

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES STAFF REPORT

For Planning Commission Meeting of December 19, 2023

SUBJECT: Amendments to Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Sections 5.29.8 and 5.29.6 related to Transportation Impact Analyses Requirements and Review Criteria. Amendments to Sections 5.29.8 “Required Plan Information” Paragraph E “Transportation Impact Analysis” and Section 5.29.6 “Site Plans” Paragraph E “Criteria for Review of a Traffic Impact Analysis”

PROPOSED CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the amendments to Chapter 55, Unified Development Code in Sections 5.29.8 and 5.29.6 related to Transportation Impact Analyses Requirements and Review Criteria, Section 5.29.8 Required Plan Information, and Section 5.29.6 Site Plans, Paragraph E Criteria for Review of a Traffic Impact Analysis to update references, simplify language and ensure multimodal emphasis.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the amendments to the Unified Development Code (UDC) to **update references, simplify language and ensure multimodal emphasis** across various sections be **approved** because the changes will improve compliance by development petitioners, further goals of the Comprehensive Plan and clarify intent.

SUMMARY:

An error in the notice for a public hearing to be held by the City Planning Commission on December 5, 2023 for amendments to the Unified Development Code related to transportation impact analyses was discovered after publishing and after a Planning Staff Report was prepared. The public hearing was held and closed while a correct notice was published for a new public hearing to be held on December 19, 2023.

No changes to the proposed amendments have been made. Please refer to the December 5, 2023 Planning Staff Report including December 5, 2023 Draft Ordinance for a description, report and analysis of the proposed amendments.

Prepared by Alexis DiLeo
2023-12-14

Attachments: December 5, 2023 Planning Staff Report including Attachments

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES STAFF REPORT

For Planning Commission Meeting of December 5, 2023

SUBJECT: Amendments to Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) Sections 5.29.8 and 5.29.6 related to Transportation Impact Analyses Requirements and Review Criteria. Amendments to Sections 5.29.8 “Required Plan Information” Paragraph E “Transportation Impact Analysis” and Section 5.29.6 “Site Plans” Paragraph E “Criteria for Review of a Traffic Impact Analysis”

PROPOSED CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the amendments to Chapter 55, Unified Development Code in Sections 5.29.8 and 5.29.6 related to Transportation Impact Analyses Requirements and Review Criteria, Section 5.29.8 Required Plan Information, and Section 5.29.6 Site Plans, Paragraph E Criteria for Review of a Traffic Impact Analysis to update references, simplify language and ensure multimodal emphasis.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the amendments to the Unified Development Code (UDC) to **update references, simplify language and ensure multimodal emphasis** across various sections be **approved** because the changes will improve compliance by development petitioners, further goals of the Comprehensive Plan and clarify intent.

Staff recommends postponement of this action until the December 19, 2023, meeting to correct an error in the publication notice.

SUMMARY:

Amendments are proposed to the required plan information requirements in Section 5.29.8.E (Transportation Impact Analysis) to update references to the “2010 Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Transportation Impact Analyses for Site Development” manual and exchange for the “2023 Institute of Transportation Engineer’s Multimodal Transportation Impact Analyses” manual. Amendments are also proposed to the site plan standards in Section 5.29.6.E (Criteria for Review of a Traffic Impact Analysis) to change references from traffic, parking and streets to multimodal transportation and multimodal levels of services.

REPORT AND ANALYSIS:

The proposed amendments bring helpful updates to the UDC to reference a modernized approach to transportation planning, encompassing all modes of travel and aligning with city practices and goals. Although staff would like to make future improvements to these sections, the immediate proposed changes are achievable, endorsed by transportation staff and would present immediate clarity to development review customers.

These batch amendments address the following issues regarding Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) standards and requirements:

1. **Update Methodology in TIA Requirements:** Section 5.29.8.E of the UDC references the 2010 Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) manual for TIAs, which is outdated compared to the 2023 version. The newer manual, the 2023 Institute of Transportation Engineer's Multimodal Transportation Impact Analysis for Site Development, emphasizes multimodal transportation analysis, including pedestrian and bike connections, safety, and ADA accessibility. These amendments clarify the 2023 document is the required reference, and strike UDC language redundant to the manual which caused confusion for UDC users.
2. **Improve Vehicle-Centric Review Criteria:** Section 5.29.6.E identifying TIA review criteria is criticized for focusing on vehicular traffic and lacking in comprehensiveness regarding all modes of travel. It is changed to emphasize multimodal level of service as the prevailing review criteria. This allows for review by many more modes of travel, including transit, pedestrian, and bicycle levels of service.

