

Chairperson Michael Melville called the Traffic Committee meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in Room 315 of the Royal Oak City Hall on Tuesday, November 24, 2009.

---

**ITEM 1      ROLL CALL**

PRESENT:    Michael Melville, Chairperson  
              Dan Godek, Vice Chairperson  
              Dana Goldberg  
              Richard Hahn  
              Alexander Rucinski  
              Todd Scott

ABSENT:     Andrew Androff  
              Arthur Makarewicz, Alternate

Also present: Elden Danielson, City Engineer  
              Lieutenant Dave Clemens

**PREAMBLE**

"The Traffic Committee consists of property owners of Royal Oak appointed by the City Commission. We are volunteers and are not paid or elected. What we decide tonight is merely a recommendation to the City Commission. If you do not agree with the findings or decisions of this committee, you may go before the City Commission and petition and/or discuss your issue with them. At this meeting you will be given an opportunity to speak during your item on the agenda. However, at the City Commission meeting, you must be recognized during "public comment" on their agenda, not when the Traffic Committee resolutions are being voted upon. Otherwise you will not be able to voice your concerns.

It is important to understand that professionals make preliminary recommendations to the Traffic Committee. They consist of civil and traffic engineers, outside consultants and public safety officials. You may have been informed that these professionals have denied your request or petition. This denial does not mean that this committee will vote that way; however, we are committed to discussing the issues at hand in a pragmatic and sensible manner. Our ultimate recommendation to the City Commission will be one that benefits our citizens and community as a whole."

---

**ITEM 2 MINUTES – September 22, 2009**

Moved by: Richard Hahn  
Supported by: Todd Scott

to **approve** the September 22, 2009 Traffic Committee Meeting minutes with corrections.

YEAS: 6  
NAYS: 0  
ABSTENTION: 0  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION PASSED

---

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT - Items not on the Agenda**

Michael Melville stated that this is the time for anyone who would like to speak on an issue that is not on the agenda to step forward. No one stepped forward.

---

**4. RESCHEDULED ITEMS**

**4.A. Request to install a mid-block crossing on Girard at Lauren Ct.**

Mr. Melville asked Mr. Danielson to give the background on this item.

A request was received from Jim Schneider, 2619 Lauren Court, Royal Oak, MI 48073 to install a mid-block crossing on Girard at Lauren Ct.

The Staff Traffic Committee has reviewed this request and determined that (1) Girard is a 37 ft. wide back to back concrete major street. (2) The requested crossing is a "T" intersection mid block on Girard. (3) The estimated ADT for Girard is 800. (3) Lauren Ct. is located approximately 355 ft. east of Ardmore, a 4-way stop intersection with Girard. (4) As a general policy, the Engineering Department does not install sidewalk crossing at midblock intersections.

This item was first addressed at the September 22, 2009 Traffic Committee Meeting. At that meeting the Traffic Committee recommended tabling this item to November 24, 2009 to allow time for the Engineering Department to provide an aerial map and offer alternative recommendations.

(1) Aerial map of the area is attached with pedestrian crossing for Girard from the east side of Lauren Court (Exhibit 4.A.-5). (2) The estimated cost for a pedestrian crossing for Girard at Lauren is \$5,000. (3) TIA review of Girard and Lauren Court recommends against mid block crossing (Exhibit 4.A.-3). (4) TIA recommends additional pavement markings for an existing pedestrian crossing at Ardmore west of Lauren Court.

**Suggested Recommendation:**

(1) The request to install a midblock pedestrian crossing for Girard at Lauren Ct. be denied. (2) The pedestrian crossing for Girard at Ardmore be marked with additional pavement markings.

Estimated City Cost: \$135.00

Chairperson Melville asked if there was anyone present to speak on this case.

Jim Schneider  
2619 Lauren Court  
Royal Oak, MI

Mr. Schneider stepped forward and stated that the recommendation from TIA to paint a crosswalk on the east approach of Girard at Ardmore is not a good solution. He iterated that pedestrians will continue to walk the south sidewalk on the south side of Girard to the east and see that the sidewalk ends. Mr. Schneider iterated that people will not back track an entire block to the west, go back to Ardmore, cross the street and go on the north side of Girard down to the sidewalk.

Mr. Schneider stated that he observes kids all the time that come around the corner from Ardmore to Girard, come down the sidewalk, and when the sidewalk ends pedestrians will go across Girard. He commented that when the sidewalk ends that is the natural location for people to cross.

Mr. Schneider stated that one of the main reasons TIA was against installing a crosswalk at Lauren was because the sight distance was less than 300 feet. He commented that TIA did not give a specific number as to how much sight distance the grid has at the location that was proposed. Mr. Schneider iterated that the guidelines require 250 feet; he believes a sight distance could be achieved by placing the crosswalk at a location that would achieve 250 feet.

Mr. Schneider stated that while driving around Royal Oak he has noticed several midblock crosswalks in the City. He commented that they are at the following locations: Troy St. at Farmers Market, Washington at Second St., Third St. at Center St., Washington at Fifth St., 12 Mile at Shire and at Northwood Elementary. Mr. Schneider stated that the Master Plan specifically calls for providing continuous sidewalks linking neighborhood schools and community facilities.

Mr. Schneider stated that the Master Plan also calls for increasing pedestrian/bike access from surrounding neighborhoods with crosswalks. He stated that the \$5,000 is an estimate and it could possibly be less if it is done simultaneously with other road work for Girard at Ardmore.

