

MINUTES  
ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

BUSINESS MEETING

7:00 p.m. – August 1, 2006

Time: Chair Pratt called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Place: Council Chamber, Second Floor, 100 North Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

---

ROLL CALL

---

Members Present: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson, Potts, Pratt

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Rampson, Vaughn

---

INTRODUCTIONS

---

None.

---

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

---

a. Minutes of June 20, 2006.

**Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Lipson, to approve the minutes as presented.**

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson,  
Potts, Pratt

NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously.**

b. Minutes of July 6, 2006.

**Moved by Potts, seconded by D'Amour, to approve the minutes as presented.**

On page 7, "James D'Amour" was changed to "Bonnie Bona," as Secretary of the Commission.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson,  
Potts, Pratt  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously.**

c. Minutes of July 18, 2006.

**Moved by Emaus, seconded by Borum, to approve the minutes as presented.**

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson,  
Potts, Pratt  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously.**

---

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

---

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Emaus, to approve the agenda.**

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson,  
Potts, Pratt  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously.**

---

REPORTS FROM CITY ADMINISTRATION, CITY COUNCIL,  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, PLANNING COMMISSION  
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

---

Potts announced that the Ordinance Revisions Committee would be finalizing upcoming meeting dates.

D'Amour reported that the Allen Creek Greenway Task Force would be holding a public meeting on August 2 at 6:30 p.m. at Courthouse Square to solicit input on refined documents the task force has been preparing in an effort to create a final report to be submitted to Council by the end of September.

Bona said she attended the Downtown Implementation Steering Committee meeting, during which a presentation was made by Wendy Rampson on the background work that has been done for the Overlay Subcommittee. She said Kristine Kidorf, an historic preservation consultant for the City, also gave a presentation on historic district guidelines. She stated that both of these presentations would be given to the Planning Commission in the near future.

---

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

---

None.

---

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

---

Pratt announced the public hearings scheduled for the meeting of August 15, 2006.

---

REGULAR BUSINESS

---

a. Public Hearing and Action on AVL Parking Lot Expansion Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval, 6.19 acres, 1801 Ellsworth Road. A proposal to construct 56 new parking spaces for a net increase of 31 paces on the site (25 spaces will be removed) and to provide new storm water detention facilities – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn described the proposal and showed photographs of the property. He explained that the petitioner has requested action be tabled this evening, as other options for the site were being considered.

Noting no further speakers, Pratt declared the public hearing continued.

**Moved by Kunselman, seconded by D'Amour, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the AVL Parking Lot Expansion Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval, subject to providing all necessary easements.**

**Moved by Potts, seconded by Emaus, to table action.**

A vote on the motion to table showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman,  
Lipson, Potts, Pratt  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously.**

b. Public Hearing and Action on Adoption of Northeast Area Transportation Plan as an element of the City's Master Plan. The plan recommends goals, objectives and actions for freeway access, non-motorized facilities, transit services and roadways, and will be used as a guide for future transportation policy and infrastructure decisions in the Northeast Area (tabled at 5/2/06 meeting) – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Wendy Rampson, of the City's Systems Planning Service Unit, explained the recommendations contained in the staff report prepared for the Northeast Area Transportation Plan. She said the recommendation of staff was to approve the plan as written, with the proposed amendments identified in the staff report. She said the overall plan was consistent with the City's multi-modal transportation recommendations and provided a balanced set of recommendations for transportation policy.

Ryan Buck, transportation planner with the Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS), stated that in April 2002 the WATS Policy Committee passed a resolution opposing the closing of the Barton/M-14 interchange without the provision of a replacement freeway access and additional river crossing. In April 2005, he said, the committee again took a formal position against a temporary closure, due to MDOT's (Michigan Department of Transportation) history of not reopening temporary closings. He stated that also based on MDOT's history, the cost of a new interchange would be shouldered entirely by local agencies.

