

# Brightmoor Christian Church Building and Parking Lot Expansion J SP15-07 

cityofnovi.org

## Brightmoor Christian Church: Building and Parking Lot Expansion JSP15-07

Public hearing at the request of Brightmoor Christian Church for Special Land Use Permit, Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan approval. The subject property is located on the north side of Thirteen Mile, west of M-5 in Section 1. The 40-ac re Church property at 40800 Thirteen Mile Road is zoned RA, Residential Acreage. The applicant is proposing to expand the existing Church building to include a new worship space, church offices, parking and associated site improvements.

## Required Action

Approve/deny the Special Land Use Permit, Preliminary Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan

| REVIEW | RESULT | DATE | COMMENTS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Planning | Approval <br> recommended | $02-25-15$ | • Planning Commission findings regarding the <br> height of the proposed building in relation to <br> surrounding land uses. <br> Items to be addressed on the final site plan <br> submittal |
| Engineering | Approval <br> recommended | $02-26-15$ | • Items to be addressed on the final site plan <br> submittal |
| Traffic | Approval <br> recommended | $02-12-15$ | • Items to be addressed on the final site plan <br> submittal |
| Landscaping | Approval <br> recommended | $02-25-15$ | •Items to be addressed on the final site plan <br> submittal <br> - Planning Commission waiver required to <br> reduce the minimum required standards for <br> Interior Parking lot landscaping. Sec. 5.5.3.C |
| Wetlands | Not Applicable |  |  |
| Woodlands | Not Applicable | Racade | Approval <br> Recommended |
| Fire | Approval <br> recommended | $02-06-15$ | - Items to be addressed on the final site plan <br> submittal |

## Motion sheet

## Approval - Special Land Use Permit

In the matter of Brightmoor Christian Church: Building and Parking Lot Expansion, JSP15-07, motion to approve the Special Land Use permit based on the following findings:
a. Relative to other feasible uses of the site:

- The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on existing thoroughfares (based on the findings of the Traffic Impact Study);
- The proposed use will not cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public senvices and facilities (given the size of the new use, and that they are not adding any additional demand than antic ipated);
- The proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land (because the plan does not impact any existing natural features);
- The proposed use is compatible with adjacent uses of land (given there is no change in existing use and the Planning Commission finds that the increased height will be compatible with, and will not have a material negative impact upon, existing and planned uses located on adjacent and surrounding properties, taking into consideration the size and configuration of the site and the proposed building(s), the size and nature of the improvements on the adjacent and surrounding properties, the aesthetic quality of the proposed building(s), including design, exterior materials, and landscaping, and any other relevant a spects of the site or proposed building(s);
- The proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the City's Master Plan for Land Use (given there is no change in existing use);
- The proposed use will promote the use of land in a socially and economically desirable manner;
- The proposed use is (1) listed among the provision of uses requiring special land use review as set forth in the various zoning districts of this Ordinance, and (2) is in hammony with the purposes and conforms to the applicable site design regulations of the zoning district in which it is located;
b. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff review letter and the conditions and the items listed in that letter being addressed; and
c. (additional comments here if any)
(This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 Article 5 and Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.)
-AND-


## Approval - Preliminary Site Plan

In the matter of Brightmoor C hristian Churc h: Build ing and Parking Lot Expansion, J SP15-07,
motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan based on and subject to the following:
a. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards as listed in Section 4.10.5 to allow a building up to 65 feet in height on sitesexceeding 30 acres.
b. Landscape waiver to permit the reduction in minimum requirements for Interior Parking Lot Landscape Calculations as listed in Section 5.5.3.C by 17 trees due to plenty of existing and proposed landscape on site, which is hereby granted;
c. The applicant will work with the City's Landscape Architect to determine the location for replacing the 58 existing trees that will be removed for this construction;
d. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff review letter and the conditions and the items listed in that letter being addressed; and
e. (additional conditions here if any).
(This motion is made because the plan is otherwise in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 Article 5 and Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the
Ordinance.)
-AND-

## Approval - Stormwater Management Plan

In the matter of Brightmoor Christian Church: Building and Parking Lot Expansion, JSP15-07, motion to approve the Stormwater Management Plan, based on and subject to:
a. The findings of compliance with Ordinance standards in the staff and consultant review letters, and the conditions and items listed in those letters being addressed on the Final Site Plan; and
b. (additional conditions here if any)
(This motion is made because it otherwise in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applic able provisions of the Ordinance.)

## -OR-

## Denial - Special Land Use Permit

In the matter of Brightmoor Christian Church: Building and Parking Lot Expansion, JSP15-07, motion to deny the Special Land Use permit for the following reasons...(because it is not in compliance with the Ordinance.)

## -AND-

## Denial - Preliminary Site Plan

In the matter of Brightmoor Christian Church: Building and Parking Lot Expansion, JSP15-07, motion to deny the Preliminary Site Plan, for the following reasons...(because the plan is not in compliance with Article 3, Article 4 Article 5 and Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.)
-AND-

## Denial - Stormwater Management Plan

In the matter of Brightmoor Christian Church: Building and Parking Lot Expansion, JSP15-07, motion to deny the Stomwater Management Plan...(because the plan is not in compliance with Chapter 11 of the Code of Ordinances and all other applicable provisions of the Ordinance.)
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Planning Review

# PLAN REVIEWCENTER REPORT 

February 25, 2015<br>Planning Review<br>Brightmoor Christian Church Expansion<br>J SP15-07

## Petitioner

## Brightmoor Christia n C hurch

## Review Type

Special La nd Use Request a nd Preliminary Site Plan Review (Amended Page 2 on 03-19-15)

## Property Characteristics

- Site Location:
- Site School District:
- Site Zoning:
- Adjoining Zoning:
- Site Use(s):
- Adjoining Uses:
- Site Size:
- Plan Date:

40800 W. Thirteen Mile Road (north side of Thirteen Mile, just west of M5)

Walled Lake Consolidated Schools
RA, Residential Acreage
North: RM-1, Low Density Multiple Family; South (across Thirteen Mile): RA; East (a cross M-5): OST, Offic e Service Technology; West: RM-1 Brightmoor Christian Church
North: Lenox Park residential condominiums; South (across Thirteen Mile): Single family, vacant; East (across M-5): Vacant; West: Fox run retirement living
40.1 acres

J a nuary 21, 2015

## Project Summary

The applicant is proposing to expand the existing Church building to the north with a worship space with auditorium style seating that seats 2,100 people along with accessory uses such as office and additional parking.

## Project History:

Brightmoor Church is an approved special land use in the RA zoning district. On November 4, 1998, the Planning Commission approved the Special Land Use (following a public hearing), the Preliminary Site Plan with a proposed conservation easement for wetland and wetland mitigation near the southeast part of the development. The development included the Brightmoor Christian Church and school complex along with associated surface parking and drainage facilities.

On June 27, 2012, the Planning Commission approved the expansion of the Special Land Use (following a public hearing), the Preliminary Site Plan, the Woodlandspermit, and the Stormwater Management Plan. The development included expansion of the existing parking lot on the north side of the Brightmoor Christian Church site, resulting in a net inc rease of 365 parking spaces and a total of 918 spaces. No new buildings or building expansions were proposed at that time.

On January 26, 2015, the City Council has approved Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.273 to amend the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance at Article 4.0, Use Standards, Section 4.10, Places of Worship, in order to allow additional height for places of worship, under certain conditions, as detailed in the Planning Review Chart.

## PLANNING COMMISSION RNDINGS:

## Special Land Use Considerations

Expansion of a special land use requires a public hearing and special land use approval from the Planning Commission, along with preliminary site plan approval. The proposal also requires approval the stormwater management plan. Section 6.1.2.C of the Zoning Ordinance outlines spec ific factors the Planning Commission shall consider in the review of any Special Land Use:
i. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will cause any detrimental impact on existing thoroughfares in tems of overall volumes, capacity, safety, vehic ular tuming pattems, intersections, view obstructions, line of sight, ingress and egress, acceleration/deceleration lanes, off-street parking, off-street loading/unloading, travel times and thoroughfare level of service.
ii. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities, including water service, sanitary sewer service, storm water disposal and police and fire protection to service existing and planned uses in the area.
iii. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land, including existing woodlands, wetlands, waterc ourses and wild life habitats.
iv. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is compatible with adjacent uses of land in tems of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.
v. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and rec ommendations of the City's Master Plan for La nd Use.
vi. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will promote the use of land in a socially and economic ally desirable manner.
vii. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is
a. listed among the provision of uses requiring special land use review as set forth in the various zoning districts of this Ordinance, and
b. Is in harmony with the purposes and conforms to the applic able site design regulations of the zoning district in which it is located.

## Additional Height Considerations (Amended on 03-19-15)

A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.273 was approved on J anuary 26, 2015 to amend the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance at Article 4.0, Use Standards, Section 4.10 , Places of Worship, in order to allow additional height for places of worship under certain conditions. Section 4.10.5. of the Zoning Ordinance outlines specific factors the Planning Commission shall consider in the review of this proposed additional height (Page 2 of the Planning Review Chart addresses these factors).

Maximum building height shall be as provided in Article 24, provided that, on sites exceeding thirty (30) a cres, buildings may be constructed up to sixty-five (65) feet in height if:
a. the minimum front, side, and rear yard building setbacks are increased by one and one-half (1.5) feet for every one (1) foot of building height in excess of thity-five (35) feet;
b. the site abuts a freeway ora MajorArterial road;
c. the Planning Commission finds that the increased height will be compatible with, and will not have a material negative impact upon, existing and planned uses located on adjacent and surrounding properties, taking into consideration the size and configuration of the site and the proposed building(s), the size and nature of the improvements on the adjacent and surrounding properties, the aesthetic quality of the proposed building(s), including design, exterior materials, and landscaping, and any other relevant aspects of the site orproposed building(s).

## Recommendation

Approval of the Special Land Use Permit and Preliminary Site Plan is recommended. The plan generally conforms to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance; however, there are landscape, engineering and traffic related items to be addressed on the next Site Plan Submittal. In its review and approval, the Planning Commission will need to consider the standards for Special Land Use consideration of Section 6.1.2.C. as listed above

## Ordinance Requirements

This project was reviewed for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance with respect to Article 3.0 (Zoning Districts), Article 4.0(Use Standards), Article 5.0(Site Standards) and any other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Please see the attached charts for information pertaining to ordinance requirements and additional minor comments to be addressed. Items in bold may require a Planning Commission waiver. All other items should be addressed in the response letter prior to the Planning Commission meeting unless otherwise noted.

1. Noise Impact Statement: A noise impact statement is required per Section 5.14.10.B.i. The Planning Commission has the authority to waive this requirement per Section 5.14.10.B.iii. The applic ant should indicate in the response letter whether this statement will be provided.
2. Community Impact Statement: A community impact statement is required for a Special Land Use over 10 acres. The Planning Commission has the authority to waive this requirement The applic ant should indic ate in the response letter whether this statement will be provided.
3. Traffic Impact Study: A traffic impact study is required for this project The applicant has noted that the study is under progress and will submit prior to preliminary site plan approval. The applicant shall submit this study as soon as possible, and no later than March 13th in order to allow the complete matter to be considered by the Planning Commission at a public hearing as antic ipated on March 25.
4. Parking Count: Please provide additional information required with regards to accessory spaces as listed in the attached chart, with the response letter.
5. Bicycle Parking: According to Sec Sec. 5.16.1, for places of worship, a minimum of five (5) percent of required automobile spaces, minimum eight (8) spaces of bicycle parking is required. For 233 of automobile parking, 12 bicycle spaces are required. Please provide bike rack details and bike rack lot layout plan according to the ordinance requirements. Refer to Sec. 5.16. Bicycle parking facility requirements.
6. Loading Spaces and Dumpster: No additional dumpsters or loading spaces are provided. Show the existing locations on the plan or cla
7. Economic Impact Statement: Provide information on total cost of the proposed building and site improvements and number of anticipated jobs created (during construction and after building is occupied, if known) in the response letter.
8. Photometric Plan: The applicant has provided a photometric plan; please refer to chart for additional information required.
9. OtherReviews:
a. Engineering Review: Additional comments to be addressed during Final Site Plan.
b. Landscape Review: Additional comments to be addressed during Final Site Plan.
c. Wetland and Woodland Review: There are no impacts to wetlands and woodlands proposed with this expansion on site.
d. Traffic Review: Additional comments to be addressed during Final Site Plan. Traffic Impact study required prior to Planning Commission meeting.
e. Facade Review: Sample board required prior to Planning Commission meeting.
f. Fire Review: Additional comment to be addressed during Final Site Plan.

## Response Letter

A letter from either the a pplic ant or the a pplic ant's representative addressing comments in this and other review letters is required prior to the Pla nning Commission submittal.

## Signage

Exterior Signage is not regulated by the Planning Division or Planning Commission. Please contact J eannie Niland (248.347.0438) for information regarding sign pemits.

If the applicant has any questions conceming the above review or the process in general, do not hesita te to contact me at 248.735 .5607 or skomaragin@cityofnovi.org.


Sri Ravali Komaragiri - Planner

## PLANNING REVIEW SUMMARY CHART

Review Date: February 23, 2015 (Amended Page 2 on 03-19-2015)
Project Name: JSP15-0007: Brightmoor Christian Church
Plan Date: February 02, 2015
Prepared by: Sri Komaragin, Planner E-mail: skomaragir@cityofnovi.org; Phone: (248) 735-5607

Items in Bold need to be addressed by the applic ant before approval of the Preliminary Site Plan. Underlined items need to be addressed before approval of the Final Site Plan.

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zoning and Use Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Master Plan (adopted August 25, 2010) | Single Family | Church | Yes | November 4, 1998: <br> Special Land Use <br> approved for Church and School <br> June 27, 2012: Special Land Use approved for additional parking |
| Area Study | The site does not fall under any special category | NA | Yes |  |
| Zoning (Effective December 25, 2013) | Residential Acreage (RA) Article 3 | RA | Yes |  |
| Uses Permitted (Sec 3.1.1.B \& C) | Sec 3.1.1.B Principal Uses Pemitted. Sec 3.1.1.C Special Land USes | Places of Worship (Church) | Yes | Special Land Use approval shall be required as this expansion was not shown on any previous plans |
| Use Standards: Places of Worship Sec 4.10 |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Site <br> Size (Sec 4.10.1) | - 3 Acres | 40.15 Acres | Yes |  |
| Minimum Site Width (Sec 4.10.2) | - (200) feet along front yard |  | Yes |  |
| Site Access (Sec 4.10.3) | - All access to the site shall be onto a Major Arterial, Arterial or MinorArterial road as shown on the City's Thoroughfare Plan | Site access is off of West 13 Mile Road | Yes |  |
| Minimum Building Setbacks (Sec 4.10.4) | - Seventy-five (75) feet from all property lines. |  | Yes | Label Building setbacks on plan |
| Parking in Front yard (Sec 4.10.5) | - There shall be no parking in front yard, | -No additional parking is proposed in the front yard | Yes | Label parking Setbacks on plan |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - nor closer than twenty (20) feet from any side or rear lot line, except in those instances, where the lot abutsa residential lot and in those instances, no closer than thirty-five (35) feet on any side or rearyard |  |  |  |
| Parking Lot Screening (Sec 4.10.6) | - Screening of vehic ular parking area sshall be in conformity with requirements atSec 5.5.3 |  |  |  |
| Noise Impact Statement (Sec 4.10.7) | - A noise impact statement is required subject to the standards of Section 5.14.10.B |  |  | Provide required noise impactstatement |

Approved Text Amendment for Increased Building Heights (Approved by City Council on J anuary 26, 2015)

| Site Ac reage | - 30 Acres for building height upto 65 feet | 40.15 Acres | Yes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site Location | - Abuts a limited access freeway ora Major Arterial road | Abuts M-5 Freeway | Yes |  |
| Planning Commission Finding | - The proposed development is compatible with and does not have negative impact on sumpundings. |  |  | Planning Commission is required to make this finding to approve the additional height (Amended 03-19-15) |
| Building Setbacks | - the minimum front, side, and rearyard build ing setbacks are increased by one and one-half (1.5) feet for every one (1) foot of build ing height in excess of thirty-five (35) feet; | For 30ft. of proposed additional height, all minimum setbacks are inc reased by 45 ft . | Yes | See below for required and proposed setbacks |
| Height, bulk, density and area limitations (Sec 3.1.1.E) |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum \% of Lot Area Covered (By All Build ings) | 25\% |  |  | Provide the maximum \% of lot c overed |
| Building Height <br> (Sec. 3.1.1.E) | 35 feet or $2^{1 / 2}$ stories 65 feet (provide the conditions listed above are met) | 65 feet | Yes |  |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building Setbacks (Sec 3.1.1.E)\& |  |  |  |  |
| Front @ Thirteen Mile Way | $75 \mathrm{ft} .+45 \mathrm{ft} .=120 \mathrm{ft}$ | 293 ft . | Yes |  |
| Side (3.6.2.C) | 120 ft. (Same as front) | $735+195=930 \mathrm{ft}$. | Yes |  |
| Rear South | $50 \mathrm{ft} .+45 \mathrm{ft}=95 \mathrm{ft}$. | 490 ft. | Yes |  |
| Parking Setback (Sec 3.1.1.E)Referto a pplic able notes in Sec 3.6.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Front @ <br> Providence Park Way | No Parking in Front Yard | Existing Parking in Front Yard | Yes |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Side East } \\ & \text { (3.6.2.B) } \end{aligned}$ | 120 ft ( Same as front) | Approx. 530 ft . | Yes |  |
| Side West | 35ft. (lot a buts a residential district) | Approx. 135 ft . | Yes |  |
| Rear South | 35ft. (lot abuts a residential district) | 35 ft . | Yes |  |
| Note To District Standards (Sec 3.6.2) |  |  |  |  |
| Area <br> Requirements <br> (Sec 3.6.2.A) | NA |  |  |  |
| Parking Setbacks (Sec 3.6.2.B) | Referto Sec 3.6.2 for more details | Minimum required setbacks are modified accordingly | Yes |  |
| Building Setbacks (Sec 3.6.2.C) | Referto Sec 3.6.2 for more details | Minimum required setbacks are modified accordingly | Yes |  |
| Wetland/Waterc ourse Setback (Sec 3.6.2.M) | Referto Sec 3.6.2 for more details | No Wetlandsand Woodlands on Site | NA |  |
| Parking, Loading and Dumpster Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Parking Spaces Churches <br> 5.2.12.B <br> One (1) for each three (3) seats <br> Schools <br> 5.2.12.B <br> One (1) foreach staff and One for every 4 students over driving age | For 2,100 Seats, a total of 700 spaces are required <br> 1 Space peremployee $=65$ Spaces +1 space for every 4 students over driving age $=13$ Spaces; Total 78 Spaces Existing <br> Total Required: 778 Spaces | Total Existing: 918 (897 <br> Regular; 21 Ba mier free) <br> Parking Lost in <br> Expansion: 191 (175 <br> Regular; 16 Ba mier free) <br> New Spaces Proposed: <br> 233 (211 Regular; 22 <br> Ba mier free) <br> TOTAL 960 (934 Regular; 26 Bamier firee) | Yes | Are the new office spaces proposed with the new addition? <br> How many Youth Worship Seats are proposed in Youth Worship area? What is the age range for the Youth Worship? <br> There are 182 additional spaces then required on site. However, staff wants to make that all accessory uses are accounted for. |
| Parking Space Dimensions and Maneuvering Lanes (Sec. | - $90^{\circ}$ Parking: $9 \mathrm{ft} . \times 19 \mathrm{ft}$. <br> - 24 ft . two way drives <br> - 9 ft. x 17 ft. parking spacesallowed along | $90^{\circ}$ Parking: $9 \mathrm{ft} . \times 17 \mathrm{ft}$. to 18.5 ft . along 8 ft . wide interior sidewalks and landscape spaces. | Yes |  |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.3.2) | 7 ft . wide interior sidewalks aslong as detail indicatesa $4^{\prime \prime}$ curb at these locations and along landscaping | -24 ft , to 28 ft . driveway within parking aisles. 28 ft . to 30 ft . wide access drive with no parking on either side. |  |  |
| Parking Space Dimensions and Maneuvering Lanes (Sec. 5.3.2) | - |  |  |  |
| Parking stall located adjacent to a parking lot entrance(public or private) (Sec. 5.3.13) | - shall not be located closer than twenty-five (25) feet from the street night-of-way (ROW) line, street easement or sidewalk, whichever is closer | NA | Yes |  |
| End Islands (Sec. 5.3.12) | - End Isla nds with landscaping and raised curbs are required at the end of all parking bays that abut traffic circulation aisles. <br> - The end islands shall generally be at least 8 feet wide, have an outside radius of 15 feet, and be constructed 3' shorter than the adjacent parking stall as illustrated in the Zoning Ordinance | End Islands are proposed | Yes |  |
| BamierFree Spaces Ba mier Free Code | For 501 to 1000 Total Parking in lot, 2 \% of total needsto be barmer free. <br> $2 \%$ of 960 spaces=19 including 3 Van accessible | 4 Van accessible and 22 regularbamier free (4 Existing) parking spaces | Yes |  |
| Bamier Free Space Dimensions Ba mier Free Code | - 8' wide with an $8^{\prime}$ wide access aisle for van accessible spaces <br> - 5 ' wide with a 5 ' wide access aisle for regular accessible spaces | Two types of accessible spacesare provided | Yes |  |
| BamierFree Signs | One sign foreach accessible parking space. | All signs are proposed | Yes |  |
|  | - |  |  |  |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bamier Free Signs <br> Banier Free Design Graphics Manual |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum number of Bic ycle Parking Sec. 5.16.1 | Five (5) percent of required automobile spaces, minimum eight (8) spaces=12 bicycle spaces are required for 233 spaces <br> Located along the building approach line \& easily accessible from the building entrance | Bicycle parking not indicated | No | Applicant should add the required bike parking as per the ordinance requirements. |
| Bic ycle Parking General requirements Sec. 5.16 | - No farther than 120 ft . from the entrance being served <br> - When 4 ormore spacesare required for a building with multiple entrances, the spaces shall be provided in multiple locations <br> - Spacesto be paved and the bike rack shall be inverted " $U$ " design - Shall be accessible via 6 ft . paved sidewalk | No <br> No <br> No <br> No | No | Note the location <br> Bic ycle spaces should be proposed in multiple locations <br> Please provide the inverted " U " bike rack detail |
| Bic ycle Parking Lot layout Sec 5.16.6 | Parking space width: 6 ft. <br> One tier width: 10 ft . <br> Two tier width: 16 ft . <br> Maneuvering lane width: 4 ft . <br> Parking space depth: 2 <br> ft . single, $2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{ft}$. double |  | No | Provide a plan detail of the bic ycle parking as required |
| Loading Spaces Sec. 5.4.1 | Required on all premises where receipt or distribution of materials ormerchandise occurs and shall be separate from parking areas | Loading Spaces are not proposed | NA | Clarify with a note that the loading spaces are not required for the proposed use. If required, please show loading space on the plan. |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dumpster Sec. 4.19.2.F | - Located in rearyard <br> - Attached to the building or <br> - No closer than 10 ft . from build ing if not attached <br> - Not located in parking setback <br> - If no setback, then it cannot be any closer than 10 ft , from property line. <br> - Away from Ba mier free Spaces | No Dumpster is shown on the plans | No | Is there an existing dumpster? <br> Identify the dumpster location on plans |
| Dumpster Enclosure Sec. 21-145. (c) | - Screened from public view <br> - A wall or fence 1 ft . higher than height of refuse bin <br> - And no less than 5 ft . on three sides <br> - Posts or bumpers to protect the screening <br> - Hard surface pad. <br> - Screening Materials: Masonry, wood or evergreen shrubbery |  | No | See above comment |
| Lighting and Other Equipment Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Exterior lighting Sec. 5.7 | Photometric plan and exterior lighting deta ils needed at time of Final Site Plan submittal | A lighting plan is provided | Yes |  |
| Roof top equipment and wall mounted utility equipment Sec. 4.19.2.E.ii | - All roof top equipment must be screened and all wall mounted utility equipment must be enclosed and integrated into the design and color of the building | Roof top equipment is not proposed | Yes | Please clarify if there is any proposed rooftop equipment |
| Rooftop appurtenances screening | Roof top appurtenances shall be screened in accordance with applicable facade regulations, and shall not be visible from any street, road oradjacent property. | Roof top equipment is not proposed | Yes | Please clarify if there is any proposed rooftop equipment |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Sidewalks <br> Article XII <br>  <br> Sec. 11-279 <br> Town Center Area Study | A 6' $-10^{\prime}$ wide sidewalk shall be constructed a long all arterial and collector roadsexcept in industrial districts <br> - All pedestrian safety paths shall be concrete and four (4) inches thick except residential driveway crossings which shall be six (6) inches thick, and industrial/commercial driveway crossings which shall be eight (8) inches thick. |  | NA |  |
| Pedestrian Connectivity | The Planning Commission shall consider the following factors in exercising its discretion over site plan approval Whether the traffic circulation features within the site and location of automobile parking a reas are designed to a ssure safety and convenience of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic both within the site and in relation to access streets | 8 foot Sidewalks are proposed throughout the site for convenient and safe pedestrian access | Yes | Consider connecting the front parking lot to rear parking lot via sidewalk |
| Building Code and other design standard Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Building Code | Build ing exits must be connected to sidewalk system or parking lot. | All exits a re connected to intemal sidewalk | Yes |  |
| Design and Construction Standards Manual | Land description, Sidwell number (metes and bounds for acreage parcel, lot number(s), Liber, and page for subdivisions). | Provided | Yes |  |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General layout and dimension of proposed physical improvements | Location of all existing and proposed buildings, proposed building heights, building la youts, (floor area in square feet), location of proposed parking and parking la yout, streets and drives, and indic ate square footage of pavement area (indicate public or private). |  | Yes |  |
| Economic Impact | - Total cost of the proposed building \& site improvements <br> - Number of antic ipated jobscreated (during construction \& after building is occupied, if known) |  | No | Provide the required information for Planning Commission |
| Development/ Business Sign | Signage if proposed requires a permit. |  |  | For sign permit information contact Jeannie Niland 248-347-0438. |

## UGHIING REVIEW SUMMARY CHART

Review Date: 11 February 2015
Project Name: JSP15-0007: Brightmoor Christian Church
Plan Date: February 02, 2015
Prepared by: Sri Koma ragiri, Planner E-mail: skoma ragiri@cityofnovi.org; Phone: (248) 735-5607
Items in Bold need to be addressed by the applicant before approval of the Preliminary Site Plan. Underlined items need to be addressed before approval of the Final Site Plan.

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code? | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Intent (Sec. } \\ & \text { 5.7.1) } \end{aligned}$ | Establish appropriate minimum levels, prevent unnecessary glare, reduce spilloveronto adjacent properties \& reduce unnecessary transmission of light into the night sky | Yes | Yes |  |
| Lighting Plan (Sec. 5.7.A.1) | Site plan showing location of all existing \& proposed build ings, la ndsc a ping, streets, drives, parking areas\& exterior lighting fixtures | Yes | Yes |  |
| Lighting Plan (Sec.5.7.A.2) | Specific a tions for all proposed \& existing lighting fixtures: <br> - Photometric data <br> - Fixture height <br> - Mounting \& design <br> - Glare control devices <br> - Type \& color rendition of lamps <br> - Hours of operation Photometric plan illustrating all light sourc es that impact the subject site, including spill-over information from neighboring properties | - Yes <br> - No <br> - Yes <br> - Yes <br> - Yes <br> - No | No | Provide the hours of operation, fixture height on plan |
| Required Conditions (Sec. 5.7.3.A) | Height not to exceed maximum height of zoning district (or 25 ft . where adjacent to residential distric ts or uses | 25 ft . | No | Provide the maximum height of the fixtures |
| Required Conditions (Sec. 5.7.3.B) | - Electrical service to light fixtures shall be placed underground <br> - Flashing light shall not be permitted <br> - Only necessary lighting for secunity purposes \& limited operations shall be permitted after a site's hours | Notes are added to the plan. | Yes | Provide the hours of operation on plan |


| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code? | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | of operation |  |  |  |
| Required Conditions (Sec.5.7.3.E) | Average light level of the surface being lit to the lowest light of the surface being lit shall not exceed 4:1 |  | No | Provide the total ratio as required |
| Required Conditions (Sec. 5.7.3.F) | Use of true color rendering lamps such as metal halide is preferred overhigh \& low pressure sodium lamps | Yes | Yes |  |
| Min. Illumination (Sec. 5.7.3.k) | - Parking a reas: 0.2 min <br> - Loading \& unloading areas: 0.4 min <br> - Walkways: 0.2 min <br> - Building entrances, frequent use: 1.0 min <br> - Building entrances, infrequent use: 0.2 min | - 0.2 min <br> - 0.4 min <br> - 0.2 min <br> - 1.0 min <br> - 0.2 min | Yes |  |
| Max. <br> Illumination adjacent to Non-Residential (Sec. 5.7.3.K) | When site abuts a nonresidential district, maximum illumination at the property line shall not exceed 1 foot candle |  | NA |  |
| Cut off Angles (Sec. 5.7.3.L) | when adjacent to residential districts <br> - All cut off a ngles of fixtures must be $90^{\circ}$ <br> - maximum illumination at the property line shall not exceed 0.5 foot candle |  | Yes | Provide the Foot-candle values along property line on plan |

Engineering Review

# PLAN REVIEW CENTER REPORT 

02/26/2015

Engineering Review<br>BRIGHTMOOR CHRISTIAN CHURCH JSP 14-0077

## Applicant

BRIGHTMOOR CHRISTIAN CHURCH

## Review Type

Preliminary Site Plan

## Property Characteristics

- Site Location:
N. of 13 Mile Rd. and W. of M-5
- Site Size:
40.15 acres
- Plan Date:

02/02/15

## Project Summary

- Construction of a building expansion and associated parking. Site access would be provided from the existing site parking lot.
- Water service and 3 existing hydrants would be relocated to accommodate the proposed building addition. No new leads are being proposed.
- Storm water would be collected by a single storm sewer collection system and detained in the existing storm water detention faculties.


## Recommendation

Approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Preliminary Storm Water Management Plan is recommended.

## Comments:

The Preliminary Site Plan meets the general requirements of Chapter 11, the Storm Water Management Ordinance and the Engineering Design Manual with the following items to be addressed at the time of Final Site Plan submittal (further engineering detail will be required at the time of the final site plan submittal):

## Additional Comments (to be addressed prior to the Final Site Plan submittal):

## General

1. The City standard detail sheets are not required for the Final Site Plan submittal. They will be required with the Stamping Set submittal. They can be found on the City website (www.cityofnovi.org/DesianManual).
2. Provide a note stating the size of the disturbed area and the size of the building addition.
3. Provide a minimum of two ties to established section or quarter section corners.
4. Provide a note stating the distributed area for construction.
5. Revise the plan set to reference at least one city established benchmark. An interactive map of the City's established survey benchmarks can be found under the 'Map Gallery' tab on www. cityofnovi.org.
6. Provide a construction materials table on the Utility Plan listing the quantity and material type for each utility (water, sanitary and storm) being proposed.
7. Provide a note that compacted sand backfill shall be provided for all utilities within the influence of paved areas, and illustrate on the profiles.
8. Provide a traffic control sign table listing the quantities of each sign type proposed for the development. Provide a note along with the table stating all traffic signage will comply with the current MMUTCD standards.
9. Provide a note stating if dewatering is anticipated or encountered during construction a dewatering plan must be submitted to the Engineering Department for review.
10. Generally, all proposed trees shall remain outside utility easements. Where proposed trees are required within a utility easement, the trees shall maintain a minimum 5 -foot horizontal separation distance from any existing or proposed utility. All utilities shall be shown on the landscape plan, or other appropriate sheet, to confirm the separation distance.

## Water Main

11. Show existing and proposed water main easements.
12. Provide a profile for all proposed water main 8 -inch and larger.
13. Three (3) sealed sets of revised utility plans along with the MDEQ permit application (1/07 rev.) for water main construction and the Streamlined Water Main Permit Checklist should be submitted to the Engineering Department for review, assuming no further design changes are anticipated. Utility plan sets shall include only the cover sheet, any applicable utility sheets and the standard detail sheets.

## Storm Sewer

14. Label all inlet storm structures on the profiles. Inlets are only permitted in paved areas and when followed by a catch basin within 50 feet.
15. Label the 10 -year HGL on the storm sewer profiles, and ensure the HGL remains at least 1 -foot below the rim of each structure.
16. Provide a schedule listing the casting type and other relevant information for each proposed storm structure on the utility plan. Round castings shall be provided on all catch basins except curb inlet structures.
17. Provide a 0.1 -foot drop in the downstream invert of all storm structures where a change in direction of 30 degrees or greater occurs.
18. Provide profiles for all proposed storm sewer.