Mr. Melville asked if there was anyone else present to speak on this issue. No one stepped forward. The discussion returned to the Committee.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Danielson if this is the type of project that is too small to do by itself and if it could be combined with other crosswalk work in the City. He questioned whether the \$5,000 cost would include combining the work. Mr. Danielson stated that he used as bid unit contract prices from last year. He commented that the cost would be included in other contract work; he would not bid this location as its own project.

Mr. Scott asked if the proposed midblock crossing would be zebra striped. Mr. Danielson stated that typically they would use zebra striping as they are using it more often.

Mr. Rucinski asked Mr. Danielson if the reason Mr. Callahan listed Lauren Ct. as a private street is because it is currently under development and it will become a public road. Mr. Danielson stated that although the development appears to be single family

units, they are actually condos. He iterated that in an attempt to speed up the process the developer, rather than getting the property subdivided with the state, developed it as one property; that is one reason why the storm water detention is towards the rear. Mr. Danielson stated that there are easements for the public waterway and public sewer. Mr. Rucinski asked if ultimately Lauren Ct. will remain a private road. Mr. Danielson stated that he is correct.

Mr. Rucinski handed the Committee copies of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Guide for the Planning, Design, and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities* (Handout 4.A.-6). He iterated that midblock crossing guidelines are established for members of the Committee. He commented that there are a couple key points for the Committee to discuss. Mr. Rucinski stated that one of the big points AASHTO talks about is the spacing between adjacent intersections exceed 660 ft. He commented that AASHTO brings up the ideas of the sight distance being a key issue. The land use in which pedestrians are highly unlikely to cross the street is an issue this Committee has discussed previously and the applicant has brought that to the Committee's attention that one would have to park at the Community Center across the street. Mr. Rucinski commented that this guide has more information for the Committee to consider.

Mr. Godek stated that the petitioner mentioned that he sees pedestrians crossing Girard, he believes on the south side when the sidewalk ends; he asked Mr. Danielson where the sidewalk actually ends. Mr. Danielson referred Mr. Godek to the aerial photograph and showed him where the fence starts for the Golf Course.

Ms. Goldberg stated that she doesn't support doing anything with the area at Ardmore; she believes it is pointless. She doesn't believe people are going to go back and cross; she will not support the recommendation.

Mr. Rucinski stated that there are 15 lots in the area, he drove the area the other day and it is obvious as you are walking down there you can see the Golf Course fence and you see where the sidewalk ends. He believes it is reasonable that somebody could look up and determine it is a bad decision to go where the sidewalk is going to end. Mr. Rucinski stated that nobody is going to want to walk 400 feet to the intersection, but it is a safer choice to make. He does not support the idea of putting in a midblock crosswalk; he doesn't believe they are a good idea. Mr. Rucinski stated that there needs to be parental responsibility where the child is told that they need to cross at a crosswalk.

Mr. Hahn commented that from Ardmore you cannot see where the sidewalk ends because of the curvature. He stated that you will not know that the sidewalk ends until you cross Lauren. Mr. Hahn stated that it was pointed out at the last meeting that one could not reasonably expect people to walk back to Ardmore to cross the street to go to a destination that is in the opposite direction. Pursuant to Mr. Danielson's recommendation at the last meeting, Mr. Hahn iterated that he went to look at the grade adjacent to the Red Run property and agrees it is severe. Mr. Hahn doesn't know what they can do to continue the sidewalk further to the east towards Alexander. He understands it would be expensive to do.

Mr. Hahn stated midblock crossings are not unusual. He commented that he hopes the Committee members received the email that he sent to Mr. Danielson that points out that there are three ramps and curb drops on the north side of the other side of the park. Mr. Hahn iterated that he can see three midblock crossings from his front porch on Maxwell. Mr. Hahn stated that in this case there is the added factor that the sidewalk ends, and the

City has midblock crossings where the sidewalk doesn't end. Mr. Hahn believes that children and adults will cross Girard at Lauren or east of Lauren. He believes it is safer if there is a crosswalk.

Mr. Hahn iterated that there are signs advising people of an upcoming crosswalk that he thinks would be appropriate for westbound movement, for example, they have them at the Lauren intersection east of the drive onto Churchill. Mr. Hahn stated that the sight distance is in excess of the minimum required for this type of crossing. He thinks it is appropriate to provide a crosswalk and to have signage with some sort of stripes; he stated that this is done in many places in the City.

Mr. Godek asked what the requirements are, if they had to be curb cut and ADA compliant. Mr. Danielson stated that it is a requirement and it drives the cost up quite a bit. Mr. Danielson stated that he thinks it is important to keep in mind that the people who are walking to the park live in the area, are familiar with the area, and they know where to cross.

Moved by: Richard Hahn  
Supported by: Todd Scott

Recommend (1) The request to install a midblock pedestrian crossing for Girard at Lauren Ct. be denied. (2) The pedestrian crossing for Girard at Ardmore be marked with additional pavement markings.

YEAS: 2  
ABSTENTION: 0  
NAYS: 4  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION FAILED

Moved by: Dan Godek  
Supported by: Alexander Rucinski

Recommend (1) pedestrian crossing for Girard be installed at Ardmore with additional pavement markings.

Mr. Danielson stated that there is already a crosswalk at Girard and Ardmore and the Engineering Department would be increasing the striping to give it more impetus for the pedestrians in the area. He iterated that the City could also add additional signing that would indicate there is a crosswalk in this location.