Cheryl McCrell, an Ann Arbor Township representative to WATS and trustee of Barton Hills Village, stated that the majority of this plan was a good plan; however, she said there were many groups on record opposing the closing of the east ramp of the Barton/M-14 interchange. She pointed out that there were no residents from Barton Drive present this evening, nor were there at the previous Commission meeting, to support closing the interchange. She said the residents never wanted it closed, but moved to the north. Since it was known that MDOT would not close the ramp unless there was consensus among all local agencies, she thought it would be good for City policy to reflect reality. She was not certain the new high school on Maple Road was taken into account during the planning for the Northeast Area Transportation Plan, as the high school was a vague idea at that time. She believed it was impractical to close the ramp without replacing it, as well as irresponsible from a safety standpoint, noting that closing the ramp would affect emergency vehicle access. She stated that safety improvements continued to be made to the ramp by MDOT and that Barton Hills Village was ready to assist in paying for more improvements. She suggested that the Planning Commission remove from the plan the recommendation to close the ramp and in its place include a request that MDOT consider other access options when studying the US-23 corridor.

Richard Voorman, 1910 Traver Road, opposed the closing of the Barton/M-14 interchange for two reasons: 1) he was a frequent user of the interchange, and 2) he was interested in road and traffic design and movement and he firmly believed that traffic was best distributed broadly over smaller roads with smaller traffic movements. He stated that closing the interchange would be inconsistent with that idea of traffic movement. It was an almost ideal interchange, he said, for making one's way into the City, adding that problems surrounding the interchange could be easily mitigated with small changes to ramp. Perhaps a roundabout at the three-way stop might be a solution, he said. He believed this interchange worked well and resulted in very little traffic on Barton. He also thought it was a good road design and a convenient entrance into the City for many motorists.

Dave Sponseller, a resident of the northeast area, said he was on the northeast area planning review committee in the 1960s and he also attended many of the citizen advisory committee meetings during creation of the Northeast Area Transportation Plan. He said the plan contained some good ideas, but he suggested caution in embracing most of the features of the plan. He questioned how many people on the citizen advisory committee had special interests and whether the plan reflected their special interests or the broad interest of the citizens of the entire community who used the streets everyday. He expressed

concern about the City's bus system, as it was evident to him that people were not interested in giving up their automobiles to ride a public bus. He believed Ann Arbor was too spread out to make a bus system work properly, as opposed to large cities like Boston and Toronto, noting that he has observed City buses driving around nearly empty. He believed there were several serious problems with the plan: 1) closing the Barton-M-14 interchange would force people to take a longer route throughout the City to access the freeway, which was a waste of fuel and time; 2) the plan, by narrowing streets and adding bus routes, tried to force people to leave their cars behind which people would not do regardless of how expensive gas became; and 3) he discouraged the approval of light rail service into this relatively small city. He asked that the City think long and hard before adopting this plan and that the City not let history repeat itself.

Noting no further speakers, Pratt declared the public hearing closed.

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Kunselman, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adopts the Northeast Area Transportation Plan as an element of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan.**

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Kunselman, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that City Council adopt the Northeast Area Transportation Plan as an element of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan.**

D'Amour stated that he was very passionate about the Northeast Area Transportation Plan (NEATP), as he had been involved from the very beginning. He appreciated the previous speaker's comments, but said the City has taken steps to move from a completely auto-oriented transit system. He said the NEATP has been the genesis of the City's non-motorized transportation plan, which has been a high priority of the City. The City was still very auto-oriented, he said, and this document reflected that. However, he said, other factors had to be considered and an effort made to look at non-motorized options. He believed this document did a terrific job of addressing all of these concerns. He also noted that the Planning Commission reviewed development proposals with respect to pedestrian orientation and non-motorized transportation. He believed the City was moving forward with different alternatives. He suggested that the "Signal Coordination" section of plan be amended as recommended in the staff report.

**Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Potts, to amend "Chapter 6: Roadway – Signalization" on pages 226 and 253, by adding the following language after "The application of SCOOT through northeast Ann Arbor" as follows: "...s arterials, in combination with the coordination of the City's traffic signal system with the freeway system and surrounding jurisdictions," and to strike out "in the Plymouth, Huron Parkway, Washtenaw Avenue and Geddes Road corridors;" "along each of these corridors;" and "their."**

Kunselman suggested that Commission agree to incorporate all of the recommended changes in the staff report, rather than wordsmith the document.