## Storm Water Management Plan

19. The Storm Water Management Plan for this development shall be designed in accordance with the Storm Water Ordinance and Chapter 5 of the new Engineering Design Manual.
20. The SWMP must detail the storm water system design, calculations, details, and maintenance as stated in the ordinance. The SWMP must address the discharge of storm water off-site, and evidence of its adequacy must be provided. This should be done by comparing pre- and post-development discharge rates and volumes. The area being used for this off-site discharge should be delineated and the ultimate location of discharge shown.
21. Provide supporting calculations for the runoff coefficient determination.
22. Provide details and calculations on the plan showing that the east basin will be enlarged to accommodate the proposed 10 -year volume while maintaining a one-foot freeboard as discussed.

## Paving \& Grading

23. The proposed parking stalls along the east curb line are dimensioned at 18.5 feet with 6 -inch curb. Parking stalls with a 6 -inch curb must be a minimum of 19 -feet long. The length can be reduced up to 17 -feet with a 4 -inch curb.

## The following must be submitted at the time of Final Site Plan submittal:

24. An itemized construction cost estimate must be submitted to the Community Development Department at the time of Final Site Plan submittal for the determination of plan review and construction inspection fees. This estimate should only include the civil site work and not any costs associated with construction of the building or any demolition work. The cost estimate must be itemized for each utility (water, sanitary, storm sewer), on-site paving, right-of-way paving (including proposed right-of-way), grading, and the storm water basin (basin construction, control structure, pretreatment structure and restoration).

## The following must be submitted at the time of Stamping Set submittal:

25. A draft copy of the maintenance agreement for the storm water facilities, as outlined in the Storm Water Management Ordinance, must be submitted to the Community Development Department with the Final Site Plan. Once the form of the agreement is approved, this agreement must be approved by City Council and shall be recorded in the office of the Oakland County Register of Deeds.
26. A draft copy of the 20 -foot wide easement for the water main to be constructed on the site must be submitted to the Community Development Department.

## The following must be addressed prior to construction:

27. A pre-construction meeting shall be required prior to any site work being started. Please contact Sarah Marchioni in the Community Development Department to setup a meeting (248-347-0430).
28. A City of Novi Grading Permit will be required prior to any grading on the site. This permit will be issued at the pre-construction meeting. Once determined, a grading permit fee must be paid to the City Treasurer's Office.
29. An NPDES permit must be obtained from the MDEQ because the site is over 5 acres in size. The MDEQ requires an approved plan to be submitted with the Notice of Coverage.
30. A Soil Erosion Control Permit must be obtained from the City of Novi. Contact Sarah Marchioni in the Community Development Department (248-347-0430) for forms and information.
31. A permit for water main construction must be obtained from the MDEQ. This permit application must be submitted through the City Engineer after the water main plans have been approved.
32. Construction Inspection Fees to be determined once the construction cost estimate is submitted must be paid prior to the pre-construction meeting.
33. An incomplete site work performance guarantee for this development will be calculated (equal to 1.5 times the amount required to complete the site improvements, excluding the storm water facilities) as specified in the Performance Guarantee Ordinance. This guarantee will be posted prior to TCO, at which time it may be reduced based on percentage of construction completed.

Please contact Jeremy Miller at (248) 735-5694 with any questions.



PLAN REVIEWCENIER REPORT
February 25, 2015
Landscape Review
Brightmoor Christian Church Expansion
J SP15-07

## Petitioner

Brightmoor Christian Church

## Review Type

Special Land Use Request and Preliminary Site Plan Review

## Property Characteristics

- Site Location:
- Site School District:
- Site Zoning:
- Adjoining Zoning:

40800 W. Thirteen Mile Road
Walled Lake Consolidated Schools
RA, Residential Acreage
North: RM-1, Low Density Multiple Family; South (across
-5): OST, Office Service Technology; West: RM-1

- Site Use(s): Brightmoor Christian Church
- Adjoining Uses: North: Lenox Park residential condominiums; South (a cross Thirteen Mile): Single family, vacant; East (ac ross M-5):
Vacant; West: Fox run retirement living
40.1 acres

February 02, 2015

- Site Size:


## Recommendation

Approval of the Special Land Use Request and Preliminary Site Plan is recommended. The plan generally conforms to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance;

## Ordinance Requirements

This project was reviewed for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance with respect to Article 5Site Standards, Sec. 5.5. - Landscape Standards, Landscape Design Manual (DM) and any other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Please see the attached charts for information pertaining to ordinance requirements and additional minor comments to be addressed. Items in bold may require a Planning Commission waiver. All other items should be addressed in the response letter prior to the Planning Commission meeting unless otherwise noted.

## Interior Parking Lot Landscape Calculations (Sec 5.5.3.C)

Applic ant is asked to recalculate a reasfor all new parking spaces (a total of 233 spaces and related driveways identified in grey shade on plans, not the net inc rease of 42 spaces). Staff has contacted the applicant'slandscape architect for furthercla rification. Please provide the required calculations as discussed for parking lot landscape area and call out the areas on the plan by square footage with the response letterprior to the Planning Commission meeting.
Based on the preliminary calculations staff prepared, the plans appearto be short 17 trees below the minimum required. A Planning Commission waiver would be required for not meeting the minimum requirements, and staff would support such waiver if the applic ant chooses to request it, due to the abundance of trees planned and existing on site.

## Planting Notations and Details (LDM)

Guying material as shown on the planting details should be revised to call for fabric ties only, not plastic orwire.

## Imigation (LDM 2.s.)

A fully automatic ingation system and a method of draining is required with Final Site Plan

## Existing and proposed utilities(LDM 2.e.(4))

Show existing and Proposed Fire Hydrants on landscape plan at the time of Final Site Plan.

## Soil type (LDM.2.r.)

Provide Soil information on plans at the time of Final Site Plan.

## Collected or Transplanted trees (LDM 3.f)

It is applicant's responsibility to work with City of Novi's Landscape Architect according to the following section

DM.3f. Collected or Transplanted Trees
(i) All collected trees shall be from on site and inspected by the City. Trees may be rejected for reasons of insect infestation, disease or standards set forth in this ordinance. Such plant material may be rejected either in full or in part.
(ii) All transplanted trees shall conform to standards set forth in Section 9.
(iii) The root ball of a ny transplanted tree shall measure 1 foot for each inch of trunk dia meter measured 12 "above the ground.
(iv) If trees are to be stored, they shall be burlapped and heeled in with mulch in a predetermined area approved by the City.
(v) The trees shall be provided with a working imigation system approved by the City to ensure their viability during storage.

## General Notes

a. All substitutions or deviations from the landscape plan must be approved by the city prior to installation.
b. Ma inta in shrubs at max. 24 " in height within lot.
c. Stamping Set must provide an original signature.

Please follow guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance and Landscape Design Guidelines. This review is a summary and not intended to substitute for any Ordinance. For the la ndscape requirements, see the Zoning Ordinance landscape section on 5.5, Landscape Design Manual and the appropriate items in the applicable zoning classific ation

If the applicant has any questions conceming the above review or the process in general, do not hesitate to contact me at 248.735.5607 or skomaragir@cityofnovi.org.

$\overline{\text { Si Ravali Komaragiri - Planner }}$

## LANDSCAPE REVIEW SUMMARY CHART

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Review Date: } & \text { 23 February 2015 } \\ \text { Project Name: } & \text { J SP15-0007: Brightmoor C hristian Church } \\ \text { Plan Date: } & 02 \text { February 2015 } \\ \text { Prepared by: } & \text { Sin Komaragiri, Planner E-mail: skoma ragin@c ityofnovi.org; Phone: (248) 735-5607 }\end{array}$
Items in Bold need to be addressed by the applicant before approval of the Final Site Plan. Underlined items need to be addressed on the Stamping Set.

| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets <br> Code | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Landscape Plan Requirements (LDM (2)) |  |  |  |  |
| Landscape Plan <br> (Sec 5.5.2) | - New commercial or <br> residential <br> developments <br> - Addition to existing <br> build ing greater than <br> 25\% inc rease in overall <br> footage or 400 SF <br> whichever is less. | Yes |  | Yes |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| proposed improvements (DM 2.e.(4)) | build ings, ea sements, parking spaces, vehic ular use areas, and R.O.W |  |  |  |
| Existing and proposed utilities (LDM 2.e.(4)) | - Overhead and underground utilities, including hydrants | No | No | Show existing and Proposed Fire Hydrants on landscape plan. |
| ClearZones (LDM 2.e.(5) | - 25 ft . comerclearance required. Refer to Sec 5.9 | NA | NA | No new exits are proposed |
| Zoning (LDM 2.f.) | - Include all adjacent zoning | Yes | Yes |  |
| Sealed by LA. (LD 2.g.) | - Requires original signature | Yes | No | Requires original signature for final site plan approval |
| Plant List (LDM 2.h.) - Include all cost estimates |  |  |  |  |
| Quantities and sizes |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Root type |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Botanic al and common names | - Referto LDM suggested plant list | Yes | Yes |  |
| Type and a mount of lawn |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Planting Details/ Info (LDM 2.i) - Utilize City of Novi Standard Details |  |  |  |  |
| Canopy Deciduous Tree | - Referto LDM fordetail drawings | Yes | Yes |  |
| Evergreen Tree |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Shrub |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Perennial/ Ground Cover |  | Yes | Yes |  |
| Cross-Section of Berms (LDM 2.j) |  |  |  |  |
| Slope, height and width | - Label c ontour lines <br> - Maximum 33\% <br> - Min. 5 feet flat horizontal a rea | NA | NA |  |
| Type of Ground Cover |  | NA | NA |  |
| Setbacks from Utilities | - Overhead utility lines and 15 ft . setback from edge of utility or 20 ft . setback from closest pole | NA |  |  |
| Walls (LDM 2.k.) .Sec 2509.3.a.(6) |  |  |  |  |
| Material, height and type of construction footing | - Freestanding walls should have brick or stone exterior with masonry or concrete interior | No | NA |  |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Walls greater than 3 $1 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$ should be designed and sealed by an Engineer |  | No | NA |  |
| Landscape Notations - Utilize City of Novi Standard Notes |  |  |  |  |
| Installation date (LD 2.I.)Refer to Sec 2509.5 | - Provide intended date | Yes | Yes |  |
| Maintenance \& Statement of intent (LDM 2.m.) \& Refer to sec 2509.6 | - Include statement of intent to install and guarantee all materia ls for 2 years. <br> - Include a minimum one cultivation in June, J uly and August for the 2-year warranty period. | Yes | Yes |  |
| Plant source (LDM 2.n \& LDM 3.a.(2) | - Shall be northem nursery grown, No. 1 grade. | Yes | Yes |  |
| Snow deposit (LD.2.q.) | - Show snow deposit areason plan | Yes | Yes |  |
| Soil type(LDM.2.r.) | - As determined by Soils survey of Oakland county | No | No | Provide Soil Information as required |
| Imigation plan (LD 2.s.) | - A fully a utomatic imigation system and a method of draining is required with Final Site Plan | Yes | No | Ingation Plan is required for Final site plan |
| Cost estimate (LD 2.t.) | - For all new plantings, mulch and sod as listed on the plan | Yes | Yes |  |
| Otherinformation (LDM 2.u) | - Required by Planning Commission | NA |  |  |
| Establishment period (5.5.5.D) | 2 yr. Guarantee | Yes | Yes |  |
| Approval of substitutions. (5.5.5.E) | - City must approve any substitutions in writing priorto installation. |  |  | Please note as stated |
| Tree stakes and guys. | - Wood stakes. Fabric guys. | Yes | Yes | All Guying material as shown on the planting details should be fabric ties only, not plastic or wire. |
| Parking Area Landscape Requirements IDM 1.c. \& Calculations (LDM 2.o.) |  |  |  |  |
| General requirements (LD 1.c) | - Clear sight distance within parking islands <br> - No evergreen trees | Yes | Yes |  |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets <br> Code | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name, type and <br> number of ground <br> cover <br> (LDM 1.c.(5)) | - Asproposed on <br> planting islands | Yes | No | Provide details for each <br> island ata largerscale |

General (Sec 5.5.3.C.ii)

| Parking lot Islands (a, b. i) | - A minimum of 300 SF to qualify <br> - 6" curbs | Yes | No | Provide square footage of all islands on the plans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curbs and Parking stall reduction (c) | - Parking stall can be reduced to 17' and the curb to 4 " adjacent to a sidewalk of minimum 7 ft . | NA | NA | Refer to Traffic Comments |
| Plantings around Fire Hydrant (d) | - No plantings with matured height greater than 12' within 10 ft . of fire hydrants |  | No | Show existing and proposed Fire Hydrants on Landscape plan |
| Landscaped area (g) | - Areas not dedic ated to parking use or driveways exceeding 100 sq. ft. shall be landscaped | Yes | Yes |  |
| Max. 15 contiguous space limit (i) |  | No | Yes |  |
| Parking Lot Landscape Calc ulations (Sec 5.5.3.C) |  |  |  |  |

Category 1: For OS-1, OS-2, OSC, OST, B-1, B-2, B-3, NCC, EXPO, FS, TC, TC-1, RC, Special Land Use or nonresidential use in any $R$ distric $t$ (Sec 5.5.3.C.iii)

| A =Total square footage of parking spaces not including access a isles $\times 10 \%$ | - $\mathrm{A}=\mathrm{x} 10 \%=$ sf |  | No | Recalculate areas for all new parking spaces (a total of 233 spaces and related driveways identified in grey shade on plans). Staff has contacted the applicant's landsc ape arc hitect for further clarification. Please provide additional information based on that disc ussion. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $B=$ Total square footage of additional paved vehic ular use areas (not including A) under 50,000 SF) $x$ 5\% | - $B=x 5 \%=$ sf <br> - Paved Vehicular access area includes loading areas |  | No |  |
| $\mathrm{C}=$ Total square footage of additional paved vehicular use areas (not including A or B) over 50,000 SF) x 1 \% | - $\mathrm{C}=\times 1 \%=s f$ | NA |  |  |

Category 2: For: l-1 and l-2 (Sec 5.5.3.C.iii)

| A. $=$ Total square <br> foota ge of pa rking <br> spaces not including <br> access a isles $\times 7 \%$ | $\cdot \mathrm{~A}=7 \% x=\mathrm{SF}$ | NA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B = Total square footage of additional paved vehicular use areas (not including <br> A) under 50,000 SF) $x$ 2\% | - $\mathrm{B}=2 \% \mathrm{x}=\mathrm{SF}$ | NA |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}=$ Total square footage of additional paved vehicular use areas (not including A or B) over 50,000 SF) $\times 0.5 \%$ | - C = $0.5 \% \mathrm{x}=\mathrm{SF}$ | NA |  |  |

## All Categories

| $D=A+B \text { or } A+C$ <br> Total square footage of landsc a ped islands | SF | Incorrect | No |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{D} / 75$ <br> Number of canopy trees required | - / 75= Trees | 35 Trees proposed | No | A Planning Commission waiver would be required for not meeting the minimum requirements. Staff is more likely to support the waiver |
| Perimeter Green space | - 1 Canopy tree per 35 I.f ; =52 trees <br> - Sub-canopy treescan be used under overhead utility lines. | 52 Trees proposed | Yes |  |
| Parking land banked | - NA | NA |  |  |

## Plant Material Requirements (LDM 3)

| General Conditions <br> (DM 3.a) | - Plant materials shall <br> not be planted within <br> 4ft. of property line | Yes | Yes |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Miss Dig Note <br> (800) 482-7171 <br> (DM.3.a.(8)) | Show on all plan <br> sheets | Yes | Yes |  |
|  <br> Existing Plant Material <br> (DM 3.b) | Yes | Yes |  |  |
|  | - Substitutions to <br> landscape standards <br> forpreserved canopy <br> treesoutside <br> woodlands/wetlands <br> should be approved <br> by LA. Referto <br> Landscape tree Credit <br> Chart in LDM | NA |  |  |
| Landscape tree <br> credit(DM3.b.(d)) |  |  |  |  |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plant Sizes for ROW, Woodland replacement and others <br> (LDM 3.c) | Canopy Deciduous shall be $3^{\prime \prime}$ and subcanopy deciduous shall be 2.5 " caliper. Referto section for more details | NA | NA |  |
| Plant size credit (LD3.c.(2)) | NA |  |  |  |
| Prohibited Plants (LD 3.d) |  | No | Yes |  |
| Rec ommended trees for planting under overhead utilities (LDM 3.e) | - Label the distance from the overhead utilities |  | NA |  |
| Collected or Transplanted trees (LM 3.f) | Referto the <br> Landscape Design Manual for further details | 58 existing trees are proposed to be evaluated for feasibility to be transplanted | No | It is applic ant's responsibility to work with City of Novi's Landscape Architect to determine the feasibility of transplanted trees, preservation and replanting. |
| Nonliving Durable Material: Mulch (LDM 4) | - Trees shall be mulched to 4 "depth and shrubs, groundcovers to 3" depth <br> - Specify natural color, finely shredded hardwood bark mulch. Include in cost estimate. <br> - Referto section for additional information | Yes | Yes |  |
| Building Foundation Landsc ape Requirements (Sec 5.5.3.D) |  |  |  |  |
| Interior site landscaping SF | - Equals to entire perimeter of the building $x 8$ with a minimum width of 4 ft . <br> - 988 lf x 8t $=\mathbf{7 , 9 0 4} \mathbf{~ 5 F}$ | 16,214 SF | Yes |  |
| 5.5.3.D.ii. All items from (b) to (e) | - If visible from public street a minimum of $60 \%$ of the exterior build ing perimeter should be covered in green space | Yes <br> Partial visibility is achieved due to shrubs and grade change. | Yes |  |
| Berms and ROW Planting |  |  |  |  |
| All berms shall have a maximum slope of $33 \%$. Gradual slopes are encouraged. Show 1 ft . contours Berm should be located on lot line except in conflict with utilities. Berms should be constructed with 6" of top soil. |  |  |  |  |

Residential Adjacent to Non-residential (Sec 5.5.3.A) \& (LDM 1.a)

| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets <br> Code | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berm requirements <br> (Sec 5.5.A) | - Refer to Residential <br> Adjac ent to Non- <br> residential berm <br> requirementschart |  | NA |  |
| Planting requirements <br> (LDM 1.a.) | EDM Novi Street Tree <br> List | NA |  |  |
| Ader |  |  |  |  |

Adjacent to Public Rights-of-Way (Sec 5.5.B) and (DM 1.b)

| Berm requirements <br> (Sec 5.5.3.A.(5)) | Referto ROW <br> landscape screening <br> requirementsc hart for <br> corresponding <br> requirements. | Existing | NA |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Planting requirements <br> (LD 1.a.) | LDM Novi Street Tree <br> List | No | NA |  |
| Street tree <br> requirements <br> (Sec 5.5.3.B.ii) | No street trees within <br> $25 \mathrm{ft} clearvision$. <br> triangle | No | NA |  |

ROW Landsc ape Screening Requirements Chart (Sec 5.5.3.B. ii)

| Greenbelt width <br> $(2)(3)(5)$ | - Parking: 20 ft. | Existing | NA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Min. berm crest width | - Parking: 2 ft. | Existing | NA |
| Minimum berm height <br> $(9)$ | - Parking: 3 ft. | Existing | NA |
| $3^{\prime}$ wall | - (4)(7) | NA |  |
| Canopy deciduous or <br> large evergreen <br> trees(1) (10) | - Parking: 35 I.f. <br> - No Pa rking: 40; | Existing | NA |
| Sub-canopy <br> deciduous trees <br> (2)(10) | - Parking: 20 I.f | - No Parking: 25 | Existing |
| Canopy deciduous <br> trees in area between <br> sidewalk and curb <br> (Novi Street Tree Lst) | - Pa rking: 35 I.f. | Existing | NA |

Non-Residential Sec 2509. e. (3)\& IDM 1.d (2)
Referto Planting in ROW, building foundation landscape, parking lot landsc a ping and LDM

| Interior Street to Industrial subdivision (LDM 1.d.(2)) | - 1 canopy deciduous or 1 large evergreen per 35 I.f. along ROW <br> - No evergreen trees c loserthan 20 ft . <br> - 3 sub canopy trees per 40 I.f. of total linear frontage <br> - Plant massing for $25 \%$ | NA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Item | Required | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | of ROW |  |  |  |
| Screening of outdoor storage, loading/ unloading (2509.e. (3).b. (iv).) |  | No | No | Are there any existing or proposed loading areas? |
| Transformers/ Utility boxes (LD 1.e from 1 through 5) | - A minimum of 2 ft . separation between boxand the plants <br> - Ground cover below 4 " is a llowed upto pad. <br> - No plant materials within 8 ft . from the doors | No | No | Show existing or proposed (ifany) <br> Transformer locations on the plan |
| Detention/ Retention Basin Planting requirements (Sec. 5.5.3.E.iv) | - C lusters shall cover 70$75 \%$ of the basin rim area <br> - 10 " to 14 " tall grass a long sides of basin <br> - Referto wetland for basin mix | NA |  |  |

## NOTES:

1. This table is a working summary chart and not intended to substitute for any Ordinance or City of Novi requirements or standards.
2. The section of the applicable ordinance or standard is indic ated in parenthesis. Forthe landscape requirements, please see the Zoning Ordinance landscape section 5.5, Landscape Design Manual and the appropriate items under the applicable zoning classification.
3. Please include a written response to a ny points requiring clarific ation or for any corresponding site plan modifications to the City of Novi Planning Department with future submittals.

Traffic Review

February 12, 2015

Barbara McBeth, AICP
Deputy Director of Community Development
City of Novi
45175 W. 10 Mile Road
Novi, MI 48375

## SUBJECT: Brightmoor Christian Church, Traffic Review for Preliminary Site Plan JSP 15-0007

Dear Ms. McBeth,
URS has completed our review of the preliminary site plan submitted for the above referenced development. Our comments are as follows:

1. General Comments
a. The applicant, Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc., is proposing to expand the building and parking lot of the existing Brightmoor Christian Church located near the intersection of 13 Mile Road and Lenox Park Drive, just west of M-5.
2. Potential Traffic Impacts
a. The applicant has stated that a traffic impact statement will be prepared and submitted prior to preliminary site plan approval. URS will review the traffic impact study once it is submitted.
3. General Plan Comments - The preliminary site plan is generally in compliance with City ordinance; however, the applicant should further review the following comments and adjust the plans as necessary:
a. Provide additional dimensions indicating the widths of the pedestrian facilities throughout the site.
b. Indicate where pedestrian ramps will be located throughout the site.
c. Provide ramp details for any proposed pedestrian ramps throughout the site.
d. Review the required turning radius for any trucks that will need access to the site and ensure that all maneuvers can be adequately completed.
e. Provide signing information, including sign type and location(s).
4. Internal Site Access and Operations - The internal site access and operations is generally in compliance with City ordinances; however, the applicant should further review the following comments and adjust the plans as necessary:
a. The parking spaces in the parking lot on the west side of the site are labeled with either 17' or 18.5 parking space depths.
i. Where the curb height is 6 ", as indicated on the grading sheet, the parking space depth should be 19'.
ii. There is a discrepancy between the grading sheet (C-5) and the typical sections and details sheet ( $\mathrm{C}-8$ ) regarding the curb height adjacent to parking spaces with a depth of 17'. The grading sheet

## URS Corporation

27777 Franklin Road, Suite 2000
Southfield, Michigan 48034
Tel: 248.204.5900
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www.urs.com
indicates a 0.5 ' difference in grade, while the typical sections and details sheet has a note that indicates a 4 " curb height where the parking spaces are 17' deep. This should be reviewed and updated to be consistent.
b. The parking spaces along the perimeter of the east parking lot indicate parking stall depths of 18.5 'and the grading sheet indicates a 0.5 ' difference in grade.
i. Where the curb height is 6 ", as indicated on the grading sheet, the parking space depth should be 19'.
ii. The parking space depths should be increased to $19^{\prime}$ if the $6^{\prime \prime}$ curb is maintained or the parking space depths may be reduced to $17^{\prime}$ if the curb height is reduced to 4 ".
c. The end island designs should be further reviewed for compliance, specifically addressing the comments below:
i. End islands should be 3 ' shorter than the adjacent parking spaces. Maneuvering lane dimensions indicate $24^{\prime}$ between parking spaces and 28 ' between islands, thereby indicating a $2^{\prime}$ difference on either side of the maneuvering lane.
ii. The outside radius of end islands should be 15'. Throughout the site there are several instances where the radius is less than 15'.

The preliminary site plan was reviewed to the level of detail provided and additional information may be required to complete the review of traffic-related elements. URS recommends approval of the plans with the condition that the applicant provides additional detail, revised plans and/or a narrative to address the aforementioned comments included in this letter.

Sincerely,
URS Corporation Great Lakes


Matthew G. Klawon, PE
Manager, Traffic Engineering and ITS Engineering Services

Traffic Study Review Letter

March 20, 2015

Barbara McBeth, AICP
Deputy Director of Community Development
City of Novi
45175 W. 10 Mile Road
Novi, MI 48375

## SUBJECT: Brightmoor Christian Church, Traffic Study Review Letter JSP 15-0007

Dear Ms. McBeth,

URS has completed our review of the traffic study prepared by Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc. (HRC) that was submitted for the above referenced development. Our comments are as follows:

1. General Comments
a. HRC conducted a traffic study to assess the impacts of the proposed Brightmoor Christian Church on the roadway network in the close vicinity.
b. The study included the following roadways and intersections:
i. 13 Mile Road and Lenox Park Drive
ii. 13 Mile Road and the driveway into Brightmoor Christian Church
iii. Lenox Park Drive and the driveway into Brightmoor Christian Church
c. The study was found to be acceptable with only minor comments, as can be seen in the attached document.

## 2. Potential Traffic Impacts

a. The site is primarily expected to generate traffic during Wednesday evenings and on Sundays, when church services are scheduled.
b. The traffic generated by the site affects traffic flow along 13 Mile Road and at the intersection of 13 Mile Road and Lenox Park Drive.
i. Traffic on 13 Mile Road operates at an acceptable level of service during all periods, as these movements are free flow.
ii. Traffic on the southbound Lenox Park Drive approach and southbound east driveway approach to 13 Mile Road can operate at unacceptable levels during peak periods. Both approaches are controlled with stop signs.
c. HRC conducted a traffic signal warrant analysis for the 13 Mile Road and Lenox Park Drive intersection. Traffic volumes and conditions meet Warrant 3 - Peak Hour during Sunday.
3. Conclusions and Recommendations - HRC has provided the following conclusions and recommendations and URS supports them.
a. The installation of a right-turn lane along westbound 13 Mile Road as

## URS Corporation
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volumes during the Sunday peak hour meet the thresholds for requiring a full-width right-turn lane. HRC used MDOT standards for determining the necessity of a right-turn lane; however, review of City of Novi standards provide the same outcome.
b. HRC recommends that the church consider adjusting the Sunday service times to alleviate overlapping ingress and egress traffic patterns. URS supports this recommendation as a means to reduce congestion.
c. While volumes and conditions met Traffic Signal Warrant 3 - Peak Hour, HRC does not recommend installing a traffic signal at this time, but rather conducting further studies in the future to assess actual conditions. We are in agreement with HRC's recommendations to their client.

The traffic study was reviewed to the level of detail URS recommends approval with the condition that the applicant reviews the comments provided in the attached document and updates as necessary.

Sincerely,
URS Corporation Great Lakes


Matthew G. Klawon, PE
Manager, Traffic Engineering and ITS Engineering Services

## URS Corporation
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February 24, 2015
City of Novi Planning Department
45175 W. 10 Mile Rd.
Novi, MI 48375-3024

## Re: FACADE ORDINANCE - Preliminary Site Plan

Brightmoor Christian Church , PSP15-0017
Façade Region: 1, Zoning District: RA
Dear Ms. McBeth;
The following is the Facade Review for Preliminary Site Plan Approval of the above referenced project based on the drawings prepared by Progressive A/E, dated $2 / 22 / 15$. The percentages of materials proposed for each façade are as shown below. Materials that are in violation of the Ordinance, if any, are shown on bold.

|  | East <br> (front) | North | West | South | Façade Ordinance <br> Section 2520 Maximum <br> (Minimum) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brick | $80 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $90 \%$ | NA | $100 \%$ (30\% Min) |
| Flat Metal Panels | $14 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $8 \%$ | NA | $50 \%$ |
| Laminated Panels | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $2 \%$ | NA | $25 \%$ |

This project consists of a significant addition to an existing structure. In this case the addition is approximately equal to the existing buildings footprint; therefor this application is treated as a separate structure with respect to the Façade Ordinance. As shown above it appears that all facades are in full compliance with the Façade Ordinance. However, a sample board was not provided at the time of this review. It is assumed the brick will substantially match that of the existing building. The material identified as "Laminated Panels" should also be clarified via the sample board. Said sample board should be provided not less than 5 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

Recommendation - The proposed addition consists of a highly articulated design that will add significantly to the architectural interest of the existing building when viewed from $\mathrm{M}-5$ connector. It is our recommendation that the application is in full compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 5.15, the Façade Ordinance, contingent on submission of the aforementioned sample board.

## Notes to the Applicant:

1. It should be noted that any roof top equipment must be screened from view from all on-site and off-site vantage points using compliant materials consistent with the building design.
2. Inspections - The Façade Ordinance requires inspection(s) for all projects. Materials displayed on the approved sample board will be compared to materials delivered to the site. It is the applicant's responsibility to request the inspection of each façade material at the appropriate time. Inspections may be requested using the Novi Building Department’s Online Inspection Portal with the following link. Please click on "Click here to Request an Inspection" under "Contractors", then click "Façade".

## http://www.cityofnovi.org/Services/CommDev/OnlineInspectionPortal.asp.

If you have any questions regarding this project please do not hesitate to call.
Sincerely,


Douglas R. Necci, AIA

Fire Review


CITY COUNCIL

## Mayor

Bob Gatt
Mayor Pro Tem
Dave Staudt
Gwen Markham
Andrew Mutch
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Director of Public Safety
Chief of Police
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February 6, 2015

TO: Barbara McBeth- Deputy Director of Community Development Kristen Kapelanski- Plan Review Center Sir Komaragiri- Plan Review Center

RE: Brightmoor Church Expansion
PSP\#14-0194
PSP\#15-0017

Project Description: Parking and Building Expansion

## Comments:

## 1) Maintain Hydrants and access to site and the FDC throughout project

## Recommendation:

## Approval

Sincerely,



J oseph Shelton- Fire Marshal City of Novi - Fire Dept.

Applicant Response Letter

PRINCIPALS
George E. Hubbell
Thomas E. Biehl Walter H. Allx Keith D. McCormack Nancy M.D. Faught Daniel W. Mitchell Jesse B. VanDeCreek Roland N. Alix

## SENIOR ASSOCIATES

Gary J. Tressel Kenneth A. Melchior Randal L. Ford William R. Davis Dennis J. Benait
Robert F. Defrain Thomas D. LaCross

ASSOCIATES
Jonathan E. Booth Michael C. MacDonald Marvin A. Olane Marshall J. Graziol James F. Burton Donna M. Martin Charles E. Hart Colleen L. Hill-Stramsak Bradley W. Shepler Karyn M. Sticke

## HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, INC.

OFFICE: 555 Hulet Drive Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302-0360

MAILING: PO Box 824 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-0824

PHONE: 248.454.6300 FAX: 248.454.6312
WEBSITE: www.hrc-engr.com EMAIL: info@hrc-engr.com

March 13, 2105

City of Novi
45175 W. Ten Mile Road
Sterling Heights, Michigan 48375
Attn: Sri Komaragiri, Planner
Re: Brightmoor Christian Church
HRC Job No. 20140319
Response to Planning Review Dated 2-25-15 JSP 15-07
Dear Ms. Komaragiri:
The following is a list of responses to the planning review letter dated 2-25-15;

## Petitioner

Brightmoor Christian Church

## Review Type

Special Land Use Request and Preliminary Site Plan Review

## Property Characteristics

- Site Location: 40800 W . Thirteen Mile Road (north side of Thirteen Mile, just west of M-5)
- Site School District: Walled Lake Consolidated Schools
- Site Zoning: RA, Residential Acreage
- Adjoining Zoning: North: RM-1, Low Density Multiple Family; South (across Thirteen Mile): RA; East (across M-5): OST, Office Service Technology; West: RM-1
- Site Use(s): Brightmoor Christian Church
- Adjoining Uses: North: Lenox Park residential condominiums; South (across Thirteen Mile): Single family, vacant; East (across M-5): Vacant; West: Fox run retirement living
- Site Size: 40.1 acres
- Plan Date: January 21,2015


## Project Summary

The applicant is proposing to expand the existing Church building to the north with a worship space with auditorium style seating that seats 2,100 people along with accessory uses such as office and additional parking.

## Project History:

Brightmoor Church is an approved special land use in the RA zoning district. On November 4, 1998, the Planning Commission approved the Special Land Use (following a public hearing), the Preliminary Site Plan with a proposed conservation easement for wetland and wetland mitigation near the southeast part of the development. The development included the Brightmoor Christian Church and school complex along with associated surface parking and drainage facilities.