Friendly amendment.

Recommend (1) pedestrian crossing for Girard be installed at Ardmore with additional pavement markings and signage notifying of upcoming crosswalk.

YEAS: 2  
ABSTENTION: 0  
NAYS: 4  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION FAILED

Moved by: Dan Godek  
Supported by: Alexander Rucinski

Recommend (1) The request to install a midblock pedestrian crossing for Girard at Lauren Ct. be denied. (2) The pedestrian crossing for Girard at Ardmore be marked with additional pavement markings.

Ms. Goldberg asked Mr. Danielson if he thinks this would create a false sense of security to have yellow signs indicating a play area to warn approaching drivers. Mr. Danielson stated that signs have their place when a park is hidden from view, this park is out in the open and it is obvious that this is a park. He stated that signs could be added.

YEAS: 4  
ABSTENTION: 0  
NAYS: 2  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION PASSED

Estimated City Cost: \$135.00

---

## 5. BUSINESS ITEMS

---

### 5.A. Request to remove "No Parking" signs at the west corner of Farnum at Catalpa.

Mr. Melville asked Mr. Danielson to give the background on this item.

A request was received from Matt Elliott, Manager, Maple Grove Manor Apartments, 6966 Crooks Road, Ste. 24, Troy, MI 48098 to remove "No Parking" signs at the west corner of Farnum at Catalpa.

The Staff Traffic Committee has reviewed this request and determined that (1) Farnum south of Catalpa is a boulevard for 160 ft. before becoming a 27' wide back to back asphalt over concrete street. (2) The east/north side of Farnum is a designated fire route and signaled "No Parking". (3) The boulevard section is 20' back to back for the south/eastbound lanes. (4) Parking could be allowed from 30 ft. south of Catalpa to 160 ft. south of Catalpa for an additional 8 parking spaces.

#### **Suggested Recommendation:**

Remove the existing "No Parking" sign for southbound Farnum from Catalpa to 160 ft. south of Catalpa.

Estimated City Cost: \$235.00

Chairperson Melville asked if there was anyone present to speak on this case. No one stepped forward. The discussion returned to the committee.

Mr. Melville stated that the parking issues the residents originally had with the Ford Dealership have been resolved because the dealership is no longer there. He commented that if the business were to change uses, future employees could park there early in the morning. Mr. Danielson stated that the signs have been up for quiet awhile and the Ford Dealership has moved from this location. He commented that if in a year

the residents are still experiencing parking problems, they could request that the "No Parking" signs be reinstalled. Mr. Danielson iterated that with the new location of the Ford Dealership, he doesn't believe Ford employees will be parking at this location.

Moved by: Todd Scott  
Supported by: Richard Hahn

Recommend the request to remove existing "No Parking" signs for southbound Farnum from Catalpa to 160 ft. south of Catalpa be approved.

YEAS: 6  
ABSTENTION: 0  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION PASSED

Estimated City Cost: \$235.00

---

**5.B. Request to remove "No Parking" signs on E. Parent east of Delaware Ave. and west of the CN RR.**

Mr. Melville asked Mr. Danielson to give the background on this item.

A request was received from George Vinocur, 406 E. Parent, Royal Oak, Michigan 48067 to remove "No Parking" signs on E. Parent east of Delaware Ave. and west of the CN RR.

The Staff Traffic Committee has reviewed this request and determined that (1) Parent is a 27' wide back to back concrete street with "No Parking" on the north side of Parent from S. Main to CN RR. (2) Parking is allowed on the south side of Parent between Delaware and CN RR. (3) An evaluation of the petition to remove the "No Parking" on the north side of Parent between Delaware and CN RR shows 8% in favor of the removal. (4) Metro Lofts is located on the north side of Parent. (5) The south side of Parent is zoned both single-family residential and commercial.

**Suggested Recommendation:**

The request to remove the "No Parking" signs on the north side of Parent be denied due to lack of support for the removal.

Estimated City Cost: \$0.00

Chairperson Melville asked if there was anyone present to speak on this case.

George Vinocur  
406 E. Parent  
Royal Oak, Michigan

Mr. Vinocur stepped forward and stated that he has additional colored photographs and he handed them to the Committee. He stated that one of the photographs shows an individual from the condos who parked directly in front of a fire hydrant on more than one occasion. He stated that another photo shows the entire south side of the street is covered with cars. Mr. Vinocur commented that for the individuals who own two cars they have to park one on the street because the driveway allows for one vehicle.

Mr. Vinocur stated that another photo depicts what the parking lot on the east side of the condos looks like; there are one or two cars in the lot and it shows there are a dozen or more additional spaces.

Mr. Vinocur iterated that the reason for this denial was because of the lack of supporting neighbors. He stated that of the list of addresses he was given, 7 or 8 addresses are vacant properties. Mr. Vinocur stated that one of the addresses is a non-operational business and the owner has a long driveway and is not concerned with his issue. The property to the west of 406 E. Parent has been vacant for over 12 months, somebody just purchased the house and is moving in. Mr. Vinocur hopes that once his neighbor experiences the parking situation that they will be in favor of his request.

Mr. Vinocur commented that if he were to bring the issue back with more signatures, the percentage would be greater than 8%. He iterated that many of the assigned addresses at the condos are vacant. He stated some of the units have changed residents two or three times since he's been there in 13 months. Mr. Vinocur stated that the residents on the first floor are the ones who would have direct access from the street, they would have to go through the back door to go up the stairs; they are the ones using the parking lot located in the back of the building.

