

## **GEDDES AVENUE RECONSTRUCTION DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

**Date:** Thursday, May 29, 2014  
**Time:** 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Angell Elementary School, 1608 S University Ave.  
**Attendees:** Public present: 39; refer to Appendix A for sign-in sheet  
Council members present: 1; Jane Lumm (Ward 2)  
City staff present: 2; Liz Rolla, Kayla Coleman  
Consultants present: 5; Nancy Faught (HRC); Chuck Hart (HRC); Sally Elmiger (CWA); Ben Carlisle, (CWA); Laura Kreps (CWA)

**Re:** Geddes Avenue Reconstruction

### **MEETING PROCEDURE**

The public meeting included an overview of the main elements of the proposed road reconstruction project, small group discussion, and re-convening as a large group for small group reports and final comments.

During small group discussion participants provided comments on the following topics: roadway, driver experience, non-motorized facilities, and stormwater management. Small group participants were asked to indicate comments and issues most important to them; using a “sticky dot” prioritization approach, participants could place all of their priority dots on one issue, or spread them among multiple comments/issues.

### **DISCUSSION SUMMARY**

Provided below are the combined comments from general discussion at the public meeting, small group notes, and additional written feedback received, organized into the following topic categories: Roadway, Driver Experience, Non-Motorized Facilities and Stormwater Management. Though some comments apply to more than one category, we have attempted to group them in their most logical fit.

Notes:

1. Numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of priority dots the comment received from the small group participants (more dots indicate a higher priority).
2. Where staff provided information and responses to questions, they are shown in italics. Additional staff comments added after the meeting are denoted as “post meeting notes.”

The attached appendices include the following:

- Appendix A: Sign-in sheet from May 29 meeting.
- Appendix B: General discussion notes from May 29 meeting.
- Appendix C: Summary of small group priorities from May 29 meeting.
- Appendix D: Comments provided after the meeting on feedback forms/electronic messages.
- Appendix E: Results of a resident-initiated survey. This survey was created and distributed by a resident within the project area, and distributed to other residents in the project area for their feedback. The survey summary, provided by an area resident, reflects the responses of 9 residents in the project area.

(Note: information within appendices is embedded as a part of the combined ‘Discussion Summary’ but has been provided separately for those interested in an additional level of detail)

Visit [www.a2gov.org/Geddes](http://www.a2gov.org/Geddes) to view information shared at the meeting.

**Combined comments from general discussion at the public meeting, small group notes, and additional written feedback received:**

**I. ROADWAY**

**a. Impacts to Residential Parcels**

- Minimize property loss (11)
  - Use narrow lanes (8)
  - Don't impact adjacent properties by adding bike lanes
- Maximize space between road and houses (11)
  - The closer the homes are to Geddes Ave., the greater the chance for a vehicle accident (1)
- Minimize tree/vegetation/landscaping removal
  - Offset vehicular lanes to south side to limit tree removal
  - Don't eliminate trees to insert lawn extension
  - Existing vegetation provides noise/pollution barrier
- Balance tree preservation and safety
- Plant new trees/hedges/bushes where vegetation is removed

**b. Road Location:**

- Re-center road so that impacts are shared equally between north and south property owners (10)

**c. Road Safety:**

- Geddes Avenue is a major commuter route.
- Geddes Avenue is dangerous. Mailboxes have been hit, and cars ended up in yards.
- Traffic drives too fast; improvements should not increase speeds
- Interest in traffic calming techniques, such as narrow lanes, pedestrian refuge islands to slow speeds (6)
- Add possible stop sign or three-way stop at Arlington/Geddes Ridge/Hill
- Add speed bumps to slow traffic

**d. Sight Distance:**

- Visibility problems from side streets onto Geddes. Difficult to exit side streets onto Geddes (7)

**e. Road/Driveway Coordination:**

- Some driveways intersecting Geddes are steep
- Concern about the impact of new street width/grade on the grade of private driveways. (9)
- Maintain existing road height to minimize impacts to private driveways.
- Concern about costs of re-grading private driveways and if cost is picked up by City
- Concern about the process of how changes to private property are determined