On June 27, 2012, the Planning Commission approved the expansion of the Special Land Use (following a public hearing), the Preliminary Site Plan, the Woodlands permit, and the Stormwater Management Plan. The development included expansion of the existing parking lot on the north side of the Brightmoor Christian Church site, resulting in a net increase of 365

Planning Response Letter
March 11, 2015
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parking spaces and a total of 918 spaces. No new buildings or building expansions were proposed at that time.

On January 26, 2015, the City Council has approved Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment 18.273 to amend the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance at Article 4.0, Use Standards, Section 4.10, Places of Worship, in order to allow additional height for places of worship, under certain conditions, as detailed in the Planning Review Chart.

## SnecialLand Use Considerations

Expansion of a special land use requires a public hearing and special land use approval from the Planning Commission, along with preliminary site plan approval. The proposal also requires approval the stormwater management plan. Section 6.1.2.C of the Zoning Ordinance outlines specific factors the Planning Commission shall consider in the review of any Special Land Use:
i. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will cause any detrimental impact on existing thoroughfares in terms of overall volumes, capacity, safety, vehicular turning patterns, intersections, view obstructions, line of sight, ingress and egress, acceleration/deceleration lanes, off-street parking, off-street loading/unloading, travel times and thoroughfare level of service.
ii. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will cause any detrimental impact on the capabilities of public services and facilities, including water service, sanitary sewer service, storm water disposal and police and fire protection to service existing and planned uses in the area.
iii. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is compatible with the natural features and characteristics of the land, including existing woodlands, wetlands, watercourses and wildlife habitats.
iv. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of location, size, character, and impact on adjacent property or the surrounding neighborhood.
v. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is consistent with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the City's Master Plan for Land Use.
vi. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use will promote the use of land in a socially and economically desirable manner.
vii. Whether, relative to other feasible uses of the site, the proposed use is
a. listed among the provision of uses requiring special land use review as set forth in the various zoning districts of this Ordinance, and
b. Is in harmony with the purposes and conforms to the applicable site design regulations of the zoning district in which it is located.

## Recommendation

Approval of the Special Land Use Permit and Preliminary Site Plan is recommended. The plan generally conforms to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance; however, there is landscape, engineering and traffic related items to be addressed on the next Site Plan Submittal. In its review and approval, the Planning Commission will need to consider the standards for Special Land Use consideration of Section 6.1.2.C. as listed above

## Ordinance_Requirements

This project was reviewed for conformance with the Zoning Ordinance with respect to Article 3.0 (Zoning Districts), Article 4.0(Use Standards), Article 5.0(Site Standards) and any other applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Please see the attached charts for information
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pertaining to ordinance requirements and additional minor comments to be addressed. Items in bold may require a Planning Commission waiver. All other items should be addressed in the response letter prior to the Planning Commission meeting unless otherwise noted.

1. Noise Impact Statement: A noise impact statement is required per Section 5.14.10.B.i. The Planning Commission has the authority to waive this requirement per Section 5.14 .10. B.iii. The applicant should indicate in the response letter whether this statement will be provided.

Response: Noise Impact Statement is attached that shows the City's noise levels for R-I Zoning shall not exceed 55 decibels at nighttime and 60 decibels during the daylight measured $51 / 2$ feet from the property line or R.O.W.
2. Community Impact Statement: A community impact statement is required for a Special Land Use over 10 acres. The Planning Commission has the authority to waive this requirement. The applicant should indicate in the response letter whether this statement will be provided.

Response: Community Impact Statement is attached.
3. Traffic Impact Study: A traffic impact study is required for this project. The applicant has noted that the study is under progress and will submit prior to preliminary site plan approval. The applicant shall submit this study as soon as possible and no later than March 13th in order to allow the complete matter to be considered by the Planning Commission at a public hearing as anticipated on March 25.

Response: HRC has been discussing with AECOM, the City's traffic consultant on this project, and it was agreed this would be furnished to AECOM by March 18, 2015 for the March 25, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting.
4. Parking Count: Please provide additional information required with regards to accessory spaces as listed in the attached chart, with the response letter.

Response: The additional 182 spaces will cover the potential additional loads associated with a full worship service.

Our calculations have accounted for the following accessory uses:
72 spaces based on the calculated occupant load of the worship platform.
60 spaces based on the calculated occupant load of the Hub as concourse.
50 spaces based on office, volunteer/child care, and choir rehearsal occupant load.
All other potential loads are non-concurrent.
The Youth Worship space is planned to accommodate 300 people. It is intended for Junior High students. Driving Age (High School) students are expected to join the adult worship service.
5. Bicycle Parking: According to Sec Sec. 5.16 .1 , for places of worship, a minimum of five (5) percent of required automobile spaces, minimum eight (8) spaces of bicycle parking is required. For 233 of automobile parking, 12 bicycle spaces are required. Please provide bike rack details and bike rack lot layout plan according to the ordinance requirements. Refer to Sec. 5.16. - Bicycle parking facility
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## requirements.

Response: Bicycle parking will be added prior to Final Site Plan submission.
6. Loading Spaces and Dumpster: No additional dumpsters or loading spaces are provided. Show the existing locations on the plan or clarify the absence.

Response: No changes are proposed by this project. The dumpster location will be labeled prior to Final Site Plan submission.
7. Economic Impact Statement: Provide information on total cost of the proposed building and site improvements and number of anticipated jobs created (during construction and after building is occupied, if known) in the response letter.

Response: Approximately 75 construction jobs will be created over a period of 12-15 months, with an additional 10 permanent employees being added to the church staff upon completion.
8. Photometric Plan: The applicant has provided a photometric plan; please refer to chart for additional information required.

Response: An updated Photometric plan will be provided prior to Final Site Plan submission.
9. Other Reviews:
a. Engineering Review: Additional comments to be addressed during Final Site Plan.
b. Landscape Review: Additional comments to be addressed during Final Site Plan.
c. Wetland and Woodland Review: There are no impacts to wetlands and woodlands proposed with this expansion on site.
d. Traffic Review: Additional comments to be addressed during Final Site Plan. Traffic Impact study required prior to Planning Commission meeting.
e. Facade Review: Sample board required prior to Planning Commission meeting.
f. Fire Review: Additional comment to be addressed during Final Site Plan.

Response: Response Letters have been submitted for each of the above.

## Response Letter

A letter from either the applicant or the applicant's representative addressing comments in this and other review letters is required prior to the Planning Commission submittal.

## Signage

Exterior Signage is not regulated by the Planning Division or Planning Commission. Please contact Jeannie Niland (248.347,0438) for information regarding sign permits.

## PLANNING REVIEW SUMMARY CHART

Review Date: February 23, 2015
Project Name: JSP15-0007: Brightmoor Christian Church
Plan Date: February 02,2015
Prepared by: Sri Komaragiri, Planner E-mail: skomaragiri@cityofnovi.org; Phone: (248)
735-5607
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Items in Bold need to be addressed by the applicant before approval of the Preliminary Site Plan. Underlined items need to be addressed before approval of the Final Site Plan.

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets Code | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zoning and Use Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Master Plan (adopted August 25, 2010) | Single Family | Church | Yes | November 4, 1998: <br> Special Land Use approved for Church and School <br> June 27, 2012: Special Land Use approved for additional parking |
| Area Study | The site does not fall under any special category | NA | Yes |  |
| Zoning (Effective December 25, 2013) | Residential Acreage (RA) <br> Article 3 | RA | Yes |  |
| Uses Permitted <br> (Sec 3.1.1.B \& C) | Sec 3.1.1.B <br> Principal Uses <br> Permitted. <br> Sec 3.1.1.C Special Land Uses | Places of Worship (Church) | Yes | Special Land Use approval shall be required as this expansion was not shown on any previous plans |
| Use Standards: Places of Worship Sec 4.10 |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Site Size (Sec 4.10.1) | -3 Acres | 40.15 Acres | Yes |  |
| Minimum Site Width (Sec 4.10.2) | - (200) feet along front yard |  | Yes |  |
| Site Access (Sec 4.10.3) | - All access to the site shall be onto a Major Arterial, Arterial or Minor Arterial road as shown on the City's Thoroughfare Plan | Site access is off of West 13 Mile Road | Yes |  |
| Minimum Building Setbacks (Sec 4.10.4) | - Seventy-five (75) feet from all property lines. |  | Yes | Label Building setbacks on plan |
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| Parking in Front yard (Sec 4.10.5) | - There shall be no parking in front yard, - nor closer than twenty (20) feet from any side or rear lot line, except in those instances, where the lot abuts a residential lot and in those instances, no closer than thirtyfive (35) feet on any side or rear yard | -No additional parking is proposed in the front yard | Yes | Label parking Setbacks on plan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parking Lot Screening (Sec 4.10.6) | - Screening of vehicular parking area s shall be in conformity with requirements atSec5.5.3 |  |  |  |
| Noise Impact Statement (Sec 4.10.7) | - A noise impact statement is required subject to the standards of Section 5.14.10.B |  |  | Provide required noise impact statement <br> Attached. |

Approved Text Amendment for Increased Building Heights (Approved by City Council on

| Site Acreage | - <br> - <br> building for <br> height up to <br> 65 feet | 40.15 Acres | Yes |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site Location | - <br> - Abuts a limited <br> access freeway <br> or a Major <br> Arterial road | Abuts M-5 <br> Freeway | Yes |  |
| Planning <br> Commission <br> Finding | - The proposed <br> development <br> is compatible <br> with and does <br> not have <br> negative <br> impact on <br> surroundings. |  |  |  |
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| Building Setbacks | - the minimum front, side, and rear yard building setbacks are increased by one and onehalf (1.5) feet for every one (1) foot of building height in excess of thirty-five (35) feet; | For 30ft. of proposed additional height, all minimum setbacks are increased by 45 ft . | Yes | See below for required and proposed setbacks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Height, bulk, density and area limitations (Sec 3.1.1.E) |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum \% of <br> Lot Area <br> Covered <br> (By All Buildings) | 25\% |  |  | Provide the maximum \% of lot covered 8.24 \% coverage, $144,268 \mathrm{sft}$. or 3.31 acres |
| Building Height (Sec. 3.1.1.E) | 35 feet or 2 <br> $1 / 2$ stories 65 <br> feet (provide <br> the <br> conditions listed <br> above are met) | 65 feet | Yes |  |
| Building Setbacks (Sec 3.1.1.E)\& |  |  |  |  |
| Front @ Thirteen Mile Way | $75 \mathrm{ft} .+45 \mathrm{ft}=.120 \mathrm{ft}$ | 293 ft . | Yes |  |
| Side (3.6.2.C) | 120 ft . (Same as front) | $\begin{aligned} & 735+195=930 \\ & \text { ft. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Yes |  |
| Rear South | $50 \mathrm{ft} .+45 \mathrm{ft}=95 \mathrm{ft}$. | 490 ft . | Yes |  |
| Parking Setback (Sec 3.1.1.E)Refer to applicable notes in Sec 3.6.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Front @ Providence Park Way | No Parking in Front Yard | Existing Parking in Front Yard | Yes |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Side East } \\ & (3.6 .2 . B) \end{aligned}$ | 120 ft . (Same as front) | Approx. 530 ft . | Yes |  |
| Side West | 35 ft . (lot abuts a residential district) | Approx. 135 ft . | Yes |  |
| Rear South | 35 ft . (lot abuts a residential district) | 35 ft . | Yes |  |
| Note To District Standards (Sec 3.6.2) |  |  |  |  |
| Area Requirements (Sec 3.6.2.A) | NA |  |  |  |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parking Setbacks (Sec } \\ & 3.6 .2 . B) \end{aligned}$ | Refer to Sec 3.6.2 for more details | Minimum required setbacks are modified accordingly | Yes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building Setbacks (Sec 3.6.2.C) | Refer to Sec 3.6.2 for more details | Minimum required setbacks are modified accordingly | Yes |  |
| Wetland/Watercourse Setback (Sec 3.6.2.M) | Refer to Sec 3.6.2 for more details | No Wetlands and Woodlands on Site | NA |  |
| Parking, Loading and Dumpster Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Parking Spaces Churches <br> 5.2.12.B <br> One (1) for each three <br> (3) seats <br> Schools <br> 5.2.12.B <br> One (1) for each staff and One for every 4 students over driving age | For 2,100 Seats, a total of 700 spaces are required <br> 1 Space per employee $=65$ Spaces <br> +1 space for every 4 students over driving age $=13$ Spaces; Total 78 Spaces Existing <br> Total Required: 778 Spaces | Total <br> Existing: 918 (897 Regular; 21 Barrier free) Parking Lost in Expansion: 191 (175 Regular; 16 Barrier free) New Spaces Proposed: 233 (211 Regular; 22 Barrier free) <br> TOTAL: 960 (934 Regular; 26 Barrier free) | Yes | Are the new office spaces proposed with the new addition? <br> How many Youth Worship Seats are proposed in Youth Worship area? What is the age range for the Youth Worship? <br> There are 182 additional spaces then required on site. However, staff wants to make that all accessory uses are accounted for. |
| Parking Space <br> Dimensions and <br> Maneuvering Lanes <br> (Sec. <br> 5.3.2) | - $90^{\circ}$ Parking: 9 ft . $\times 19 \mathrm{ft}$. <br> - 24 ft. two way drives <br> $-9 \mathrm{ft} . \times 17 \mathrm{ft}$. parking spaces allowed along <br> 7 ft . wide interior sidewalks as long as detail indicates a 4 " curb at these locations and along landscaping | $90^{\circ}$ Parking: 9 $\mathrm{ft.x} 17 \mathrm{ft}$ to 18.5 ft . along 8 ft . wide interior sidewalks and landscape spaces. -24 ft to 28 ft. driveway within parking aisles. 28ft. to 30 ft. wide access drive with no parking on either side. | Yes |  |


| Parking Space <br> Dimensions and <br> Maneuvering Lanes <br> (Sec. 5.3.2) | - |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Parking stall located |  |  |  |
| adjacent to a parking |  |  |  |
| lot entrance(public |  |  |  |
| or private) |  |  |  |
| (Sec. 5.3.13) |  |  |  | | - shall not be |
| :--- |
| located closer |
| than twenty-five |
| (25) feet from the |
| street right-of- |
| way (ROW) line, |
| street easement or |
| sidewalk, |
| whichever is |
| closer |$\quad$| NA |  |
| :--- | :--- |
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| Barrier Free Space Dimensions Barrier Free Code | $-8^{6}$ wide with an 8 ' wide access aisle for van accessible spaces <br> - 5 ' wide with a 5' wide access aisle for regular accessible spaces | Two types of accessible spaces are provided | Yes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Barrier Free Signs | One sign for each accessible parking space. | All signs are proposed | Yes |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Barrier Free Signs } \\ \text { Barrier Free } \\ \text { Design Graphics } \\ \text { Manual } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum number of Bicycle Parking Sec. 5.16.1 | Five (5) percent of required automobile spaces, minimum eight <br> (8) spaces $=12$ bicycle spaces are required for 233 spaces <br> Located along the building approach line <br> \& easily accessible from the building entrance | Bicycle parking not indicated | No | Applicant should add the required bike parking as per the ordinance requirements. Will be added prior to Final Site Plan submission. |
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| Bicycle Parking General requirements Sec. 5.16 | - No farther than 120 ft . from the entrance being served <br> - When 4 or more spaces are required for a building with multiple entrances, the spaces shall be provided in multiple locations <br> - Spaces to be paved and the bike rack shall be inverted "U" design <br> - Shall be accessible via 6 ft . paved sidewalk | No No <br> No No | No | Note the location <br> Bicycle spaces should be proposed in multiple locations <br> Please provide the inverted "U" bike rack detail <br> Will be added to Final Site Plan submission. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycle Parking Lot layout Sec 5.16.6 | Parking space width: 6 ft . <br> One tier width: 10 <br> ft . Two tier width: 16 ft . Maneuvering lane width: 4 ft . <br> Parking space depth: 2 ft . single, $21 / 2 \mathrm{ft}$. double |  | No | Provide a plan detail of the bicycle parking as required <br> Will be added to Final Site Plan submission. |
| Loading Spaces Sec. 5.4.1 | Required on all premises where receipt or distribution of materials or merchandise occurs and shall be separate from parking areas | Loading Spaces are not proposed | NA | Clarify with a note that the loading spaces are not required for the proposed use. If required, please show loading space on the plan. <br> No revisions proposed from what exist. |


| Dumpster Sec. 4.19.2.F | - Located in rear yard <br> - Attache d to the building or <br> - No closer than 10 ft . from building if not attached <br> - Not located in parking setback <br> - If no setback, then it cannot be any closer than 10 ft , from property line. <br> - Away from Barrier free Spaces | No Dumpster is shown on the plans | No | Is there an existing dumpster? <br> Identify the dumpster location on plans Dumpster location has been labeled and will not change. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dumpster Enclosure Sec. 21-145. (c) | - Screened from public view <br> - A wall or fence 1 ft . higher than height of refuse bin <br> - And no less than 5 ft . on three sides <br> - Posts or bumpers to protect the screening <br> - Hard surface pad. <br> - Screening Materials: Masonry, wood or evergreen shrubbery |  | No | See above comment |
| Lighting and Other Equipment Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Exterior lighting Sec. 5.7 | Photometric plan and exterior lighting details needed at time of Final Site Plan submittal | A lighting plan is provided | Yes |  |
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$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Roof top } \\ \text { equipment and } \\ \text { wall mounted } \\ \text { utility equipment } \\ \text { Sec. 4.19.2.E.ii }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { - All roof top } \\ \text { equipment must } \\ \text { be screened and } \\ \text { all wall } \\ \text { mounted utility } \\ \text { equipment must } \\ \text { be enclosed and } \\ \text { integrated into } \\ \text { the design and } \\ \text { color of the } \\ \text { building }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Roof top } \\ \text { equipmen } \\ \text { t is not } \\ \text { proposed }\end{array} & \text { Yes } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Please clarify if } \\ \text { there is any } \\ \text { proposed } \\ \text { rooftop } \\ \text { equipment } \\ \text { Plan with } \\ \text { distances } \\ \text { attached to Noise }\end{array} \\ \text { Study letter. }\end{array}\right\}$

Sidewalk Requirements

| Sidewalks | - A 6' -10' wide <br> sidewalk shall be <br> Article XII <br> constructed along <br> all arterial and <br> collector roads <br> except in <br> $11-279$ |  | NA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| industrial districts |  |  |  |
| Town Center Area |  |  |  |
| Study | - All pedestrian <br> safety paths shall <br> be concrete and <br> four (4) inches <br> thick except |  |  |
|  | residential <br> driveway <br> crossings which <br> shall be six (6) <br> inches thick, and <br> industrial/comme |  |  |
|  | rcial driveway <br> crossings which <br> shall be eight (8) <br> inches thick. |  |  |
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| Pedestrian Connectivity | The Planning Commission shall consider the following factors in exercising its discretion over site plan approval Whether the traffic circulation features within the site and location of automobile parking areas are designed to assure safety and convenience of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic both within the site and in relation to access streets | 8 foot <br> Sidewalks are proposed throughout the site for convenient and safe pedestrian access | Yes | Consider connecting the front parking lot to rear parking lot via sidewalk <br> Added on east side of addition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building Code and other design standard Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| Building Code | Building exits must be connected to sidewalk system or parking lot. | All exits are connected to internal sidewalk | Yes |  |
| Design and Construction Standards Manual | Land description, Sidwell number (metes and bounds for acreage parcel, lot number(s), Liber, and page for subdivisions). | Provided | Yes |  |
| General layout and dimension of proposed physical improvements | Location of all existing and proposed buildings, proposed building heights, building layouts, (floor area in square feet), location of proposed parking and parking layout, streets and drives, and indicate square footage of pavement area (indicate public or private). |  | Yes |  |
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| Economic Impact | - Total cost of <br> the proposed <br>  <br> site <br> improvement <br> s |  | No <br> - Number of <br> anticipated jobs <br> created (during <br>  <br> after building is <br> occupied, if <br> known) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Commission |  | See George Auch letter <br> attached. |  |  |
| Development/ <br> Business Sign | Signage if proposed <br> requires a permit. |  | For sign permit <br> information contact |  |
| Jeannie Niland 248-347- |  |  |  |  |
| 0438. |  |  |  |  |

## LIGHTING REVIEW SUMMARY CHART

| Review Date: | 11 February 2015 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Name: | JSP15-0007: Brightmoor Christian Church |
| Plan Date: | February 02, 2015 |
| Prepared by: | Sri Komaragiri, Planner E-mail: skomaragiri@cityofnovi.org; Phone: |
| (248) $735-5607$  |  |

Items in Bold need to be addressed by the applicant before approval of the Preliminary Site Plan. Underlined items need to be addressed before approval of the Final Site Plan.

| Item | Required Code | Proposed | Meets <br> Code? | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Intent (Sec. 5.7.1) | Establish appropriate <br> minimum levels, prevent <br> unnecessary glare, reduce <br> spillover onto adjacent <br> properties \& reduce <br> unnecessary transmission <br> of light into the night sky | Yes | Yes |  |
| Lighting Plan | Site plan showing <br>  <br> proposed buildings, | Yes | Yes |  |
| (Sec. 5.7.A.I) | landscaping, streets, <br>  <br> exterior lighting fixtures |  |  |  |
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| Lighting Plan (Sec.5.7.A.2) | Specifications for all proposed <br> \& existing lighting fixtures: <br> a Photometric data <br> - Fixture height <br> - Mounting \& design <br> - Glare control devices <br> - Type \& color rendition of lamps <br> - Hours of operation Photometric plan illustrating all light sources that impact the subject site, including spill-over information from neighboring properties | - Yes <br> - No <br> - Yes <br> - Yes <br> - Yes <br> - No | No | Provide the hours of operation, fixture height on plan <br> Will be added prior to Final Site Plan submission-hours dusk to 11:00 p.m. with nighttime levels at $+/-25 \%$ of full operations. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Required Conditions (Sec. 5.7.3.A) | Height not to exceed maximum height of zoning district (or 25 ft . where adjacent to residential districts or uses | 25 ft . | No | Provide the maximum height of the fixtures Will be provided prior to Final Site Plan submission |
| Required Conditions (Sec. $5.7 .3 . B$ ) | - Electrical service to light fixtures shall be placed underground <br> - Flashing light shall not be permitted <br> - Only necessary lighting for security purposes \& limited operations shall be permitted after a site's hours | Notes are added to the plan. | Yes | Provide the hours of operation on plan Will be provided prior to Final Site Plan submission |


|  | of operation |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Required Conditions <br> (Sec.5.7.3.E) | Average light level of the <br> surface being lit to the <br> lowest light of the surface <br> being lit shall not exceed <br> 4:1 | No | Provide the total <br> ratio as required <br> Will be provided <br> prior to Final Site <br> Plan submission |  |
| Required Conditions <br> (Sec. 5.7.3.F) | Use of true color <br> rendering lamps such as <br> metal halide is preferred <br> over high \& low pressure <br> sodium lamps | Yes |  |  |
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| Min. Illumination (Sec. 5.7.3.k) | - Parking areas: 0.2 min <br> - Loading \& unloading areas: <br> 0.4 min <br> - Walkways: 0.2 min <br> - Building entrances, frequent use: 1.0 min <br> - Building entrances, infrequent use: 0.2 $\min$ | - 0.2 min <br> - 0.4 min <br> - 0.2 min <br> - 1.0 min <br> - 0.2 min | Yes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Max. Illumination adjacent to NonResidential (Sec. 5.7.3.K) | When site abuts a nonresidential district, maximum illumination at the property line shall not exceed 1 foot candle |  | NA |  |
| Cut off Angles (Sec. 5.7.3.L) | when adjacent to residential districts <br> - All cut off angles of fixtures must be $90^{\circ}$ <br> - maximum illumination at the property line shall not exceed 0.5 foot candle |  | Yes | Provide the Footcandle values along property line on plan <br> Will be provided prior to Final Site Plan submission |

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,


GJT/nf
pc: HRC; File
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Brick "C" on Worship Center Body Belden 661 Velour A, Utility


Vision Glass
Sunguard SuperNeutral 54
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March 13, 2015
City of Novi
45175 W. Ten Mile Road
Novi, Michigan 48375
Attn: Jeremy Miller
Re: Brightmoor Christian Church
HRC Job No. 20140319
Response to Engineering Review JSPI-0077 Dated February 26, 2015 for Preliminary Site Plan Submittal

Dear Mr. Miller:
Please see our responses to your engineering review letter dated 2-26-15 as follows:

## Recommendation

Approval of the Preliminary Site Plan and Preliminary Storm Water Management Plan is recommended.

## Comments:

The Preliminary Site Plan meets the general requirements of Chapter 11, the Storm Water Management Ordinance and the Engineering Design Manual with the following items to be addressed at the time of the Final Site plan submitted (further engineering detail will be required at the time of the final site plan submittal):

## Additional Comments (to be addressed prior to the Final Site Plan Submittal):

## General

1. The City standard detail sheets are not required for the Final Site Plan submittal. They will be required with the Stamping Set submittal. They can be found on the City website (www.cityofnovi.org/DesignManual).

Response: Standard detail sheets will be attached to the Final Site Plan submittal.
2. Provide a note stating the size of the disturbed area and size of the building addition.

Response: A note stating the size of the disturbed areas and size of building addition will be added to the Final Site Plan.
3. Provide a minimum of two ties to established section or quarter section corners.

Response: Please see contract drawing C-03 Existing Topography for two ties.
4. Provide a note stating the disturbed area for construction.

Response: Area of disturbance will be noted on the Final Site Plan.
5. Revise the plan set to reference at least one city established benchmark. An interactive map of the City's established survey benchmarks can be found under the 'Map of Gallery' tab on www.cityofnovi.org

Response: Please see Contract Drawing C-03 Existing Topography for existing datums on City survey benchmarks.
6. Provide a construction materials table on the Utility Plan listing the quantity and material type for each utility (water, sanitary and storm) being proposed.

Response: This information will be provided as part of the Final Site Plan.
7. Provide a note that compacted sand backfill shall be provided for all utilities within the influence of paved areas, and illustrate on the profiles.

Response: These notes will be added as part of the Final Site Plan approval.
8. Provide a traffic control sign table listing the quantities of each sign type proposed for the development. Provide a note along with the table stating all traffic signage will comply with the current MMUTCD standards.

Response: The traffic control sign table listing the quantities of each type of sign for the proposed development will be added as a part of the Final Site Plan approval.
9. Provide a note stating if dewatering is anticipated or encountered during construction a dewatering plan must be submitted to the Engineering Department for review.

Response: A note will be added to the Final Site Plan indicating if dewatering is anticipated, prior to beginning dewatering a plan will be submitted to the engineering department for review prior to beginning dewatering.
10. Generally, all proposed easements shall remain outside utility easements. Where proposed trees are required within a utility easement, the trees shall maintain a minimum 5 -foot horizontal separation distance from any existing or proposed utility. All utilities shall be shown on the landscape plan, or other appropriate sheet, to confirm the separation distance.

Response: All proposed easements have been shown on the Iandscape plans along with any proposed easements for City's review, the issue of 5 foot horizontal clearance will be resolved prior to final submission of site plan approval.
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## Water Main

11. Show existing and proposed water main easements.

Response: Existing and proposed watermain easements are shown on Contract Drawing C-07.
12. Provide a profile for all proposed water main 8 -inch and larger.

Response: A profile will be prepared for the watermain relocation on the north side of the proposed expansion.
13. Three (3) sealed sets of revised utility plans along with the MDEQ permit application ( $1 / 07$ rev.) for water main construction and the Streamlined Water Main Permit Checklist should be submitted to the Engineering Department for review, assuming no further design changes are anticipated. Utility plan sets shall include only the cover sheet, any applicable utility sheets and the standard detail sheets.

Response: Three (3) sets of sealed plans will be submitted to with a checklist for their review and processing of the permit.

## Storm Sewer

14. Label all inlet storm structures on the profiles. Inlets are only permitted in paved areas and when followed by a catch basin within 50 feet.

Response: The inlet storm structures and profiles will be provided as part of the Final Site Plan approval. HRC will review that inlets only occur within paved areas and must have a catch basin within 50 feet.
15. Label the 10 -year HGL on the storm sewer profiles, and ensure the HGL remains at least 1 -foot below the rim of the structure.

Response: The ten year hydraulic grade line will be indicated on all storm profiles to ensure that it maintains at least 1 foot below the rim of the structures.
16. Provide a schedule listing the casting type and other relevant information for each proposed storm structure on the utility plan. Round castings shall be provided on all catch basins except curb inlet structures.

Response: A schedule will be added for the casting types and other relevant information on the proposed storm sewers. Round castings shall be provided at all catch basins except curb inlets as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.
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17. Provide a 0.1 -foot drop in the downstream invert of all storm structures where a change in direction of 30 degrees or greater occurs.

Response: 0.1 foot drop on the downstream inverts will be provided within the design of the storm system.
18. Provide profiles for all proposed storm sewer.

Response: Profiles will be provided for all proposed storm sewer as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.

## Storm Water Management Plan

19. The Storm Water Management plan for this development shall be designed in accordance with the Storm Water Ordinance and Chapter 5 of the new Engineering Design Manual.

Response: Stormwater Management Plan for the development shall be designed in accordance with the Stormwater Ordinance Chapter 5 of the new Engineering Design Standards for a ten year storm water event as a part of Final Site Plan submission.
20. The SWMP must detail the storm water design, calculations, details, and maintenance as stated in the ordinance. The SWMP must address the discharge of storm water off-site, and evidence of it adequacy must be provided. This should be done by comparing pre- and post-development discharge rates and volumes. The area being used for this off-site discharge should be delineated and the ultimate location of the discharge shown.

Response: The SWMP shall be provided as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.
21. Provide supporting calculations for the runoff coefficient determination.

Response: Calculations for runoff coefficients will be submitted for review for the City as part of the Final Site Plan submission.
22. Provide details and calculations on the plan showing that the east basin will be enlarged to accommodate the proposed 10 -year volume while maintaining a one-foot freeboard as discussed.

Response: HRC will provide details and calculations on the plan that show that the east basin will be enlarged to accommodate the ten year volume while maintaining one-foot freeboard.
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## Paving and Grading

23. The proposed parking stalls along the east curb line are dimensioned at 18.5 feet with the 6 -inch curb. Parking stalls with a 6 -inch curb must be a minimum of 19 -feet long. The length can be reduced up to 17 -feet with a 4 -inch curb.

Response: Proposed parking stalls along the east curb line are dimensioned at $181 / 2$ feet with 6 inch curb. HRC will either adjust the curb height to be 4 inches (as it is less that 19 feet) or will increase the length of the space to be 19 feet to allow the 6 inch curb as a part of final site plan submission.

## The following must be submitted at the time of Final Site Plan submittal:

24. An itemized construction cost estimate must be submitted to the Community Development Department at the time of Final Site Plan submittal for the determination of plan review and construction inspection fees. This estimate should only include the civil site work and not any costs associated with construction of the building or any demolition work. The cost estimate must be itemized for each utility (water, sanitary, storm sewer), on-site paving, right-of-way paving (including proposed right-of-way), grading, and the storm water basin (basin construction, control structure, pretreatment structure and restoration).

Response: An itemized cost estimate will be provided as a part of Final Site Plan.

## The following must be submitted at the time of Stamping Set submittal:

25. A draft copy of the maintenance agreement for the storm water facilities, as outlined in the Storm Water Management Ordinance, must be submitted to the Community Development Department with the Final Site Plan. Once the form of the agreement is approved, this agreement must be approved by City Council and shall be recorded in the office of the Oakland County register of Deeds.

Response: A draft of the Maintenance Agreement for the Stormwater Facilities will be provided as a part of Final Site Plan.
26. A draft copy of the 20 -foot wide easement for the water main to be constructed on the site must be submitted to the Community Development Department.

Response: A draft copy of the watermain easement that will be relocated on the site will be provided to the Community Development Department for their review and input.
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## The following must be addressed prior to construction:

27. A pre-construction meeting shall be required prior to any site work being started. Please contact Sarah Marchioni in the Community Development to setup a meeting (248-347-0430).

Response: Requirement is understood and will be complied with at the appropriate time and prior to construction.
28. A City of Novi Grading Permit will be required prior to any grading on the site. This permit will be issued at the pre-construction meeting. Once determined, a grading permit fee must be paid to the City Treasurer's Office.

Response: Requirement is understood and will be complied with at the appropriate time and prior to construction.
29. An NPDES permit must be obtained for the MDEQ because the site is over 5 acres in size. The MDEQ requires an approved plan to be submitted with the Notice of Coverage.

Response: Requirement is understood and will be complied with at the appropriate time and prior to construction.
30. A Soil Erosion Control Permit must be obtained from the City of Novi. Contact Sarah Marchioni in the Community Development Department (248-347-0430) for forms and information.

Response: Requirement is understood and will be complied with at the appropriate time and prior to construction.
31. A permit for water main construction must be obtained from the MDEQ. This permit application must be submitted through the City Engineer after the water main plans have been approved.

