Extension; however, there were some they could not find. He recalled Saddlebrook Orchards, a ten-unit project off of Auburn, and said that Staff could not contact them at all, and that the plan had expired.

Ms. Brnabic did not think they had to be concerned with developments like those because they took care of themselves. There were enough applicants going on several Extensions, and she did not think they should get a free pass. She thought the policy should apply, and noted that the Planning Commission had been fairly lenient. They understood the economic turmoil and the situations of the applicants, and they looked at the requests logically, but she thought too many requests warranted enforcing the policy.

Mr. Anzek said that the policy could state that anything approved after July 1, 2007 would be entitled to one free pass. They would have had one Extension, but not the second. That would give it a point in time. He maintained that the policy would give Staff the authority to state that the Planning Commission had a policy that had to be adhered to before a plan could be brought forward. Ms. Brnabic and Mr. Hooper agreed.

Mr. Delacourt said that because City Council also had a say in plats and site condos, they would probably ask both boards to recommend and adopt the policy. Staff would draft something up with the appropriate date, and he would talk with Mr. Staran, the City Attorney about the process.

Chairperson Boswell asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, he moved to the next Agenda item.

This matter was Discussed

2009-0234

Street Lighting

(Reference: Memo prepared by Ed Anzek, dated June 12, 2009 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the discussion was Paul Shumejko, the City's Transportation Engineer.

Mr. Anzek recalled that during a CIP discussion, Mr. Hooper brought up the need to have a street lighting policy for the City. It was his opinion that the Planning Commission would be the best body to put something together to forward to City Council. They would be utilized because the Commission dealt with the aesthetics and architectural guidelines for the community. The Commission could decide appropriate lighting levels and the appropriate look. He advised that Mr. Paul Davis, the City Engineer, had requested to get on the June 29th City Council agenda to get approval for a street lighting plan for the roundabout at Hamlin and Livernois. Staff would like to get input from the Planning Commission, but he did not think they were in a position to adopt a policy at the meeting because there was further information to gather. The fundamental key was safety, and they had to generate something that incorporated that for the rights-of-way.

Mr. Shumejko noted that Engineering had worked on street lighting several years ago. In 2005, Staff, through the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board, initiated a discussion on a street lighting policy. They received many requests to install street lighting from subdivision associations, usually for a crosswalk or school bus stop. The subs that had an association were a lot more successful at pursuing that because they had funding available. The challenges Staff faced was for older areas where subdivisions did not have associations. He gave Jungel Orchards as an example. They wanted a light by Hamlin Elementary, and he felt it was probably a worthy cause to have one there, but the City did not have a policy or funding mechanism. The Traffic Board and former AIS Committee worked on it and developed a policy in 2006. One avenue for funding could be Metro Act dollars, and they thought they could set aside \$10-15,000.00 annually, if something met the criteria. The Crooks Boulevard project was getting underway, and they talked about boulevards on a larger scale, because mass corridors were the other component of the street lighting policy. Council deferred the decision at that time, and Staff put a project in the CIP last year for the illumination of boulevards.

Mr. Shumejko brought up the new Hamlin Road Boulevard between Crooks and Livernois. One of the components of that was the roundabout at Livernois. They had been working with Detroit Edison for the past five or six months, trying to come up with a decorative-style pole to use as an

alternate to the traditional overhead light. They also worked with the Road Commission, since they had a say in their intersection, about the illumination of the roundabout. There was not a set standard in place, but there were several guidelines. They had incorporated some of the guidelines and came up with a design. He showed an example of the pole they were looking at, which was a square, black, fluted pole. The pole would be used at the approach of each leg of the roundabout. The lighting would start about 400 feet from the center of the roundabout. The average footcandle would be 2.3, and they wanted to create uniformity.

Mr. Anzek noted that the employee parking lot for City Hall was 2.0 footcandles. The visitor's lot was a little brighter, and he wanted to give them an idea for that range.