**f. Trash Pick-Up/Mail Delivery:**

- Ensure road extensions are level for recycle/trash/compost cart placement (2)
- Stopped garbage trucks are a problem.
- Collect garbage on one side of the road only
- Relocate mail boxes; add mail-box cut-outs or mail delivery on both sides

g. **Other:**

- Residents on the north and south side of Geddes have different priorities (1)
- Residents have different priorities for road improvements than the general public
- Bury overhead utilities (1)
- Consider maintaining and improving bus routes. Evaluate location of bus stops for better locations.
- Build road and utility facilities based on sound standards
- Provide graphics/visual location of 66-foot road right-of-way. Include this and property lines on any drawings showing design options for road improvements.
- Consider modern “green” materials for the road itself.

**II. DRIVER EXPERIENCE**

a. **Vehicle Speeds:**

- Drivers speed and don’t drive within the speed limit (2)
- Those abiding by the speed limit are passed by others driving too fast.
- The speed limit switches between the city and township jurisdictions. The road should have a consistent speed limit (1)

b. **Road Character:**

- Existing Geddes has a “pretty” aesthetic character. Concerned about losing the existing windy, hilly, country feel. (9)
- Tree removal will be necessary. Concern about how this will change the character of the area (5)

**III. NON-MOTORIZED FACILITIES**

a. **Path/Sidewalk:**

- Existing path/sidewalk considered unusable for children
- Considers space for new path/sidewalk inadequate
- Support for a safe path/sidewalk to Gallup Park (1)
- Support for exploring alternative bike path location on side streets rather than Geddes Ave. (2)
- Support for widening the existing path/sidewalk to path compliant with the American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA) (five-feet -no wider). (1) Concern whether this is feasible given the steep grades
- Support for adding a barrier or lawn extension between road and path/sidewalk.
- Trade-offs of a lawn extension:

<b>Pro</b>	<b>Con</b>
Safety	Impact upon property
Stormwater	Tree and vegetation
Snow plow capture	Stormwater
	Loss of noise buffer

- Concern for putting barrier between path/sidewalk and road (1)
- Adhere to Complete Streets principles.

b. **Pedestrian Crossing at Gallup Park/Geddes Ridge**

- Improve existing pedestrian Crossing at Gallup Park/Geddes Ridge to increase safety. Use a HAWK/blinking light, or other technique (6)

- Add warning, strobe lights (like on Plymouth Road) further uphill, approximately forty-feet on either side of pedestrian crossing
- Concern for rear-end accidents when vehicles are stopped for pedestrians at bottom of hill

c. **Bike Lanes:**

- Don't add a bike lane (8). There is not enough space for bike lanes.
- If bike lanes are added and the road widened, then this shouldn't impact adjacent properties.
- Don't want to encourage biking due to safety (2). Geddes is not a safe route for biking.
- Bike lanes should share space with the off-road pedestrian path/sidewalk (6), or be buffered somehow from traffic (3) to increase safety
- Cyclists should be directed through side streets (2); Cyclists don't want to use Geddes.
- Need some type of bike facility (1)

d. **Non-motorized Facilities – in General:**

- Keep driving lanes same width (no wider) but gain space for bike lanes and path/sidewalk (5)
- Identify path/sidewalk maintenance responsibilities (1)
  - Plows push snow on to sidewalk when they come down Geddes. Who shovels this?

**IV. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT (4)**

- Examine individual properties to determine stormwater issues and localized approach to these issues (17)
- Concern that removal of vegetation will incur stormwater problems. Maintain existing vegetation to manage stormwater runoff (2)
- Existing stormwater issues include:
  - Run-off washing down Arlington
  - 24" culvert at Huntington becomes full and floods yard
    - o Sump across street needs cleaning
  - More than 0.5" of rain creates flows off Geddes onto personal property/driveways.
  - Runoff washes away plants
- Opposition toward curb and gutter unless essential (4). However, others think curb and gutter is acceptable if the property owner does not need to pay for it.
- Concern about how the costs for curb and gutter will be shared. Will properties that benefit indirectly from curb and gutter have to share in the assessment?
- Ditches are acceptable, but limit the width (2)
- Prefer to maintain existing vegetation to take care of stormwater issues; however, stormwater issues on private property need to be addressed.
- Consider installing stormwater facilities on the north side of the street due to the road crown.
- Can stormwater facilities be located between the road and sidewalk?