Response: Requirement is understood and will be complied with at the appropriate time and prior to construction.
32. Construction Inspection Fees to be determined once the construction cost estimate is submitted must be paid prior to the pre-construction meeting.

Response: Requirement is understood and will be complied with at the appropriate time and prior to construction.
33. An incomplete site work performance guarantee for this development will be calculated (equal to 1.5 times the amount required to complete the site improvements, excluding the storm water facilities) as specified in the Performance Guarantee Ordinance. This guarantee will be posted prior to TCO, at which time it may be reduced based on percentage of construction
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completed.
Response: Requirement is understood and will be complied with at the appropriate time and prior to construction.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,
HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, INC.


GJT/nf
Attachment
Enclosure
pc: City of Novi; Ben Croy, Brian Coburn, Sri Komaragiri, Michael Andrews HRC; File

March 6, 2015

Ms. Sri Komaragiri
Ms. Barbara McBeth
Planning and Community Development
City of Novi
45175 W. Ten Mile Road
Novi, MI 48375

## RE: Response to Landscape Architectural Preliminary Site Plan Approval Review JSP 15-07

Dear Ms. Komaragiri:
The comments provided in your review letter dated February 25, 2015 have been addressed as follows. Revisions to our plans will appear on the resubmitted final site plan documents.

## 1. Interior Parking Lot Landscape Calculations:

a. We will revise our landscape calculations to reflect the new parking space total of 233 spaces.
b. We will add square footages to all parking lot islands that have been counted toward the interior parking lot landscape requirements.
c. We request a waiver from the planning commission for the 17 additional trees that result from the revised parking lot calculations. As discussed, we have provided 13 additional trees in the lower youth area and are hopeful that the planning commission will consider these additional trees in their deliberations.

## 2. Planting Notations and Details

a. We will revise the tree planting detail to include fabric ties only.

## 3. Irrigation Plan:

a. We will provide an irrigation plan and cost estimate.

## 4. Existing and Proposed Utilities:

a. We will show existing and proposed fire hydrants.

## 5. Soil Type:

a. We will show soil information on our plans. This also is shown on the civil engineers plans.

## 6. Collected or Transplanted Trees:

a. We have determined that transplanting the existing trees is not economically feasible. We will provide 58 new 7 foot (minimum height) evergreens that will be field located on the

Page 2
Mr. Sri Komaragiri
Ms. Barbara McBeth
northern berm to enhance the buffer between the church property and the adjacent residential community.

## 7. General Notes:

a. We will provide an original seal and signature on the final site plan submittal and adhere to the other stated requirements.

If we can provide you any additional information, or answer any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,
RUSSELL DESIGN, INC.


Marc R. Russell, ASLA
Principal

PRINCIPALS
PRINCIPALS
George E. Hubbell Thomas E. Biehl Walter H. Alix Keith D. McCormack Nancy M. D. Faught Daniel W. Mitchell Jesse B. VanDeCreek Roland N. Alix

SENIOR ASSOCIATES
Gary J. Tressel Kenneth A. Melchior

Randal L. Ford William R. Davis Dennis J. Benoit Robert F. DeFrain Thomas D. LaCross

ASSOCIATES Jonathan E. Booth Michael C. MacDonald Marvin A. Olane Marshall J. Grazioli James F. Burton Donna M. Martin

Charles E. Hart Colleen L. Hill-Stramsak Bradley W. Shepler Karyn M. Stickel

[^0]March 13, 2015
City of Novi
45175 W. 10 Mile Road
Novi, Michigan 48375
Attn: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development
Re: Brightmoor Christian Church
HRC Job No. 20140319
Preliminary Site Plan JSP15-0007
Response to Traffic Review dated 2-12-15
Dear Ms. McBeth:
The following are our responses to the Preliminary Site Plan traffic review dated February 12, 2015:

## 1. General Comments

a. The applicant, Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Inc., is proposing to expand the building and parking lot of the existing Brightmoor Christian Church located near the intersection of 13 Mile Road and Lenox Park Drive, just west of M-5.

## Response:

## 2. Potential Traffic Impacts

a. The applicant has stated that a traffic impact statement will be prepared and submitted prior to preliminary site plan approval. URS will review the traffic impact study once it is submitted.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study will be submitted prior to COB, Wednesday, March 18, 2015 for review by URS/AECOM.
3. General Plan Comments - The preliminary site plan is generally in compliance with City ordinance; however, the applicant should further review the following comments and adjust the plans as necessary:
a. Provide additional dimensions indicating the widths of the pedestrian facilities throughout the site.

Response: The dimensions shall be provided as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.
b. Indicate where pedestrian ramps will be located throughout the site.

Response: Pedestrian ramps shall be labeled as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.
C. Provide ramp details for any proposed pedestrian ramps throughout the site.

## Response: Ramp details shall be provided as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.

CONSULTING ENGINEERS SINCE 1915
d. Review the required turning radius for any trucks that will need access to the site and ensure that all maneuvers can be adequately completed.

## Response: Turning radii shall be provided as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.

e. Provide signing information, including sign type and location(s).

Response: The traffic control sign table listing the quantities of each type of sign for the proposed development will be added as a part of the Final Site Plan approval.
4. Internal Site Access and Operations - The internal site access and operations is generally in compliance with City ordinances; however, the applicant should further review the following comments and adjust the plans as necessary:
a. The parking spaces in the parking lot on the west side of the site are labeled with either 17 ' or 18.5 parking space depths.
i. Where the curb height is 6 ", as indicated on the grading sheet, the parking space depth should be 19 '.

Response: Parking space depth will be addressed as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.
ii. There is a discrepancy between the grading sheet (C-5) and the typical sections and details sheet (C-8) regarding the curb height adjacent to parking spaces with a depth of 17’. The grading sheet indicates a 0.5 ' difference in grade, while the typical sections and details sheet has a note that indicates a 4" curb height where the parking spaces are 17' deep. This should be reviewed and updated to be consistent.

Response: Discrepancies will be addressed as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.
b. The parking spaces along the perimeter of the east parking lot indicate parking stall depths of 18.5 'and the grading sheet indicates a 0.5 ' difference in grade.
i. Where the curb height is 6 ", as indicated on the grading sheet, the parking space depth should be 19 '.

Response: Parking space depth will be addressed as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.
ii. The parking space depths should be increased to 19 ' if the 6" curb is maintained or the parking space depths may be reduced to 17 ' if the curb height is reduced to 4 ".

Response: Parking space depths will be addressed as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.
c. The end island designs should be further reviewed for compliance, specifically addressing the comments below:
i. End islands should be 3' shorter than the adjacent parking spaces. Maneuvering lane dimensions indicate 24' between parking spaces and 28 ' between islands, thereby indicating a 2 ' difference on either side of the maneuvering lane.

## Response: End island designs will be addressed as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.

ii. The outside radius of end islands should be 15'. Throughout the site there are several instances where the radius is less than 15 '.

## Response: End island designs will be addressed as a part of the Final Site Plan submission.

The preliminary site plan was reviewed to the level of detail provided and additional information may be required to complete the review of traffic-related elements. URS recommends approval of the plans with the condition that the applicant provides additional detail, revised plans and/or a narrative to address the aforementioned comments included in this letter.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,
HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, INC.


Colleen Hill-Stramsak, P.E., PTOE Associate

CHS/nef
pc: URS; Matthew G. Klawon
HRC; File
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HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, INC. OFFICE: 555 Hulet Drive Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302-0360 MAILING: PO Box 824 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-0824 PHONE: 248.454.6300 FAX: 248.454.6312
WEBSITE: www.hrc-engr.com EMAIL: info@hrc-engr.com

March 13, 2015
City of Novi
45175 W. Ten Mile Road
Novi, Michigan 48375
Attn: Barbara McBeth, Deputy Director of Community Development
Re: Brightmoor Christian Church Expansion
HRC Job No. 20140319
Preliminary Site Plan PSP\#14-0194 \& PSP\#15-0017
Response to Fire Department Review Letter dated 2-6-15
Dear Ms. McBeth:
The following is a list of responses to your review letter dated 2-6-15;
Project Description: Parking and Building Expansion
Comments: Maintain Hydrants and access to site and the FDC throughout the project.

## Recommendation: Approval

Response: HRC and Brightmoor Christian Church will work with the Fire Department to ensure hydrants are maintained to the greatest extend possible and that access to the site will be coordinated with the Fire Department throughout construction. The current FDC which is located on the south side of the building will remain in service at all times and available to the Fire Department in the event of an emergency.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,
HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, ${ }^{\text {INC. }}$

Gary J. Tressel
Senior Associate
GJT/nf
pc: City of Novi; Joseph Marshal, Barbara McBeth, Kristen Kapelanski, Sri Komaragiri
HRC; File

Noise Impact Statement
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## HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, INC.

OFFICE: 555 Hulet Drive Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302-0360 MAILING: PO BOX 824 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-0824 PHONE: 248.454.6300 FAX: 248.454.6312
WEBSITE; www.hrc-engr.com
EMAIL: info@hrc-engr.com

March 13, 2015

City of Novi
45175 W. Ten Mile Road
Novi, Michigan 48375
Attn: Sri Komaragiri, Planner
Re: Noise Analysis Letter
HRC Job No. 20140319
Brightmoor Christian Church Preliminary Site Plan Approval

Dear Ms. Komaragiri:
In accordance with your review letter for the subject project, Hubbell, Roth \& Clark, Inc. (HRC) has obtained the catalog cuts from Progressive AE Architects as it pertains to the roof top units and the generator that would be built on the west side of the property.

HRC has also reviewed the Ordinance section of your Development Guidelines under Section 5.1410 where we see that within the current R1 zoning that the nighttime hour's allowable decibel readings are 55 and the daytime hours decibel readings cannot exceed 60 at the property lines. We have also attached a map to show where the noise generating equipment will be on the project as it relates to the associated property lines.

On the westerly side the minimum dimension from the generator to the west property line will be a minimum of 291 feet and the roof top units will be a minimum of 313 feet. On the south side these roof top units will be a minimum of 572 feet from the Thirteen Mile Road right-of-way. On the east side the roof top units will be a minimum of 806 feet from the M-5 freeway and on the north side the measurement to the property line will be for the adjacent Lenox Park Condominiums will be a minimum of 588 feet from the roof top unit.

The roof top units height above finished floor do vary as noted on the Architectural plans and will be provided with screening due to City ordinances for roof top units. It should also be noted that the generator (while on the west side and only 291 feet from the west property line) is the closest noise generating unit. The generator will have a 6 foot high masonry wall between the west side of the generator and the west property line to absorb and redirect the noise impacts while in operation.

Upon your review of the attached information, should you have any questions or wish to discuss further detail, HRC would be happy to assemble a discussion with Progressive AE, Brightmoor Christian Church and HRC to resolve any open issues you may have regarding the noise levels. HRC has attached a catalog cuts for the

Sri Komaragiri
March 13, 2015
HRC Job Number 20140319
Page 2 of 2
appropriate units as well for your review and consideration.
Very truly yours,
HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, INC.


GJT/nf
Attachment
pc: Brightmoor Christian Church; Gary Jonna, Norm Frechette Progressive AE Architects; Seth Horton, Andy Hopkins CGP Architects; Evan Caruso
HRC; Tom Biehl, Matt Slicker, File


## Brightmoor Christian Church

## RTU Outdoor Sound Power Levels

RTU-10:

Table 131. Outdoor sound power level - dB (ref. 10-12W)

| Tons | Unit Model Number | Octave Center Frequency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Overall dBA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 63 | 125 | 250 | 500 | 1000 | 2000 | 4000 | 8000 |  |
| 3 | T/YSC036E | 79 | 85 | 79 | 79 | 77 | 71 | 67 | 58 | 81 |
| 4 | T/YSCO48E | 82 | 84 | 83 | 80 | 76 | 72 | 66 | 58 | 82 |
| 5 | T/VSC060E | 85 | 82 | 81 | 81 | 77 | 72 | 67 | 61 | 82 |
| 6 | T/YSC072F | 91 | 95 | 90 | 87 | 84 | 79 | 75 | 68 | 89 |
| 71/2 | T/YSC090F | 91 | 95 | 90 | 87 | 84 | 79 | 75 | 68 | 89 |
| 71/3 | T/YSC092F | 92 | 96 | 92 | 89 | 85 | 80 | 76 | 69 | 91 |
| B1/2 | T/YSC102F | 91 | 95 | 90 | 87 | 84 | 79 | 75 | 68 | 89 |
| 10 | T/YSC120F | 91 | 86 | 90 | 86 | 82 | 78 | 73 | 67 | 88 |
| 3 | T/YHC036E | 79 | 85 | 79 | 79 | 77 | 71 | 67 | 58 | 81 |
| 4 | T/YHCO4BE | 80 | 86 | 84 | B5 | 83 | 79 | 73 | 67 | 87 |
| 4 | T/YHCO48F | 80 | 86 | 84 | 85 | 83 | 79 | 73 | 67 | 87 |
| 5 | T/YHC060E | 80 | 86 | 84 | 85 | 83 | 79 | 73 | 67 | 87 |
| 5 | T/YHC060F | 80 | 86 | 84 | 85 | 83 | 79 | 73 | 67 | 87 |
| 6 | T/YHC.072E,F | 91 | 95 | 90 | 87 | 84 | 79 | 75 | 68 | 89 |
| 71/2 | T/YHC092F | 91 | 86 | 90 | 86 | 82 | 78 | 73 | 67 | 88 |
| B1/2 | T/YHC102F | 83 | 85 | 85 | 86 | 84 | 78 | 74 | 70 | 88 |
| 10 | T/YHC120E | 89 | 87 | 91 | 85 | 80 | 77 | 73 | 66 | 87 |

Noto: Tests follow AR1270-95.

## RTU-11A1 (Alternate A1)

The following is the Voyager II Outdoor Sound Power Levels. The Outdoor Sound Tests were conducted in accordance with ARI 370-86.

Units were tested at 400 CFM/Ton at an average of $1.75^{\prime \prime}$ total static.
NOTE: The sound provided per ARI270 is sound power, and thus there is no distance associated with it.
Note: All measurements are made in a reverberation chamber. For outdoor sound, the unit is placed in the chamber, supply and return are ducted out of the chamber. Sound measured is mainly due to the condenser fan and the compressors.


[^1]
# Table 1 - 20-55 Ton Large Commercial Packaged Rooftops - Sound Power Ratings S*FC-C20 THROUGH S*FC-C55 60 Hz MODELS 



Table 3-20-55 Ton Large Commercial Packaged Rooftops - Sound Pressure Levels S^AC-C20 THROUGH S*FC-C55 60 Hz MODELS

Table 3:

| Octave Band (Hz) |  | Octave Band Sound Pressure Levels, dB re $20 \mu \mathrm{~Pa}$ at 10 meters Condensing Section End of Unit |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 ton | 25 ton | 30 ton | 40 ton |  |  |  |
| 63 |  | 72 | 72 | 72 | 74 | 74 | 74 |
| 125 |  | 69 | 69 | 69 | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| 250 |  | 64 | 64 | 64 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| 500 |  | 66 | 66 | 66 | 68 | 68 | 68 |
| 1000 |  | 64 | 64 | 64 | 66 | 66 | 66 |
| 2000 |  | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| 4000 |  | 55 | 55 | 55 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
| 8000 |  | 48 | 48 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| A-Weighted |  | 68 | 68 | 68 | 70 | 70 | 70 |

RTU-12, RTU-12A3 (Alternate A3), RTU-13, RTU-14, RTU-16:

Table 2 - 60-130 Ton Large Commercial Packaged Rooftops - Sound Power
Ratings S*FC-C60 THROUGH S*GC-D Hz MODELS

Table 2


Table 4 - 60-130 Ton Large Commercial Packaged Rooftops - Sound Pressure Levels
S $^{\star}$ FC-C60 THROUGH S*GC-D13 60 Hz MODELS

Table 4:
Octave
Band
(Hz)
Octave Band Sound Pressure Levels, dB re $20 \mu \mathrm{~Pa}$ at 10 meters Condensing Section End of Unit


## TRANE

## Engineering

Bulletin

| Library | Product Literature |
| :--- | :--- |
| Product Section | UNITARY |
| Product | Rooftop Air Conditioners |
| Model | $383 \& 393$ |
| Literature Type | Engineering Bulletin |
| Sequence | 108 |
| Date | October 1994 |
| File No. | PL-UN-RT-000-EB-108-1094 |
| Supersedes | New |

Ordering No.
RT-EB-108

## OUTDOOR SOUND

## MORE "SOUND" ADVICE FROM TRANE LARGE COMMERCIAL PACKAGED ROOFTOP INSTALLATIONS

20-60 TON SCROLL COMPRESSOR ROOFTOPS
70-130 TON MODEL R SEMI-HERMETIC COMPRESSOR ROOFTOPS

Wise planning and coordination during the design phases of a new construction project will often minimize, if not eliminate, the need for auxiliary sound attenuation.

The information in this bulletin should be utilized by the Trane sales engineer to guide the mechanical designer in laying out a "sound job". The bulletin is written with the assumption that the reader has a fundamental working knowledge of acoustics. This bulletin contains the following information:

- Lot line outdoor sound level considerations and recommended practices.
- Special application considerations and sound attenuation methods.
- Equipment sound power and sound pressure data (for use in the design phase of a project)
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## Lot Line Standards and Unit Location

Outdoor HVAC equipment must be located to prevent objectionable noise levels at adjacent property lines or building structures. When choosing a location for large rooftop equipment consider the following recommended practices. Also, refer to engineering bulletin RT-EB-80 for detailed recommendations on minimizing indoor sound levels.

## Ground Level Mounted Equipment

1) Equipment should be located next to an unoccupied space such as a storage room, mechanical room, switch gear / electrical room...etc. or other typically unoccupied space. Never locate the equipment near occupied, sound sensitive areas of the building or near window glass. Also, do not locate the equipment adjacent to other building walls or large objects which may reflect the sound back to a sound sensitive receiver.
2) Seal all piping and electrical conduit penetrations in the building envelope with an approved fire-safe sealant. Utilize insulated, dielectrically compatible sleeves at wall penetrations to properly support the piping and provide some vibration dampening. Provide flexible couplings and vibration isolators for the hot water circulating pump, when hot water heating models are utilized, to prevent the transmission of regenerated sound throughout the building.
3) Install the unit on a pad isolated from the building or, install the unit with proper vibration isolation underneath to prevent machine vibrations from being transmitted to the structure of the building.

## Roof Mounted Equipment

1) Do not install the unit on beams or structure at mid-span of a column grid. Install the unit over direct support rigid enough to minimize beam deflection and vibratory motion of the roof structure. Also, when selecting the location of equipment, consider the importance of location with regard to indoor sound. Avoid locating the equipment directly above a sound sensitive space (as outlined in RT-EB-80).
2) Seal all piping and electrical conduit penetrations with a fire safe sealant / material after routing it through insulated piping sleeves / pitch pockets.
3) Install the unit upon an inertia base or concrete pad structure with vibration isolation chosen to match the characteristics of the roof structure. BEWARE OF LIGHTWEIGHT ROOF STRUCTURES which are difficult, if not impossible, to isolate from vibration!

An additional concern for the designer will be the resulting noise level at adjacent property lines. When commercial equipment is installed near a residential lot line there is likely to be a noise problem. In this misapplication, the problem is not the equipment but rather locating the equipment too close to a quiet zone! Typical maximum lot line dBA levels are shown in the Table on the following page. The reader is cautioned that

## Lot Line Standards and Unit Location

The values shown in the Table are typical of major cities in the U.S. Always check the criteria and local requirements before selecting equipment locations.

| Typical Maximum Lot Line Sound Levels |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Day | Night |
| Residential | $50-55 \mathrm{dBA}$ | 45 dBA |
| Commercial | $60-65 \mathrm{dBA}$ | $55-60 \mathrm{dBA}$ |
| Industrial | $65-70 \mathrm{dBA}$ | $65-70 \mathrm{dBA}$ |

The bottom line - follow the recommended practices contained in this bulletin and be aware of the sound requirements that must be met at the adjoining lot lines. As the old adage goes "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." Sound attenuation after the fact is usually a very expensive proposition. Plan and investigate up front! Use the information available from Trane to engineer a "sound" job!

## Unit Orientation

The sound emanated from 20-130 ton commercial rooftops is directional in nature allowing the installing contractor / engineer to position the unit to minimize potential noise problems. Notice that the end of the unit opposite the compressors is significantly more quiet than the other sides of the unit. In order to minimize noise infringement upon a quiet zone, orient the unit so that the end opposite the compressors faces the sound sensitive area. With the unit oriented in this manner it is estimated that the following reductions in sound pressure levels ( dB re $20 \mu \mathrm{~Pa}$ ) can be expected at 10 meters from the unit (see Figures 1 through 3 below).

Figure 1 - Orientation of the 20-30 Ton Large Commercial Rooftop Unit to Minimize Noise Infringement Upon a Quiet Zone


## Lot Line Standards and Unit Location

Figure 2 - Orientation of the 40-60 Ton Large Commercial Rooftop Unit to Minimize Noise Infringement Upon a Quiet Zone


Figure 3 - Orientation of the 70-130 Ton Large Commercial Rooftop Unit to Minimize Noise Infringement Upon a Quiet Zone


## Distance Factor

The distance between a source of sound and the receiver of sound plays an important role in minimizing the potential for noise problems. Figures 4 and 5 below give the reductions in sound pressure ( dBA ) that can be expected based upon increasing the distance of the receiver from the large commercial rooftop. Figure 4 should be utilized for $20-60$ ton IntelliPak rooftops. Figure 5 should be used for $70-130$ ton IntelliPak rooftops. The rooftops have been treated as line sources. The dBA reductions shown are to be applied to the sound pressure levels shown in Tables 3 and 4. As we will see in the next section of this bulletin, the Trane Acoustics Program (TAP) may also be used to quickly and conveniently determine distance correction for a large commercial rooftop unit.


Figure 4 - Semi-log Plot of Sound Attenuation Due to Distance of Sound Source (IntelliPak Rooftop) from a Receiver


Figure 5 - Semi-log Plot of Sound Attenuation Due to Distance Of Sound Source (IntelliPak Rooftop) from Receiver

## Barrier Walls

Acoustical barrier walls may be utilized to effectively intercept the direct sound path from a source to a receiver. The Trane Acoustics Program (TAP), available from the Trane Customer Direct Service (CDS) Network, provides a convenient method for calculating the sound pressure at an adjoining lot line (with or without barriers employed). It prompts the user for the information required (rooftop sound power must be known) to make the calculation and displays the end result in dBA.

The TAP is a powerful program capable of modeling a wide variety of indoor and outdoor acoustical applications. Complete information on how to run the program can be found in the publication DSN-IPT-2. Performing an outdoor distance correction is a small part of the capabilities of the program. An example of a typical outdoor distance calculation is shown below.

In this example, a SFHF-C75 ( 75 ton) gas-electric packaged rooftop is located on the roof of a building 75 feet from the adjoining building as shown in Figure 6 below.

Figure 6 - Outdoor Sound Pressure Level at an Adjoining Lot Line (No Acoustical Barrier Employed)


The TAP analysis consists of two lines. The first line is the sound power of the large commercial rooftop and the second line is the outdoor distance correction. The sample output is shown in Figure 7 below.

Figure 7 - Example of TAP Program Output
PROJECT NAME: ROOFTOP SOUND EB EXAMPLE PROJECT NUMBER: RTEBEXAM
ANALYSIS TITLE: SOUND AT LOT LINE WITH NO BARRIER
DATE: 2/3/94

|  | $1 / 1$ OCT BAND CENTER FREQ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DESCRIPTION | 63 | 125 | 250 | 500 | 1 K | 2 K | 4 K |
| 1 75 TON S*FC ROOFTOP SOUND POWER | 102 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 92 | 88 |
| 2 OUTDOOR DISTANCE CORRECTION | -35 | -35 | -35 | -35 | -35 | -35 | -35 |
| SUM WITH NOISE REDUCTION VALUES | 67 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 57 | 53 |

$\overline{N C}: N C=62 \quad R C: R C=61(N) \quad$ DBA: 66 DBA

The program can be run a second time to determine the effect of adding a 9 foot barrier or parapet wall 6 feet from the large commercial rooftop, located between the large rooftop and the adjacent building. The results are shown in Figure 8 below.

Figure 8 - Example of TAP Program Output (Acoustical Barrier Wall Employed)

PROJECT NAME: ROOFTOP SOUND EB EXAMPLE
PROJECT NUMBER: RTEBEXAM
ANALYSIS TITLE: SOUND AT LOT LINE WITH 9 FT BARRIER 6FT FROM UNIT
DATE: $2 / 3 / 94$

| DESCRIPTION | $\begin{array}{r} 1 / 1 \\ 63 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OCT } \\ 125 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BANL } \\ & 250 \end{aligned}$ | CENTER FREQ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 500 | 1 K | 2K | 4K |
| 175 TON S*FC ROOFTOP SOUND POWER | 102 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 92 | 88 |
| 2 OUTDOOR DISTANCE PLUS BARRIER CORRECTION | -43 | -45 | -47 | -49 | -51 | -54 | -57 |
| SUM WITH NOISE REDUCTION VALUES | 59 | 53 | 51 | 49 | 47 | 38 | 31 |

NC: $N C=46$
RC: RC=45(N)
DBA: 51 DBA

A word of caution! When barrier walls are applied, adequate clearance must be provided to insure servicing of components and permit unrestricted condenser air flow. Encroaching upon recommended catalogued clearances will cause a reduction in unit performance. Also, if the barrier wall is significantly higher than the unit (more than 2-3 feet higher in elevation than the condenser fan outlet), warm air recirculation off the condenser fan discharge may occur causing increased operating head pressure and reduced capacity / improper operation. Figures 9 and 10 below provide the capacity, and maximum operating ambient reductions, that result when the large rooftop is encroached upon by a building or barrier wall.

Figure 9 - \% Total Capacity Reduction Due to Encroachment Upon condenser Air Inlet Clearance


Air inlet clearance ft. from wall (wall height $=$ unit height) or ft. between units (multiply by 2 )

Figure 10 - Maximum Operating Ambient Reduction Due to Encroachment Upon Condenser Air Inlet Clearance


Air inlet clearonce ft. from wall (wall height $=$ unit height) or ft. between units (multiply by 2)

For a barrier of greater height than the unit, the factory should be always consulted since performance may be adversely affected.

## Barrier Wall Enclosures

An acoustical enclosure constructed of barrier walls made of $1 / 2$ " exterior grade plywood can give a substantial reduction in sound (up to 10 dBA ). Solid walls constructed of brick, block or more robust materials are even more desirable and will give better attenuation. In addition, there are also prefabricated interlocking metal frame barriers available to form sound absorption enclosures. However, it is very important that the barriers walls constructed do not encroach upon the rooftop unit any more than the clearance requirements outlined in the product catalog. To do so will result in restricted condenser air flow, loss of capacity and/or improper operation See Figures 11 and 12 following). The barrier wall heights should be at least 2 feet minimum above the top of the unit condensing section but not more than 11/2 times the height of the unit condensing section (as measured from the bottom of base rail to top of cabinet) when the barrier walls form an enclosure (exceeding this height will result in excessive recirculation of the discharged condenser air causing loss of capacity and/or improper operation). Also, provisions must be made, on units with powered exhaust, to provide sufficient clearance for exhaust air to properly discharge, clear of the unit, avoiding recirculation into the units outside air intake. Use of louvered or perforated screen walls with significant amounts of free area opening are not recommended for sound sensitive jobs. For best results a three sided barrier wall enclosure is recommended as shown in Figure 13 following. Finally, and attenuating enclosure provided must be self supporting (independent of the rooftop unit) and be properly supported by the roof structure it is mounted upon.

Figure 11 - Capacity Reduction Due to Discharge Condenser Air Recirculation in a Pit Installation


Figure 12 - Maximum Ambient Operating Reduction Due to Discharge Condenser Air Recirculation in a Pit Installation


Figure 13 - Suggested Acoustical Barrier Wall Arrangement For Maximum Sound Sound Attenuation


Notes: * Recommended minimum clearance of $8^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ is required for $20-75$ ton sizes. Recommended minimum clearance of $11^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ is required for $90-130$ ton sizes.

## Acoustical Fan Discharge Stacks / Silencers

Acoustical fan stacks are generally not recommended as a method of sound attenuation for the following reasons:

- Fan silencers, or stacks, typically impose substantial pressure drops on the propeller type condenser fans. The added pressure drop imposed on each condenser fan, if it exceeds $0.20^{\prime \prime}$, will cause reduced air flow, decreasing unit capacity and efficiency. Because restricted air flow increases the operating head pressure of the machine, nuisance tripping may result at high outdoor ambient temperatures.
- Fan failure may result causing serious injury or death. The propeller type fans utilized have not been designed, or tested, to determine their performance at the higher static pressures imposed by obstructions or devices such as fan silencers.
- Fan silencers will only attenuate the higher frequency components of condenser fan noise. Fan silencers do not attenuate the lower frequency compressor sound which is often the dominant noise source.
- The unit cabinet is not designed to support the weight of, or laterally stabilize, fan discharge stacks.


## Compressor Blanket Wraps

Compressor blanket wraps, or acoustical enclosures, are available from several manufacturers to provide additional sound attenuation of the low frequency sounds generated by compressors. The effectiveness of the wrap depends upon the type and manufacturer used (assuming that it is properly installed) and the type of compressor involved. For scroll and conventional reciprocating compressors, manufacturers will typically quote noise reductions, for the compressor only, on the order of 3 to 6 dBA . In order to determine more precisely how much attenuation can be expected from compressor wraps the manufacturer of the wrap should be consulted with the specifics of the application involved. The reader is cautioned that, depending on the typed of wrap or acoustical enclosure applied, the performance of the machine may be affected. Acoustical wraps or enclosures used must not block condenser air flow across the coil face area! Also, the reader is cautioned to keep in mind that compressor wraps attenuate compressor noise only. Overall unit sound may or may not be significantly reduced depending upon the level and character of noise generated by other noise producing sources on the unit such as condenser fans, exhaust fans...etc.

## Example Problem

Consider Figure 14. An example is given to demonstrate how to use the preceding information to minimize the potential for noise problems to occur when sound sensitive applications are involved.

Flgure 14 - Example Installation


72 dBA - From Table 4 "Large Rooftop Sound Pressure Levels" @ 10m., dB re $20 \mu \mathrm{P}$, $60 \mathrm{~Hz}, 75$ Ton Unit
-6 dBA - Estimated deduct because of unit orientation - end opposite the compressors facing the receiver (See Figure 3)
-6 dBA - Due to the distance factor @ 80 ft . from lot line (See Figure 5) 60 dBA - Total estimated Sound Pressure Level at the Lot Line

Since this meets the lot line sound requirement no further action is required. Had additional attenuation been needed we could have installed a barrier wall / parapet wall to form an acoustic attenuating barrier or surrounded the unit with a 3-sided acoustical enclosure (as outlined previously). The resulting reduction in sound pressure levels could be determined from modeling the application on the TAP program, or by calculating the barrier insertion losses from methods outlined in the ASHRAE Applications Handbook.

## Test Procedures Used to Develop Sound Data

Scroll Compressor Rooftops (20-60 Nominal Tons)
Testing for the scroll compressor rooftops was conducted in accordance with ARI 370 "Sound Rating of Large Outdoor Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning Equipment." The "free field" technique qualified per ANSI S1.34 1980 was implemented using the American National Standard "Engineering Methods for the Determination of Sound Power Levels of Noise Sources for Essentially Free-Field Conditions Over a Reflecting Plane". The results of these tests were used to calculate the sound power data in Table 1. Sound pressure data, for scroll compressor rooftops, is found in Tables 3 and 4 on the following page (the data in Tables 3 and 4 are valid at 10 meters from the unit in a free field).

## Model R Compressor Rooftops (70-130 Nominal Tons)

Testing for model R compressor rooftops was conducted in accordance with ARI 370. The "free field" technique qualified per ANSI S1.34 1980 was implemented using the American National Standard "Engineering Methods for the Determination of Sound Power Levels of Noise Sources for Essentially Free-Field Conditions Over a Reflecting Plane". The data listed in Table 2 is given in sound power and Table 4 in sound pressure levels (Table 4 is valid at 10 meters from the unit in a free field).

Since each rooftop installation is different, all sound pressure data is given for free field acoustic radiation. Consequently, actual sound pressure levels at an installation may differ from published values. These differences can be attributed to the acoustic properties of the particular installation surroundings. Refer to the Trane applications manual FND-AM-5 (6/86) "Acoustics in AirConditioning" for an in-depth discussion of basic acoustic properties.