Mr. Schumejko advised that the parking lot had white lights, but they would use high-pressure sodium for the roundabout, which produced a softer yellow. They proposed a 250-watt illumination. There would be 15 poles for the roundabout; six duals and nine singles. The duals would be in Hamlin Rd. to the west and one in each of the splitter islands. The single poles would be alternating, three at each leg. It would cover the entire exiting and entering lanes of the roundabout. Detroit Edison first came up with a plan that showed 24 lights, and the City minimized that on each approach leg. The height of the pole was 22 feet for the fluted part; the curbed area was another four feet, and the bottom of the lens would be about 22 feet high from the top of the pavement. He showed prismatic lenses, which helped keep the light cascading down and the sky pollution lower. Another key was the pedestrian crossings, and they needed the illumination to provide lighting in front and back, so there was not a shadow effect. That was a big issue for the Road Commission. They also took into consideration where the location of the crossing for pedestrians would be if the signal was in effect as part of ADA requirements for roundabouts. They did an analysis regarding shifting the crossing and providing the proper lighting for the crosswalk.

Mr. Yukon asked what would effect an ADA requirement. Mr. Shumejko said that the Road Commission's roundabout at Maple and Drake was the subject of a lawsuit. The roundabout there did not comply with ADA standards for pedestrians. Based upon that, the Road Commission agreed to install the hawk signal for pedestrians. The light would stay dark until the button was pushed. It would then go into a flashing mode and then red. Vehicles entering would stop, and the pedestrian would go on the island, push another button at a crosswalk further away from the center of the roundabout and then cross. They would also use a strobe

light where the button was pushed. It was not a traditional yellow and red signal - it would flash. They were going to do a three-year study for that and provide a recommendation, because it would be one of the first of its kind for roundabouts in the country. The results would be provided to the Federal Highway Association, and a recommendation might come out of it to utilize it or do something completely different. They were taking into consideration that if the splitter island had to be widened at some point, that they would be able to accommodate it. It would only apply to dual-lane roundabouts. They would not have to retrofit the Tienken and Sheldon and Tienken and Washington roundabouts, because they were single-lane roundabouts. It would only apply to roundabouts of two or more lanes.

Mr. Shumejko pointed out the slotted grooves on the pole, which would allow the City to add clips and hang banners or street signs. They could utilize yield signs or "keep right" signs on the poles in the splitter islands. They could have an outlet inside a pole so DPS could plug directly into one. The estimated cost to incorporate them into the project would be about \$107,000.00. If they used the standard cobra lights, which would require 26 lights, the cost would be \$62,000.00, so the decorative lights would cost about \$45,000.00 more. As he mentioned, Staff had been working with Detroit Edison for a while because a street lighting policy was on the table for the entire City, and he wanted to get feedback for the proposed roundabout lighting. They were ready to jump on it because it would have to be installed by November. The roundabout would not be able to be open to traffic without the street lighting in place. Mr. Anzek asked about LED lighting.

Mr. Shumejko indicated that there had been a host of issues with it. One was that to get an equivalent illumination at the pavement surface, it would take more LED lighting. LED loses about 30% of its brightness from the light to the pavement, and they would have to trade to a higher wattage LED to have an equivalent to what he was proposing. There were also three different components to an LED light and three different manufacturers. The warranty part was difficult, and there were also some issues with heat. The pole spacing for LED was every 30 feet. In a parking lot, that would be one for every three spaces. Detroit Edison was working on it, but the technology was not there yet. He indicated that in the future, the lights could be retrofitted with LED bulbs.

Mr. Shumejko advised that they paid an annual fee for service contracts with Detroit Edison. It was for energy usage and a little was for future maintenance. He explained that the poles would all be break away, and if

one was hit by a vehicle, Detroit Edison would replace it as part of the contract. It would not be an additional cost. At first, the Road Commission was hesitant to allow the City to put the poles within the splitter islands, but by putting them there, it really helped make it look more aesthetic and also reduced the number of poles.

Mr. Anzek asked if the lights would be paid for by the City but owned by the Road Commission. Mr. Shumejko stated that the Road Commission did not own, operate or maintain streetlights. Mr. Anzek asked if there were other communities that had the same style of lighting. Mr. Shumejko believed that there was similar lighting in Farmington Hills on a roundabout, which were kind of hybrids. They took a standard, steel pole, painted it black and retrofitted it for a decorative top. Detroit Edison was trying to make the pole he showed a standard, to reduce costs and have uniformity.