**V. OTHER**

- Corridor is dark – needs more safe, reasonable lighting (2)
- Question of project necessity: Existing road is in good shape – why disrupt? (2)
- Phone lines are deteriorating; does AT&T know about the project so they can do the repairs at the same time?
- Prefer to meet sanitary needs for people on Riverview without having to go down Riverview.
- Welcome water main going down Riverview.
- Concern about costs.

**APPENDIX A: Sign in sheet**

MIKE MORAN

LARRY ORGANIK

RICH KISLER

Robert Gordon

Susan Wichhart

Steve Davis

Lisa Weidenbach

Pat Johnston

JONATHAN TROBE

Lisa Perschke

NANCY KAPLAN

Jim Wynn

Yen Silk

Joan Margeson

Frank Bogum

DERRICK REDDING

GREG KACVINSKY

MARITA INGLEHART

DAVID + JAWET GARABRANT

Alissa Beveridge

Kay Wilson

HARRY SHEEHAN

Ann Schriber

Edward May

Debbie Dawson

Douglas Dawson

Sheryl Szady

Jarrah Barton Fowler

RAYMOND BEVERIDGE

Julie Seagraves

JOHN WITTEKINDT

Erika Homann

Jere Johnston

Joan Lowenstein

Tom Sidlik

Jenna Foley

Jack Petersen

Michael Wellmar

WOLFRANG BRAT

## **APPENDIX B: General Discussion Notes**

*Note: This is not a direct transcription of the meeting discussion. The following summary has been developed from notes taken during the meeting; comments are paraphrased. Where staff provided information and responses they are shown in italics. Additional staff comments added after the meeting are denoted as “post meeting notes.”*

- What process is used to determine utility/road project priorities? *Road and utility project priorities are determined via the City’s Capital Improvements Planning Process. Post meeting note: Detailed information about the City’s Capital Improvements Planning process is available at [www.a2gov.org/CIP](http://www.a2gov.org/CIP). The staff contact for further questions on this topic is Deborah Gosselin ([dgosselin@a2gov.org](mailto:dgosselin@a2gov.org)).*
- Request for clarification of setback standards – does making the pavement wider mean narrowing of setbacks? *Post meeting note: No, the width of the pavement does not affect the setback. “Setback line, required” is defined as a line parallel to a property line representing the minimum required setback from that property line. For properties fronting Geddes Ave, the setback would be measured from the established Geddes Ave. right-of-way line which will not change with this project.*
- Is project start date in 2015 feasible? *This is a tight project schedule, but the team still anticipates that starting in 2015 is feasible.*
- Will individual properties be evaluated during rain events? [to observe the stormwater impact] *Post meeting note: Yes. Members of the project team plan to visit Geddes during a heavy rain event(s).*
- Recommendation to maintain Devonshire as the preferred bicycle route, rather than Geddes
- Concerned about assessments for new curb and gutter/stormwater system. What does this cost?
  - *High estimate \$15/ft for curb and gutter*
  - *Conventional storm sewer is unlikely; need to comply with Green Street policy*
- Concerned about where stormwater will be directed, want to be kept informed of this during the design process
- It is difficult to assess priorities without cost information...*We don’t have cost information at this time but will provide cost estimates later in the project process.*
  - *Concept Plans, to be shared at a future public meeting, will include cost estimates*
  - *What about costs for replacement landscaping?*
- How will costs of curb & gutter/storm sewer be shared among property owners? *Post meeting note: Typically curb & gutter assessments are calculated by multiplying a unit cost x the length of curb fronting the adjacent/benefitting parcel. Storm sewer assessment methodologies are variable. Work on calculating possible cost estimates or methods of assessment will not happen until we determine an element may be added. We currently do not have plans to add either curb nor conventional storm sewer at this time aside from specific locations / short segments where the property line is substantially higher than the roadway.*
- Prefer next round of meetings scheduled in September rather than July or August