Table 1 - 20-55 Ton Large Commercial Packaged Rooftops - Sound Power Ratings S*FC-C20 THROUGH S*FC-C55 60 Hz MODELS

Table 1:
Octave
Band $\quad$ Octave Band Sound Power Levels, dB re 1 pW (Hz)

|  | 20 ton | 25 ton | 30 ton |  | 40 ton |  | 50 ton |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 63 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 102 | 102 | 102 |  |
| 125 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 101 | 101 | 101 |  |
| 250 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 99 | 99 | 99 |  |
| 500 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 97 | 97 | 97 |  |
| 1000 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 94 | 94 | 94 |  |
| 2000 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 91 | 91 | 91 |  |
| 4000 | 85 | 85 | 85 | 87 | 87 | 87 |  |
| 8000 | 78 | 78 | 78 | 80 | 80 | 80 |  |
| A-Weighted |  |  |  | 97 | 99 | 99 | 99 |

## Table 2-60-130 Ton Large Commercial Packaged Rooftops - Sound Power Ratings S*FC-C60 THROUGH S*GC-D Hz MODELS

Table 2

| Octave Band | Octave Band Sound Power Levels, dB re 1 pW |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 60 ton | 70/75 ton | 90 ton | 105 ton | 115 ton | 130 ton |
| 63 | 102 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 |
| 125 | 101 | 98 | 100 | 101 | 102 | 103 |
| 250 | 99 | 98 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 |
| 500 | 97 | 98 | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 |
| 1000 | 94 | 98 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 100 |
| 2000 | 91 | 92 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 |
| 4000 | 87 | 88 | 85 | 91 | 92 | 93 |
| 8000 | 80 | 81 | 78 | 86 | 87 | 88 |
| A-Weighted | 99 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 |

Table 3 - 20-55 Ton Large Commercial Packaged Rooftops - Sound Pressure Levels S*FC-C20 THROUGH S*FC-C55 60 Hz MODELS

Table 3:


Table 4 - 60-130 Ton Large Commercial Packaged Rooftops - Sound Pressure Levels S*FC-C60 THROUGH S*GC-D13 60 Hz MODELS

Octave
Band (Hz)

Table 4:
Octave Band Sound Pressure Levels, dB re $20 \mu \mathrm{~Pa}$ at 10 meters
Condensing Section End of Unit

|  | 60 ton | $70 / 75$ ton | 90 ton | 105 ton | 115 ton |  | 130 ton |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63 | 74 | 79 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 |  |  |
| 125 | 71 | 74 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 |  |  |
| 250 | 66 | 68 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 |  |  |
| 500 | 68 | 68 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 |  |  |
| 1000 | 66 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 |  |  |
| 2000 | 62 | 63 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 |  |  |
| 4000 | 57 | 58 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 |  |  |
| 8000 | 50 | 49 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 |  |  |
|  |  | 70 | 72 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 |  |

## References / Suggested Reading

ASHRAE. 1991. ASHRAE Handbook - 1991 HVAC Applications, chapter 42. Atlanta, GA: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc. (Revised every four years)

Schaffer, Mark E., 1991. "A Practical Guide to Noise and Vibration Control For HVAC Systems." Atlanta, GA: American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and AirConditioning Engineers, Inc.

The Trane Company. 1986. Acoustics in Air Conditioning Application Manual FND-AM-5. LaCrosse, WI: The Trane Company.

## GENERAC" | industrial POVVER

## Industrial Spark-Ignited Generator Set

### 9.0L


*EPA Certified Prime ratings are not avallabie in the U.S. or its Territories

## Codes and Standards

Generac products are designed to the following standards:
(4U) US UL2200, UL508, UL142, UL498


NFPA70, 99, 110, 37


NEC700, 701, 702, 708

IS09001, 8528, 3046, 7637, Pluses \#2b, 4

R4 ${ }^{1 / 2}$ NEMA ICS10, MG1, 250, ICS6, AB1

AMSI ANSI C62.41
Ameriean Nallonal Stardards instifule

## Powering Ahead

For over 50 years, Generac has led the industry with innovative design and superior manufacturing.

Generac ensures superior quality by designing and manufacturing most of its generator components, including alternators, enclosures and base tanks, control systems and communications software.

Generac's gensets utilize a wide variety of options, configurations and arrangements, allowing us to meet the standby power needs of practically every application.

Generac searched globally to ensure the most reliable engines power our generators. We choose only engines that have already been proven in heavy-duty industrial application under adverse conditions.

Generac is committed to ensuring our customers' service support continues after their generator purchase.

## Standard Features

| ENGINE SYSTEM |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | General |
| - | Oil Drain Extension |
| - | Air Cleaner |
| - | Fan Guard |
| - | Stainless Steel flexible exhaust connection |
| - | Critical Exhaust Silencer |
| - | Factory Filled Oil |
|  | Radialor duct adapter (open set only) |
|  | Fuel Syslem |
|  | Primary and Secondary Fuel Shutolf |
|  | Flexible Fuel Line - NPT Connection |
|  | Cooling System |
|  | Closed Coolant Recovery System |
|  | UV/Ozone resistant hoses |
|  | Factory-installed Radiator |
|  | Radiator drain extension |
|  | 50/50 Elhylene glycol antifreeze |
|  | Engine Electrical System |
| - | Battery charging alternator |
|  | Batlery Cables |
|  | Ballery Tray |
|  | Solenoid activated slarter motor |
|  | Rubber-booted engine electrical connections |

ALTERNATOR SYSTEM

- UL2200 GENprotect ${ }^{\text {"M }}$
- Class H insulation malerial
- $2 / 3$ Pitch
- Skewed Slator
- Brushless Excitalion
- Sealed Bearings
- Amortisseur winding
- Full load capacity alternator


## generator set

- Internal Genset Vibration Isolation
- Separation of circuits - high/low vollage
- Separation of circuits - mulliple breakers
- Wrapped Exhaust Piping
- Standard Factory Testing
- 2 Year Limiled Warranty (Standby rated Unils)
- 1 Year Warranty (Prime rated unils)
- Silencer mounted in the discharge hood (enclosed only)

ENCLOSURE (il selected)

- Rust-proot tasteners wilh nylon washers to protect finish
- High perlormance sound-absorbing material
- Gasketed doors
- Stamped air-intake louvers
- Air discharge hoods for radiator-upward pointing
- Stainless steel lift off door hinges
- Stainless steel lockable handles
- Rhino Coat"' - Textured polyester powder coat

CONTROL SYSTEM


- Real/Reactive/Apparent Power
- All Phase AC Voltage
- All Phase Currents
- Oill Pressure
- Coolant Temperature
- Coolant Level
- Engine Speed
- Ballery Voltage
- Frequency
- Date/Time Fault History (Event Log)
- Isochronous Governor Control
- Walerproot/sealed Conneclors
- Audible Alarms and Shutdowns
- Not in Aulo (Flashing Light)
- Auto/Ofi/Manual Switch
- E-Slop (Red Mushroom-Type)
- NFPA110 Level I and II (Programmable)
- Customizable Alarms, Warnings, and Events
- Modbus protocol
- Prediclive Maintenance algorilhm
- Sealed Boards
- Password parameter adjustment protection
- Single point ground
- 15 channel data logging
- 0.2 msec high speed data logging
- Alarm information automalically comes up on the display
Alarms
- Oil Pressure (Pre-programmable Low Pressure Shutdown)
- Coolant Temperature (Pre-programmed High Temp Shuldown)
- Coolant Level (Pre-programmed Low Level Shutdown)
- Low Fuel Pressure Alarm
- Engine Speed (Pre-programmed Over speed Shuldown)
- Battery Vollage Warning
- Alarms \& warnings time and date stamped
- Alarms \& warnings for transient and steady slate conditions
- Snap shots of key operation parameters during alarms \& warnings
- Alarms and warnings spelled out (no alarm codes)


## Configurable Options

| ENGINE SYSTEM | GENERATOR SET |
| :---: | :---: |
| General | O Gen-Link Communications Soffware (English Oniy) |
| O Engine Block Heater |  |
| - Oil Heater | O Extended Factory Testing (3 Phase Only) |
| - Air Filler Restriction Indicator | - IBC Seismic Certification |
| - Stone Guard (Open Set Only) | O 8 Posilion Load Center |
| Engine Electrical System | O 2 Year Exlended Warranty |
| - 10A UL battery charger | O 5 Year Warranty |
| O 2.5A UL. battery charger | O 5 Year Extended Warranty |
| - Batlery Warmer |  |
| ALTERNATOR SYSTEM | CIRCUIT BREAKER OPTIONS |
| O Alternator Upsizing | - Main Line Circuil Breaker |
| O Anti-Condensation Heater | O 2nd Main Line Circuil Breaker |
| O Tropical coating | O Shunt Trip and Auxiliary Conlact |
| O Permanent Magnet Excilation | - Electronic Trip Breakers |

## ENCLOSURE

O Standard Enclosure

- Level 1 Sound Allenuation
- Level 2 Sound Altenuation
- Steel Enclosure

O Aluminum Enclosure
O 150 MPH Wind Kit

- 12 VDC Enclosure Lighting Kit

O 120 VAC Enclosure Lighting Kil
O AC/DC Enclosure Lighting Kit
O Door Alarm Switch

O Alternator Upsizing
Anti-Condensation Heater
O Permanent Magnet Excilation

- Electronic Trip Breakers
- Main Line Circuil Breaker

O 2nd Main Line Circuil Breaker
O Shunt Trip and Auxiliary Conlact

## CONTROL SYSTEM

| O | 21-Light Remole Annunciator |
| :--- | :--- |
| O | Remote Relay Panel (8 or 16) |
| O | Oil Temperature Sender wilh Indication |
| Alarm |  |

O 21-Light Remole Annunciator
O Oil Temperalure Sender wilh Indicalion Alarm

O Remole E-Stop (Break Glass-Type, Surface Mount)
O Remote E-Stop (Red Mushroom-Type, Surface Mount)
O Remote E-Stop (Red Mushroom-Type, Flush Mount)

O Remote Communication - Modem
O Remote Communication - Ethernet
O 10A Run Relay

- Ground faull indication and protection functions


## Engineered Options



## Rating Delinitions

Standby - Applicable for a varying emergency load for the duration of a utility power oulage with no overload capability.
Prime - Applicable for supplying power to a varying load in lieu of utility for an unlimited amount of running time. A $10 \%$ overload capacity is available for 1 out of every 12 hours. The Prime Power oplion is only available on International applications.
Power ratings in accordance with ISO 8528-1, Second Edition dated 2005-06-01, detinitions for Prime Power (PRP) and Emergency Slandby Power (ESP).

GENERAC
industaial
SG100 application and engineering data

ENGINE SPECIFICATIONS

| General |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Make | Generac |
| Cylinder \# | 8 |
| Type | $V$ |
| Displacement-L ( (Cu In) | 8.9L (540) |
| Bore - mm (in) | 114.31 (4.5) |
| Stroke - mm (in) | 107.15 (4.25) |
| Compression Ratio | 10.5:1 |
| Intake Air Method | Naturally Aspliated |
| Number of Main Bearings | 5 |
| Connecting Rods | Forged |
| Cylinder Head | Cast Iron |
| Cylinder Liners | No |
| Ignition | High Energy |
| Pistons | Aluminum Alloy |
| Crankshaft | Steel |
| Litter Type | Hydraulic Roller |
| Intake Valve Malerial | Steel Alloy |
| Exhaust Valve Material | Stainless Steel |
| Hardened Valve Seats | Yes |

## Engine Governing

Governor
Frequency Regulation (Steady State)

| Electronic |
| :---: |
| $+/-0.25 \%$ |

Lubricalion System
Oil Pump Type
Oil Filler Type
Crankcase Capacity - L (qls)

| Gear |
| :---: |
| Full-flow spin-on cartridge |
| $8.5(8.0)$ |

Cooling System
Cooling System Type
Waler Pump Flow - gpm (lpm)
Fan Type
Fan Speed (rpm)
Fan Diameter mm (in)
Coolant Heater Watlage
Coolant Heater Standard Vollage

| Pressurized Closed |
| :---: |
| $26(98)$ |
| Pusher |
| 2330 |
| $558(22)$ |
| 1500 |
| 120 V |

Fuel System
Fuel Type
Carburetor
Secondary Fuel Regulator
Fuel Shut Off Solenoid
Operating Fuel Pressure

| Natural Gas, Propane Vapor |
| :---: |
| Down Draft |
| Slandard |
| Standard |
| $11^{\prime \prime}-14^{n} \mathrm{H} 20$ |


| Engine Electrical System |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| System Vollage 12 VDC <br> Battery Charging Allernator Standard <br> Battery Size See Battery Index <br> Battery Vollage 0161970 SBY <br> Ground Polarity 12 VDC | Negative |

## ALTERNATOR SPECIFICATIONS

| Standard Model | 390 mm |
| :--- | :---: |
| Poles | 4 |
| Field Type | Revolving |
| Insulation Class - Rotor | H |
| Insulation Class - Stator | H |
| Total Harmonic Distortion | $<5 \%$ |
| Telephone Interference Factor (TIF) | $<50$ |
| Slandard Exciltation |  |
| Bearings | Brushless |
| Coupling | Sealed Ball |
| Prototype Short Circuit Test | Direct Drive |

Vollage Regulator Type Number of Sensed Phases Regulation Accuracy (Steady State)

| Full Digital |
| :---: |
| All |
| $+/-0.25 \%$ |

## POWER RATINGS

| Single-Phase 120/240 VAC @1.0pl | Natural Gas |  | Propane Vapor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 100 kW | Amps: 417 | 100 kW | Amps: 417 |
| Three-Phase 120/208 VAC @0.8pl | 100 kW | Amps: 347 | 100 kW | Amps: 347 |
| Three-Phase 120/240 VAC @0.8pl | 100 kW | Amps: 301 | 100 kW | Amps: 301 |
| Three-Phase 277/480 VAC @0.8pf | 100 kW | Amps: 150 | 100 kW | Amps: 150 |
| Three-Phase 346/600 VAC @0.8pf | 100 kW | Amps: 120 | 100 kW | Amps: 120 |

## STARTING CAPABILITIES (sKVA)

| Allernator | kW | sKVA vs. Vollage Dip |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 480VAC |  |  |  |  |  | 208/240VAC |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 10\% | 15\% | 20\% | 25\% | 30\% | 35\% | 10\% | 15\% | 20\% | 25\% | 30\% | 35\% |
| Slandard | 100 | 79 | 118 | 157 | 197 | 236 | 275 | 59 | 89 | 118 | 148 | 177 | 206 |
| Upsize 1 | 130 | 116 | 174 | 232 | 290 | 348 | 406 | 87 | 131 | 174 | 218 | 261 | 305 |

## FUEL CONSUMPTION RATES*

| Nalural Gas - $113 / \mathrm{hr}(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{hr}$ ) |  | Propane Vapor - $13 / 3 / \mathrm{hr}\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{hr}\right.$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent Load | Slandby | Percent Load | Standby |
| 25\% | 391 (11.1) | 25\% | 157.4 (4.5) |
| 50\% | 669 (19.0) | 50\% | 269.9 (7.6) |
| 75\% | 904 (25.6) | 75\% | 364.4 (10.3) |
| 100\% | 1116 (31.6) | 100\% | 449.8 (12.7) |

*Fuel supply inslallation must accommodate fuel consumption rates al $100 \%$ load.
COOLING

|  | Standby |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air Flow (inlet air combustion and radialor) | $n^{3} / \mathrm{min}\left(\mathrm{m}^{3} / \mathrm{min}\right)$ | 5797 (164.2) |
| Coolant Flow per Minute | g.pm (lpm) | 26 (98) |
| Coolanl Syslem Capacily | gal (L) | 6.0 (22.7) |
| Heat Rejection lo Coolant | BTU/hr | 390,000 |
| Max. Operaling Air Temp on Radialor | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | 122 (50) |
| Maximum Radiator Backpressure | in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 0.5 |

COMBUSTION AIR REQUIREMENTS


[^2]

Standard enclosure

| $L \times W \times H$ in $(\mathrm{mm})$ | $111.79(2839.5) \times 40.46$ (1027.8) $\times 56.18$ (1427) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Weight lbs (kg) | Sleel: 2708 (1228) <br> Aluminum: $2413(1094)$ |
| Sound Level (dBA*) | 79.7 |


| L $\times$ W $\times$ H in ( mm ) | $94.2(2394) \times 40(1016) \times 47.5(1206)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Weight lbs $(\mathrm{kg})$ | $2064(936.2)$ |
| Sound Level (dBA*) | 83.8 |

LEVEL 1 ACOUSTIC ENGLOSURE

| $L \times W \times H$ in $(\mathrm{mm})$ | $129.42(3287.2) \times 40.46(1027.8) \times 56.18(1427)$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Weight lbs $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Steel: $2798(1269.2)$ <br> Aluminum: $2355(1068)$ |
| Sound Level ( (dBA*) | 75.3 |

w

Level 2 acoustic enclosure

| H | L $\times$ W $\times$ H in (mm) | 111.81 (2840) $\times 40.46$ (1027.8) $\times 68.61$ (1742.8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Weight lbs (kg) | Steel: 3022 (1370.8) Aluminum: 2431 (1103) |
|  | Sound Level (dBA*) | 70.8 |


*All measurements are approximate and for estimation purposes only. Sound levels measured al 23 \# $(7 \mathrm{~m})$ and does not account for amblent site conditions.


ii. Where background sound levels exceed the sound level limits in Table 5.14.10.A.ii , below, a violation shall be deemed to exist if the complained for activity exceeds the background sound levels by six (6) decibels.

| 5.14.10.A.ii Weighted Sound Level Limit Decibels |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Receiving Zoning Districts |  |  |  |
| R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, RT, RA, <br> RM-1, RM-2, MH | NCC, B-1, B-2, B-3, <br> EXPO, EXO, OS-1, OSC, <br> TC, TC-1, RC, FS, C, I-1, <br> I-2, P-1, PSLR |  |  |
| Night <br> Time <br> Hours <br> Decibels | Day Time <br> Hours <br> Decibels | Night <br> Time <br> Hours <br> Decibels | Day Time <br> Hours <br> Decibels |
| 55 | 60 | 70 | 75 |

iii. The measurement of sound level shall be made at a height of five (5) feet ( + or -), at a horizontal distance of five and one half (5.5) feet ( + or - ) from a lot line or right-of-way line on any lot or right-of-way other than that on which the sound source or sources being measured is located.
The sound level meter shall be a Type I or Type II instrument, adjusted to measure $\mathrm{dB}(\mathrm{A})$ sound levels using fast meter response. The instrument calibration shall be verified before use. A wind screen shall be used and no measurement shall be made when the wind speed is in excess of twelve (12) miles per hour.
iv. No person shall sound or permit the sounding of any exterior burglar or fire alarm, or motor vehicle alarm unless such alarm is automatically terminated within sixty (60) minutes of activation.
v. No person shall idle a motor vehicle, or unnecessarily race the motor of a motor vehicle in a manner which would annoy or disturb a reasonable person or normal sensitivity.
vi. Nothing in this subsection shall be interpreted as preempting or otherwise eliminating those provisions of Chapter 22 of the Novi Code of Ordinances pertaining to construction activities and noise.
B. Special land use approvals. Where required by this ordinance, the applicant shall submit a noise impact statement or noise analysis as part of a special land use application. The noise impact statement or noise analysis shall demonstrate that the completed structure and all activities associated with the structure and land use will comply with the standards set forth in Table $5 \cdot 14.10$.A.il at all times. The noise impact statement or noise analysis shall document the ability to comply with said standards, including all internal and external equipment which generates sound. The reports shall be prepared in accordance with the following standards:
i. Noise Impact Statement. The Noise Impact Statement shall be prepared by a design professional and include a description of the proposed use as well as a description of how the proposed noise emissions, if any, will comply with Section 5.14.10.A. The design professional shall be defined as the project architect or project engineer. All external and internal equipment that generates sound shall be noted and where available, manufacturer's specifications shall be provided. Hours of operation and any proposed soundproofing measures or other noise attenuation features (i.e. walls, berms, etc.) shall be noted. Based on the results of the Noise Impact Statement, a noise analysis may be required.
ii. Noise Analysis. Where required, a Noise Analysis shall be prepared by a certified sound engineer qualified to evaluate noise emissions under maximum operating conditions. A noise analysis shall contain all information generally evaluated by a licensed professional for purposes of determining compliance with the noise limitations or attenuation requirements of this Section.
iii. Waiver. The Planning Commission may, upon request of the applicant, waive the noise analysis and/or noise impact statement requirement upon a demonstration by the applicant that a practical difficulty exists, or that the proposed use clearly meets the standards of Section 5,14.10.A.
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# COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT BRIGHTMOOR CHRISTIAN CHURCH 

Northwest Corner 13 Mile Road and M-5 NOVI, MICHIGAN
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In accordance with Section 2 of the Community Impact Statement from the City of Novi's Community Development Department, this Impact Statement is being prepared for a Non-Residential Use, for the expansion of the Brightmoor Christian Church which consists of approximately 40 acres and requires a Special Land Use approval in order to allow for the expansion.

## 1. Impact on Police and Fire Services

A. Expected Annual Number of Police Responses for the Proposed Development can be based on Statistics from Similar Developments.

One or two responses are anticipated and have been experienced at this facility since it has been built.
B. Expected Annual Number of Fire Responses for the Proposed Development.

One or two per year since the Brightmoor Christian Church was built.

## 2. Employment Opportunities

A. Anticipated Number of Employees including both Permanent and Construction Jobs.

Brightmoor Christian Church anticipates adding approximately 2-4 permanent positions after the construction is complete. During the construction the George Auch Company anticipates approximately 58 construction jobs will be ongoing at various levels (261 individuals throughout project) over a period of approximately 16 months.

## 3. City Performance Standards

A. Compliance with Section 2519

Response: The project will comply with Section 2519 as attached.

## 4. Utility Connections

A. Estimated Number of Sewer and Water Taps and Information on Peak Hour Demand, Minimum/Maximum Operating Pressures for the Water System.

The George Auch Company has contacted the City regarding the number of additional REU's that will be required for the proposed expansion of the Church. They have been told that there will be 9.9 additional REU's required for the water and sewer taps.

As noted within the Progressive AE attached letter there is a water service calculation worksheet that identifies the peak hour demand. The letter also identifies that the minimum water system operating pressure is 45 PSIG and maximum water pressure is 80 PSIG.

## 5. Surrounding Land Uses

## A. Relationship to the Proposed Development with Surrounding Uses.

Proposed development is an addition of a new worship gathering space and supporting children's areas onto the existing church. Drive access, site circulation, parking and outdoor activity fields surrounding the church will be utilized as they are today. Open spaces include soccer and football fields will be unchanged. Connectivity to the housing developments on the north and west will remain as they are today.

## 6. Proposed Land Use

## A. Description of Proposed Land Use.

The proposed land use will not change from the way the land is used today. It aligns with the existing and planned use map for the City of Novi. The applicant is proposing to expand the existing church building to the north with a worship space with auditorium style seating's that will seat 2100 people along with accessory uses such as an office and additional parking. The facility will continue to support children and youth activities.

## 7. Environmental Factors

## Description of Environmental Factors and Impacts Addressing the Following:

A. Natural Features on the Site (E.G., Unusual Topography, Habitat Areas, Wetlands, Woodlands, Historic Trees etc.)

No additional impacts will result as a result of the approval and construction of this project.
B. Temporary and Permanent Impacts to Natural Features on the Site.

No additional impacts will be experienced as a result of the construction of these projects.
C. Manufactured Use or Storage of Hazardous Material or Toxic Waste on the Site including Environmental Protection Agency Requirements and the need for Pollution Incident Prevention plan (IPPP).

The church does not have any materials that would be beyond normal cleaning fluids for floors and toilets on their site.

## D. Location Type Depth and Contents of any Existing or Proposed Underground Storage Tanks.

No underground storage tanks exist or are proposed for this site.
E. Environmental Use and or Contamination History for this Site IE Groundwater Contamination, Land Fill, Chemical Spills Etc.

No environmental or contaminated history exists for this site.

## F. Potential Impacts of Existing Wildlife on Site.

No additional impacts will be experienced by existing wildlife on the site as all areas are currently been developed and are just being redeveloped as a part of the proposed expansion.

## 8. Social Impacts

## Description of Social Impacts Addressing the Following:

A. Replacement or Relocation of any Existing Use or Occupants on the Site.

No replacement or relocation of any uses or occupants are contemplated as a part of this development.

## 9. Traffic Impacts

A. Traffic Impacts - Information can come from any Required Traffic Impact Study or Statistics or from other Similar Developments where a Study is Not Required.

HRC is preparing a traffic impact study with a guidance of AECOM input as the City's traffic consultant. It is anticipated that the traffic study will be finalized approximately March 18, 2015.

## 10. Proposed Site Amenities IE Walks, Public Parks, Bicycle Paths Etc.

A. A sidewalk connection is proposed on the east side of the building connecting the new expansion areas to the south side of school, are proposed as a part of this project. All existing baseball fields and soccer fields will remain as they exist.
B. Increases in the Permanent Population of the City as a result of the Proposed Development, Specific Numbers be included in the Statistics from Similar Developments can be used.

No additional permanent population of the city will result as the project is implemented. The expansion is to respond to current needs of the church for the existing members.

### 5.14 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

No use otherwise allowed, shall be permitted within any district which does not conform to the following standards of use, occupancy, and operation, which standards are hereby established as the minimum requirements to be maintained within said area:

1. Smoke. It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to permit the emission of any smoke from any source whatever to a density greater than that density described as No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart; provided that the following exceptions shall be permitted: Smoke, the shade or appearance of which is equal to but not darker than No. 2 of the Ringelmann Chart, for a period, or periods, aggregating four (4) minutes in any thirty (30) minutes.

Method of Measurement: For the purpose of grading the density of smoke, the Ringelmann Chart, as now published and used by the United States Bureau of Mines, which is hereby made a part of the Ordinance, shall be the standard. However, the Umbrascope readings of smoke densities may be used when correlated with Ringelmann's Chart.
2. Dust, Dirt and Fly Ash. No person, firm or corporation shall operate or cause to be operated, maintain or cause to be maintained, any process for any purpose, or furnace or combustion device for the burning of coal or other natural or synthetic fuels, without maintaining and operating, while using said process or furnace or combustion device, recognized and approved equipment, means, method, device or contrivance to reduce the quantity of gas-borne or air-borne solids of fumes emitted into the open air, which is operated in conjunction with said process, furnace or combustion device so that the quantity of gas-borne or air-borne solids shall not exceed 0.20 grains per cubic foot of the carrying medium at a temperature of fivehundred (500) degrees Fahrenheit.
Method of Measurement: For the purpose of determining the adequacy of such devices, these conditions are to be conformed to when the percentage of excess air in the stack does not exceed fifty (50) percent at full load. The foregoing requirement shall be measured by the A.S.M.E. Test Code for dust-separating apparatus, All other forms of dust and dirt shall be completely eliminated insofar as escape or emission into the open air is concerned. The Building Inspector [Official] may require such additional data as is deemed necessary to show that adequate and approved provisions for the prevention and elimination of dust and dirt have been made.
3. Odor. Offensive, noxious, or foul odors shall not be allowed to escape into the atmosphere in concentrations that are offensive, that produce a public nuisance or create a hazard to adjoining property, or would be otherwise detrimental to human, plant, or animal life. Michigan Environmental Protection \& HAP (Hazardous Air Pollutant Standards) Agency Standard, Act 348, as amended.
4. Gases. The escape of emission of any gas that may be injurious or destructive to life or property, or that is explosive, is prohibited. All uses shall maintain compliance with applicable state and federal regulations and statutes controlling the emission of gases or other substances into the atmosphere, including, but not limited to, Part 55 of 1994 PA 451, as amended, and 42 U.S.C. 7401, et seq.
5. Airborne Matter, General. In addition to 1. through 4. above, there shall not be discharged from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment or nuisance to the public or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of persons or which cause injury or damage to business or property.
6. Glare and Radioactive Materials. Glare from any process (such as, or similar to, arc welding, or acetylene torch cutting) which emits harmful ultraviolet rays shall be performed in such a manner as not to be seen from any point beyond the property line and as not to create a public nuisance or hazard along lot lines. Radioactive materials, wastes and emissions, including electromagnetic radiation such as generated from an x-ray machine, shall not exceed levels established by Federal or State agencies with regulatory jurisdiction. No operation shall be conducted in a manner that emits, outside of any property line, levels of radiation that exceed the lowest concentration permitted for the general population. NESHAPS (National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants), NRPC 1993, Chapter 41, as amended.
7. Fire and Explosive Hazards
A. The storage, utilization or manufacture of materials or products ranging from incombustible to moderate burning, as determined by the Fire Chief, or his designee, is permitted, subject to compliance with all other performance standards above mentioned, and to the provisions of any other applicable City Code or Ordinance. The following shall define the ranges of burning:
i. Intense burning materials are materials which, by virtue of low ignition temperature, high rate of burning, and large heat evolution, burn with great intensity. An example would be Manganese.
ii. Free and active burning materials are materials constituting an active fuel. Free burning and active burning is the rate of combustion described by a material which burns actively, and easily supports combustion. An example would be feel oil.
iii. Moderate burning implies a rate of combustion described by material which supports combustion and is consumed slowly as it burns. An example would be coal.
B. The storage, utilization, or manufacture of materials, goods or products ranging from free or active burning to intense burning, as determined by the Fire Chief, or his designee, is permitted subject to compliance with all other yard requirements and performance standards previously mentioned, and to the provisions of any other applicable City Code or Ordinance, and providing that the following conditions are met:
i. Said materials or products shall be stored, utilized or produced within completely enclosed buildings or structures having incombustible exterior walls, which meet the requirements of the Building Code of the Municipality.
ii. All such buildings or structures shall have a setback of at least forty (40) feet from lot lines, or in lieu thereof, all such buildings or structures shall be protected throughout by an automatic sprinkler system complying with the installation standards prescribed by the National Fire Association.
iii. The storage and handling of flammable liquids, petroleum, gases, and explosives shall comply with the State Rules and Regulations as established by Public Act No. 207 of 1941 [MCL 29.1 et seq., MSA 4.559 (1) et seq.], as amended.
8. Vibration. Machines or operations which cause vibration shall be permitted in Industrial districts, but no operation shall cause a displacement exceeding . 003 of one (1) inch as measured at the property line.
9. Sewage Wastes. No waste shall be discharged in the public sewer system which is dangerous to the public health and safety. The following standards shall apply at the point wastes are discharged into the public sewer:
A. Acidity or alkalinity shall be neutralized within an average pH range of between five and one-half $(51 / 2)$ to seven and one-half $(71 / 2)$ as a daily average on the volumetric basis, with a temporary variation of pH four and one-half (4.50) to ten (10.0).
B. Wastes shall contain no Cyanides. Wastes shall contain no chlorinated solvents in excess of .1 p.p.m.; no Fluorides shall be excess of 10 p.p.m.; and shall contain no more than 5 p.p.m. of Hydrogen Sulphide; and shall contain not more than 10 p.p.m. of Sulphur Dioxide and Nitrates; and shall contain not more than 25 p.p.m. of Chromates.
C. Wastes shall not contain any insoluble substance in excess of 10,000 p.p.m. or exceed a daily average of 500 p.p.m. or fail to pass a No. 8 Standard Sieve or have a dimension greater than one-half $(1 / 2)$ inch.
D. Wastes shall not have chlorine demand greater than 15 p.p.m.
E. Wastes shall not contain phenols in excess of .05 p.p.m.
F. Wastes shall not contain any grease or oil or any oily substance in excess of 100 p.p.m. or exceed a daily average of 25 p.p.m.
10. Noise

## A. Noise Disturbances

i. No activity, operation or use of land, open body of water, buildings or equipment shall make, continue or cause to be made or continue, any noise disturbance or allow to be emitted, sound from any source or combination of sources other than a motor vehicle registered for use on public highways, which when measured in accordance with the procedure described in this Section exceeds the sound level limits in Table 5.14.10.A.ii Weighted Sound Level Limit Decibels. The measurements made are to be evaluated under Table 5.14.10.A.ii based upon the zoning of the property receiving the emitted sound.


ii. Where background sound levels exceed the sound level limits in Table 5.14.10.A.ii , below, a violation shall be deemed to exist if the complained for activity exceeds the background sound levels by six (6) decibels.

| 5.14.10.A.ii Weighted Sound Level Limit Decibels |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Receiving Zoning Districts |  |  |  |
| R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, RT, RA, <br> RM-1, RM-2, MH | NCC, B-1, B-2, B-3, <br> EXPO, EXO, OS-1, OSC, <br> TC, TC-1, RC, FS, C, I-1, <br> I-2, P-1, PSLR |  |  |
| Night <br> Time <br> Hours <br> Decibels | Day Time <br> Hours <br> Decibels | Night <br> Time <br> Hours <br> Decibels | Day Time <br> Hours <br> Decibels |
| 55 | 60 | 70 | 75 |

iii. The measurement of sound level shall be made at a height of five (5) feet (+ or -), at a horizontal distance of five and one half (5.5) feet (+ or -) from a lot line or right-of-way line on any lot or right-of-way other than that on which the sound source or sources being measured is located.
The sound level meter shall be a Type I or Type II instrument, adjusted to measure $\mathrm{dB}(\mathrm{A})$ sound levels using fast meter response. The instrument calibration shall be verified before use. A wind screen shall be used and no measurement shall be made when the wind speed is in excess of twelve (12) miles per hour.
iv. No person shall sound or permit the sounding of any exterior burglar or fire alarm, or motor vehicle alarm unless such alarm is automatically terminated within sixty (60) minutes of activation.
v. No person shall idle a motor vehicle, or unnecessarily race the motor of a motor vehicle in a manner which would annoy or disturb a reasonable person or normal sensitivity.
vi. Nothing in this subsection shall be interpreted as preempting or otherwise eliminating those provisions of Chapter 22 of the Novi Code of Ordinances pertaining to construction activities and noise.
B. Special land use approvals. Where required by this ordinance, the applicant shall submit a noise impact statement or noise analysis as part of a special land use application. The noise impact statement or noise analysis shall demonstrate that the completed structure and all activities associated with the structure and land use will comply with the standards set forth in Table 5.14.10.A.ii at all times. The noise impact statement or noise analysis shall document the ability to comply with said standards, including all internal and external equipment which generates sound. The reports shall be prepared in accordance with the following standards:
i. Noise Impact Statement. The Noise Impact Statement shall be prepared by a design professional and include a description of the proposed use as well as a description of how the proposed noise emissions, if any, will comply with Section 5.14.10.A. The design professional shall be defined as the project architect or project engineer. All external and internal equipment that generates sound shall be noted and where available, manufacturer's specifications shall be provided. Hours of operation and any proposed soundproofing measures or other noise attenuation features (i.e. walls, berms, etc.) shall be noted. Based on the results of the Noise Impact Statement, a noise analysis may be required.
ii. Noise Analysis. Where required, a Noise Analysis shall be prepared by a certified sound engineer qualified to evaluate noise emissions under maximum operating conditions. A noise analysis shall contain all information generally evaluated by a licensed professional for purposes of determining compliance with the noise limitations or attenuation requirements of this Section.
iii. Waiver. The Planning Commission may, upon request of the applicant, waive the noise analysis and/or noise impact statement requirement upon a demonstration by the applicant that a practical difficulty exists, or that the proposed use clearly meets the standards of Section 5.14.10.A.
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March 18, 2015

Brightmoor Christian Church
c/o Whitehall Real Estate Interests
3852513 Mile Road, Suite 250
Novi, Michigan 48377
Attn: Norman Prechette, Administrative Pastor
Re: Brightmoor Christian Church Expansion Traffic Impact Study

Dear Pastor Prechette:
Hubbell, Roth \& Clark, Inc. (HRC) has been retained by the Brightmoor Christian Church to prepare the Traffic Impact Study required by Novi’s site plan review process for the expansion of the church's sanctuary from 1050 seats to 2100 seats. Service Times for Brightmoor Christian Church are Sundays at 9:15 AM and 11:15 AM and Wednesdays at 7:00 PM. HRC has undertaken the following tasks to complete this traffic study:
> Provide a description of the adjacent roadway system.
> Collect 24 hour counts at the following locations on Wednesday and Sunday:
o Driveway to site from 13 Mile Road
o Lenox Park Drive
o 13 Mile Road
> Collect turning movement counts at the following locations on 13 Mile Road:
o Driveway to site
o Lenox Park Drive
> Determine the background traffic from future phases of Fox Run.
> Project background traffic in the study area.
> Estimate the trips to be generated by full occupancy of the site using the techniques in the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual.
> Distribute and assign the site generated trips to the adjacent roadway system.
> Conduct a traffic signal warrant analysis for Lenox Park Drive at 13 Mile using MDOT standard format.
> Conduct a capacity analysis for existing and site build out for the Wednesday PM and Sunday peak using Synchro 9 software on the adjacent roadway network using the techniques outlined in the Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual.
> Review internal circulation (vehicle and pedestrian) of the drop off area and the parking lot.
> Geometric review of the drop off area at the main entrance.
$>$ Determine road improvements necessary on the adjacent roadway system.
$>$ Prepare a report with our findings and recommendations.