Mr. Vinocur stated that he spoke to some of the residents and two roommates were supportive, one was not supportive and one person was moving out and didn't care. He stated that the percentage of people he polled was closer to 50% in favor of his petition. He asked if he came back with more signatures if this issue could be reconsidered. Mr. Vinocur asked how it is decided which streets receive "No Parking" signs. He commented that Knowles St. just north of Harrison have "No Parking" signs on both sides of the street and it is difficult to navigate through. Mr. Vinocur stated that there are a lot of single family homes and a business on one side of the street. He iterated that some of the homes do not have driveways.

Mr. Vinocur commented that all the households on the south side of the street own two cars; he doesn't know where guests are supposed to park.

Chairperson Melville asked if there was anyone else present to speak on this case. No one stepped forward. The discussion returned to the committee.

Mr. Hahn asked Mr. Danielson what the purpose is of having "No Parking" signs on one side of the street. Mr. Danielson stated that because of the high rise, one of the benefits of not having parking on both sides of the street is that it gives emergency vehicles direct access to that facility. He stated that he doesn't believe it is a fire route because it is a dead-end street.

Mr. Godek asked if there is another reason, other than lack of support, why this request was denied. Mr. Danielson stated that this request would have to go before the Police and Fire Departments for their input. Typically until you have over 50% of residents in favor, the signing isn't changed because it becomes too argumentative.

Mr. Godek asked if the petitioner wanted to get more signatures if the Committee could table the item. Mr. Danielson stated that the petitioner could bring this issue back. Mr. Melville iterated that he would like to have the Police and Fire Departments give their opinion. He has an issue with this due to emergency vehicles having access. Mr. Melville stated that if there was parking on both sides of the street, it will become like Knowles where it is very tight because there are multi-unit dwellings on the street. He

stated that on the west side of Delaware up by Holiday Market there is parking allowed on the south side. Mr. Melville doesn't believe that will change. He stated that he lives in the townhouses and he knows his neighbors would not like parking on that side of the street because with the traffic near Holiday Market it would become a problem for two cars to go down the street at the same time. Mr. Melville iterated that his issue would be that it would be a problem for emergency vehicles to get down the street if parking is allowed on both sides of the street.

Mr. Melville stated that if he were a resident on Parent he would ask for permit parking. Mr. Vinocur inquired about permit parking. Mr. Melville stated that he would receive permits that he would have to display in his vehicle and he would receive permits for his guests as well; it would be limited to the north side of the street. He asked Mr. Danielson what his thoughts are. Mr. Danielson stated that it has been the policy in the past that if permit parking is permitted on his street, residents on both sides of the street receive permits to park there. He stated it is not limited to just one side of the street. Mr. Melville asked Mr. Danielson if they don't allow it for a multi-unit. Mr. Danielson stated that they do not.

Mr. Melville iterated that he walks his dog back in that area and it is easier for residents to park on the street as apposed to using the parking lot. He stated it is unfortunate that the management can't enforce that the residents take advantage of their parking lot. Mr. Hahn asked if parking was allowed on both sides of the street if that would preclude access of emergency vehicles. He asked if the street is too narrow to have parking on both sides of the street. Mr. Danielson stated that there are a number of streets in Royal Oak that are 27' wide and parking is allowed on both sides; mostly where there are single family dwellings.

Mr. Danielson stated that if you were to take 6 to 8 ft. off of each side you would be left with a 10 ft. aisle for the fire truck. He iterated that they could navigate that, although they would not feel comfortable with it, especially since it dead-ends. Mr. Danielson stated that emergency vehicles could pull into the parking lots to the north and circle around; he doesn't believe the drivers would like to get themselves boxed in a street where they can't drive straight through. Mr. Hahn stated that if there were no cars on the street they would still be "boxed in". Mr. Danielson stated that it would be easier to turn a truck around with no cars on the street.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Danielson how he handles vacancies. Mr. Danielson stated they don't count as a "yes" or a "no"; he counts the residents that vote in favor as a "yes". Mr. Scott stated that it still counts toward his percentage; he won't dismiss them and reduce the number. Mr. Danielson stated that he is correct.

Mr. Rucinski stated that one of the reasons Mr. Danielson believes there is no parking on the north side was because the Metrolofts are required to provide on-sight parking for their residents. Mr. Danielson stated that he is correct. Mr. Rucinski alluded to the discussion about permit only parking. He understood the past practices of not precluding residents on one side of the street from receiving permit parking, but since the residents on the north side of the street have been provided parking on-sight, the rationale is that there is a reason to preclude them from getting a permit because they've already been provided parking within their property as a part of their development. Mr. Rucinski iterated that it may not be convenient parking, but it is there; that is something to think about.

Mr. Danielson stated that it is a requirement of all single family residents that they provide two off-street parking spaces with each home. He stated that each home should be providing two off-street parking spaces. Mr. Rucinski asked Mr. Danielson if he is aware if the Metrolofts have provided on-sight parking. Mr. Danielson stated that he is not aware of their requirements.

Mr. Godek stated that if there are two parking spots behind each unit, he thinks that has some merit. He hates to table this for the petitioner to try and get more support, and then be denied by the Police and Fire Departments. Mr. Danielson iterated that he would recommend the Committee take action to deny until the petitioner can come back with signatures in excess of 50% for reconsideration.