D'Amour said he was willing to move all of the amendments recommended in the staff report with the exception of the amendment to the "Street Interconnections" section. He also clarified that the Barton/M-14 interchange was not a part of these amendments. He withdrew his first motion and continued with the following motion:

**Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Potts, to amend the two main motions by adding the following language to the end of each, "subject to adoption of recommended changes in the August 1, 2006 staff report, with the exception of the proposed amendment to Street Interconnections."**

Carlberg noted that in the "Intergovernmental Cooperation" section, line 5 of the paragraph under "7.6 Inter-jurisdictional Cooperation," the word "Washtenaw" needed to be added in front of "Metro Alliance."

Commission agreed with this friendly amendment to the motion.

Potts said she agreed with the proposed amendments, except for the changes regarding intersection/roadway widening under "Roadside Standards." She said Commission recently had a presentation on roundabouts and wondered if they were being recommended as part of this plan.

Rampson stated that the roundabout option was evaluated for the Maiden Lane/ Broadway/Plymouth Road intersection, but said it was removed from the recommendations because of lack of support from the citizen advisory committee.

Potts asked about the Main/Kingsley/Beakes intersection.

Rampson responded that a roundabout was not feasible for this intersection because of the lack of space. She said buildings were situated too close to the right-of-way.

Potts asked what level of analysis was contained in the report as to what was suitable for each intersection.

Rampson stated that there was underlying analysis in the documentation that supported all the planning for the report. She said this analysis included evaluation of the different intersections and their levels of service. If there were concern that the plan made it sound as though roadway widening was the only option, she suggested perhaps Commission might want to add language that spoke to other capacity-enhancing improvements, such as roundabouts.

Potts thought the plan should contain a recommendation for roundabouts where feasible. She suggested that the end of the first sentence of the first paragraph in Section 7.3 read, "...to the effect that an alternative plan for widening select intersections should include a consideration for roundabouts."

Pratt said it might be appropriate to change the title of Table 7-2 to "Improvement Priorities." If Commission were going to move to specific modifications of the text, he suggested that this be considered after Commission voted on whether to amend the two main motions, as was currently on the table.

Emaus stated that one of the intentions of this section was to change the LOS (level of service) from C to D and wondered if the section could say, "to explore alternative designs to try and maintain a LOS C." He said the entire section on widening was about reducing the LOS and the widening came into play to try and maintain that level of service. If a standard of accepting a LOS D were adopted, he said, there would be no need for a high priority of widening streets.

Rampson stated that the intersection widening priorities were based on LOS D; the widenings would have been more dramatic if a LOS C were continued.

Pratt believed the idea was that keeping these difficult intersections at a LOS D would allow getting by with minor improvements. He thought perhaps other Commissioners were interested in heading toward an alternative concept of maintaining a LOS C or better if alternatives besides widening were allowed. With this in mind, he wondered if any Commissioners thought other sections of the plan should be reworded, or if this were the only section that should be discussed.

Bona suggested following through with the motion on the table, which was to amend the main motions to include the recommended amendments contained in the staff report, as the discussion about LOS C and LOS D were part of the base report, not part of the recommended changes.

Carlberg did not think it would be appropriate to amend the main motion to include the recommended amendments, and then go back and change those amendments.

Pratt clarified that the motion on the floor was to amend the main motion by adding the two pages of recommended amendments in the staff report, with the exception of the amendments to the Street Interconnections section on page 2 of the report.

D'Amour suggested that the word "widening" in the title of Table 7-2 be changed to "improvement".

Pratt suggested that where the word "widening" appeared in Section 7.3, it be replaced with "capacity improvement."

Lipson suggested that the title of Section 7.3 be changed to "Roadway Capacity Improvement" and the title of Table 7-2 be changed to "Roadway Capacity Improvement Priorities."

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Kunselman, to change the title of Section 7.3 to "Roadway Capacity Improvement," to change the title of Table 7-2 to "Roadway Capacity Improvement Priorities," and that where the word "widening" appeared in Section 7.3, it be replaced with "capacity improvement."**

A vote on the amendment showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson,  
Potts, Pratt  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Potts moved to amend the motion to the two main motions to eliminate "with the exception of the proposed amendment to Street Interconnections."