## Roadway Description

Thirteen Mile Road is an urban minor arterial with a posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour (mph). Thirteen Mile Road is under the jurisdiction of the City of Novi. In front of the church site, 13 Mile Road has one westbound through lane, one eastbound
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through lane, a center left turn lane, and a dedicated westbound right turn lane that runs from the main entrance to Fox Run to the east church drive. Lenox Park Drive is a local road with median at 13 Mile. The Lenox Park leg of the intersection has two inbound lanes and two outbound lanes. The intersection of 13 Mile Road and Lenox Park Drive is not signalized. The east driveway to the church site has one inbound and one outbound lane. The site plan is provided in Attachment A. Lenox Park Drive serves a residential complex with 158 townhouses north of the church site. During the weekday, the church campus is home to Franklin Road Christian School, a K-12 accredited school. The school hours are 8:00 AM to 3:00 PM. Enrollment is 300.

## Existing Traffic Volumes

## Turning Movement Counts

Turning movement counts were collected on Sunday, February 22, 2015 from 12:00 AM to 11:59 PM and on Wednesday, February 25, 2015 from 12:00 AM to 11:59 PM. Turning movement counts were taken at two locations: 13 Mile and Lenox Park Drive and 13 Mile and driveway to the church. Complete turning movement counts are provided in Attachment B.

## 24 Hour Counts

Twenty-four hour traffic counts were collected on Sunday, February 22, 2015 from 12:00 AM to 11:59 PM and on Wednesday, February 25, 2015 from 12:00 AM to 11:59 PM. The counts were taken at two 13 Mile intersections: Lenox Park Drive and the east church drive. The 24 -hour counts are provided in Tables $1-3$ below. The rose highlighted cells are the peak hour on Sunday and the green highlighted cells are the peak hour on Wednesday. The Sunday peak hour of the road is 10:45-11:45 AM.

Table 1: 24 Hour Counts on 13 Mile Road

| Start Time | Sunday, 2/22/15 |  |  | Wednesday, 2/25/15 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | Total | EB | WB | Total |
| $0: 00$ | 38 | 75 | 113 | 15 | 38 | 53 |
| $1: 00$ | 23 | 34 | 57 | 14 | 20 | 34 |
| $2: 00$ | 17 | 32 | 49 | 8 | 13 | 21 |
| $3: 00$ | 20 | 21 | 41 | 13 | 10 | 23 |
| $4: 00$ | 12 | 16 | 28 | 43 | 15 | 58 |
| $5: 00$ | 22 | 13 | 35 | 127 | 27 | 154 |
| $6: 00$ | 49 | 53 | 102 | 312 | 149 | 461 |
| $7: 00$ | 87 | 71 | 158 | 729 | 329 | 1058 |
| $8: 00$ | 159 | 272 | 431 | 687 | 363 | 1050 |
| $9: 00$ | 272 | 373 | 645 | 376 | 217 | 593 |
| $10: 00$ | 239 | 292 | 531 | 220 | 173 | 393 |
| $11: 00$ | 311 | 529 | 840 | 233 | 322 | 555 |
| $12: 00$ | 228 | 331 | 559 | 262 | 298 | 560 |
| $13: 00$ | 282 | 287 | 569 | 265 | 265 | 530 |
| $14: 00$ | 296 | 319 | 615 | 262 | 380 | 642 |
| $15: 00$ | 272 | 306 | 578 | 336 | 521 | 857 |
| $16: 00$ | 222 | 275 | 497 | 351 | 621 | 972 |
| $17: 00$ | 253 | 278 | 531 | 372 | 889 | 1261 |
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| Start Time | Sunday, 2/22/15 |  |  | Wednesday, 2/25/15 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{E B}$ | $\mathbf{W B}$ | Total | EB | $\mathbf{W B}$ | Total |
| $18: 00$ | 221 | 255 | 476 | 335 | 628 | 963 |
| $19: 00$ | 144 | 188 | 332 | 213 | 358 | 571 |
| $20: 00$ | 133 | 133 | 266 | 161 | 241 | 402 |
| $21: 00$ | 62 | 114 | 176 | 92 | 182 | 274 |
| $22: 00$ | 65 | 73 | 138 | 70 | 103 | 173 |
| $23: 00$ | 47 | 42 | 89 | 46 | 64 | 110 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 6 8}$ |

Table 2: $\mathbf{2 4}$ Hour Counts on Lenox Park Drive

| Start Time | Sunday, 2/22/15 |  |  | Wednesday, 2/25/15 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB | NB | Total | SB | NB | Total |
| $0: 00$ | 14 | 4 | 18 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| $1: 00$ | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| $2: 00$ | 7 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| $3: 00$ | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $4: 00$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| $5: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| $6: 00$ | 3 | 3 | 6 | 21 | 7 | 28 |
| $7: 00$ | 9 | 6 | 15 | 77 | 197 | 274 |
| $8: 00$ | 21 | 99 | 120 | 81 | 59 | 140 |
| $9: 00$ | 30 | 172 | 202 | 63 | 45 | 108 |
| $10: 00$ | 114 | 64 | 178 | 30 | 26 | 56 |
| $11: 00$ | 219 | 152 | 371 | 31 | 44 | 75 |
| $12: 00$ | 86 | 29 | 115 | 50 | 38 | 88 |
| $13: 00$ | 325 | 59 | 384 | 38 | 26 | 64 |
| $14: 00$ | 48 | 50 | 98 | 31 | 118 | 149 |
| $15: 00$ | 41 | 45 | 86 | 105 | 99 | 204 |
| $16: 00$ | 41 | 48 | 89 | 54 | 82 | 136 |
| $17: 00$ | 38 | 34 | 72 | 71 | 111 | 182 |
| $18: 00$ | 19 | 41 | 60 | 44 | 126 | 170 |
| $19: 00$ | 36 | 28 | 64 | 24 | 71 | 95 |
| $20: 00$ | 16 | 17 | 33 | 120 | 46 | 166 |
| $21: 00$ | 24 | 12 | 36 | 50 | 14 | 64 |
| $22: 00$ | 6 | 10 | 16 | 23 | 11 | 34 |
| $23: 00$ | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 1 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 6 7}$ |

Table 3: $\mathbf{2 4}$ Hour Counts on Church Driveway

| Start Time | Sunday, 2/22/15 |  |  | Wednesday, 2/25/15 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB | NB | Total | SB | NB | Total |
| $0: 00$ | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $1: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $2: 00$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $3: 00$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $4: 00$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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| Start Time | Sunday, 2/22/15 |  |  | Wednesday, 2/25/15 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SB | NB | Total | SB | NB | Total |
| $5: 00$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $6: 00$ | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| $7: 00$ | 0 | 7 | 7 | 98 | 17 | 115 |
| $8: 00$ | 5 | 160 | 165 | 24 | 7 | 31 |
| $9: 00$ | 4 | 188 | 192 | 7 | 10 | 17 |
| $10: 00$ | 44 | 68 | 112 | 11 | 10 | 21 |
| $11: 00$ | 96 | 222 | 318 | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| $12: 00$ | 73 | 17 | 90 | 11 | 2 | 13 |
| $13: 00$ | 235 | 11 | 246 | 9 | 9 | 18 |
| $14: 00$ | 9 | 8 | 17 | 9 | 8 | 17 |
| $15: 00$ | 20 | 8 | 28 | 97 | 5 | 102 |
| $16: 00$ | 2 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 1 | 19 |
| $17: 00$ | 3 | 7 | 10 | 21 | 34 | 55 |
| $18: 00$ | 5 | 16 | 21 | 13 | 105 | 118 |
| $19: 00$ | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 42 | 53 |
| $20: 00$ | 11 | 4 | 15 | 114 | 9 | 123 |
| $21: 00$ | 13 | 1 | 14 | 28 | 2 | 30 |
| $22: 00$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| $23: 00$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 6}$ | 752 |

## Background Traffic

The construction schedule projects that the church addition will be ready for occupancy by mid-2016. Once the sanctuary with greater capacity is built, membership is expected to grow. HRC proposed to use a future date of early 2017 for the build-out date. HRC examined the traffic volume trends at adjacent intersections. Data from the Road Commission for Oakland County's traffic volume web site, http://oakland.ms2soft.com/tcds/tsearch.asp?loc=Oakland\&mod=. The data revealed decreases in traffic volumes in the decade of the 2000's. Since 2010, traffic volumes are showing small increases. HRC recommends a growth rate of 2\%/year for this study. This recommendation was approved by the City of Novi traffic consultant.

## Trip Generation

One of the most critical elements of a traffic study is estimating the amount of traffic to be generated by a proposed development. This is usually done by using trip generation rates or equations to provide an estimate of all future trips generated by a proposed development.

Rates are commonly expressed in trips per unit of development. For example, trips per dwelling unit are commonly used for residential developments, while trips per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area are used for offices and retail. Equations provide a direct estimate of trips based upon development units being multiplied in a mathematical relationship.
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Trips are defined as a single or one directional movement with either the origin or destination of the trip inside the study site. Thus, a car entering and leaving a site would be recorded as generating two trips. Trip generation estimates are often the most critical factors in assessing impacts and needs of a proposed development.
There are several sources for trip generation rates and equations, which are based on data collected from locations in the United States and Canada. These are compilations of data that have been gathered over many years for various land uses. National data sources are starting points in estimating the amount of traffic that may be generated by a specific building or land use. Whenever possible, the National rates should be adjusted to reflect local or forecasted conditions. These National sources are not intended to be used without question, deviation or sound judgment. They often reflect what are supposed to be the average or typical conditions. Data collected from local sites may be more representative than National averages of other developments within the area.

The most widely used source of national trip generation data is the Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The information in this report is almost solely derived from suburban and urban sites. Data included in trip generation was obtained from actual driveway counts of vehicular traffic entering and exiting the site. The ninth edition contains more than 4,800 data sets from individual trip generation studies. The report also includes discussions on the application and use of trip generation rates and equations; descriptions of the characteristics of each land use; maximum/minimum average rates for weekdays, weekends and peak hours of the generator and adjacent street traffic; and additional statistical data regarding data variability.

HRC selected ITE Land Use Code 560 - Church as the most appropriate for this study. Table 4 shows the number of trips expected during the peak hour of the generator on a Sunday for the existing number of seats and the future number of seats.

Table 4: Trip Generation for Brightmoor Christian Church

| ITE <br> Land Use Code 560 - Church | Variable: \# of Seats | Average Sunday Total Trips | Sunday Peak <br> Hour of the Generator |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | IB 50\% | OB 50\% |
| Current | 1050 | 1943 | 640 |  |
|  |  |  | 320 | 320 |
| Future | 2100 | 3885 | 1282 |  |
|  |  |  | 641 | 641 |

HRC compared the trip generation rates to the actual Sunday counts to see how valid the ITE rates were. Table 5 compares the peak hour of Brightmoor Christian Church to the ITE trip generation numbers.
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Table 5: Comparison of Trips Generated on a Sunday to Actual Counts

| Source | Sunday Peak <br> Hour of the Generator |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IB | OB |
| ITE Manual | 640 |  |
|  | $320-50 \%$ | $320-50 \%$ |
| Actual Count on <br> $2 / 22 / 15$ | $315-46 \%$ | $374-54 \%$ |
|  | 689 |  |

A portion of the traffic on Lenox Park Drive is from the Lenox Park residential development to the north of the church site. The number of trips expected to be generated by the 158 townhouse units is shown in Table 6. The summation of the trip generation for the church with the trip generation for Lenox Park is reasonably close to the actual count taken during the peak hour of the generator on Sunday.

Table 6: Sunday Trip Generation for Lenox Park

| ITE <br> Land Use Code | Variable: <br> \# of Dwelling <br> Units | Average <br> Sunday <br> Total Trips | Sunday Peak <br> Hour of the Generator |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IB 49\% | OB 51\% |  |
| 230 - Residential | 1380 | 789 | 82 |  |
| Condo/Townhouse |  | 40 | 42 |  |

HRC concluded that the ITE Trip Generation rate for the expanded church will be a reasonable prediction of future trips.

## Trip Distribution/Assignment

Traffic expected to be generated by a project must be distributed and assigned to the roadway system so that the impacts of the proposed project on roadway links and intersections within the study area can be analyzed. After an estimate of the total traffic into and out of the site has been made, that traffic must be distributed and assigned to the roadway system. The trip distribution step produces estimates of trip origins and destinations. The assignment step produces estimates of the amount of site traffic that will use certain access routes between their origin and destination.

The trips expected to be generated by the expansion were assigned to the road. Our methodology included using the directional split on 13 Mile Road for the two peak hours shown in Table 1.

- Sunday (10:45-11:45 AM) $37 \%$ of trips are EB and $63 \%$ of trips are WB
- Sunday (1:00-2:00 PM) $48 \%$ of trips are EB and $52 \%$ of trips are WB
- Wednesday (5:00-6:00 PM) 30\% of trips are EB and 70\% of trips are WB
- Wednesday (8:30-9:30 PM) 37\% of trips are EB and $63 \%$ of trips are WB

The church's site plan provides three access driveways - one directly from 13 Mile
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Road and two from Lenox Park Drive. The majority of the parking is to the north and behind the church. Using the 24 -hour counts, the following splits were observed at the driveway and Lenox Park Drive at 13 Mile Road. These splits were retained for the background and future scenarios.

- On Sunday during peak hour of the road, 10:45-11:45 AM
o Church Driveway $31 \%$ outbound and $59 \%$ inbound trips
o Lenox Park Drive $69 \%$ outbound and $41 \%$ inbound trips
- On Sunday during peak hour of the generator, 1:00-2:00 PM
o Church Driveway $42 \%$ outbound and $16 \%$ inbound trips
o Lenox Park Drive $58 \%$ outbound and $84 \%$ inbound trips
- On Wednesday during the peak hour of the road, 5:00-6:00 PM
o Church Driveway $23 \%$ outbound and $23 \%$ inbound trips
o Lenox Park Drive $\quad 77 \%$ outbound and $77 \%$ inbound trips
- On Wednesday during the peak hour of the generator, 8:30-9:30 PM
o Church Driveway $45 \%$ outbound and $14 \%$ inbound trips
o Lenox Park Drive $55 \%$ outbound and $86 \%$ inbound trips
The site plan for the church expansion proposes a large new parking lot on the east side of the church and a small new parking lot on the west side of the church. Due to this layout, HRC believes the split between the driveway and the Lenox Park Drive will remain the same.

Tables 7-10 show the turning movement volumes for existing, background, and future for four critical time periods. Table 7 is the Sunday peak hour of the road and Table 8 is the Sunday peak hour of the generator. Table 9 is the Wednesday peak hour of the road and Table 10 is the Wednesday peak hour of the generator.

Table 7: Sunday Peak Hour of Road, 10:45-11:45 AM

| Intersection | Approach/ <br> Movement | Existing <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | Background <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Future <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lenox Park <br> Drive \& 13 Mile | WB TH | 262 | 272 | 272 |
|  | WB RT | 112 | 112 | 224 |
|  | EB LT | 64 | 64 | 128 |
|  | EB TH | 230 | 246 | 246 |
|  | SB LT | 184 | 184 | 368 |
|  | SB RT | 113 | 113 | 226 |
|  | WB TH | 361 | 375 | 470 |
|  | WB RT | 231 | 231 | 462 |
|  | EB LT | 20 | 20 | 40 |
|  | SB TH | 394 | 410 | 274 |
|  | SB RT | 119 | 13 | 26 |
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Table 8: Sunday Peak Hour of Generator, 1:00-2:00 PM

| Intersection | Approach/ <br> Movement | Existing <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | Background <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Future <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lenox Park <br> Drive \& 13 Mile | WB TH | 277 | 288 | 288 |
|  | WB RT | 29 | 29 | 29 |
|  | EB LT | 30 | 30 | 30 |
|  | EB TH | 252 | 262 | 262 |
|  | SB LT | 168 | 168 | 336 |
| Church <br> Driveway \& 13 <br> Mile | SB RT | 157 | 157 | 314 |
|  | WB TH | 282 | 293 | 269 |
|  | WB RT | EB LT | 10 | 10 |
| 20 | 20 |  |  |  |
|  | EB TH | 419 | 429 | 596 |
|  | SB LT | 211 | 211 | 422 |

Table 9: Wednesday PM Peak Hour of Road, 5:00-6:00 PM

| Intersection | Approach/ <br> Movement | Existing <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | Background <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Future <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lenox Park <br> Drive \& 13 Mile | WB TH | 770 | 801 | 801 |
|  | WB RT | 70 | 70 | 105 |
|  | EB LT | EB TH | 31 | 41 |
|  | SB LT | 37 | 350 | 350 |
|  | SB RT | 34 | 37 | 37 |
|  | WB TH | 835 | 34 | 34 |
|  | WB RT | 32 | 896 | 896 |
|  | EB LT | 2 | 2 | 64 |
|  | SB LT | 370 | 385 | 383 |
|  | SB RT | 16 | 16 | 32 |
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Table 10: Wednesday PM Peak Hour of Generator, 8:30-9:30 PM

| Intersection | Approach/ <br> Movement | Existing <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | Background <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | Future <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lenox Park <br> Drive \& 13 <br> Mile | WB TH | 194 | 202 | 202 |
|  | WB RT | 18 | 18 | 18 |
|  | EB LT | 7 | 7 | 7 |
|  | EB TH | 117 | 125 | 125 |
|  | SB LT | 90 | 90 | 180 |
| Church <br> Driveway \& 13 <br> Mile | SB RT | 62 | 62 | 124 |
|  | WB TH | 209 | 217 | 214 |
|  | WB RT | 4 | 4 | 8 |
|  | EB LT | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | EB TH | 207 | 215 | 305 |
|  | SB LT | 123 | 123 | 246 |

## Capacity Analysis

HRC conducted a capacity analysis on the study intersections using Synchro 9 Software. The intersections were analyzed following the procedures for unsignalized intersections as outlined in the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual. Table 11 indicates the control delay criteria used for determining level of service (LOS) for un-signalized intersections.

Table 11: Level of Service Criteria for Un-Signalized Intersections

| Level of Service | Control Delay per Vehicle (Seconds) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $<10$ |
| B | $>10$ to $\leq 15$ |
| C | $>15$ to $\leq 25$ |
| D | $>25$ to $\leq 35$ |
| E | $>35$ to $\leq 50$ |
| F | $>50$ |

At an un-signalized intersection with stop control on the minor approach (two way stop controlled intersections), LOS "F" occurs when there are not enough gaps of suitable size to allow a minor-street demand to safely cross through traffic on the major street. This is typically evident from extremely long control delays experienced by minor street traffic and by queuing on the minor approaches. LOS "F" may also appear in the form of drivers on the minor street selecting smaller than usual gaps. In such cases, safety may be a problem, and some disruption to the major traffic stream may result. Note that LOS "F" may not always result in long queues but in adjustments to normal gap acceptance behavior, for example a left turning vehicle using a shorter than normal gap in traffic to complete the left turn.

At two way stop controlled intersections, the critical movement, often the minor-street
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left turn, may control the overall performance of the intersection. The lower threshold for LOS " F " is set at 50 seconds of delay per vehicle as shown in Table 11. In some cases, the delay equations will predict delays greater than 50 seconds for minor-street movements under very low-volume conditions on the minor street (less than 25 vehicles per hour). A LOS "F" threshold is reached with a movement capacity of approximately 85 vehicles per hour or less.

The capacity analysis at the existing driveway and Lenox Park Drive during the Sunday and Wednesday peak hours of the road and generator is provided in Tables 12 15. The Sunday analyses are shown in Tables $12-13$ and the Wednesday analyses are shown in Tables 14-15. Synchro reports are provided in Attachment C.

Table 12: Capacity Analysis--Sunday Peak Hour of Road (10:45-11:45 AM)

| Intersection | Approach | Existing (2015) |  | Background (2017) |  | Future (2017) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) |
|  | EB Left | A | 8.6 | A | 8.6 | A | 9.5 |
|  | WB Right | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 |
|  | SB Left | FB Right | B | 71.6 | F | 86.0 | F |
| Church Drive <br> $\boldsymbol{\&} \mathbf{1 3}$ Mile | EB Left | A | 916.7 |  |  |  |  |
|  | WB Right | A | 0.7 | B | 12.3 | C | 16.8 |
|  | SB LT/RT | F | 107.1 | A | 9.7 | B | 12.6 |

Table 13: Capacity Analysis--Sunday Peak Hour of Generator (1-2 PM)

| Intersection | Approach | Existing (2015) |  | Background (2017) |  | Future (2017) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) | LOS | Delay (s/veh) |
| Lenox Park Drive \& 13 Mile | EB Left | A | 8.1 | A | 8.1 | A | 8.1 |
|  | WB Right | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 |
|  | SB Left | E | 38.7 | E | 42.5 | F | 312.9 |
|  | SB Right | B | 13.5 | B | 13.7 | D | 31.2 |
| Church Drive \& 13 Mile | EB Left | A | 7.9 | A | 7.9 | A | 7.9 |
|  | WB Right | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 |
|  | SB LT/RT | F | 246.0 | F | 268.4 | F | Error |
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Table 14: Capacity Analysis--Wednesday Peak Hour of Road (5-6 PM)

| Intersection | Approach | Existing <br> (2015) |  | Background <br> (2017) |  | Future <br> (2017) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) |
|  | EB Left | B | 10.5 | B | 10.7 | B | 11.1 |
|  | WB Right | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 |
|  | SB Left | E | 39.7 | E | 43.8 | F | 50.8 |
|  | SB Right | C | 17.1 | C | 17.8 | C | 17.8 |
| Church Drive <br> $\mathbf{1 3}$ Mile | EB Left | B | 10.1 | B | 10.2 | B | 10.5 |
|  | WB Right | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 |
|  | SB LT/RT | D | 27.4 | D | 29.2 | E | 37.0 |

Table 15: Capacity Analysis--Wednesday Peak Hour of Generator (8:30-9:30 PM)

| Intersection | Approach | Existing (2015) |  | Background (2017) |  | Future (2017) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) | LOS | Delay <br> (s/veh) |
|  | A | 7.8 | A | 7.9 | A | 7.9 |  |
|  | WB Right | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 |
|  | SB Left | BB Right | B | 13.3 | B | 13.6 | C |
| Church Drive <br> $\mathbf{1 3}$ Mile | EB Left | A | 10.4 | B | 10.4 | B | 11.5 |
|  | WB Right | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 |
|  | SB LT/RT | C | 19.2 | C | 20.0 | F | 139.9 |

- In all analyses, the level of service for through traffic on 13 Mile Road is a LOS A as it is free flowing. The level of service for westbound right turns is also LOS A as right turns are free flowing. The level of service for eastbound left turns is either LOS A or LOS B.
- Under existing conditions, the left turns from Lenox Park Drive are a LOS E or LOS F except for Wednesday during the PM peak hour of the generator. The level of service worsens in the background and future and the delay increases substantially. On Sunday for both peak hours analyzed, the queues range from 900 to nearly 1300 feet.
- Under existing conditions, the right turns from Lenox Park Drive are a LOS B or LOS C. The level of service does not change except for the future scenario during the peak of the generator when the level of service is LOS D.
- Under existing conditions, the shared outbound driveway from the church has an unacceptable level of service on Sundays (LOS F) for both peaks analyzed. On Wednesday, the level of service is LOS C or LOS D. The background has little effect on level of service. In the future, the level of service is unacceptable in all scenarios at all peaks.


## Right Lane Warrant

A right lane taper currently exists on westbound 13 Mile Road at the east church drive. HRC analyzed the need for a right turn lane at this driveway using the guideline from
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the Michigan Department of Transportation's Traffic and Safety Note 604A. Based on the graphic for a two-lane highway with a posted speed of at or under 45 miles per hour, the right-turn volumes at the church driveway during the Sunday peak hour of the road met the guidelines for a full-width right turn lane.

Figure 1 compares the turning movement volumes during the peak hour of the road (light green data) and the peak hour of the generator (light blue data) on westbound 13 Mile Road on Sunday, February 22, 2015.


Figure 1: Need for Right-Turn Lane on Sunday

## Traffic Signal Warrant

Traffic control signals should not be installed unless one or more of the signal warrants in the Michigan Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices are met. Information obtained by means of engineering studies are compared with the requirements set forth in the warrants. If the requirements are not met, traffic signals should not be put in operation. When a traffic control signal is indicated as being warranted, it is presumed that the signal and all related traffic control devices and markings are installed according to the standards set forth in the Michigan Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

A traffic signal warrant analysis was performed for the intersection of 13 Mile Road and Lenox Park Drive, which is currently an unsignalized 3-leg intersection. An investigation of the need for traffic signal controls included, where applicable, an analysis of the factors contained in the following warrants:
Warrant 1 - Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume
Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Volume
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Warrant 3 - Peak Hour
Warrant 4 - Pedestrian Volume
Warrant 5 - School Crossing
Warrant 6 - Coordinated Signal System
Warrant 7 - Crash Experience
Warrant 8 - Roadway Network
Warrant 9 - Intersection Near a Grade Crossing

The complete analysis is explained in detail in Attachments D and E. A summary of the traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection by day is provided in Tables 16 and 17.

Table 16: Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis Summary for Sunday

| Warrant | Exist <br> Met | Back <br> Met | Future <br> Met |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | No | No | No |
|  | Condition B | No | No | No |
|  | Combination of A \& B | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Volume | No | No | No |  |
| Warrant 3 - Peak Hour | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Warrant 4 - Pedestrian Volume | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| N/A Warrant 5 - School Crossing | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 6 - Coordinated Signal System | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 7 - Crash Experience | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 8 - Roadway Network | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 9 - Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |

Table 17: Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis Summary for Wednesday

| Warrant | Exist <br> Met | Back <br> Met | Future <br> Met |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Condition A | No | No | No |
|  | Condition B | No | No | No |
|  | Combination of A \& B | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Warrant 2 - Four-Hour Vehicular Volume | No | No | No |  |
| Warrant 3 - Peak Hour | No | No | No |  |
| Warrant 4 - Pedestrian Volume | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 5 - School Crossing | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 6 - Coordinated Signal System | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 7 - Crash Experience | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 8 - Roadway Network | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |
| Warrant 9 - Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |

As shown in the tables, the peak hour warrant is met on Sunday. The installation of a
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signal will reduce delay for the church and residential traffic but is not warranted at other times. A three year (2012-2014) review of crashes indicated that there were none at this intersection and that warrant was not applicable.

## Review of Internal Circulation

HRC reviewed internal circulation (vehicle and pedestrian) of the drop off area and the parking lot and found them to be acceptable. The new drop off circle will accommodate a school bus. The revised portion of the site plan separate vehicular and pedestrian traffic which improves safety for the pedestrians. All the handicapped accessible parking spaces are located in the new parking areas which are served by the new pathways.

## Qualifications of the Preparer

The preparer's resume is provided in Attachment F.

## Summary and Recommendations

The proposed expansion of Brightmoor Christian Church is not expected to adversely impact the operation of 13 Mile Road traffic when it is built and fully occupied in 2017. A right turn lane on eastbound 13 Mile Road is required for the church driveway because Sunday volumes meet the MDOT guidelines during the peak hour of the road.

HRC recommends that the church consider adjusting the Sunday service times so there is less congestion and delay at the Lenox Park Drive intersection with 13 Mile Road. HRC recommends that the church monitor the traffic situation and consider conducting a signal warrant analysis in the future.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,
HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, INC.