Mr. Hahn stated that two parking spaces for residents is not supposed to serve their parking demand. He stated that a typical residential development in southeast Michigan is done on the premise that you will have the ability to park on the adjacent street for visitors, vendors or for people within your residence who also have vehicles. Mr. Hahn stated that to count on the permit parking concept, it appears to him it would be more difficult to get the condominium owners to agree to a permit parking arrangement if they are not going to have the ability to get a permit then it would be to get a petition to allow parking on both sides of the street.

Mr. Vinocur asked Mr. Danielson that if he knows a property to be vacant or does not exist, can he indicate that on the petition and provide signatures where there are structures. Mr. Hahn stated that he could indicate that when he submits the petition. Mr. Danielson stated that he would take a look at it and give it consideration. Mr. Vinocur commented that there are seven addresses on the petition that do not exist; he asked Mr. Danielson to adjust the petition or his calculations.

Mr. Godek stated that although there may not be a structure on the property, somebody owns it. He iterated that Mr. Vinocur could go down to the Assessor's Office during business hours and get the names and addresses of the property owners.

Moved by: Richard Hahn  
Supported by: Dan Godek

Recommend the request to remove the "No Parking" signs on the north side of Parent be denied due to lack of support for the removal.

Mr. Scott asked if the Committee were to deny this, would that mean he is not able to come back at the next meeting. Mr. Danielson stated that that is the current policy, if the Committee wishes to waive that the Committee may do so. Mr. Godek stated that he wishes to remove his motion because he thought by taking action it would allow Mr. Vinocur to come back within a 12 month period. Mr. Danielson stated that he could make that part of the motion. Mr. Godek modified his motion as follows:

Recommend the request to remove the "No Parking" signs on the north side of Parent be denied to allow the petitioner additional time to receive more signatures.

YEAS: 6  
ABSTENTION: 0  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION PASSES

Estimated City Cost: \$0.00

---

**5.C. Request to install a “Do Not Enter” sign at the end of Longfellow Avenue.**

Mr. Melville asked Mr. Danielson to give the background on this item.

A request was received from Timothy Huber, 1115 Longfellow Ave., Royal Oak, MI 48067 to install a “Do Not Enter” sign at the end of Longfellow Avenue.

The Staff Traffic Committee has reviewed this request and determined that (1) Longfellow is currently signed “No Thru Traffic” at Lincoln and at Irving. (2) Traffic counts for the 23rd, 24th, and 25th of June, 2009 average 542 vehicles per day. (3) The 85th percentile for Longfellow was 28MPH. (4) The ADT for Mohawk in 2003 south of Harrison was 796.

**Suggested Recommendation:**

The request for “Do Not Enter” sign for Longfellow at Irving be denied.

Estimated City Cost: \$

Mr. Melville asked if there was anyone present to speak on this issue.

Timothy Huber  
1115 Longfellow Ave.  
Royal Oak, MI

Mr. Huber stepped forward and stated that for the last couple of years since the berm was put in at Mohawk there have been a significant amount of cars that come northbound from westbound I-696, exit Mohawk, cut through Longfellow and go north to Lincoln. He iterated that his quality of life has declined ever since the berm was put in.

Mr. Huber stated that his letter didn’t state what he was recommending. He iterated that they could either put up a sign that says “Do Not Enter”, like the two signs that are to the east of him, or, take all the signs down and open everything up. He commented that his last suggestion was not put in his letter. Mr. Huber iterated that comparing Longfellow to a national average doesn’t do it justice. He believes that Longfellow is 27’ ft. wide and from 3:30PM to approximately 5:30 or 6:00PM every time the light changes on Irving and the Service Drive, every two or three minutes two or three cars will travel up Longfellow.

Mr. Huber stated that he has watched the vehicles and one or two vehicles will go up to Lincoln. He iterated that the 15 signs that are up currently do not work; people do not abide by them. Mr. Huber iterated that if year after year the police try to enforce the area and people continue to disobey the signs; something is wrong. He thinks the idea of putting up more signs or more enforcement is not the answer.

Mr. Huber stated that the neighborhood is changing. He believes the cut-through signs, the truck route that goes around Irving and the berms that were put had to do with the industry at the time. He iterated that the industry is no longer there. Mr. Huber stated there are no longer delivery trucks, etc. He would like to see every sign taken out of the area and let people chose what street they want to turn down: Longfellow, Mohawk or Wyandotte. He doesn’t want to see drivers being sent places they don’t want to go with

one-ways, do-not-enters, etc. because many people do not want to take the stair-step route to Main St., they just want to go to Lincoln.

Mr. Huber stated that the reason people disobey the signs is because the intersection at Woodward and I-696 is horrendous. As a 15 year resident of Longfellow, he has driven these areas enough and has some good ideas. Mr. Melville stated that that intersection is the responsibility of MDOT. Mr. Huber believes the way they handled the intersection at Square Lake and Telegraph is the way MDOT should handle this situation. He believes MDOT should create two or three right hand lanes that do nothing but turn right on Woodward; you couldn't go straight. He feels that would alleviate a lot of the traffic.

Mr. Huber iterated that he would like to see a sign that is put up at the south end of Longfellow and Irving that discourages people from cutting through. He would rather see every one of those signs taken down and let people cut through all three streets, and take out the berm at Batavia and Harrison. Mr. Huber feels Harrison, being immediately north of Holiday Market, would do a lot for the neighborhood in terms of letting people cut-through as they wish, and the pharmacy on the corner would see an increase in traffic that may spur development and increase businesses.