Mr. Anzek referred to the light poles Troy put in the Crooks Boulevard, which he thought were about 40 feet high. He asked Mr. Shumejko if the lights were high-pressure sodium or mercury vapor. Mr. Schroeder agreed the poles were high, but he did not recall the exact height. He said they were not reused, but were part of the contract. Mr. Shumejko believed they were high-pressure sodium. Mr. Anzek asked if the City started with that style, if they would stay with it as they lit other boulevards. He wondered if the Planning Commissioners could weigh in on the lights as to whether they were appropriate, but he felt it would be hard to make a choice without having a few more in front of them.

Mr. Hooper thanked Mr. Shumejko for bringing the example to the Planning Commission. His goal was to have an overall policy that encompassed the draft policy done in conjunction with the Advisory Traffic and Safety Board for citizen requested lighting, as well as a citywide policy for street lighting. He did not feel they should deal with private lighting, which was an architect's purview for choosing lighting on private property. They should, however, set a standard for public lighting. He suggested that Detroit Edison had a variety of choices, and he asked Mr. Shumejko if the Engineering Department had decided upon the one he brought forward.

Mr. Shumejko explained that the one they were considering provided a decorative look, and also minimized the number of poles needed. He showed examples of others. The subject pole was 22 feet high to the bottom of the lens. If that were dropped, the spacing would have to be reduced and more poles would be required. Mr. Hooper noted that pole

height had been the topic of debate when applicants came before the Commission. He asked the final date Engineering needed a decision from Council to get the ball rolling on lighting the intersection.

Mr. Shumejko felt that the latest would be mid-July. He noted that the lights were already 80% Federally-funded. Mr. Hooper reiterated that he definitely wanted to have a policy, and he had believed they would have plenty of time to develop it. However, the separate issue of lighting the roundabout was driving a decision. The recommendation made to City Council could be the one that was used throughout the City as a guideline, and he did not feel that they could make a decision that evening based on one example. He said that was the unfortunate thing; the Planning Commission would not meet again until the third week in July. Council was meeting June 22 and June 29 and not again until the middle of July, which would be the date for a decision. He said he would like to get a recommendation from Planning Commission, rather than having to decide between various options at the Council level. He agreed that the Commission would be the appropriate body to make a recommendation.

Mr. Shumejko said that they had a lot of documentation, and there was a lot of options for lighting, but the roundabout was unique. Typical boulevard requirements were not as stringent as those for a roundabout because of the traffic patterns through it. Mr. Hooper observed that it was interesting that the Road Commission did not own, operate or pay for the lights, yet they required them for intersections.

Mr. Shumejko advised that Act 51 dollars did not allow for street lighting, and the Road Commission viewed it as the community's request for a roundabout. Mr. Hooper thought that a standard intersection also had to be lit, but Mr. Shumejko did not believe so. Mr. Hooper clarified that a signalized intersection could be dark, but because it was a roundabout, it had to be lit.

Mr. Anzek suggested that if there was an opportunity, the Planning Commission could meet in several weeks for a special meeting to review more information. There was a safety and aesthetic issue, and they needed a little more time to look at this issue. He felt it was important, and if they had a majority support for a specific style, it would carry more weight with City Council. Mr. Hooper thought it would be best if Planning Commission looked at alternatives and decided the height, illumination, patterns and long-term view of what the City should look like and make a recommendation. That would eliminate 90% of the discussion and

potential subjectivity. He strongly encouraged the recommendation of Planning Commission to City Council for lighting the roundabout, which he felt was a critical decision.

Chairperson Boswell agreed that they could have a special meeting, but he wondered how long it would take Engineering to bring forward options and information and to write something up. Mr. Anzek suggested July 7 would give Staff three weeks to get the information together. Mr. Anzek thought that they could look at different fixtures for lumens and coverage, and that they could be designed with different wattages to cover more of a spread. The Planning Commission had worked hard to make sure there was not spillage out onto the residential areas. They needed to have a consistent lighting policy, and he suggested that they could meet with DTE to work some things out. He also suggested that several Planning Commission members might attend the meeting.