Colleen Hill-Stramsak, P.E., PTOE
Associate
CH-s/bjl
Attachments A-Site Plan
B-Turning Movement \& 24 Hour Counts
C-Synchro Reports
D-Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis for Sunday
E-Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis for Wednesday
F-Resume of Preparer
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pc: Whitehall Real Estate Interests; Gary Jonna HRC; Gary Tressel, matt Slicker, File


Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34O

Traffic Data Collection 7504 Sawgrass Drive www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Lenox Park Drive Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road Westbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 12:00 AM | 2 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 44 |
| 12:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 36 |
| 12:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 26 |
| 12:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 22 |
| Hourly Total | 2 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 72 | 0 | 76 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 128 |
|  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 |
| 1:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 |
| 1:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| 1:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 13 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 31 | 0 | 35 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 60 |
| 2:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| 2:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| 2:30 AM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 |
| 2:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 26 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 53 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| 3:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| 3:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 17 |
| 3:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 22 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 42 |
| 4:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 4:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 |
| 4:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| 4:45 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 29 |
| 5:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 11 |
| 5:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| 5:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| 5:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 35 |
| 6:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 13 |
| 6:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 20 |
| 6:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 22 |
|  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 50 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 52 | 0 | 53 | 47 | 2 | 0 | 49 | 105 |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 35 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 36 |
| 7:30 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 39 |
|  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 50 |
| Hourly Total | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 59 | 0 | 64 | 86 | 1 | 0 | 87 | 160 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 19 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 25 | 50 |
| 8:15 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 22 | 33 | 6 | 0 | 39 | 63 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 37 | 28 | 14 | 0 | 42 | 81 |
| 8:45 AM | 3 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 37 | 21 | 0 | 58 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 53 | 122 |
| Hourly Total | 8 | 13 | 0 | 21 | 62 | 74 | 0 | 136 | 122 | 37 | 0 | 159 | 316 |
| 9:00 AM | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 59 | 17 | 0 | 76 | 49 | 37 | 0 | 86 | 171 |
| 9:15 AM | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 37 | 28 | 0 | 65 | 54 | 17 | 0 | 71 | 143 |
| 9:30 AM | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 24 | 56 | 5 | 0 | 61 | 94 |
| 9:45 AM | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 34 | 0 | 37 | 50 | 4 | 0 | 54 | 96 |
| Hourly Total | 5 | 25 | 0 | 30 | 109 | 93 | 0 | 202 | 209 | 63 | 0 | 272 | 504 |
| 10:00 AM | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 32 | 0 | 33 | 46 | 2 | 0 | 48 | 88 |
| 10:15 AM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 34 | 0 | 41 | 63 | 3 | 0 | 66 | 112 |
| 10:30 AM | 3 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 11 | 48 | 0 | 59 | 54 | 6 | 0 | 60 | 131 |
| 10:45 AM | 43 | 47 | 0 | 90 | 23 | 81 | 0 | 104 | 54 | 11 | 0 | 65 | 259 |
| Hourly Total | 48 | 66 | 0 | 114 | 42 | 195 | 0 | 237 | 217 | 22 | 0 | 239 | 590 |
| 11:00 AM | 46 | 85 | 0 | 131 | 52 | 68 | 0 | 120 | 59 | 29 | 0 | 88 | 339 |
| 11:15 AM | 16 | 34 | 1 | 51 | 22 | 54 | 0 | 76 | 78 | 16 | 0 | 94 | 221 |
| 11:30 AM | 8 | 18 | 2 | 28 | 15 | 59 | 0 | 74 | 55 | 8 | 0 | 63 | 165 |
| 11:45 AM | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 52 | 0 | 55 | 59 | 7 | 0 | 66 | 130 |


| Hourly Total | 74 | 142 | 3 | 219 | 92 | 233 | 0 | 325 | 251 | 60 | 0 | 311 | 855 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00 PM | 6 | 16 | 0 | 22 | 6 | 65 | 0 | 71 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 152 |
| 12:15 PM | 21 | 16 | 0 | 37 | 3 | 98 | 0 | 101 | 51 | 4 | 0 | 55 | 193 |
| 12:30 PM | 8 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 9 | 82 | 0 | 91 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 176 |
| 12:45 PM | 5 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 62 | 0 | 68 | 41 | 1 | 0 | 42 | 124 |
| Hourly Total | 40 | 46 | 0 | 86 | 24 | 307 | 0 | 331 | 223 | 5 | 0 | 228 | 645 |
| 1:00 PM | 79 | 76 | 1 | 156 | 8 | 75 | 0 | 83 | 56 | 6 | 0 | 62 | 301 |
| 1:15 PM | 44 | 55 | 0 | 99 | 8 | 79 | 0 | 87 | 74 | 5 | 0 | 79 | 265 |
| 1:30 PM | 21 | 20 | 0 | 41 | 5 | 51 | 0 | 56 | 59 | 6 | 0 | 65 | 162 |
| 1:45 PM | 12 | 17 | 0 | 29 | 8 | 72 | 0 | 80 | 63 | 13 | 0 | 76 | 185 |
| Hourly Total | 156 | 168 | 1 | 325 | 29 | 277 | 0 | 306 | 252 | 30 | 0 | 282 | 913 |
| 2:00 PM | 13 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 70 | 0 | 75 | 76 | 8 | 0 | 84 | 177 |
| 2:15 PM | 4 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 58 | 0 | 67 | 65 | 2 | 0 | 67 | 144 |
| 2:30 PM | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 67 | 0 | 74 | 79 | 3 | 0 | 82 | 165 |
| 2:45 PM | 4 | 7 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 78 | 0 | 90 | 59 | 4 | 0 | 63 | 164 |
| Hourly Total | 23 | 25 | 0 | 48 | 33 | 273 | 0 | 306 | 279 | 17 | 0 | 296 | 650 |
| 3:00 PM | 9 | 11 | 0 | 20 | 7 | 64 | 0 | 71 | 58 | 4 | 0 | 62 | 153 |
| 3:15 PM | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 74 | 0 | 81 | 54 | 7 | 0 | 61 | 149 |
| 3:30 PM | 4 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 81 | 0 | 86 | 87 | 2 | 0 | 89 | 187 |
| 3:45 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 61 | 0 | 68 | 54 | 6 | 0 | 60 | 130 |
| Hourly Total | 19 | 22 | 0 | 41 | 26 | 280 | 0 | 306 | 253 | 19 | 0 | 272 | 619 |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 49 | 0 | 57 | 54 | 2 | 0 | 56 | 123 |
| 4:15 PM | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 62 | 0 | 73 | 57 | 2 | 0 | 59 | 137 |
| 4:30 PM | 8 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 64 | 0 | 72 | 46 | 5 | 0 | 51 | 135 |
| 4:45 PM | 5 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 58 | 0 | 67 | 53 | 3 | 0 | 56 | 137 |
| Hourly Total | 19 | 22 | 0 | 41 | 36 | 233 | 0 | 269 | 210 | 12 | 0 | 222 | 532 |
| 5:00 PM | 5 | 11 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 73 | 0 | 78 | 64 | 4 | 0 | 68 | 162 |
| 5:15 PM | 3 | 6 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 55 | 0 | 59 | 65 | 3 | 0 | 68 | 136 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 61 | 0 | 69 | 58 | 5 | 0 | 63 | 138 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 55 | 0 | 59 | 53 | 1 | 0 | 54 | 120 |
| Hourly Total | 10 | 27 | 1 | 38 | 21 | 244 | 0 | 265 | 240 | 13 | 0 | 253 | 556 |
| 6:00 PM | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 59 | 0 | 67 | 45 | 8 | 0 | 53 | 127 |
| 6:15 PM | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 53 | 0 | 57 | 50 | 3 | 0 | 53 | 115 |
| 6:30 PM | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 61 | 0 | 67 | 63 | 1 | 0 | 64 | 136 |
| 6:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 49 | 0 | 52 | 43 | 8 | 0 | 51 | 105 |
| Hourly Total | 7 | 12 | 0 | 19 | 21 | 222 | 0 | 243 | 201 | 20 | 0 | 221 | 483 |
| 7:00 PM | 8 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 44 | 0 | 52 | 40 | 2 | 0 | 42 | 107 |
| 7:15 PM | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 42 | 0 | 45 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 29 | 84 |
| 7:30 PM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 37 | 0 | 40 | 36 | 3 | 0 | 39 | 89 |
| 7:45 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 43 | 0 | 47 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 34 | 84 |
| Hourly Total | 18 | 18 | 0 | 36 | 18 | 166 | 0 | 184 | 134 | 10 | 0 | 144 | 364 |
| 8:00 PM | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 35 | 0 | 37 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 76 |
| 8:15 PM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 31 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 67 |
| 8:30 PM | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 29 | 0 | 33 | 36 | 3 | 0 | 39 | 77 |
| 8:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 32 | 0 | 36 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 66 |
| Hourly Total | 6 | 10 | 0 | 16 | 10 | 127 | 0 | 137 | 126 | 7 | 0 | 133 | 286 |
| 9:00 PM | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 32 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 62 |
| 9:15 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 21 | 0 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 46 |
| 9:30 PM | 2 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 28 | 1 | 29 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 51 |
|  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 43 |
| Hourly Total | 4 | 20 | 0 | 24 | 10 | 105 | 1 | 116 | 60 | 2 | 0 | 62 | 202 |
| 10:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 18 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 48 |
| 10:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 17 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 38 |
| 10:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 29 |
| 10:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 28 |
| Hourly Total | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 64 | 0 | 72 | 63 | 2 | 0 | 65 | 143 |
| 11:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 26 |
| 11:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 |
| 11:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 32 |
| 11:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 16 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 40 | 0 | 43 | 46 | 1 | 0 | 47 | 92 |
| Grand Total | 448 | 650 | 5 | 1103 | 566 | 3218 | 1 | 3785 | 3149 | 325 | 0 | 3474 | 8362 |
| Approach \% | 40.6 | 58.9 | 0.5 | - | 15.0 | 85.0 | 0.0 | - | 90.6 | 9.4 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 5.4 | 7.8 | 0.1 | 13.2 | 6.8 | 38.5 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 37.7 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 41.5 | - |
| Lights | 448 | 650 | 5 | 1103 | 566 | 3212 | 1 | 3779 | 3140 | 325 | 0 | 3465 | 8347 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.8 | 100.0 | 99.8 | 99.7 | 100.0 | - | 99.7 | 99.8 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 13 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34O

## Traffic Data Collection

## 7504 Sawgrass Drive

www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Sunday Site Code: TMC_1 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015 Page No: 3


Turning Movement Data Plot

LENOX PARK DR \& 13 MILE

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34O

## Traffic Data Collection

## 7504 Sawgrass Drive

www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Sunday Site Code: TMC_1 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015
Page No: 4

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (10:45 AM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lenox Park Drive Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 10:45 AM | 43 | 47 | 0 | 90 | 23 | 81 | 0 | 104 | 54 | 11 | 0 | 65 | 259 |
| 11:00 AM | 46 | 85 | 0 | 131 | 52 | 68 | 0 | 120 | 59 | 29 | 0 | 88 | 339 |
| 11:15 AM | 16 | 34 | 1 | 51 | 22 | 54 | 0 | 76 | 78 | 16 | 0 | 94 | 221 |
| 11:30 AM | 8 | 18 | 2 | 28 | 15 | 59 | 0 | 74 | 55 | 8 | 0 | 63 | 165 |
| Total | 113 | 184 | 3 | 300 | 112 | 262 | 0 | 374 | 246 | 64 | 0 | 310 | 984 |
| Approach \% | 37.7 | 61.3 | 1.0 | - | 29.9 | 70.1 | 0.0 | - | 79.4 | 20.6 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 11.5 | 18.7 | 0.3 | 30.5 | 11.4 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 38.0 | 25.0 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 31.5 | - |
| PHF | 0.614 | 0.541 | 0.375 | 0.573 | 0.538 | 0.809 | 0.000 | 0.779 | 0.788 | 0.552 | 0.000 | 0.824 | 0.726 |
| Lights | 113 | 184 | 3 | 300 | 112 | 260 | 0 | 372 | 243 | 64 | 0 | 307 | 979 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.2 | - | 99.5 | 98.8 | 100.0 | - | 99.0 | 99.5 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | - | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.0 | - | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Cldy. Snow Flurries Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_34O

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Sunday Site Code: TMC_1 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015 Page No: 5


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (10:45 AM)

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34O

## Traffic Data Collection

## 7504 Sawgrass Drive

www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Sunday Site Code: TMC_1 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015
Page No: 6

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (1:00 PM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lenox Park Drive <br> Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 1:00 PM | 79 | 76 | 1 | 156 | 8 | 75 | 0 | 83 | 56 | 6 | 0 | 62 | 301 |
| 1:15 PM | 44 | 55 | 0 | 99 | 8 | 79 | 0 | 87 | 74 | 5 | 0 | 79 | 265 |
| 1:30 PM | 21 | 20 | 0 | 41 | 5 | 51 | 0 | 56 | 59 | 6 | 0 | 65 | 162 |
| 1:45 PM | 12 | 17 | 0 | 29 | 8 | 72 | 0 | 80 | 63 | 13 | 0 | 76 | 185 |
| Total | 156 | 168 | 1 | 325 | 29 | 277 | 0 | 306 | 252 | 30 | 0 | 282 | 913 |
| Approach \% | 48.0 | 51.7 | 0.3 | - | 9.5 | 90.5 | 0.0 | - | 89.4 | 10.6 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 17.1 | 18.4 | 0.1 | 35.6 | 3.2 | 30.3 | 0.0 | 33.5 | 27.6 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 30.9 | - |
| PHF | 0.494 | 0.553 | 0.250 | 0.521 | 0.906 | 0.877 | 0.000 | 0.879 | 0.851 | 0.577 | 0.000 | 0.892 | 0.758 |
| Lights | 156 | 168 | 1 | 325 | 29 | 277 | 0 | 306 | 252 | 30 | 0 | 282 | 913 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Cldy. Snow Flurries Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_34O

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Sunday Site Code: TMC_1 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015 Page No: 7


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (1:00 PM)

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Cldy. Snow Flurries Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_34O

Traffic Data Collection<br>7504 Sawgrass Drive<br>www.tdccounts.com<br>Washington, Michigan, United States 48094<br>Ph. (586) 786-5407<br>Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Sunday Site Code: TMC_1 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015 Page No: 8

Comments: 24 hour intersection video turning movement count conducted during typical Sunday. Intersection peak hour reports provided for 12:00 AM - 12:00 PM \& 12:00 PM - 12:00 AM. TMC was performed with Miovision video VCU recording cameras for Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study for Hubbell, Roth \& Clark, Inc.
Non-signalized "T" intersection, video VCU camera was located at NE quadrant. Classification Summary Details \& Percentages: Three (3) Groupings:
1)Lights Includes: FHWA Classes 1-3 (Motorcycles, Cars, Light Goods Vehicles)
2)Mediums Includes: FHWA Class 4 (School Buses \& Regional Transportation Metro Buses) Single-Unit Trucks: FHWA Classes 5-7 (2-4 Axle SU Medium Trucks)
3)Articulated Trucks Includes: FHWA Classes 8-12 (Heavy Trucks W/Single \& Multi Unit Trailers)

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic
Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Snow Showers
AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_3CU

Traffic Data Collection 7504 Sawgrass Drive www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Weekday Site Code: TMC_1
Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015
Page No: 1


| Hourly Total | 11 | 20 | 0 | 31 | 29 | 244 | 0 | 273 | 218 | 15 | 0 | 233 | 537 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00 PM | 5 | 7 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 75 | 0 | 83 | 63 | 8 | 0 | 71 | 166 |
| 12:15 PM | 3 | 11 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 78 | 0 | 82 | 61 | 3 | 0 | 64 | 160 |
| 12:30 PM | 5 | 9 | 0 | 14 | 3 | 62 | 0 | 65 | 61 | 4 | 0 | 65 | 144 |
| 12:45 PM | 5 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 60 | 0 | 64 | 58 | 4 | 0 | 62 | 136 |
| Hourly Total | 18 | 32 | 0 | 50 | 19 | 275 | 0 | 294 | 243 | 19 | 0 | 262 | 606 |
| 1:00 PM | 5 | 12 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 60 | 0 | 61 | 71 | 1 | 0 | 72 | 150 |
| 1:15 PM | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 78 | 76 | 5 | 0 | 81 | 168 |
| 1:30 PM | 4 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 46 | 0 | 50 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 115 |
| 1:45 PM | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 67 | 0 | 76 | 51 | 3 | 0 | 54 | 135 |
| Hourly Total | 14 | 24 | 0 | 38 | 17 | 248 | 0 | 265 | 256 | 9 | 0 | 265 | 568 |
| 2:00 PM | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 45 | 0 | 55 | 61 | 2 | 0 | 63 | 124 |
| 2:15 PM | 6 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 65 | 0 | 75 | 52 | 9 | 0 | 61 | 147 |
| 2:30 PM | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 84 | 0 | 103 | 64 | 8 | 0 | 72 | 182 |
| 2:45 PM | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 46 | 99 | 0 | 145 | 52 | 14 | 0 | 66 | 218 |
| Hourly Total | 11 | 20 | 0 | 31 | 85 | 293 | 0 | 378 | 229 | 33 | 0 | 262 | 671 |
| 3:00 PM | 14 | 6 | 0 | 20 | 39 | 111 | 0 | 150 | 73 | 8 | 0 | 81 | 251 |
| 3:15 PM | 24 | 30 | 0 | 54 | 16 | 109 | 0 | 125 | 84 | 5 | 0 | 89 | 268 |
| 3:30 PM | 9 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 4 | 122 | 0 | 126 | 82 | 8 | 0 | 90 | 233 |
| 3:45 PM | 11 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 117 | 0 | 129 | 69 | 7 | 0 | 76 | 219 |
| Hourly Total | 58 | 47 | 0 | 105 | 71 | 459 | 0 | 530 | 308 | 28 | 0 | 336 | 971 |
| 4:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 132 | 0 | 151 | 106 | 7 | 0 | 113 | 268 |
| 4:15 PM | 11 | 11 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 115 | 0 | 126 | 73 | 13 | 0 | 86 | 234 |
| 4:30 PM | 11 | 6 | 0 | 17 | 11 | 141 | 0 | 152 | 78 | 1 | 0 | 79 | 248 |
| 4:45 PM | 6 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 180 | 0 | 192 | 65 | 8 | 0 | 73 | 276 |
| Hourly Total | 30 | 24 | 0 | 54 | 53 | 568 | 0 | 621 | 322 | 29 | 0 | 351 | 1026 |
| 5:00 PM | 9 | 7 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 183 | 0 | 194 | 95 | 13 | 0 | 108 | 318 |
| 5:15 PM | 9 | 13 | 0 | 22 | 20 | 203 | 0 | 223 | 78 | 4 | 0 | 82 | 327 |
| 5:30 PM | 9 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 218 | 0 | 240 | 91 | 8 | 0 | 99 | 357 |
| 5:45 PM | 7 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 166 | 0 | 183 | 67 | 16 | 0 | 83 | 281 |
| Hourly Total | 34 | 37 | 0 | 71 | 70 | 770 | 0 | 840 | 331 | 41 | 0 | 372 | 1283 |
| 6:00 PM | 8 | 11 | 0 | 19 | 16 | 135 | 0 | 151 | 84 | 9 | 0 | 93 | 263 |
| 6:15 PM | 5 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 129 | 0 | 144 | 76 | 13 | 0 | 89 | 244 |
| 6:30 PM | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 101 | 0 | 112 | 61 | 14 | 0 | 75 | 193 |
| 6:45 PM | 7 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 24 | 92 | 0 | 116 | 54 | 24 | 0 | 78 | 202 |
| Hourly Total | 21 | 23 | 0 | 44 | 66 | 457 | 0 | 523 | 275 | 60 | 0 | 335 | 902 |
| 7:00 PM | 3 | 7 | 0 | 10 | 22 | 103 | 0 | 125 | 67 | 9 | 0 | 76 | 211 |
| 7:15 PM | 7 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 60 | 0 | 73 | 45 | 4 | 0 | 49 | 133 |
| 7:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 63 | 0 | 66 | 40 | 10 | 0 | 50 | 118 |
| 7:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 50 | 0 | 57 | 35 | 3 | 0 | 38 | 96 |
| Hourly Total | 11 | 13 | 0 | 24 | 45 | 276 | 0 | 321 | 187 | 26 | 0 | 213 | 558 |
| 8:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 55 | 0 | 61 | 43 | 5 | 0 | 48 | 110 |
| 8:15 PM | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 53 | 0 | 63 | 35 | 8 | 0 | 43 | 110 |
| 8:30 PM | 28 | 39 | 0 | 67 | 12 | 59 | 0 | 71 | 29 | 4 | 0 | 33 | 171 |
| 8:45 PM | 18 | 30 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 125 |
| Hourly Total | 48 | 72 | 0 | 120 | 28 | 207 | 0 | 235 | 143 | 18 | 0 | 161 | 516 |
| 9:00 PM | 12 | 13 | 0 | 25 | 3 | 48 | 0 | 51 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 29 | 105 |
| 9:15 PM | 4 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 47 | 0 | 50 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 25 | 87 |
| 9:30 PM | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 34 | 0 | 38 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 58 |
| 9:45 PM | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 44 | 0 | 46 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 77 |
| Hourly Total | 22 | 28 | 0 | 50 | 12 | 173 | 0 | 185 | 90 | 2 | 0 | 92 | 327 |
| 10:00 PM | 2 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 19 | 0 | 23 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 55 |
| 10:15 PM | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 27 | 0 | 28 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 56 |
| 10:30 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 21 | 0 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 43 |
| 10:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 40 |
| Hourly Total | 6 | 17 | 0 | 23 | 9 | 92 | 0 | 101 | 68 | 2 | 0 | 70 | 194 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 18 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 |
| 11:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 28 |
| 11:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 17 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 40 |
| 11:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 61 | 0 | 65 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 112 |
| Grand Total | 384 | 542 | 2 | 928 | 706 | 5297 | 0 | 6003 | 5109 | 433 | 0 | 5542 | 12473 |
| Approach \% | 41.4 | 58.4 | 0.2 | - | 11.8 | 88.2 | 0.0 | - | 92.2 | 7.8 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 3.1 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 5.7 | 42.5 | 0.0 | 48.1 | 41.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 44.4 | - |
| Lights | 374 | 539 | 1 | 914 | 698 | 5230 | 0 | 5928 | 5050 | 425 | 0 | 5475 | 12317 |
| \% Lights | 97.4 | 99.4 | 50.0 | 98.5 | 98.9 | 98.7 | - | 98.8 | 98.8 | 98.2 | - | 98.8 | 98.7 |
| Mediums | 10 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 8 | 66 | 0 | 74 | 57 | 8 | 0 | 65 | 153 |
| \% Mediums | 2.6 | 0.6 | 50.0 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.2 |  | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.8 | - | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3CU

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Weekday Site Code: TMC_1
Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015 Page No: 3


Turning Movement Data Plot

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3CU

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Weekday
Site Code: TMC_1
Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015
Page No: 4

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lenox Park Drive <br> Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road. <br> Westbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 7:30 AM | 6 | 13 | 0 | 19 | 43 | 62 | 0 | 105 | 189 | 14 | 0 | 203 | 327 |
| 7:45 AM | 12 | 18 | 0 | 30 | 61 | 88 | 0 | 149 | 178 | 42 | 0 | 220 | 399 |
| 8:00 AM | 3 | 14 | 0 | 17 | 14 | 76 | 0 | 90 | 173 | 6 | 0 | 179 | 286 |
| 8:15 AM | 6 | 15 | 0 | 21 | 5 | 73 | 0 | 78 | 162 | 3 | 0 | 165 | 264 |
| Total | 27 | 60 | 0 | 87 | 123 | 299 | 0 | 422 | 702 | 65 | 0 | 767 | 1276 |
| Approach \% | 31.0 | 69.0 | 0.0 | - | 29.1 | 70.9 | 0.0 | - | 91.5 | 8.5 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 2.1 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 9.6 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 33.1 | 55.0 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 60.1 | - |
| PHF | 0.563 | 0.833 | 0.000 | 0.725 | 0.504 | 0.849 | 0.000 | 0.708 | 0.929 | 0.387 | 0.000 | 0.872 | 0.799 |
| Lights | 27 | 60 | 0 | 87 | 123 | 291 | 0 | 414 | 699 | 65 | 0 | 764 | 1265 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.3 | - | 98.1 | 99.6 | 100.0 | - | 99.6 | 99.1 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | - | 1.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | - | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3CU

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Weekday Site Code: TMC_1
Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015
Page No: 5


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (7:30 AM)

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3CU

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Weekday
Site Code: TMC_1
Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015
Page No: 6

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lenox Park Drive <br> Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road. <br> Westbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 5:00 PM | 9 | 7 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 183 | 0 | 194 | 95 | 13 | 0 | 108 | 318 |
| 5:15 PM | 9 | 13 | 0 | 22 | 20 | 203 | 0 | 223 | 78 | 4 | 0 | 82 | 327 |
| 5:30 PM | 9 | 9 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 218 | 0 | 240 | 91 | 8 | 0 | 99 | 357 |
| 5:45 PM | 7 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 17 | 166 | 0 | 183 | 67 | 16 | 0 | 83 | 281 |
| Total | 34 | 37 | 0 | 71 | 70 | 770 | 0 | 840 | 331 | 41 | 0 | 372 | 1283 |
| Approach \% | 47.9 | 52.1 | 0.0 | - | 8.3 | 91.7 | 0.0 | - | 89.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 2.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 25.8 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 29.0 | - |
| PHF | 0.944 | 0.712 | 0.000 | 0.807 | 0.795 | 0.883 | 0.000 | 0.875 | 0.871 | 0.641 | 0.000 | 0.861 | 0.898 |
| Lights | 33 | 37 | 0 | 70 | 69 | 768 | 0 | 837 | 327 | 41 | 0 | 368 | 1275 |
| \% Lights | 97.1 | 100.0 | - | 98.6 | 98.6 | 99.7 | - | 99.6 | 98.8 | 100.0 | - | 98.9 | 99.4 |
| Mediums | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| \% Mediums | 2.9 | 0.0 | - | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.3 | - | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 | - | 1.1 | 0.6 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3CU

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Weekday Site Code: TMC_1 Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015 Page No: 7


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (5:00 PM)

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3CU

LENOX PARK DR \& 13 MILE

Traffic Data Collection<br>7504 Sawgrass Drive<br>www.tdccounts.com<br>Washington, Michigan, United States 48094<br>Ph. (586) 786-5407<br>Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park Weekday Site Code: TMC_1 Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015
Page No: 8

Comments: 24 hour intersection video turning movement count conducted during typical weekday (Wednesday), while school was in session. Intersection peak hour reports provided for 12:00 AM - 12:00 PM \& 12:00 PM - 12:00 AM. TMC was performed with Miovision video VCU recording cameras for Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study for Hubbell, Roth \& Clark, Inc.
Non-signalized "T" intersection, video VCU camera was located at NE quadrant. Classification Summary Details \& Percentages: Three (3) Groupings:
1)Lights Includes: FHWA Classes 1-3 (Motorcycles, Cars, Light Goods Vehicles)
2)Mediums Includes: FHWA Class 4 (School Buses \& Regional Transportation Metro Buses) Single-Unit Trucks: FHWA

Classes 5-7 (2-4 Axle SU Medium Trucks)
3)Articulated Trucks Includes: FHWA Classes 8-12 (Heavy Trucks W/Single \& Multi Unit Trailers)

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34G

Traffic Data Collection 7504 Sawgrass Drive www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Brightmoor Church Dw. Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road. <br> Westbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road Eastbound |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 12:00 AM | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 52 |
| 12:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 34 |
| 12:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 27 |
| 12:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 22 |
| Hourly Total | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 75 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 135 |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 |
| 1:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 20 |
| 1:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 1:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 34 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 58 |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 |
| 2:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 2:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 16 |
| 2:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 32 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 56 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 3:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| 3:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 |
| 3:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 43 |
| 4:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 4:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 |
| 4:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 |
| 4:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 16 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 28 |
| 5:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 |
| 5:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| 5:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| 5:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 11 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 36 |
| 6:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 |
| 6:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
| 6:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 |
| 6:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 31 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 52 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 51 | 0 | 53 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 104 |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 17 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 33 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 36 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 18 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 43 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 22 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 52 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 65 | 0 | 71 | 92 | 1 | 0 | 93 | 164 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 26 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 49 |
| 8:15 AM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 39 | 27 | 5 | 0 | 32 | 74 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 37 | 0 | 64 | 28 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 94 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 91 | 52 | 0 | 143 | 39 | 6 | 0 | 45 | 190 |
| Hourly Total | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 147 | 125 | 0 | 272 | 117 | 13 | 0 | 130 | 407 |
| 9:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 89 | 76 | 0 | 165 | 45 | 5 | 0 | 50 | 216 |
| 9:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 56 | 64 | 0 | 120 | 61 | 7 | 0 | 68 | 190 |
| 9:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 26 | 0 | 42 | 55 | 4 | 0 | 59 | 102 |
| 9:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 35 | 0 | 46 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 103 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 172 | 201 | 0 | 373 | 218 | 16 | 0 | 234 | 611 |
| 10:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 34 | 0 | 38 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 49 | 89 |
| 10:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 42 | 0 | 47 | 65 | 3 | 0 | 68 | 117 |
| 10:30 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 59 | 0 | 72 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 138 |
| 10:45 AM | 7 | 30 | 0 | 37 | 39 | 96 | 0 | 135 | 86 | 3 | 0 | 89 | 261 |
| Hourly Total | 7 | 37 | 0 | 44 | 61 | 231 | 0 | 292 | 262 | 7 | 0 | 269 | 605 |
| 11:00 AM | 3 | 58 | 0 | 61 | 96 | 112 | 0 | 208 | 136 | 6 | 0 | 142 | 411 |
| 11:15 AM | 1 | 27 | 0 | 28 | 63 | 76 | 0 | 139 | 102 | 8 | 0 | 110 | 277 |
| 11:30 AM | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 33 | 77 | 0 | 110 | 70 | 3 | 0 | 73 | 189 |
| 11:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 60 | 0 | 72 | 66 | 1 | 0 | 67 | 140 |

SUNDAY
CHURCH DRIVEWAY \& 13 MILE
ATTACHMENT B

| Hourly Total | 6 | 90 | 0 | 96 | 204 | 325 | 0 | 529 | 374 | 18 | 0 | 392 | 1017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00 PM | 2 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 68 | 0 | 74 | 70 | 3 | 0 | 73 | 161 |
| 12:15 PM | 3 | 47 | 0 | 50 | 5 | 93 | 0 | 98 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 213 |
| 12:30 PM | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 86 | 0 | 87 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 171 |
| 12:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 71 | 0 | 72 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 51 | 127 |
| Hourly Total | 6 | 67 | 0 | 73 | 13 | 318 | 0 | 331 | 264 | 4 | 0 | 268 | 672 |
| 1:00 PM | 15 | 106 | 0 | 121 | 5 | 63 | 0 | 68 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 300 |
| 1:15 PM | 8 | 72 | 0 | 80 | 1 | 70 | 0 | 71 | 132 | 0 | 1 | 133 | 284 |
| 1:30 PM | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 65 | 1 | 68 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 160 |
| 1:45 PM | 1 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 78 | 0 | 80 | 73 | 1 | 0 | 74 | 168 |
| Hourly Total | 24 | 211 | 0 | 235 | 10 | 276 | 1 | 287 | 388 | 1 | 1 | 390 | 912 |
| 2:00 PM | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 72 | 0 | 75 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 157 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 67 | 0 | 68 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 139 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 76 | 0 | 78 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 164 |
| 2:45 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 97 | 0 | 98 | 66 | 1 | 0 | 67 | 167 |
| Hourly Total | 4 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 312 | 0 | 319 | 298 | 1 | 0 | 299 | 627 |
| 3:00 PM | 1 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 68 | 0 | 70 | 68 | 2 | 0 | 70 | 148 |
| 3:15 PM | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 78 | 0 | 79 | 57 | 2 | 0 | 59 | 145 |
| 3:30 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 89 | 0 | 90 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 184 |
| 3:45 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 67 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 128 |
| Hourly Total | 4 | 16 | 0 | 20 | 4 | 302 | 0 | 306 | 275 | 4 | 0 | 279 | 605 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 57 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 112 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 80 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 135 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 69 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 118 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 68 | 0 | 69 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 137 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 274 | 0 | 275 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 225 | 502 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 79 | 0 | 81 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 149 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 62 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 139 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 69 | 0 | 73 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 137 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 61 | 0 | 62 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 122 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 271 | 0 | 278 | 266 | 0 | 0 | 266 | 547 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 65 | 0 | 66 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 45 | 114 |
| 6:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 55 | 0 | 65 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 123 |
| 6:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 69 | 0 | 71 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 133 |
| 6:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 51 | 0 | 53 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 106 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 240 | 0 | 255 | 215 | 1 | 0 | 216 | 476 |
| 7:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 57 | 0 | 59 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 103 |
| 7:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 44 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 75 |
| 7:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 37 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 80 |
| 7:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 48 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 81 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 186 | 0 | 188 | 149 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 339 |
| 8:00 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 35 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 79 |
| 8:15 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 31 | 0 | 33 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 72 |
| 8:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 0 | 31 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 69 |
| 8:45 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 34 | 30 | 1 | 0 | 31 | 68 |
| Hourly Total | 3 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 130 | 0 | 133 | 143 | 1 | 0 | 144 | 288 |
| 9:00 PM | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 37 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 67 |
| 9:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 47 |
| 9:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 28 | 0 | 29 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 51 |
| 9:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 43 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 113 | 0 | 114 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 208 |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 44 |
| 10:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 33 |
| 10:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 27 |
| 10:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 19 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 27 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 71 | 0 | 73 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 131 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 28 |
| 11:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 |
| 11:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 30 |
| 11:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 42 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 93 |
| Grand Total | 61 | 473 | 0 | 534 | 658 | 3723 | 1 | 4382 | 3680 | 67 | 1 | 3748 | 8664 |
| Approach \% | 11.4 | 88.6 | 0.0 | - | 15.0 | 85.0 | 0.0 | - | 98.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.7 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 7.6 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 50.6 | 42.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 43.3 | - |
| Lights | 61 | 473 | 0 | 534 | 658 | 3717 | 1 | 4376 | 3672 | 67 | 1 | 3740 | 8650 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.8 | 100.0 | 99.9 | 99.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.8 | 99.8 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34G

## Traffic Data Collection

## 7504 Sawgrass Drive

www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw. Sunday Site Code: TMC_2 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015 Page No: 3