Moving forward, planning and transportation staff recognize the importance of addressing multimodal transportation impacts in both the review and approval processes, reflecting the city's commitment to comprehensive transportation planning. This amendment review process revealed opportunities for future changes and clarification. These were discussed with the Ordinance Revisions Committee but are not ready at this time, as they will require additional staff time to formulate. These include:

3. **Deeper Amendments to Review Criteria:** The existing review criteria for TIAs focus on completeness and accuracy but lack clear compliance thresholds. The current criteria should be reviewed more thoroughly to assess the City's response to developer TIA outputs and make explicit our expectations in areas such as mitigation measures. This should be considered carefully and in concert with all affected departments.

Please see attached draft ordinance for proposed amendments to Section 5.29 regarding transportation impact analysis requirements and review criteria as recommended above by staff.

Prepared by Hank Kelley and Alexis DiLeo
Reviewed by Brett Lenart
12-05-2023

Attachments: 2023-12-05_CPC_Transportation MTIA UDC Ordinance
2023-06-27_ORC_Staff Memo MTIA Requirements Standards

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 5.29.6 and 5.29.8 OF CHAPTER 55
(UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE) OF TITLE V OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF ANN
ARBOR - MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS

The City of Ann Arbor ordains:

Section 1. That Section 5.29.6.E of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor be amended as follows:

E. Criteria for Review of a Multimodal Traffic Impact Analysis

1. The ~~traffic and/or parking~~multimodal transportation impact analysis shall be reviewed by the Public Services Area for completeness and accuracy.
2. Proposed plans that will ~~contribute traffic to streets or intersections that are or will be as a result of this proposed plan at in~~ a multimodal level of service D, E, or F ~~as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual~~ may be denied by the Planning Commission or City Council until such time as ~~necessary street or traffic~~ transportation improvements are scheduled for construction.

Section 2. That Section 5.29.8.E of Chapter 55 (Unified Development Code) of Title V of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor be amended as follows:

E. Transportation Impact Analysis

~~For proposed Special Exception Uses or Developments that will generate more than three trips per unit per peak hour or 50 trips per peak hour, a transportation impact analysis must be provided including the following. The methodology to be employed in determining street capacities shall conform to the 2010 Institute of Transportation Engineers' Transportation Impact Analyses for Site Development, or the latest revision thereof.~~

1. ~~For proposed Special Exception Uses or Developments~~Site plans that will propose to generate more than three trips per unit per peak hour or 50 trips per peak hour shall provide ; a multimodal transportation impact analysis must be provided including the following. The following the methodology to be employed in determining street capacities shall conform to the 2010 of the 2023 Institute of Transportation Engineers' Multimodal Transportation Impact Analyses for Site Development, or the latest revision thereof.
2. Area plans that propose to generate more than three trips per unit per peak hour or 50 trips per peak hour shall provide information on trip generation, trip distribution, modal split, and areas of impact so the magnitude of the rezoning or proposed development can be understood.

- ~~1. Existing traffic volumes passing on all streets abutting the proposed SEU or Development during the peak hour. Traffic from other new and proposed SEUs and Developments in the area should be considered.~~
- ~~2. Existing peak hour turning movements of vehicular and non-motorized traffic at all public street intersections within a minimum 200 feet of the proposed SEU or Development, or those intersections that may be impacted by the proposed SEU or Development.~~
- ~~3. Projected peak hour generation rate and peak hours of generation for the proposed SEU or Development.~~
- ~~4. Projected peak hour traffic movements as a result of the SEU or Development.~~
- ~~5. A capacity analysis for impacted intersections.~~
- ~~6. A statement of the total impact the projected generation will have on the existing level of service as determined and certified by a registered engineer.~~
- ~~7. A sketch plan showing all existing Driveways to public streets within 200 feet of the proposed SEU or Development and all on-street parking or loading areas.~~
- ~~8. Proposed Site access Driveways with a determination if a deceleration lane or taper is necessary based on current City warrant analysis standards, a determination if a left-turn by-pass lane is necessary based on a warrant analysis, and a sight distance study at the Site access Driveway.~~
- ~~9. A pedestrian circulation plan showing all possible points of conflict between motorized traffic and pedestrian/bicycle traffic on public streets and sidewalks within 200 feet of the proposed SEU or Development, or those intersections that may be impacted by the proposed SEU or Development.~~
- ~~10. A gap study for pedestrian or vehicular traffic may be required at non-signalized locations that may be impacted by the proposed SEU or Development.~~
- ~~11. The analysis shall provide a determination of the service volume and capacity of adjacent streets including the traffic from the SEU or Development.~~

Section 3. That this ordinance shall take effect and be in full force on and after ten days from legal publication.



M E M O R A N D U M

To: City Planning Commission Ordinance Revisions Committee

FROM: Alexis DiLeo, City Planner
Hank Kelley, Deputy Planning Manager

DATE: June 27, 2023

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendment to Unified Development Code (UDC) –
Transportation Impact Analysis Requirements and Standards

City of Ann Arbor Transportation Division staff have requested and suggested ways to clarify and improve the requirements and standards for approval for transportation impact analyses (TIA). Below are diagnosis and commentary with conceptual amendments for discussion.