Mr. Huber commented that he would like to see the berms taken out. He thinks it would improve the neighborhood and reduce the intolerable traffic on northbound Longfellow. He stated that he cannot play catch with his kids because they have to watch for cars all the time. He thanked the Committee for their time.

Chairperson Melville asked if there was anyone else present to speak on this case. No one stepped forward. The discussion returned to the committee.

Mr. Hahn commented that on Mr. Danielson's report it appears that there is less traffic per day on Longfellow than there is on Mohawk. Mr. Danielson stated that he is correct. Mr. Melville stated that 2003 was prior to the berm which went in approximately 2005. Mr. Danielson stated that the 2003 count was taken right after the berm was installed so he could have a comparison to see what the traffic volume was on both Mohawk and Longfellow. He commented that at the time Mohawk had a higher traffic count than Longfellow.

Mr. Melville stated that he is in the car business and recalls when his neighbor called protesting, he remembers the model year of the car he was driving, a 2004; it wasn't brand new. He believes the berm was installed in 2005 or 2006. Mr. Melville asked Mr. Danielson if he has any traffic counts before 2003. Mr. Danielson stated that he does not.

Mr. Hahn stated that the petitioner referenced a "Do Not Enter" sign. He stated that the City doesn't have any "Do Not Enter" signs at Irving and Mohawk; they have "No Thru Traffic" signs. Mr. Hahn stated that Dondero has "Do Not Enter" signs and a block north there are "Do Not Enter 7-9AM and 3-6PM Mon-Fri" signs that would pertain to northbound traffic on Mohawk and Wyandotte. Mr. Hahn commented that there is not a similar sign on northbound Longfellow at Dondero. Mr. Hahn stated that there is one less sign at Longfellow and Dondero, but if the numbers in the report are correct, without that sign there is still more traffic on Mohawk than there is on Longfellow. He commented that the streets have the same length and number of dwellings, he'd expect the same amount of traffic generated from the residents on the street. Mr. Hahn stated that he is not sure what the Committee is trying to accomplish by doing anything else.

Ms. Goldberg asked if the "Do Not Enter" signs were on Longfellow preceding the berm. Mr. Melville stated that it was. Mr. Vinocur stated that there was a school there at the time the sign went in and it is no longer there. Mr. Melville stated that he is correct. Mr. Vinocur stated that that would affect everything. Mr. Hahn asked Mr. Vinocur if his residence is south of Dondero. Mr. Vinocur stated that he is north of Dondero. Mr. Vinocur stated that vehicles will go up to the signs, turn left and go west on Dondero to Longfellow and the drivers will turn right and go north. Mr. Vinocur commented that the drivers will see the "Do Not Enter" signs, turn left and go north up Longfellow.

Mr. Hahn asked where the counts that are reflected in his report taken. Mr. Danielson stated that they were taken closer to Harrison. Mr. Danielson stated that the reasons the "Do Not Enter" signs were installed at Wyandotte and Mohawk is when the original traffic counts were taken, those are the two streets that were receiving the majority of the traffic; one is before the Irving turn off and Mohawk was right in line with Irving/Mohawk. Mr. Danielson iterated that after the signs were installed traffic counts were taken again to see if they had "equalized" the traffic on all three streets; the goal was to achieve a uniform traffic volume on those three streets. Mr. Danielson stated that Longfellow was still less than Mohawk, but they reduced the traffic on Mohawk and Wyandotte considerably.

Mr. Danielson stated that the Traffic Committee meetings were contentious when it came to Franklin School, residents were both for and against installing "Do Not Enter" signs. Mr. Danielson stated that he did the best he could to reach a fair compromise. He stated that there were a number of residents that wanted to get to their home in that area.

Mr. Hahn stated for clarification purposes that the traffic volumes along Wyandotte, Mohawk and Longfellow north of Dondero are such that presently they are greater on Mohawk and Wyandotte than they are on Longfellow. Mr. Danielson stated that he is correct. Mr. Melville stated that he was on the Committee during that issue and it was contentious; he stated at one point the Mohawk traffic count was approaching 2,000 cars a day. Mr. Danielson stated that there were counts of over 2,000 cars per day on Mohawk. Mr. Melville iterated that the traffic was equalized between the three streets. He commented that 542 cars a day is a low number. Mr. Melville stated that if the hours weren't as restricted on Mohawk and Wyandotte, there would be an increase. He iterated the count is still low.

Mr. Hahn stated that he is not certain what putting up "Do Not Enter" signs would accomplish, as stated in Mr. Huber's original letter. Mr. Hahn iterated that the traffic count on Longfellow is already low and the "Do Not Enter" sign would reduce the traffic count; assuming people pay attention to it. Mr. Melville stated that all three streets would want to go north; that was the point that people want to get to their houses. If drivers take Mohawk to Dondero they are either going to go left or right and go further east a couple of blocks where they can go up into the neighborhood or they will go left one block up Longfellow into the neighborhood. Mr. Melville doesn't believe people would want to do that. He commented that it says "No Thru Traffic", it is hard to enforce because drivers could go straight up.

Mr. Scott recalled in reviewing the traffic counts in the past that he was comfortable with the distribution of cars across the roads; he is hesitant to change that since Longfellow traffic counts are so low.

Moved by: Todd Scott  
Supported by: Richard Hahn

Recommend the request to install "Do Not Enter" signs for Longfellow at Irving be denied.