There was no second to this motion.

Pratt suggested that language be added to the motion that would amend the two main motions to read as follows: "subject to adoption of recommended changes in the August 1, 2006 staff report related to Signal Coordination, Traffic Studies and Funding Related to New Development, Roadside Standards, and Intergovernmental Cooperation."

Commission agreed that this be a friendly amendment.

A vote on the amendment to the two main motions showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson,  
Potts, Pratt  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously, reads as follows:**

**“..., subject to adoption of recommended changes in the August 1, 2006 staff report related to Signal Coordination, Traffic Studies and Funding Related to New Development, Roadside Standards, and Intergovernmental Cooperation.”**

D'Amour stated that with regard to the Street Interconnections section, when the NEATP was being developed, the consultant focused on no new roads and it was agreed that any new asphalt be kept to a minimum. He wondered what the basis was for the proposed changes in this section, as it appeared that new roads had now been added.

Bona said she initiated this as a way of continuing to disperse traffic and not continue to funnel it onto fewer and fewer streets. She thought it was very important to interconnect neighborhoods for both the safety of neighborhoods and for the dispersal of traffic.

Lipson agreed with Commissioner Bona. Although he did not attend the NEATP meetings, he said, it was his understanding that the consultant's theory of reducing roadways was related to reducing major new improvements in roadways. He said these small interconnections, in fact, would reduce the need for extensive new roadways and would shorten trips. He stated that this was a good philosophy to promote and said he supported this change to the plan.

Emaus said he fully supported Commissioner Bona's recommended change in the Street Interconnections section. He said he lived south of the northeast area where there were a lot of interconnected neighborhoods and, therefore, accessibility to many different things. In looking at the Neighborhood Accessibility Map, he said, there was almost nothing accessible in the northeast area. It appeared to be a rural area, he said, which was surprising since it was in the middle of Ann Arbor. He said it was difficult to access the high school, the hospital system, and other areas from the northeast area. He believed that simple designs to provide more interconnection in this area of the City, when the opportunities presented themselves, would be very beneficial to the community as a whole, and to the services that exist in the area. He supported moving in that direction, stating that it was a good vision.

Potts agreed, stating that this was an effort to correct some of the mistakes of the past involving the isolation of neighborhoods.

**Moved by Bona, seconded by D'Amour, to amend the two main motions by adding the proposed amendments to the Street Interconnections section contained in the August 1, 2006 staff report.**

A vote on the amendment to the two main motions showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson,  
Potts, Pratt  
NAYS: None

**Motion carried unanimously.**

D'Amour stated that the issue of the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange has been around for a very long time, before the Northeast Area Plan came into being. He provided background information on both the Northeast Area Plan and Northeast Area Transportation Plan in relation to the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange. He stated that the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange was a major issue during the Northeast Area Transportation Plan, with many neighborhoods and residents living outside of the City participating. It generated a great deal of controversy, he said, and it took a while for the technical citizens advisory committee to come together as a group. However, he said, the committee did a good job of coming up with methods to get through the process. In the end, he said, the consultant concluded that the closure of the eastern side of the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange would be the most feasible, taking into account future traffic demands and determining that the intersection would be insufficient in operating at capacity. The majority of the technical citizens advisory committee agreed, he said, and he had a great deal of difficulty interfering with the public process and changing the hard work of the consultant and committee. If Commission were going to change this result, which was truly a public process, he said, then Commission would need to be specific about what changes it thought should be made. He did not want to come up with a recommendation of no change/status quo after such a long process and the time and amount of money spent. If Commission were to change the recommendation for the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange, he said, specific options should be identified.

Kunselman stated that the recommendation for the interchange was made in 2002 and it was now 2006. A new high school was being constructed on Maple Road at M-14, he said, which was not part of the modeling done at the time. It did not take into account the large number of high school students who would be using the interchange to get to and from school. Also, he thought it would be contradictory to recommend the closing of the interchange in light of the amendments Commission just made about interconnectedness between neighborhoods. If this interchange were closed, he said, it would force people to drive roundabout ways through town, which he did not support. He strongly supported removing the recommendation of closing the interchange from the plan.