- Like to see an example roadway that is similar to options proposed for Geddes Ave (rather than just conceptual drawings)
- Concerned about input from special interest groups. Property owner concerns should have priority. *Post meeting note: The City of Ann Arbor and consultant project team has reached out to various stakeholder and users of this corridor for additional input to supplement the feedback received from property owners within the project area. A range of stakeholders were invited to the May 29 public meeting and will continue to be engaged throughout the project.*
- Impact of stormwater on Township properties needs to be addressed

## **APPENDIX C: Priorities by Small Group**

Geddes Ave. Public Meeting (May 29, 2014)

City of Ann Arbor

### **Roadway**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Number of Priority Responses</b>
Minimize property loss (narrow vehicle travel lanes; maximize space between road and houses).	<b>31</b>
Re-center road so that impacts are shared equally between north and south property owners.	<b>10</b>
Concerned about how existing driveways on private property will be re-graded to meet the new roadway elevations. Who pays for work on private property? What is the process for deciding what will happen to private property?	<b>9</b>
Visibility concerns (exiting side streets/drives onto Geddes Ave.)	<b>7</b>
Interest in traffic calming design features to slow traffic speeds	<b>6</b>
Leveling of extensions for recycle/trash/compost cart placement	<b>2</b>
Bury overhead utilities	<b>1</b>

### **Driver Experience**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Number of Priority Responses</b>
Existing character of Geddes is pretty – concerned about losing the trees and curvy, country feel.	<b>14</b>
Speeding is a problem	<b>2</b>
Speed limit changes between City and Township should be standardized	<b>1</b>

### **Non-motorized Transportation**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Number of Priority Responses</b>
Opposition toward bicycle facilities on Geddes Avenue due to safety, available space and potential impacts on adjoining properties.	<b>10</b>
Bike lanes should share space with off-road pedestrian path/sidewalk	<b>6</b>
Improve pedestrian crossing at Geddes Ridge/Gallup Park to increase safety (hawk/blinking light, etc.)	<b>6</b>
Maintain existing driving lane width but increase space for bike and sidewalk	<b>5</b>
Off-road bike path or buffer for on-road bike path	<b>3</b>
Improve existing path to 5-foot sidewalk to Gallup Park	<b>2</b>
Direct bicycles through side streets and not down Geddes Ave.	<b>2</b>
Support some type of bike facility along Geddes Ave.	<b>1</b>
Identify sidewalk maintenance responsibilities. Who shovels the walk after the plow pushes snow onto it?	<b>1</b>
Concerned about putting barrier between path and road	<b>1</b>

## Stormwater

Topic	Number of Priority Responses
Conduct an analysis of existing stormwater issues at individual properties and determine localized approach to address road runoff on private property	17
Opposition toward curb and gutter	4
Maintain existing vegetation to manage stormwater runoff	2
Interest in limiting ditch width	2

## Other

Topic	Number of Priority Responses
Existing corridor is dark – needs more lighting	2
Question of project necessity: Existing road is in good shape – why disrupt?	2

## **APPENDIX D: Feedback Form/Written Comment Summary**

In addition to feedback received at the public meeting May 29 additional feedback was received, as summarized below. Post meeting feedback included:

- five written feedback forms/ responses
- four electronic responses (including the results of a resident-initiated survey, completed by 9 residents in the study area)

Note: Numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of people making the same comment.

### ***Roadway:***

- Minimize property/vegetation loss and replace impacted landscaping. (2)
- Share any additional width of the new road equally between north and south properties. (2)
- Calm traffic. (2)
- Turn onto Riverview is dangerous. Can't see cars or pedestrians on Riverview from Geddes.
- Provide ample, level, wide areas for carts (trash, recycle, compost) three-feet apart and highly accessible to automated truck arms. The curb extension should be level to avoid carts being knocked over by wind & passing vehicles.
- Look into modern ("green") materials for road construction.

