

DRAFT MINUTES
Advisory Traffic and Safety Board
October 11, 2005

2005-0659 Rochdale Drive Traffic Study

Chairperson Colling said the next item was the Rochdale Parking Study. Mr. Shumejko read from the Summary. On July 8, 2005, the City received a Traffic Information Survey request to investigate the need for "No Standing, Stopping, Parking" signage along Rochdale from Walton Boulevard to Oakstone Drive. The concern is due to vehicles crossing over the double yellow pavement markings when there are cars parked along the street obstructing the motoring vehicles' path.

City Staff performed random site visits to catalog vehicles parked along Rochdale. The following is a summary of the findings. The parking observation study was performed from August 25 through September 30th of 2005. We did eight random site visits, and of those there were five instances where cars were parked within the roadway obstructing vehicles.

Based upon the data presented above, the primary area of conflict is along the east side of Rochdale from Valley Circle to Oakstone Drive. When heading north on Rochdale drivers must cross the double yellow line to avoid vehicles parked along the street (see the attached photos). Also, limited sight distance exists due to the curvature of the road.

After reviewing the field conditions, Staff feels that the "No Stopping, Standing or Parking" signs are warranted to reduce the traffic conflicts that parked vehicles pose to the motoring public. Rochdale is classified as a City Major Road and striped from the nose of the median island near the shopping plaza north to Oakstone Drive.

Chairperson Colling asked if there were problems with the same thing when they were building Livernois and used Rochdale as a detour. Mr. Shumejko and Mr. Matich said they were still receiving cut through complaints from valley Stream. Mr. Brown said he goes into that sub frequently, and drivers coming out of the shopping center with the Whole Foods Market go out on Rochdale to get to Livernois rather than using Walton.

Chairperson Colling said he didn't blame them, and one night he sat and watched traffic at that location for about four hours. He never saw a speeding problem, the drivers were courteous, but people don't want them in their sub. As long as there is an entrance to a shopping center from a public road he didn't feel it was cut through traffic, but is a legal way to go.

Mr. Brown agreed it was legal, but said he had seen cars parked in the area in question and seen drivers having to swerve around them. Mr. Shumejko: said it probably should have been signed back when the striping was originally put in, because it is a major road with centerline striping

Chairperson Colling said it reminded him of Cumberland Road, which is a wide roadway that can park cars and still allow free passage, but he didn't think Rochdale was as wide. Mr. Shumejko said that was the problem. Mr. Duistermars asked if there was more traffic on that road because of the elementary school and the parent/bus drop off. Mr. Shumejko said he thought the bus drop off is down Rochdale off Oakrock, and the parent drop off is down Allston. It was separated into two loops when construction was done. He said they had received complaints about the buses speeding through the subdivision.

Chairperson Colling said that the red Aspire that kept showing up in the report's photographs must belong to a resident, and wondered why the car would be parked on the street. He said there was a concern with vehicles crossing the yellow line. He asked if any other residents were voicing complaints, or if they had talked with the residents along the roadway. He asked if they had been notified that this issue was coming before the Board this evening.

Mr. Matich responded that they had sent out letters to eleven residents who fronted Rochdale, and the private condominium to the right, Valley Stream Circle.

Mr. Shumejko said that in their field survey they noted that when a vehicle was parked in the street, often times the parking spaces in the driveway were empty. After the residents noted staff coming out, they began parking in their driveways.

Mr. Moore asked why the double yellow line was there, as the road did not change width. Mr. Matich said it was because they went through a functional classification change from a local road to a major street with State Highway. In order for the City to meet the funding requirements it had to be shown as a major road, and the striping was one of the requirements. When Rochdale was rebuilt and the bridge replaced, the money came from the Major Road Fund. Mr. Matich said the traffic volume on Rochdale was 3,000 cars a day, which then split off into the two local streets, Oakstone and Greenleaf.

Mr. Moore said after Oakstone you would be allowed to park on the street, and though there was not a double yellow line, it would be the same thing with vehicles having to go around the parked cars. He asked Mr. Brown if he had seen cars parked there, who replied that he had. Mr. Brown said this stretch is a through street, and once past that point there is less traffic. There it is more of a subdivision street with people parking on the street. He stated from his own observations he thought the recommendation made perfect sense.

Mr. Zendel said he had driven Rochdale the day before, and the red Aspire was parked on the roadway again. He said the tree as shown in the photograph blocked the view of traffic coming around the curve, you are also going up hill, and you have to cross the double yellow line to get around the parked cars. He questioned why they would post no parking signs south of Valley Circle as there are no homes along there, so there is no reason for anyone to park there. The study showed that the problem was with lot 402, and he thought it would be a waste.

Chairperson Colling said the reason they would do it that way is that there is a distinct possibility that people would park there instead of going into the parking lot for the stores. He said he had seen it done, and thought the recommendation made sense.

Mr. Shumejko said they would put the no parking signs further apart in the corridor that wasn't residential, 500 feet rather than the 300 feet spacing that is typical. Mr. Matich said they were talking about putting in ten signs, five on each side.

Mr. Zendel thought in this case they only needed to be concerned with no parking north of Valley Circle. Mr. Shumejko said the recommendation followed their standard of signing striped roadways no parking. He said they could issue a TCO to cover the area, and install the signs if parking became a problem. Chairperson Colling thought there must be more to the problem than a couple of people parking in the street. He suspected if they signed south of Oakstone to Walton they would still get complaints from further up, and thought they should make it the whole length. Mr. Shumejko said there was a proposed detached condominium development with 15 units coming in on the west side.

Chairperson Colling asked if anyone would like to continue the discussion, or would like to make a motion.

A motion to approve PK-86 was made by Hunter.

Second by Brown

Hearing no further discussion, Chairperson Colling called for a roll call vote.

Ayes: Moore, Hunter, Colling, Brown, Blackstone

Nays: Zendel