Carlberg asked if it were correct that the new high school was not considered in the traffic projections.

Rampson stated that the model included growth from the proposed new high school, but it did not anticipate particular driving patterns.

Carlberg stated that she has been on city Council since the original resolution was made ten years ago to look into the interchange situation. She said it was driven by residents on Barton Drive who were very concerned about traffic on their small residential street, which was why Council moved forward with an investigation into what should be done about the ramps onto the highway. She stated that the traffic consultant for the NEATP predicted that, in time, this interchange would become a non-functional access onto the highway, that, without taking any action, this ramp would close down or become less and less used by people who find it to be unsafe or non-functional. She said she has been on other similar exit ramps where the speed limit was 15 miles per hour, so this was not too unusual, but she did not think it was usual for entrance ramps. She said WATS has taken into account other access points that have been closed for the protection of neighborhoods and were never reopened, so their concern was for people living outside of the community having fewer opportunities to come into Ann Arbor, which she thought was a disadvantage. She was impressed that the City was no longer hearing concerns or requests to close the interchange from the residents along Barton Drive. She thought conditions had changed over time to make this less compelling of an action to take. She also expressed concern about closing the interchange now and there being no funds to reopen it at some time in the future. There was no way of saying what MDOT would do, she said, but they were definitely looking for a signal from this community and, once a decision was made, there would then be conversations on how to proceed. For

various reasons, she did not feel it was in the community's best interest to close the access ramp on the eastern side of the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange. She did not see any appropriate options and said she was willing to keep it open and see what happened over time.

Lipson pointed out that, ultimately, this was not Commission's decision, that Commission would only be making a recommendation on the interchange and that the final decision would be that of MDOT. When he saw the accident report, he said, he was struck by how few accidents there were at the entrance ramp. He thought this may reflect the statement made by Commissioner Carlberg; that people who knew the unsafe condition of the intersection were choosing to go elsewhere. He did not see a reason to close the intersection at this time, noting that this access provided an important interconnection to neighborhoods. He also noted the argument made by adjacent townships that this interchange was important to keep open for emergency vehicle access. He disagreed with one of the previous speakers about the contents of this plan, stating that it was critical now, especially with high gas prices, to look into the viability of other alternatives. He noted that the AATA bus that stops near his office every 15 minutes is always full. He stated that the benefits of having viable public transportation and bicycle transportation far outweighed their costs. He said this plan helped to promote all the alternatives that need to be used. He suggested that perhaps it would be best if Planning Commission adopted the plan this evening without the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange recommendation, and that Commission then vote on the interchange separately.

**Moved by Lipson, seconded by Kunselman, to amend the two main motions by adding the following language to the end of each: "..., with the exception of the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange closing recommendation."**

Lipson said this would allow Commission to go ahead and discuss the actual interchange and how to proceed with that following action on the plan itself.

Pratt stated that the record would show how many Commission members voted in favor of the amendment and how many voted against it. He did not necessarily see the value in having a second discussion, unless Commission was to come up with a concrete proposal for a different option.

Emaus said it was good to have a number of routes by which to get around the City, stating that there were several alternatives that presented additional routes in this area that could be considered while leaving the interchange open, such as extending Whitmore Lake Road, improving the interchange to make it more accessible, or revise the interchange at Main Street with more avenues for people to use. He also pointed out that the accident report indicated more accidents in the westbound portion of M-14, rather than the eastbound portion. This could be because people were already aware of the dangerous situation at the westbound interchange and no longer used it. He thought it was important to consider some of the other recommendations and not focus on one way.

Potts stated that one of the most impressive things about the consultant's work was the analysis done on all of the possible alternatives. She said they were very thoroughly researched, data was provided for them, and then a detailed outline on why each one would or would not work was done. She said each one had enough problems so that none of them could be recommended. Another part she found impressive was the analysis done on what the impact would be on those people who would no longer be able to use the interchange once it was closed. She said this resulted in almost a negligible amount of time added on to an alternative trip. She wondered if the study MDOT would be doing on US-23 could possibly include the M-14 area. This would result in additional information that may be helpful in coming up with a solution to the interchange problems, she said.