DIAGNOSIS AND COMMENTARY #1

Requirements for preparation of transportation impact analyses reference the 2010 Institute of Transportation Engineer (ITE) manual, as well as 11 specific components. This requirement is outdated as the most current manual was published in 2023, which now defines and provides uniform guidance for multimodal analysis, and presents potential conflicts between the published methodology and listed specifications.

Required information on site plans is articulated in Section 5.29.8, Chapter 55 of the Unified Development Code. Subsection E provides the requirements for when and how a transportation impact analysis (TIA) is provided. A TIA is required when a project will generate more than 50 trips per peak hour¹. The TIA must use the methodology prescribed in “the 2010 Institute of Transportation Engineer’s Transportation Impact Analysis for Site Development” or latest revision thereof.” Eleven specific data points or measurements are also listed, however it is unclear if these points are in addition to or instead of the methodology provided in the ITE manual.

Outdated Methodology – Transportation staff have been requesting and requiring applicants to provide a multimodal transportation analysis (MTIA) for quite some time, which include analysis of things like crashes, pedestrian and bike connections, and safety. However, applicants often express frustration at unclear guidelines in the UDC or elsewhere to produce an MTIA, along with the added expense to analyze additional factors².

¹ Morning and evening peak hour depends in part on site location; in Ann Arbor they are generally weekdays 6am to 9am and 3pm to 6pm.

² An excellent, recent example is the South Town project.

As evidenced by the name, the latest revision of the Institute of Transportation Engineers manual now explicitly directs analysis to address multimodal transportation. The differences in the findings between results from the previous 2010 methodology for a TIA and the current 2023 methodology for a MTIA include:

- Sidewalk gaps analysis to determine the ability to travel to/from a site as a pedestrian;
- Transit stop and ADA accessibility to/from the site;
- Bicycle and pedestrian quality/level of service; and
- The impacts proposed development will have on the safety performance/outcomes of an intersection or corridor (especially critical at locations identified with existing safety needs by A2 Moving Together plan).

Potential Conflicts – By listing numerous criteria below the requirement to follow the methodology of the ITE manual, it is unclear if these data sets and points of analysis are in addition to, or instead of, the ITE methodology.

Comments and Conceptual Amendments – Section 5.29.8.E should be amended to reflect that a report conforming to the 2023 Institute of Transportation Engineer’s Multimodal Transportation Impact Analysis for Site Development is required. With this amendment, listing the individual components is not necessary.

Section 5.28.8 Required Plan Information

E. Transportation Impact Analysis

~~1. For proposed Special Exception Uses or Developments Site plans that will propose to generate more than three trips per unit per peak hour or 50 trips per peak hour shall provide; a multimodal transportation impact analysis must be provided including the following. The following the methodology to be employed in determining street capacities shall conform to of the 2010-2023 Institute of Transportation Engineers’ Multimodal Transportation Impact Analyses for Site Development, or the latest revision thereof.~~

~~2. Area plans that proposed to generate more than three trips per unit per peak hour or 50 trips per peak hour shall provide information on trip generation, trip distribution, modal split, and areas of impact so that the magnitude of the rezoning or proposed development can be understood.~~

- ~~1. Existing traffic volumes passing on all streets abutting the proposed SEU or Development during the peak hour. Traffic from other new and proposed SEUs and Developments in the area should be considered.~~
- ~~2. Existing peak hour turning movements of vehicular and non-motorized traffic at all public street intersections within a minimum 200 feet of the proposed SEU or Development, or those intersections that may be impacted by the proposed SEU or Development.~~

- ~~3. Projected peak hour generation rate and peak hours of generation for the proposed SEU or Development.~~
- ~~4. Projected peak hour traffic movements as a result of the SEU or Development.~~
- ~~5. A capacity analysis for impacted intersections.~~
- ~~6. A statement of the total impact the projected generation will have on the existing level of service as determined and certified by a registered engineer.~~
- ~~7. A sketch plan showing all existing Driveways to public streets within 200 feet of the proposed SEU or Development and all on-street parking or loading areas.~~
- ~~8. Proposed Site access Driveways with a determination if a deceleration lane or taper is necessary based on current City warrant analysis standards, a determination if a left-turn by-pass lane is necessary based on a warrant analysis, and a sight distance study at the Site access Driveway.~~
- ~~9. A pedestrian circulation plan showing all possible points of conflict between motorized traffic and pedestrian/bicycle traffic on public streets and sidewalks within 200 feet of the proposed SEU or Development, or those intersections that may be impacted by the proposed SEU or Development.~~
- ~~10. A gap study for pedestrian or vehicular traffic may be required at non-signalized locations that may be impacted by the proposed SEU or Development.~~
- ~~11. The analysis shall provide a determination of the service volume and capacity of adjacent streets including the traffic from the SEU or Development.~~

DIAGNOSIS AND COMMENTARY #2

Criteria for review of a TIA is weak and does not address all modes of travel.