Mr. Shumejko informed that every revision DTE did had to be submitted to the Road Commission. Mr. Hooper assumed that whatever DTE had would readily flow through the Road Commission. Mr. Shumejko agreed, for the most part. He thought they had gotten past some of the bigger hurdles by putting them in the splitter islands. They did not want to go higher than a 250-watt light. Mr. Hooper noted that private development could not have more than a zero footcandle at a residential property line, and he thought they would be violating that with the proposed lighting. He was not saying that was a bad idea, but he wanted a discussion about it so that it was understood.

Mr. Anzek asked if Mr. Reece and Mr. Dettloff would be available for a daytime meeting with DTE prior to the special meeting. They had to decide what they were looking for - if it was an historic look and/or something timeless and tasteful. That would become an aesthetic judgment, and they needed to hear from the Planning Commission whether the style Mr. Shumejko showed appealed to them. Mr. Shumejko said they discussed with DTE the possibility of adding cutoff lenses, but that changed the spacing and increased the cost quite a bit.

Mr. Dettloff asked if there were any lights like it in the City currently, noting that he could not recall any. Mr. Shumejko said that there were some decorative lights in subdivisions, but they were the acorn style, which were bright. Mr. Dettloff asked if the lights were similar to those in downtown Rochester. Mr. Anzek agreed they were. Mr. Anzek asked if there were options the Commission had not seen, and Mr. Shumejko said there might be others, but he only had what DTE provided.

Mr. Hooper said he would not be opposed if their sister city had something they could carry on with. Mr. Reece also thought that they could look at adjoining communities to make sure thought was put into having some uniformity. Mr. Shumejko said that the poles in Troy on Crooks were private and not through Edison. Mr. Reece asked why the City was going with Edison versus using a private company.

Mr. Shumejko explained that the City wanted to have a uniform provider of streetlights. There was fear that a private company could go out of business. There was more reassurance that Edison would be in business, and that the streetlights would be maintained. Mr. Reece wondered what cost penalty there was by going with Edison versus private. Mr. Shumejko said that Edison had a very good program. With residential lighting, the City paid a fixed cost every year and if anything was damaged, it was included. Rookery Woods did street lighting several years ago and they chose another company. They set up an agreement with the City that said if, for some reason, they stopped paying for electricity or if they did not want to use them anymore, the City would have the right to special assess the homeowners for the removal. Although the electricity costs were a little less, if something got damaged, they would have to pay \$2,500 to \$3000 to have someone reset a light.

Mr. Anzek brought up Christian Hills, and recalled that they had contracted with DTE, but they went through the City for an annual assessment, and the association got billed to maintain the streetlights. Their private party was DTE. Mr. Shumejko advised that the City paid DTE and the association reimbursed the City. He stated that the way Christian Hills did it was the way it should be. They were assessed, and the City got revenue. A lot of other subdivisions were supposed to reimburse the City on a quarterly basis, but a lot of times they were delinquent. He thought it would be ideal if everything went through special tax assessments.

Mr. Dettloff asked if that was put into the policy developed with the AIS committee. Mr. Shumejko said it was discussed. Mr. Anzek thought that should definitely be in the policy, as something preferred by the City for subdivisions. The question before them, however, was a policy for the major arterials, which they had to get together quickly. Mr. Reece added that he was talking about the competitive part; bidding it out to contractors versus paying Edison for the fixtures and for installing them. He did not think Edison would be cheaper than a private contractor. He understood the ramifications regarding insurance and so forth. He thought the City

could control uniformity, regardless.

Mr. Shumejko noted a situation on Hamlin in a tech park. There were eight streetlights and some went out. The City contacted Edison to get them back on, but for whatever reason, they were never built to Edison specs, so now they had a separate agreement with them and every year they had to renew the service contract. With private companies, there was a risk of separate agreements.

Chairperson Boswell said that Mr. Hooper had talked about having a comprehensive plan before City Council. He asked if they should do the City streets first, however, if they had to make a decision quickly.

Mr. Hooper said that the only thing they needed right now was what type of lighting the Planning Commission would recommend for citywide public lighting. The policy would come later. Chairperson Boswell clarified that Mr. Hooper did not want the overall policy yet, just the style of lighting for major roads. Mr. Hooper agreed, and said style, height, lumens, supporting documentation in a resolution from Planning Commission. He thought that a policy would be a year-long project, and he said there was a list of things he would like to see in it. It would take a number of meetings to develop a comprehensive, overall policy.