Rampson said it was her understanding that the scope of that study did not include M-14, only US-23.

Potts said she would be happy to encourage MDOT to make any kind of improvements to the on-ramp that could be done without rebuilding the interchange. She thought this would be the best solution to allow keeping it open.

Bona disclosed that she did have a conversation with Cheryl McCrell, of Barton Hills Village, about this subject. She asked Ms. Rampson if there had been any minor improvements to the interchange since the plan had been completed.

Rampson stated that MDOT has made signage and lane marking improvements, adding that MDOT continued to evaluate the issue of improvements and would continue to make improvements as the budget allowed.

Bona said she did not support recommending the closure of this interchange for many of the reasons already stated. She was opposed to creating less access into and around the City. She said the issue of cost was relative and she was not sure they were at the point now to evaluate whether something was or was not worth doing. She was not opposed to having ramps that worked slowly and encouraged traffic to move more slowly. She said the speed limit on M-14 in this location was 55 miles per hour, yet traffic moved at a much faster speed. Perhaps there were ways to reduce the speed on this portion of the highway, she said, which could improve the situation. She was not opposed to making a recommendation to leave this ramp open and said she would like to see how some of the smaller improvements over time dealt with the traffic issues at this interchange. She agreed that this ramp was not used very often and would continue to have a low use.

Borum said he was resisting the idea of closing the ramp, particularly without a specific plan to replace it. He believed its closure would put more pressure on other areas of the City. He supported the proposed amendment to the main motion, stating that he did not want to see all of the good recommendations in the plan delayed.

Pratt stated that the overall needs of the community had to be considered, noting that closure of the interchange would cut off a large distance of access with no alternative. It was difficult to recommend closing the interchange without having alternatives in place. He expressed his appreciation for all of the hard work that has gone into this plan.

Pratt said it appeared that cheap material was used for the signage improvements at the interchange, noting that the reflectivity was gone. Perhaps a resolution might be in order in the near future to recommend the examination of safety improvements, he said.

A vote on the amendment to the main motions showed:

YEAS:	Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson, Potts, Pratt
NAYS:	D'Amour

**Amendment carried.**

Emaus stated that for future master plans having a major corridor that ran between two planning areas, he would like that major corridor to be considered as a separate entity, rather than part of a specific master plan. For example, he used the Washtenaw Avenue corridor. He stated that the neighborhoods south of Washtenaw were interconnected and when Washtenaw was operating at a LOS E or F, people used the southern neighborhoods to get through. This was not possible in the neighborhoods to the north, he said, because they were not interconnected. He said it was not appropriate for the residents in

these neighborhoods to the south to participate in the Northeast Area Plan, because they did not live in that area, yet the major corridor was relevant to the whole City.

**Moved by D’Amour, seconded by Potts, that the two main motions be amended by adding the following language to the end of each: “...with the recommendation of the “no change option” including incremental improvements (safety and signage) for the Barton Drive interchange and including text amendments to page 23, Chapter 3 (the no change option with incremental improvements for the Barton Drive interchange.)”**

D’Amour said approval of this amendment would be telling City Council that the Planning Commission recommend keeping the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange open with the understanding that improvements, such as signage and safety improvements, be made.

Potts said she did not want to draw the line as to being specific about improvements, as an extension of the ramp might be possible. She would not want to preclude that improvement.

A friendly amendment was made to remove “safety and signage.”

Kunselman suggested that perhaps it would be appropriate to make this change to the actual document, not the motion.

Pratt said this would include narrative changes to the plan on pages 23 and 108, Chapter 3, to encourage safety improvements.

D’Amour said he would agree with doing that. He supported amending the main motion, as well as page 23, which would read, “the no change option with incremental improvements be considered for the Barton Drive interchange.”