YEAS: 6  
ABSTENTION: 0  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION PASSES

Estimated City Cost: \$ 0.00

---

**5.D. Public Hearing request to remove "No Parking 9AM-5PM Except Sat-Sun & Holidays" signs on the east and west side of Phillips Place between 11 Mile Rd. and E. Third St.**

Mr. Melville asked Mr. Danielson to give the background on this item.

A request was received from Julie Cieszanski, 207 Phillips Place, Royal Oak, MI 48067 to remove "No Parking 9AM-5PM Except Sat-Sun & Holidays" signs on the east and west side of Phillips Place between 11 Mile Rd. and E. Third St.

The Staff Traffic Committee has reviewed this request and determined that (1) Phillips Place is a 27' back to back asphalt street with new curb and gutter from 11 Mile Rd. to Fourth St. (2) Phillips Place is currently signed "No Parking 9AM-5PM Except Sat-Sun & Holidays". (3) An evaluation of a petition requesting removal of "No Parking 9AM-5PM Except Sat-Sun & Holidays" signs on the east and west side of Phillips Place between 11 Mile Road and E. Third St. shows 72% in favor of removing the parking restrictions.

**Suggested Recommendation:**

Hold a public hearing at the November 24, 2009 Citizens Traffic Committee Meeting for residents on Phillips Place between 11 Mile Road and E. Third St. to hear comments for and against removing "No Parking 9AM-5PM Except Sat-Sun & Holidays" signs on the east and west side of Phillips Place between 11 Mile Rd. and E. Third St.

Mr. Melville opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone present to speak on this issue.

Bob Wayner  
527 E. Third  
Royal Oak, MI

Mr. Wayner stepped forward and stated that he did not sign the petition but he and his wife are here tonight to support it. He stated he lives on the corner of Third and Phillips and the request would affect him and his wife; they are in favor of it. Mr. Wayner stated that he has lived on E. Third for 22 years and it is his understanding that originally the signs were put up because there was a rental business on 11 Mile Rd. and Phillips Place and the employees would park their trucks up and down the street. He sees no reason to keep the signs.

Gerald Reed  
123 Phillips Place  
Royal Oak, MI

Mr. Reed stepped forward and stated that he is in favor of the removal. He stated that in the 13 years he has lived there the only time he sees non-residents parking on Phillips Place are on Saturday morning when people attend the Farmers Market. Mr. Reed iterated that he is aware there is parking for Farmers Market at the church across the street to the employees as well as visitors to the Farmers Market. He is here to support the recommendation.

Moved by: Dan Godek  
Supported by: Richard Hahn

Recommend the request to remove "No Parking 9AM-5PM Except Sat-Sun & Holidays" signs on the east and west side of Phillips Place between 11 Mile Rd. and E. Third St. be approved.

YEAS: 6  
ABSTENTION: 0  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION PASSES

Estimated City Cost: \$235.00

---

## 6. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

Mr. Danielson stated that Royal Oak Middle School implemented a new traffic signing/traffic pattern procedure for student drop-off and pick-up for the start of the 2009/2010 school year. He iterated that to compare how the traffic improvements at Royal Oak Middle School impacted traffic volumes on Marywood, traffic counts were taken prior to the close of school in the spring of 2009 and again this fall. Mr. Danielson stated that there has been no significant change in traffic volume and the 85th percentile went from 30MPH in the spring to 28MPH in the fall.

Mr. Rucinski asked if Mr. Danielson has heard from any of the residents who generated their concerns and/or complaints in the past. Mr. Danielson stated that he has not heard comments either in favor or against the new signage. He has heard from the police officers who are at the school in the mornings and they feel the traffic is flowing well and commented that it is easier to manage the traffic flow, especially on Austin.

Mr. Scott asked Mr. Danielson what four days he received a traffic count average on Marywood. Mr. Danielson stated that he took the traffic counts on Marywood in the middle of the week. Mr. Scott stated that the traffic counts are still low.

Mr. Godek asked the Engineering Department to consider the feasibility of reducing the speed limit on residential streets while the Master Plan is being updated. He questioned the possibility of putting up advisory 20MPH speed limit signs; he asked for Mr. Danielson's opinion.

Mr. Danielson commented that if he is going to take the time to put up advisory signs, he questions why Mr. Godek wouldn't put up signs that could be enforced. Mr. Danielson

stated that as soon as the City breaks from the norm, they would have to start putting up signs on every street and the cost becomes prohibitive. Mr. Danielson stated that it would be time consuming. Mr. Danielson stated that he will get an opinion from the City Attorney's Office.

Lieutenant Clemens stated that throughout the State of Michigan all residential areas are 25MPH and few, if any, are posted. In order to enforce this the City would have to have signage on every street or send out a public notice in the tri-county area. Lieutenant Clemens stated that he doesn't believe that would be feasible. Ms. Goldberg asked if advisory speed limit signs are similar to where you see a yellow sign approaching a curb recommending a driver to slow down. She asked Mr. Godek for his reasoning for the 20MPH signs; if he wants them near a school. Mr. Godek stated that this Committee doesn't have enforceable options when residents ask for "Stop" signs; he thinks the City streets would be safer if people thought the speed limit was 20MPH. He commented that if it is not enforceable, and the City has to be signed, he asked if the residents could be given a public notice that the City has an advisory speed limit of 20MPH. Mr. Godek iterated that this would be a traffic calming of sorts to advise people to drive 20MPH. This would be Option B based on the fact that the City couldn't just say it is 20MPH, it is enforceable, no signs needed; he doesn't believe that is possible.