Section 5.29.6.E provides two criteria for review of a transportation impact analysis. The first criterion is: “the traffic and/or parking impact analysis shall be reviewed by the Public Services Area for completeness and accuracy.”

The second criterion is solely focused on vehicular traffic: projects “that will contribute traffic to streets or intersections that are or will be ... at a level of service D, E, or F may be denied”

Weak and Vehicle-Focused – The criterion that a TIA shall be reviewed for completeness and accuracy is unhelpful as a review measure. It lacks a tangible threshold of compliance and is also unnecessary if the analysis conforms to the methodology of the ITE manual as required.

Vehicle level of service is no longer the sole measure of a successful and safe transportation network. The significant resources and engagement devoted to transportation planning in Ann Arbor are yet not reflected in our codified standards for review.

Conceptual Amendments – Transportation staff suggest modest amendments to improve Section 5.29.6.E:

Section 5.29.6 Site Plans

E. Criteria for Review of a Traffic Impact Analysis

1. The ~~traffic and/or parking~~multimodal transportation impact analysis shall be reviewed by the Public Services Area for completeness and accuracy.
2. Proposed plans that will ~~contribute traffic to streets or intersections that are or will be as a result of this proposed plan at~~in a multimodal level of service D, E, or F ~~as defined in the Highway Capacity Manual~~ may be denied by the Planning Commission or City Council until such time as necessary ~~street or~~ traffic~~transportation~~ improvements are scheduled for construction.

Comments – Planning staff find the conceptual amendments inadequate to address how multimodal transportation impact analyses should be reviewed. For example, compared to the robust and comprehensive criteria for review of natural feature plans (see Section 5.29.6.F), neither the current nor the proposed criteria for review offer meaningful measures to assess a MTIA. Ideally, the review criteria should outline how to determine the effects of a proposed development on the transportation system, along with requesting and evaluating adequacy of mitigation measures.

The criteria for multimodal transportation impact analysis review should address each mode of transportation and factors such as safety and accessibility. The criteria should be based on, and support, the goals and objectives of A2 Moving Together. For example, and for discussion purposes only, the review criteria could be re-written to resemble something like the following:

1. How the proposal addresses safety. (*Example: The effects of the proposed development and recommended improvements to the safety of the transportation system to reduce or eliminate serious injuries and fatalities.*)
2. How the proposal addresses mobility.
3. How the proposal addresses accessibility for all.
4. How the proposal addresses healthy people and sustainable places.
5. How the proposal addresses regional connectivity.

While considering a more robust set of review criteria, it will be important to outline fairness in assigning responsibility for mitigation measures, so that developers do not disproportionately bear the cost for public improvements. Doing so could disincentivize some development and work against other city goals.

Planning staff recommend working with the Transportation Division to improve the criteria for review, and returning to the Ordinance Revisions Committee and Planning Commission with a proposed amendment.

DIAGNOSIS AND COMMENTARY #3

Standards for site plan approval do not address transportation.

Section 5.29.6 Site Plans

C. Criteria for Site Plan Approval

1. The City Council, Planning Commission, or Planning Manager shall make its decision on the site plan based on the following criteria:
 - a. The contemplated Development shall comply with all applicable local, state, and federal law, ordinances, standards, and regulations.
 - b. The Development shall limit the disturbance of Natural Features to the minimum necessary to allow a reasonable use of the land, applying criteria for reviewing a Natural Features Plan as provided in Section 5.29.6F below.

Comments – Planning staff again suggest that the conceptual amendments do not adequately address what to do with the results of a multimodal transportation impact analysis. There is currently no standard for approval in the criteria for site plan approval provided in Section 5.29.6.C – although there is mention that proposed plans contributing (vehicle only) traffic to intersections with levels of service D, E, or F may be denied in the criteria for *review* of a TIA in Section 5.29.6.E.

If transportation impacts resulting from a proposed site plan are as important as protection and mitigation of natural features, a standard for approval should be provided.

Planning staff recommend working with the Transportation Division to craft a new criterion for site plan approval and returning to the Ordinance Revisions Committee and Planning Commission with a proposed amendment. The standard could be formatted similarly to the current standard for disturbance to natural features, and might read as follows:

The Development shall maintain or improve the safety of the transportation system and maintain or reduce vehicle miles traveled, applying the criteria for reviewing a multimodal transportation impact analysis as provided in Section _____.