A vote on the amendment to the main motion showed:

YEAS:	Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D’Amour, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson, Potts, Pratt
NAYS:	None

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Carlberg stated that this document represented the work of hundreds of people, including staff, citizens, and the consultant. It also represented the finest document developed in this community to move forward in the direction Ann Arbor should go, she said. She thought the community would be well served by using this document as guideline. The challenge would be in implementing the document, she said, adding that decision-makers would need to be continually reminded that this document should be used as a reference when making decisions. She thanked all who participated in the plan for a fine job.

Rampson stated that, at one time, there was a question as to whether the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange should be moved to the north. She said Council might appreciate feedback from the Planning Commission as to whether that was no longer an option so the right-of-way that was reserved could be used for parkland or something else.

D'Amour stated that the "no change" recommendation approved by Commission indicated that the interchange should remain in its current form and not intrude into the right-of-way that was originally set aside and had now become a greenway.

Emaus said this was one of the reasons he voted in favor of the "no change" option for the interchange, adding that he did not vote for alternative #1, which recommended using the greenway as an interchange.

Potts stated that if that right-of-way were going to be used for an alternative access, it would have been used by now. She did not think it was a suitable alternative any longer.

Bona suggested that perhaps this should be addressed in a separate recommendation because it has been made clear in the document that this interchange would fail and the City did set aside that land some time ago when planning for the future. She supported letting Council know whether or not Commission thought the City should continue holding onto that land for an access option.

A vote on the main motions, as amended, showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus,  
Kunselman, Lipson, Potts, Pratt  
NAYS: None

**Motions carried unanimously, read as follows:**

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Kunselman, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adopts the Northeast Area Transportation Plan as an element of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan, subject to adoption of recommended changes in the August 1, 2006 staff report related to Street Interconnections, Signal Coordination, Traffic Studies and Funding Related to New Development, Roadside Standards, and Intergovernmental Cooperation, with the exception of the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange closing recommendation but including incremental improvements for the interchange with the "no change" option and necessary text amendments to Chapter 3 to include incremental improvements for the interchange; and subject to changing the title of Section 7.3 to "Roadway Capacity Improvement," changing the title of Table 7-2 to "Roadway Capacity Improvement Priorities," and where the word "widening" appeared in Section 7.3, replacing it with "capacity improvement."**

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Kunselman, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that City Council adopt the Northeast Area Transportation Plan as an element of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan, subject to adoption of recommended changes in the August 1, 2006 staff report related to Street Interconnections, Signal Coordination, Traffic Studies and Funding Related to New Development, Roadside Standards, and Intergovernmental Cooperation, with the exception of the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange closing recommendation but including incremental improvements for the interchange with the "no change" option and necessary text amendments to Chapter 3 to include**

**incremental improvements for the interchange; and subject to changing the title of Section 7.3 to “Roadway Capacity Improvement,” changing the title of Table 7-2 to “Roadway Capacity Improvement Priorities,” and where the word “widening” appeared in Section 7.3, replacing it with “capacity improvement.”**

---

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

---

Cheryl McCrell, of Barton Hills Village, volunteered to assist the Planning Commission in coming up with requests for safety improvements for the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange. She suggested that an intergovernmental group, or at least the City, Ann Arbor Township and Barton Hills Village, work together on this. She had a letter from Barton Hills Village to MDOT containing requested safety improvements and said she would provide a copy to staff. She noted the Main Street/M-14 interchange, which had poor visibility, saying she made the suggestion to mitigate the whole situation, which involved having all traffic further west on M-14 moving into the left lane and only allowing traffic entering the highway from Main Street to use the right lane. This would help several situations, she said, including the stop sign at the entrance ramp at Barton Drive.

---

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

---

Potts suggested that another presentation on the Calthorpe recommendations be placed on the next agenda, as it seemed to be a light agenda.

D’Amour said he might take it upon himself to come up with clarifying language as to what was voted on this evening regarding the greenway.

Carlberg suggested that one of the items contained in a recent Commission resolution regarding communication improvements be placed on a future agenda.

---

ADJOURNMENT

---

Pratt declared the meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

---

Mark Lloyd, Manager  
Planning and Development Services

---

Bonnie Bona, Secretary