

From: Kevin Malley
Date: May 16, 2016 at 1:03:56 PM EDT
To: Alex Milsheyn
Subject: Windy Crest Partnership Annexation

Good afternoon, Mr. Milsheyn.

I reside at 310 Meadow Creek Dr and am writing concerning the petition for Windy Crest Partnership Annexation and Zoning for City Council Approval, a hearing for which is scheduled 5/17 @ 7:00. I apologize for the length of this email, but have erred on the side of completeness.

My concerns with the proposal center on whether staff have adequately assessed traffic, pedestrian safety and environmental impacts of the proposed use of this property and with the timing of this petition relative to other supercedent needs and projects. I have previously expressed my concerns re: traffic and safety on Geddes Ave to various city officials, including Sally Petersen and Jane Lumm (ask Sally about her attempt to run along the stretch of Geddes Ave between Concordia West and the boat ramp at Gallup Park), and received positive acknowledgement of the issue, but nothing has been done other than to point to future plans, notably B2B. This leads me to ask the question, "is the city putting the cart before the horse?" Below I summarize some of the issues that I believe should be addressed, beyond future access to water and sewer, before approving this petition.

Traffic

- Geddes Ave has become a main artery into and out of A2.
- The speed limit is set at a patently absurd 40 mph for a narrow urban artery with no shoulders, entering traffic from both sides and limited sightlines, and in comparison with other nearby high traffic roads. Effective speeds, especially west bound along a gradual descent from High Orchard to the boat ramp and beyond, are much higher.
- Sightlines to Geddes traffic east and west from Windy Crest and perhaps from other side roads are very limited due to the S-curve and much worse when trees have leafed out.
- My calculation is that a driver pulling into traffic from Windy Crest has a maximum of 9 seconds from a standing stop to decide, accelerate, merge into 45 mph traffic and come up to 80% of prevailing speed.
- Has the traffic safety impact of adding yet another egress onto Geddes under these conditions with an estimated 2 vehicles per property been modeled?

Pedestrian safety

- no sidewalks and virtually no shoulder
- no designated bike lane
- no cross-walks to and from AATA bus stops
- no safe standing areas at the bus stops
- ironically, AATA cannot improve the bus stops, because they cannot provide ADA access due to the absence of sidewalks
- my in-laws lived with us during warm weather months and were so terrified making their way to the AATA stops along Geddes that we had to purchase a car for their use

- Has the pedestrian safety impact of introducing more homes into an area with no pedestrian infrastructure been modeled?

My take is that, combined, the traffic and safety issues I outline represent known risks with undesirable human consequences that should be addressed prior to increasing the number of residents subject to those risks.

Environmental impact

Some of the environmental impact of the proposed use of this property should now be obvious:

- Want to visit Gallup Park directly across the street? Get in your car, crank it up and drive to the other side of the street.
- Want to take a bike ride? Load the bike onto your car and drive somewhere safe to start your ride.
- Want to commute by bike? It's not safe.
- Beyond that, I assume the staff recommendation has adequately assessed the environmental implications of building in a floodplain, a floodway, and the Huron River Watershed, including:
 - storm water and snow pack runoff introducing vehicle pollutants from new hardscape into the watershed
 - introduction of undesirable runoff from lawn and garden fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides into the watershed
 - the effect of increased infiltration of phosphorous, nitrogen and dissolved inorganic carbon concentrations on undesirable aquatic growth in the Huron River basin, an issue of increasing concern.

At the end of the day, my concerns are two-fold:

1. Have the traffic, safety and environmental issues I outline been adequately and thoroughly assessed prior to issuance of staff recommendation? What is truly known and what hypotheses underlie the recommendations?
2. If the committee is satisfied with the completeness and depth of the staff assessment, is the sequence right? I have been advised that some of my concerns will be addressed via B2B, but this may be a bit too glib. B2B, as I understand it, will not address traffic safety issues on Geddes. B2B will not transport pedestrians from the north side of Geddes to the B2B trail. B2B will not address ADA access to AATA facilities. And BTB will not address the environmental issues I outline. I think a plan and funding to address these issues prior to proceeding with the intent of the petition is the correct sequence.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Kevin Malley
734-730-0490