### ***Stormwater:***

- Importance of existing vegetation to manage stormwater runoff. (2)
- Conflicted regarding curb/gutter since they can help resolve stormwater issues. If possible, prefer to maintain existing vegetation to take care of stormwater issues. If not, some other alternate will be needed to keep stormwater off of private property.
- Concern related to storm debris collecting at the end of driveways
- Currently experiencing private property impacts during intense storm events
- Opposition toward trading existing vegetation for curb/ gutter/ storm drains
- Interested in stormwater management solutions for private property owners

### ***Non-Motorized:***

- Strong opposition toward widening the street to add bike lanes along Geddes Ave. Geddes Ave is dangerous and shouldn't be encouraged as a cyclist route (2)
- Explore alternatives to a bike path on Geddes Ave. (possibly Devonshire or existing bike path that runs through Gallup Park) (2)
- Interest in bike lane on Geddes Ave. Cyclists are already using this road, and it will be safer with a bike lane.
- Adhere to Complete Street principles. (Illustration provided indicating two 4-foot wide bike lanes along both sides of the road, 2-foot wide buffers with vegetation between the bike lanes and vehicular travel lanes, and two 10-foot wide vehicle travel lanes in the middle.)
- Interest in reviewing a design model of proposed new walkway/sidewalk

**Utilities:**

- Preference toward meeting sanitary needs for Riverview residents without utilizing Riverview.
- Interest in/ preference toward water main going down Riverview.
- Interest expressed toward connecting to City water

**Other:**

- Interest in timing repair of overhead telecommunications lines at the same time the new utilities are installed
- Not sure if the setback is affected by additional easements or just the Right-of-way? *Post meeting note: "Setback line, required" is defined as a line parallel to a property line representing the minimum required setback from that property line. For properties fronting Geddes Ave, the setback would be measured from the established Geddes Ave right-of-way line which will not change with this project.*
- Concerned about costs.

## APPENDIX E: Results of Resident Initiated Survey

Resident-initiated survey. This survey was created and distributed by a resident within the project area, and distributed to other residents in the project area for their feedback. The survey summary, provided by an area resident, reflects the responses of 9 residents in the project area.

### Geddes Avenue Resident Survey May 28th 2014

	Name & Address	
	Yes or No	Block Score
1. Are you happy/content with the current look of Geddes Avenue ?	Yes	9 out of 9
2. Is the speed of traffic on Geddes Avenue a concern that you have ?	Yes /No	7/2
3. Do you want to see Geddes Avenue increase in width ?	No	9 out of 9
4. Do you believe increasing the width of Geddes Avenue will result in an increase in traffic speeds ?	Yes	9 out of 9
5. Are you content with the maintenance of the Geddes Avenue pathway ?	No	9 out of 9
6. Would an improved sidewalk be an improvement you would support ?	Yes /No	4/5
7. Would you support an improved sidewalk if there was cost to you as a resident ?	No	9 out of 9
8. Would you support an improved sidewalk if you lost property frontage as a result ?	Maybe /No	1/8
9. Do you want to maintain the trees on Geddes Avenue ?	Yes	9 out of 9
10. Do you want bicycle lanes on Geddes Avenue ?	No	9 out of 9
11. Do you think bicycle lanes on Geddes Avenue would be safe for the riders ?	No	9 out of 9
12. Do you want bicycle lanes on Geddes Avenue if you lost property frontage as a result ?	No	9 out of 9
13. Do you currently have any drainage problems on your property/residence ?	No/Yes	5/4
14. Does the noise associated with passing traffic currently disturb you on your property ?	No/Yes	5/4
15. Do you believe the "City improvements" will increase traffic on Geddes Avenue ?	Yes	9 out of 9
16. What are your top 3 current concerns with Geddes Avenue ? Suggestions below but feel free to add		
a) Overall traffic speed	4	
b) Safety leaving your driveway	2	
c) Safety when picking up your mail	2	
d) Drainage & run off	3	
e) Traffic noise	2	
f) Pathway condition		
g) Maintenance of pathway including snow ploughing procedures	5	
h) Cyclists suitability		
?		
?		
17. Do you believe the \$28K City sewer connection fee is a reasonable charge ?	No	7 out of 9