Mr. Delacourt indicated that he liked the idea of a fluted pole, especially for the reduction in signage. In looking at what DTE offered, he wondered if they would be able to mix and match the pole with different heads, or if they were a single component. Mr. Shumejko said that the pole he brought was a standalone, and they could attach variable tops.

Mr. Schroeder stated that lighting should be included in every State contract because they paid 80%. His experience with Edison was that they were very expensive and very unreliable. Street lighting was at the bottom of their priority list, and a city could wait for years to get something taken care of. Regarding the type of pole, he emphasized that they should pick a manufacturer that would stay in business, and they should not get anything exotic, because even if it was a standard manufacturer, they might not make something in the next few years or keep it in stock. They could have a pole down for a long time before it got replaced, and perhaps the City would have to put up a different pole if it became critical. He suggested that there should be posts on the top and bottom for the banners, so they did not wave. He also advised that manufacturers changed colors every few years, and they could end up with posts that did not match. Mr. Shumejko thought that was why DTE recommended

black. They were also trying to make it their standardized pole for all the reasons mentioned. Mr. Schroeder also suggested that electrical should be part of the State contract, and then they could hire a private contractor to do the maintenance. It would be much more reliable and much less costly than dealing with Edison. He said that the Road Commission had one standard color, and if the City wanted something to match, the traffic signal posts could always be different. The City of Troy paid for them on Big Beaver and when one got knocked down, the Road Commission put up their standard post and the City had to pay for the removal of that post and put in the one they originally had. He again stressed that they needed to get a standard, reliable manufacturer with a standard, in-stock item, and that they should not get too exotic.

Ms. Brnabic agreed with Mr. Anzek, and said she did not think she could make a choice from what they were shown. She wanted to confirm whether they would have a special meeting.

Chairperson Boswell summarized that they were going to have a special meeting on July 7, and that anyone that was available during the day was invited to meet with DTE when that meeting was scheduled prior to July 7. As long as there was 18 hours to notify the public that there might be a quorum, they had the opportunity to meet with DTE, and look over what they had to offer.

Mr. Schroeder said that they would never convince a resident about light spillage, no matter how many meters, if they could see it. He stated that it was a losing battle to try to convince residents that light did not spill over.

Mr. Anzek recapped that the task before them was to schedule a meeting with DTE in the next week or so and discuss everything. Mr. Hooper advised that if the Commission came up with a recommendation on July 7, he would put it on Council's July 13 meeting. Mr. Shumejko added that they would have the design engineer and a salesman from DTE at the meeting, noting that they had done a lot of roundabouts. Mr. Anzek reminded that cost was not too strong of a consideration for the Planning Commission, but they did not want to send something to Council that was cost-prohibitive, either.

Mr. Shumejko indicated that whatever was chosen for the roundabout would probably apply to the two Tienken roundabouts. The City had been getting a lot of requests from Hart Middle School about the illumination at the crosswalks there. When those roundabouts were built, there was no street lighting planned at all. They put one at each corner, but they did

not have any design guidelines. Based on their discussions, they would like to upgrade that one, as well.

Mr. Anzek asked Mr. Delacourt if the Historic Districts Commission would have to approve the lighting for the roundabout at Tienken and Runyon. Mr. Delacourt said he would check with the City Attorney, but he thought that anything within the contiguous boundaries was usually approvable by that body. Mr. Shumejko reminded that the Washington roundabout was in the City of Rochester.

Chairperson Boswell asked Mr. Hooper if they had covered everything to be included in the recommendation. Mr. Hooper reiterated that they should include style, height, lumens and spacing. Chairperson Boswell thanked Mr. Shumejko for coming, and reaffirmed that they would see him shortly at the meeting with DTE.

This matter was Discussed

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Anzek gave a brief update on the status of car dealership closings and repositionings in the City.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The Chair reminded the Commissioners that the next Special Meeting was scheduled for July 7, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business to come before the Commission and upon motion by Yukon, the Chair adjourned the Regular Meeting at 10:00 p.m., Michigan time.

William F. Boswell, Chairperson
Rochester Hills Planning Commission

Maureen Gentry, Recording Secretary