Mr. Godek stated that he would like a legal opinion on Option A and Option B being a public notice advisory speed limit of 20MPH on residential streets. Mr. Danielson stated that he dealt with a similar issue about an ordinance forbidding talking on cell phones and the City Commission was not in favor of this primarily because it is difficult to enforce. He stated that some communities have done this but it is difficult and he is not sure that the Committee wants to put the burden on the Police Department to start enforcing something that the people aren't tuned into. Mr. Melville stated that he has a business in Southfield and he wasn't aware they were doing this until it was mentioned in a Newsletter from the City. He iterated that if you receive an infraction while you are on your cell phone in Southfield they can give you a ticket.

Mr. Melville believes that the same people who don't obey a 25MPH speed limit sign are going to be the same people who disobey other signs. He commented that this is a "feel good" solution to make it appear as though the City is doing something. Mr. Melville believes it is a matter of deciding where the City wants to be in terms of tolerating how fast individuals are allowed to go on residential streets. Mr. Godek stated that there is something to be said about a "warm feeling" about speed limits; it is effective traffic calming. He likes the "Drive 25, Keep Em Alive" signs; he iterated that the Committee doesn't have any tools when petitioners come before the Committee and express that they are concerned about their children in the streets. Mr. Godek iterated that on Royal Ave. cars speed down that street, he is frustrated that there aren't enough police officers for traffic safety. He stated this would be an attempt to implement traffic calming.

Mr. Melville stated that he goes Downriver often and there are several communities, for example, Allen Park is known to have zero tolerance for speeding. Mr. Melville stated that a pedestrian was killed at Reeck and Allen Rd. and approximately every other house had a yellow sign up regarding speed. Mr. Melville stated that everyone knows you do not speed in Allen Park; there is usually a police vehicle down the street. He commented that he has been pulled over twice in Taylor and he never knew what for, he thinks he was being hassled because he had a commercial truck with commercial plates. Mr. Melville stated that the City of Royal Oak needs to emulate those communities and let drivers know that the City has a zero tolerance for speeding in residential neighborhoods. He understands with limited patrol vehicles that it makes it difficult to enforce.

Mr. Scott iterated that the City's Nonmotorized Master Plan should begin in February with the consultants. He stated that he showed the consultants around Detroit, for his job, he believes they may have some ideas on how to do traffic calming to slow cars to the 25MPH speed limit. Mr. Scott stated that traffic calming ideas allow the road to inform the user what the speed should be, allowing greater compliance. He iterated that people will do what the road tells them to do; if it is wide they will speed, if it is narrower they will slow down.

Mr. Danielson iterated that if he is going to pursue this he would like it to be a recommendation made by the entire Committee.

.Mr. Godek iterated that when the Committee received a "cheat sheet" for the Master Plan, it summarized what was important in the City of Royal Oak. He stated that one of the blaring items was traffic on residential streets. Mr. Godek stated that the Committee deals with issues of parking, cut-through traffic and speeding.

Moved by: Dan Godek  
Supported by: Todd Scott

Recommend (1) the Engineering Department look into options, as a part of the Master Plan Review, to reducing the speed limit in residential neighborhoods from 25MPH to 20MPH.

YEAS: 3  
ABSTENTION: 0  
NAYS: 3  
ABSENT: 1  
MOTION FAILED

Estimated City Cost: \$ 0.00

Mr. Melville would like to look into various traffic calming ideas in the Master Plan. He stated that he goes to Ann Arbor twice a month and they have done some impressive things. Mr. Godek stated that he appreciates the Committee's input. He is trying to bring public awareness to driving slower and safer on side streets. Mr. Godek commented that something could be put in the newspaper; he thinks if the Committee can get drivers to driver slower, it's done a good thing.

---

## 7. ADJOURN

---

---

Elden R. Danielson, City Engineer

cc: Traffic Committee Members, Incl. Ex-Officio Members  
Michael Melville, Chairperson  
Dan Godek, Vice Chairperson  
Richard Hahn  
Dana Goldberg

Todd Scott  
Andrew Androff  
Arthur Makarewicz  
Alexander Rucinski  
Royal Oak City Commission  
Bill Allen, Chamber of Comm.  
Anders Linell, Royal Oak Schools  
Tom Moline, Royal Oak Schools  
Mark Weatherwax, PTA Council President  
Chris Jahnke, Police Chief  
Deputy Chief of Operations  
Traffic Safety Officer  
Wilbur White, Fire Chief  
Tim Thwing, Director of Planning  
Greg Rassel, Director of Rec. & Public Service  
Scott Newman, Information Systems

- 4.A. Jim Schneider, 2619 Lauren Ct., Royal Oak, MI 48073**
- 5.A. Matt Elliott, Manager, Maple Grove Manor Apartments, 6966 Crooks Road, Ste. 24, Troy, MI 48098**
- 5.B. George Vinocur, 406 E. Parent, Royal Oak, Michigan 48067**
- 5.C. Timothy Huber, 1115 Longfellow Ave., Royal Oak, MI 48067**
- 5.D. Julie Cieszanski, 207 Phillips Place, Royal Oak, MI 48067**  
**Bob Wayner, 527 E. Third, Royal Oak, MI**  
**Gerald Reed, 123 Phillips Place, Royal Oak, MI**