Turning Movement Data Plot

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34G

## Traffic Data Collection

## 7504 Sawgrass Drive

www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw. Sunday Site Code: TMC_2 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015
Page No: 4

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (10:45 AM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Brightmoor Church Dw. Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road. |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 10:45 AM | 7 | 30 | 0 | 37 | 39 | 96 | 0 | 135 | 86 | 3 | 0 | 89 | 261 |
| 11:00 AM | 3 | 58 | 0 | 61 | 96 | 112 | 0 | 208 | 136 | 6 | 0 | 142 | 411 |
| 11:15 AM | 1 | 27 | 0 | 28 | 63 | 76 | 0 | 139 | 102 | 8 | 0 | 110 | 277 |
| 11:30 AM | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 33 | 77 | 0 | 110 | 70 | 3 | 0 | 73 | 189 |
| Total | 13 | 119 | 0 | 132 | 231 | 361 | 0 | 592 | 394 | 20 | 0 | 414 | 1138 |
| Approach \% | 9.8 | 90.2 | 0.0 | - | 39.0 | 61.0 | 0.0 | - | 95.2 | 4.8 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 1.1 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 20.3 | 31.7 | 0.0 | 52.0 | 34.6 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 36.4 | - |
| PHF | 0.464 | 0.513 | 0.000 | 0.541 | 0.602 | 0.806 | 0.000 | 0.712 | 0.724 | 0.625 | 0.000 | 0.729 | 0.692 |
| Lights | 13 | 119 | 0 | 132 | 231 | 359 | 0 | 590 | 392 | 20 | 0 | 412 | 1134 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.4 | - | 99.7 | 99.5 | 100.0 | - | 99.5 | 99.6 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | - | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34G

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw. Sunday Site Code: TMC_2 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015 Page No: 5


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (10:45 AM)

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34G

## Traffic Data Collection

## 7504 Sawgrass Drive

www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw. Sunday Site Code: TMC_2 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015
Page No: 6

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (1:00 PM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Brightmoor Church Dw. <br> Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road. <br> Westbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 1:00 PM | 15 | 106 | 0 | 121 | 5 | 63 | 0 | 68 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 300 |
| 1:15 PM | 8 | 72 | 0 | 80 | 1 | 70 | 0 | 71 | 132 | 0 | 1 | 133 | 284 |
| 1:30 PM | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 65 | 1 | 68 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 160 |
| 1:45 PM | 1 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 78 | 0 | 80 | 73 | 1 | 0 | 74 | 168 |
| Total | 24 | 211 | 0 | 235 | 10 | 276 | 1 | 287 | 388 | 1 | 1 | 390 | 912 |
| Approach \% | 10.2 | 89.8 | 0.0 | - | 3.5 | 96.2 | 0.3 | - | 99.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | - | - |
| Total \% | 2.6 | 23.1 | 0.0 | 25.8 | 1.1 | 30.3 | 0.1 | 31.5 | 42.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 42.8 | - |
| PHF | 0.400 | 0.498 | 0.000 | 0.486 | 0.500 | 0.885 | 0.250 | 0.897 | 0.735 | 0.250 | 0.250 | 0.733 | 0.760 |
| Lights | 24 | 211 | 0 | 235 | 10 | 276 | 1 | 287 | 388 | 1 | 1 | 390 | 912 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Cldy. Snow
Flurries Temp. 10's
Video VCU ID: SCU_34G

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw. Sunday Site Code: TMC_2 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015 Page No: 7


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (1:00 PM)

Project: Brightmoor

Traffic Data Collection<br>7504 Sawgrass Drive<br>www.tdccounts.com<br>Washington, Michigan, United States 48094<br>Ph. (586) 786-5407<br>Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw. Sunday Site Code: TMC_2 Sunday Start Date: 02/22/2015 Page No: 8

Comments: 24 hour intersection video turning movement count conducted during typical Sunday. Intersection peak hour reports provided for 12:00 AM - 12:00 PM \& 12:00 PM - 12:00 AM. TMC was performed with Miovision video VCU recording cameras for Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study for Hubbell, Roth \& Clark, Inc.
Non-signalized "T" intersection, video VCU camera was located at NE quadrant. Classification Summary Details \& Percentages: Three (3) Groupings:
1)Lights Includes: FHWA Classes 1-3 (Motorcycles, Cars, Light Goods Vehicles)
2)Mediums Includes: FHWA Class 4 (School Buses \& Regional Transportation Metro Buses) Single-Unit Trucks: FHWA Classes 5-7 (2-4 Axle SU Medium Trucks)
3)Articulated Trucks Includes: FHWA Classes 8-12 (Heavy Trucks W/Single \& Multi Unit Trailers)

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Snow Showers
AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3EP

Traffic Data Collection 7504 Sawgrass Drive www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw Weekday
Site Code: TMC_2
Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015
Page No: 1


| Hourly Total | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 321 | 0 | 322 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 239 | 568 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 83 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 154 |
| 12:15 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 85 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 159 |
| 12:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 65 | 0 | 66 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 138 |
| 12:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 63 | 0 | 64 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 130 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 296 | 0 | 298 | 272 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 581 |
| 1:00 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 60 | 0 | 61 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 147 |
| 1:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 76 | 0 | 78 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 161 |
| 1:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 47 | 0 | 50 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 113 |
| 1:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 73 | 0 | 76 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 134 |
| Hourly Total | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 256 | 0 | 265 | 281 | 0 | 0 | 281 | 555 |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 51 | 0 | 53 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 123 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 73 | 0 | 76 | 58 | 1 | 0 | 59 | 135 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 104 | 0 | 105 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 175 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 145 | 0 | 146 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 210 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 373 | 0 | 380 | 253 | 1 | 0 | 254 | 643 |
| 3:00 PM | 14 | 46 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 137 | 0 | 138 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 278 |
| 3:15 PM | 4 | 20 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 128 | 0 | 128 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 263 |
| 3:30 PM | 1 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 119 | 0 | 120 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 222 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 132 | 0 | 135 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 212 |
| Hourly Total | 19 | 78 | 0 | 97 | 5 | 516 | 0 | 521 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 357 | 975 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 152 | 0 | 152 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 267 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 131 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 220 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 150 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 236 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 188 | 0 | 188 | 69 | 1 | 0 | 70 | 260 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 17 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 621 | 0 | 621 | 343 | 1 | 0 | 344 | 983 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 201 | 0 | 203 | 102 | 1 | 0 | 103 | 309 |
| 5:15 PM | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 238 | 0 | 248 | 91 | 1 | 0 | 92 | 347 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 236 | 0 | 245 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 351 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 182 | 0 | 193 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 275 |
| Hourly Total | 5 | 16 | 0 | 21 | 32 | 857 | 0 | 889 | 370 | 2 | 0 | 372 | 1282 |
| 6:00 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 160 | 0 | 171 | 92 | 3 | 0 | 95 | 269 |
| 6:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 149 | 0 | 163 | 78 | 4 | 0 | 82 | 245 |
| 6:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 109 | 0 | 140 | 62 | 3 | 0 | 65 | 206 |
| 6:45 PM | 1 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 35 | 119 | 0 | 154 | 52 | 4 | 0 | 56 | 219 |
| Hourly Total | 1 | 12 | 0 | 13 | 91 | 537 | 0 | 628 | 284 | 14 | 0 | 298 | 939 |
| 7:00 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 28 | 126 | 0 | 154 | 71 | 2 | 0 | 73 | 231 |
| 7:15 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 72 | 0 | 80 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 49 | 133 |
| 7:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 64 | 0 | 65 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 108 |
| 7:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 57 | 0 | 59 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 96 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 39 | 319 | 0 | 358 | 196 | 3 | 0 | 199 | 568 |
| 8:00 PM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 60 | 0 | 63 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 110 |
| 8:15 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 65 | 0 | 68 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 112 |
| 8:30 PM | 0 | 63 | 0 | 63 | 3 | 65 | 0 | 68 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 198 |
| 8:45 PM | 0 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 42 | 0 | 42 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 148 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 114 | 0 | 114 | 9 | 232 | 0 | 241 | 213 | 0 | 0 | 213 | 568 |
| 9:00 PM | 2 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 45 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 100 |
| 9:15 PM | 1 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 51 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 93 |
| 9:30 PM | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 39 | 0 | 40 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 60 |
| 9:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 46 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 75 |
| Hourly Total | 4 | 24 | 0 | 28 | 2 | 180 | 0 | 182 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 328 |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 61 |
| 10:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 52 |
| 10:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 24 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 42 |
| 10:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 40 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 103 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 195 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 |
| 11:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 |
| 11:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 39 |
| 11:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 64 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 110 |
| Grand Total | 74 | 412 | 0 | 486 | 238 | 5988 | 0 | 6226 | 5631 | 28 | 0 | 5659 | 12371 |
| Approach \% | 15.2 | 84.8 | 0.0 | - | 3.8 | 96.2 | 0.0 | - | 99.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.6 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 1.9 | 48.4 | 0.0 | 50.3 | 45.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 45.7 | - |
| Lights | 74 | 410 | 0 | 484 | 238 | 5926 | 0 | 6164 | 5565 | 28 | 0 | 5593 | 12241 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 99.5 | - | 99.6 | 100.0 | 99.0 | - | 99.0 | 98.8 | 100.0 | - | 98.8 | 98.9 |
| Mediums | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 126 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.5 | - | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | - | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | - | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road
Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3EP

Traffic Data Collection<br>7504 Sawgrass Drive<br>www.tdccounts.com<br>Washington, Michigan, United States 48094<br>Ph. (586) 786-5407<br>Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw Weekday Site Code: TMC_2 Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015 Page No: 3


Turning Movement Data Plot

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3EP

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \&
Church Dw Weekday
Site Code: TMC_2
Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015
Page No: 4

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Int. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Brightmoor Church Dw. <br> Southbound |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 7:30 AM | 1 | 12 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 105 | 202 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 320 |
| 7:45 AM | 24 | 54 | 0 | 78 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 119 | 197 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 394 |
| 8:00 AM | 8 | 12 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 80 | 0 | 82 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 289 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 82 | 0 | 83 | 175 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 258 |
| Total | 33 | 78 | 0 | 111 | 3 | 386 | 0 | 389 | 761 | 0 | 0 | 761 | 1261 |
| Approach \% | 29.7 | 70.3 | 0.0 | - | 0.8 | 99.2 | 0.0 | - | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 2.6 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 0.2 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 60.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.3 | - |
| PHF | 0.344 | 0.361 | 0.000 | 0.356 | 0.375 | 0.811 | 0.000 | 0.817 | 0.942 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.942 | 0.800 |
| Lights | 33 | 78 | 0 | 111 | 3 | 378 | 0 | 381 | 755 | 0 | 0 | 755 | 1247 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.9 | - | 97.9 | 99.2 | - | - | 99.2 | 98.9 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | - | 2.1 | 0.8 | - | - | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3EP

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw Weekday Site Code: TMC_2 Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015 Page No: 5


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (7:30 AM)

Project: Brightmoor
Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3EP

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \&
Church Dw Weekday
Site Code: TMC_2
Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015
Page No: 6

| Start Time | Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (5:00 PM) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Brightmoor Church Dw. |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  | 13 Mile Road |  |  |  | Int. Total |
|  | Southbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | Right | Left | U-Turn | App. Total | Right | Thru | U-Turn | App. Total | Thru | Left | U-Turn | App. Total |  |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 201 | 0 | 203 | 102 | 1 | 0 | 103 | 309 |
| 5:15 PM | 3 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 238 | 0 | 248 | 91 | 1 | 0 | 92 | 347 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 236 | 0 | 245 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 351 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 182 | 0 | 193 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 275 |
| Total | 5 | 16 | 0 | 21 | 32 | 857 | 0 | 889 | 370 | 2 | 0 | 372 | 1282 |
| Approach \% | 23.8 | 76.2 | 0.0 | - | 3.6 | 96.4 | 0.0 | - | 99.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | - |
| Total \% | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 2.5 | 66.8 | 0.0 | 69.3 | 28.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 29.0 | - |
| PHF | 0.417 | 0.667 | 0.000 | 0.750 | 0.727 | 0.900 | 0.000 | 0.896 | 0.907 | 0.500 | 0.000 | 0.903 | 0.913 |
| Lights | 5 | 16 | 0 | 21 | 32 | 853 | 0 | 885 | 365 | 2 | 0 | 367 | 1273 |
| \% Lights | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | 99.5 | - | 99.6 | 98.6 | 100.0 | - | 98.7 | 99.3 |
| Mediums | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 |
| \% Mediums | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | - | 0.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 | - | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% Articulated Trucks | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU_3EP

## Traffic Data Collection

7504 Sawgrass Drive
www.tdccounts.com
Washington, Michigan, United States 48094
Ph. (586) 786-5407
Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw Weekday Site Code: TMC_2 Wednesday
Start Date: 02/25/2015 Page No: 7


Turning Movement Peak Hour Data Plot (5:00 PM)

Project: Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study
Corridor: 13 Mile Road Weather: Snow Showers AM, Clear PM Temp. 10's Video VCU ID: SCU 3EP

Traffic Data Collection<br>7504 Sawgrass Drive<br>www.tdccounts.com<br>Washington, Michigan, United States 48094<br>Ph. (586) 786-5407<br>Reliable Traffic Data

Count Name: 13 Mile \& Church Dw Weekday Site Code: TMC_2 Wednesday Start Date: 02/25/2015 Page No: 8

Comments: 24 hour intersection video turning movement count conducted during typical weekday (Wednesday), while school was in session. Intersection peak hour reports provided for 12:00 AM - 12:00 PM \& 12:00 PM - 12:00 AM. TMC was performed with Miovision video VCU recording cameras for Brightmoor Christian Church Traffic Study for Hubbell, Roth \& Clark, Inc.
Non-signalized "T" intersection, video VCU camera was located at NE quadrant. Classification Summary Details \& Percentages: Three (3) Groupings:
1)Lights Includes: FHWA Classes 1-3 (Motorcycles, Cars, Light Goods Vehicles)
2)Mediums Includes: FHWA Class 4 (School Buses \& Regional Transportation Metro Buses) Single-Unit Trucks: FHWA

Classes 5-7 (2-4 Axle SU Medium Trucks)
3)Articulated Trucks Includes: FHWA Classes 8-12 (Heavy Trucks W/Single \& Multi Unit Trailers)

ATTACHMENT C
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive


## 10:45-11:45 AM <br> SUNDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE ROAD HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C
5: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park


ATTACHMENT C
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive


## 10:45-11:45 AM <br> SUNDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE ROAD HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C
5: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park


ATTACHMENT C
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive


## 10:45-11:45 AM <br> SUNDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE ROAD HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C
5: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park


| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\boldsymbol{4}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ | $\mathbf{~}$ |
| Volume (veh/h) | 128 | 246 | 272 | 224 | 368 | 226 |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  | $0 \%$ |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.57 | 0.57 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 156 | 300 | 349 | 287 | 646 | 396 |

## Pedestrians

Lane Width (ft)
Walking Speed ( $\mathrm{tt} / \mathrm{s}$ )
Percent Blockage
Right turn flare (veh) None None
Median type
Median storage veh)
Upstream signal (ft)

| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VC, conflicting volume | 636 | 961 |

vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol
vC 2 , stage 2 conf vol
vCu, unblocked vol $636 \quad 961 \quad 349$

| tC , single $(\mathrm{s})$ | 4.1 | 6.4 | 6.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage ( s )

| $\mathrm{tF}(\mathrm{s})$ | 2.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

p0 queue free \% $84 \quad 0 \quad 43$
cM capacity (veh/h) $948 \quad 238 \quad 695$

| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume Total | 156 | 300 | 349 | 287 | 646 | 396 |
| Volume Left | 156 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 646 | 0 |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | 287 | 0 | 396 |
| cSH | 948 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 238 | 695 |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.17 | 2.72 | 0.57 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1385 | 91 |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 816.7 | 16.8 |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  |  | F | C |
| Approach Delay (s) | 3.3 |  | 0.0 |  | 512.4 |  |

Approach LOS
F

## Intersection Summary

| Average Delay | 250.9 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $51.8 \%$ | ICU Level of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |

## 1:00-2:00 PM <br> SUNDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C Timing Plan: Sun
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive


## 1:00-2:00 PM <br> SUNDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## ATTACHMENT C

Timing Plan: Sun
5: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park


## 1:00-2:00 PM <br> SUNDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C Timing Plan: Sun
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive



## 1:00-2:00 PM <br> SUNDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C Timing Plan: Sun
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive


## 1:00-2:00 PM <br> SUNDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C Timing Plan: Sun
5: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park

5:00-6:00 PM WEDNESDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE ROAD
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive


5:00-6:00 PM WEDNESDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE ROAD
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive



3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


8:30-9:30 PM WEDNESDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive

8:30-9:30 PM WEDNESDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

8:30-9:30 PM WEDNESDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive

8:30-9:30 PM WEDNESDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

8:30-9:30 PM WEDNESDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C
3: 13 Mile \& Brightmoor Church Drive

8:30-9:30 PM WEDNESDAY PEAK HOUR OF THE GENERATOR
HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

ATTACHMENT C Timing Plan: Wed

5: 13 Mile \& Lenox Park






| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Four-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: |  | Existing-SUN |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by BJL |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close



| How Many Hours Are Met | N/A |
| :---: | :---: |
| Is Warrant 4 B (70\%): Four Hour Met? | N/A |


| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Peak-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Existing-SUN |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by BJL |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | :What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close




| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 6: Coordinated Signal System |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Existing-SUN |  |  |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile |  |  |
| Date | 3/9/2015 |  | BJL |  |
| The Progressive Movement warrant is satisfied when: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. On a one-way street or a street which has predominantly unidirectional traffic, the adjacent signals are so far apart that they do not provide the necessary degree of vehicle platooning, or |  |  |  |  |
| 2. On a two-way street, adjacent signals do not provide the necessary degree of a platooning and the proposed or adjacent signals could constitute a progressive signal system. |  |  |  |  |
| The installation of a signal according to this warrant should not be considered where the resultant signal spacing is less than 1,000 feet. |  |  |  |  |
| Is Warrant 6 Met? |  |  |  | NO |









| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Four-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: |  | Background-SUN |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by $\quad$ BJL |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close



| How Many Hours Are Met | N/A |
| :---: | :---: |
| Is Warrant 4 B (70\%): Four Hour Met? | N/A |


| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 ( $70 \%$ ): Peak-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: |  | Background-SUN |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by ${ }^{\text {BJL }}$ |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | :Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close




| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 6: Coordinated Signal System |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Background-SUN |  |  |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile |  |  |
| Date | 3/9/2015 |  | BJL |  |
| The Progressive Movement warrant is satisfied when: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. On a one-way street or a street which has predominantly unidirectional traffic, the adjacent signals are so far apart that they do not provide the necessary degree of vehicle platooning, or |  |  |  |  |
| 2. On a two-way street, adjacent signals do not provide the necessary degree of a platooning and the proposed or adjacent signals could constitute a progressive signal system. |  |  |  |  |
| The installation of a signal according to this warrant should not be considered where the resultant signal spacing is less than 1,000 feet. |  |  |  |  |
| Is Warrant 6 Met? |  |  |  | NO |









| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Four-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: |  | Future-SUN |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by BJL |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close



| How Many Hours Are Met | N/A |
| :---: | :---: |
| Is Warrant 4 B (70\%): Four Hour Met? | N/A |


| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Peak-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Future-SUN |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close












| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Four-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: |  | Existing-WED |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by BJL |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close



| How Many Hours Are Met | N/A |
| :---: | :---: |
| Is Warrant 4 B (70\%): Four Hour Met? | N/A |


| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Peak-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Existing-WED |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close



| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 5: School Crossing |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: |  | Existing-WED |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |  |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by ${ }^{\text {bJL }}$ |  |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |  |
|  | 0 | : Width of Street |  |
|  | 0 | : Number of Children per Group |  |
|  | 3 | : Safe Gap (Seconds) |  |
|  | 0 | : Number of Gaps in Study Period |  |
|  | 0 | : Study Period (Minutes) |  |
|  | 0 | : Number of School Children |  |
|  |  | Is Warrant 5 Met? | NO |


| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 6: Coordinated Signal System |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Existing-WED |  |  |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile |  |  |
| Date | 3/9/2015 |  | BJL |  |
| The Progressive Movement warrant is satisfied when: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. On a one-way street or a street which has predominantly unidirectional traffic, the adjacent signals are so far apart that they do not provide the necessary degree of vehicle platooning, or |  |  |  |  |
| 2. On a two-way street, adjacent signals do not provide the necessary degree of a platooning and the proposed or adjacent signals could constitute a progressive signal system. |  |  |  |  |
| The installation of a signal according to this warrant should not be considered where the resultant signal spacing is less than 1,000 feet. |  |  |  |  |
| Is Warrant 6 Met? |  |  |  | NO |









| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Four-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: |  | Background-WED |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by BJL |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close



| How Many Hours Are Met | N/A |
| :---: | :---: |
| Is Warrant 4 B (70\%): Four Hour Met? | N/A |



## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close




| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 6: Coordinated Signal System |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Background-WED |  |  |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile |  |  |
| Date | 3/9/2015 |  | BJL |  |
| The Progressive Movement warrant is satisfied when: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. On a one-way street or a street which has predominantly unidirectional traffic, the adjacent signals are so far apart that they do not provide the necessary degree of vehicle platooning, or |  |  |  |  |
| 2. On a two-way street, adjacent signals do not provide the necessary degree of a platooning and the proposed or adjacent signals could constitute a progressive signal system. |  |  |  |  |
| The installation of a signal according to this warrant should not be considered where the resultant signal spacing is less than 1,000 feet. |  |  |  |  |
| Is Warrant 6 Met? |  |  |  | NO |









| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Four-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: |  | Future-WED |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by BJL |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close



| How Many Hours Are Met | N/A |
| :---: | :---: |
| Is Warrant 4 B (70\%): Four Hour Met? | N/A |


| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 4 (70\%): Peak-Hour Pedestrian Volume |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Future-WED |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by |
|  | 0 | : Distance to Nearest Signal or Stop Control on Major Road |
|  | 0\% | : Percentage Reduction in Pedestrian Volumes |
|  | 45 | : Speed limit or 85th Percentile? (MPH) |
|  | NO | : Is the intersection within an Isolated community? |
|  | 0 | : What is the of the population isolated community? |

## Adjacent Traffic Signal or Stop Sign is Too Close




| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 6: Coordinated Signal System |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Future-WED |  |  |  |
| Intersection: |  | 13 Mile |  |  |
| Date | 3/9/2015 |  | BJL |  |
| The Progressive Movement warrant is satisfied when: |  |  |  |  |
| 1. On a one-way street or a street which has predominantly unidirectional traffic, the adjacent signals are so far apart that they do not provide the necessary degree of vehicle platooning, or |  |  |  |  |
| 2. On a two-way street, adjacent signals do not provide the necessary degree of a platooning and the proposed or adjacent signals could constitute a progressive signal system. |  |  |  |  |
| The installation of a signal according to this warrant should not be considered where the resultant signal spacing is less than 1,000 feet. |  |  |  |  |
| Is Warrant 6 Met? |  |  |  | NO |




| Michigan Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Worksheet for Signal Warrants (Section 4C) WARRANT 9: Intersection Near a Grade Crossing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spot Number: | Future-WED |  |  |  |
| Intersection: | 13Mile @ Lenox Park Dr |  |  |  |
| Date | 3/9/2015 | by | BJL |  |
| Adjustment | $\begin{array}{l\|l} \hline 0 & \text { Clear Storage Distance (ft) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | : Number of Approach Lanes Crossing Tracks |  |  |
|  | 0 | : Peak Hour |  |  |
|  | \#N/A | : Peak Hour Major Street Volume |  |  |
|  | \#N/A | : Peak Hour Minor Street Volume |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| fail | 0 | : Trains per Day |  |  |
| 1 | 0\% | : Percentage High Occupancy Busses |  |  |
| 2.7 | 2.6\% to 7.5\% | : Percentage Tractor Trailers |  |  |
|  | \#N/A | : Adjusted Minor Street Volume |  |  |
|  | \#N/A | : Is Figure 4C-10 Satisfied? |  |  |
| Is Warrant 9 Met? |  |  |  | \#N/A |

## Education

B.S., Civil Engineering, Transportation
Wayne State University 2000
M.S., C.E., Transportation

Wayne State University 2002
Professional Registration/
Certification
Professional Engineer, Michigan
No. 51514

Professional Traffic Operations
Engineer
No. 1427
Affiliations
American Society of Civil Engineers
Institute of Transportation Engineers
Tau Beta Pi, The Engineering Honor Society

Women's Transportation Seminar
Intelligent Transportation Society of Michigan

Colleen Hill-Stramsak, P.E., PTOE
Associate

Ms. Hill-Stramsak has been with HRC since 2002. She manages the Traffic Engineering Department and provides municipal traffic engineering services to several communities in Michigan. She prepares transportation studies, impact studies for land developments, traffic crash analysis, traffic operations, safety studies and traffic maintenance plans. She is responsible for modeling and simulating transportation networks to optimize, also evaluating safety and operational improvements. Software proficiency in Highway Capacity Software, Synchro/SimTraffic, CORSIM, ACCUSIM II, MicroStation, Autodesk Map 3D, RODEL and VISSIM. Ms. HillStramsak is also responsible for preparing traffic control and detours plans, traffic signal design and layout plans. She conducted the Older Driver Highway Design Workshop while at Wayne State University. She is a former member of the International Board of Direction and the Great Lakes District President (2012-2014) of the Institute of Transportation Engineers and a member of the Michigan Section.

## Professional Experience

## Providence Park Hospital Parking Study

## St. John Providence

HRC performed a site analysis of existing and future parking requirements at Providence Park Hospital in the City of Novi. As Project Manager, evaluated the existing and projected future conditions based planned 32 bed expansion of the hospital. Aerial photographs were used to evaluate existing parking demand during typical weekday peak hours. Relocation of accessible parking spaces based on need was also included in the study.

## Site Circulation and Traffic Impact Assessment Yeshiva Beth Yehudah Schools

A traffic study was performed for the proposed school expansion of Yeshiva Beth Yehudah at the 10 Mile Road campus in the City of Oak Park. Extensive data collection was conducted to analyze the site access, circulation and parking needs at the existing girls’ school and the preschool center. Recommendations were provided for future traffic operations, site access and student drop off and pick circulation for the proposed schools.

## Traffic Impact Study for MotorCity Casino

## Detroit Entertainment, LLC

Traffic impact study for site plan approval of the original Casino, with a gaming floor area of $68,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. The study responded to all of the transportation requirements set forth in the Development Agreement between the City of Detroit and the casino developers. This included access for pedestrians and transit vehicles. Approximately six months after the MotorCity Casino was opened, HRC conducted a traffic operation study to identify any operational and/or safety problems and to develop countermeasures to reduce the risk of crashes and conflicts.

## Westmarket Square

## City of Novi

HRC performed a shared parking study for Westmarket Square for the peak design month of December and used the time of day factors for a peak day in December for the retail stores. HRC utilized the Urban Land Institute's Shared Parking, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Edition to determine if the number of parking spaces provided met the requirements of the City of Novi Zoning Ordinance. The parking lot provided in excess of 1,570 spaces initially and was expanded during the various project phases while maintaining parking and access to the operational portion of the center.

## Traffic Impact Study for Rezoning of Northwest Corner of 10 Mile Road and Beck Road <br> Ten \& Beck, LLC <br> A traffic impact study was performed for the rezoning of 10 Mile Road and Beck Road in the City of Novi. The study included estimation of background traffic, trip generation, trip distribution and assignment, capacity analysis, recommendations to mitigate impacts of additional traffic and a report summarizing results.

## Dixie Highway Safety Study

## Charter Township of Springfield

The study area included the Dixie Highway corridor from Big Lake Road north to Davisburg Road. The study included crash analysis, review and evaluation of safety countermeasures, access management techniques, signal warrant study, left-turn phasing study and possible realignment of Big Lake Road/Dixie Highway intersection with Deerhill Drive/Dixie Highway intersection. A comprehensive report was prepared and the results presented to the Township Board of Trustees.

## Traffic Impact Study for Mixed Use Development <br> Real Estate interests Group, Inc.

Preparation of traffic impact study for the mixed use development in Northville Township including all field data collection and two traffic signal warrant studies.

## Shoppes of Fenton

## Detroit Development

Corrected, revised and optimized traffic model of existing and future traffic for a planned unit development including five adjacent signals in the city of Fenton.

## Traffic Impact and Parking Analysis for Heritage Park North

## Grand Sakwa of Grand Blanc, LLC

Traffic Engineer for traffic impact analysis of 600,000 SF mixed commercial development in Grand Blanc Township to accompany rezoning request and subsequent site plan review. Study included data collection, trip generation and comparisons, trip assignment, capacity analysis of existing and future traffic conditions, parking analysis, signal optimization and recommendations. Conducted signal warrant analysis and access management review. Retained to develop alternatives for access issues, design the new traffic signal on Saginaw Road and modify traffic signal on Dort Highway.

## Transportation and Infrastructure Assessment and Master Plan Vandewalle \& Associates

Traffic Engineer for Project Development Study to provide transportation and utilities planning and analysis for 640 acre planned unit development for the Lansing Township Downtown Development Authority Master Plan. Work involved conducting traffic volume studies, performing trip generation and traffic assignment; determining internal capture rate, developing traffic model using Synchro 6.0 and SimTraffic for existing and eight alternative scenarios.

## Traffic Impact Analysis for White Lake Hill Mixed Use Development Laurtec, Ltd. <br> Traffic Engineer for traffic impact analysis of mixed commercial

Colleen Hill-Stramsak, P.E., PTOE
Associate
development in White Lake Township to accompany rezoning request and site plan review. Study included data collection, trip generation and comparisons, trip assignment, capacity analysis of existing and future traffic conditions, signal optimization and recommendations.

## Community Policy on Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossings City of Wyoming

Researched and recommended practices and developed policy for approving and format for evaluating requests for mid-block crossings.

## Traffic Impact Analysis for the Proposed National Street Extension City of Howell

Traffic Operations Study which involves developing traffic model of proposed extension of National Street from Grand River Avenue to D-19 at ramps to I-96 as a by-pass to downtown Howell. Developed methodology for calculating traffic to be diverted to National Street Extension and performed capacity analysis using Synchro for existing, background and 2015 traffic conditions. Evaluated alternatives to signalization and performed analysis of two recommended roundabouts using RODEL.

## Road Safety Audit for the Proposed Brandon Elementary School

## Charter Township of Brandon

Project Engineer for the road safety audit of a driveway onto Oakwood Road from the proposed Brandon Elementary School. Performed a sight distance evaluation and a detailed crash analysis for the road segment to be accessed by the proposed driveway. The road safety audit included: 24 hour traffic volumes and speeds; sight distance evaluation; a detailed crash analysis; projected traffic volumes and patterns for the proposed elementary school and recommended road improvements for safe access to and from the site.

## Traffic Circulation Analysis for Ann Arbor Huron High School City of Ann Arbor

Circulation and Safety Study to improve overall safety in and around school campus for drivers, bus users and pedestrians. Analyzed existing traffic conditions, identified deficiencies and suggested countermeasures. Conducted license plate survey to track traffic on the school premise. Performed capacity analysis using HCS and detailed crash analysis at two intersections and two driveways.

## State Farm Intersection Safety Studies <br> Road Commission for Oakland County

Reviewed geometrics, traffic volume, traffic crash and traffic conflict characteristics for three high crash intersections. Evaluated existing safety issues, recommended potential traffic safety engineering countermeasures, and developed an implementation plan of action.

## M-15 Access Management Plan <br> Michigan Department of Transportation

Performed driveway spacing analysis using MDOT, Oakland and Genesee County Standards. Responsible for performing traffic crash analysis for driveways and intersections along the $\mathrm{M}-15$ corridor over its 20 mile length between I-75 and I-69.

## Colleen Hill-Stramsak, P.E., PTOE

Associate

## Presentations/Publications

"Road Safety Audits," ACEC/MDOT (American Council of Engineering Companies of Michigan/Michigan Department of Transportation) Partnering Workshop January 2014 (with Jeffrey Bagdade, P.E., PTOE, and Steven Loveland, P.E., PTOE).
"Intersection Safety within a Signal Optimization Project," Institute of Transportation Engineers 2004 Technical Conference and Exhibit Compendium of Technical Papers, March 2004 (with Stephen B. Dearing, P.E.).
"Intersection Safety within a Signal Optimization Project," Presented Institute of Transportation Engineers 2004 Technical Conference and Exhibit, March 31, 2004.
"Intersection Safety within a Signal Optimization Project," Presented Institute of Transportation Engineers Michigan Section Technical Session, February 12, 2004.
"Michigan ITE Website Update," Presented Institute of Transportation Engineers Michigan Section Technical Session, February 12, 2004.
"Change and Clearance Interval Design on Red-Light Running and Late Exits," Transportation Research Record, No. 1856 (p. 193-201), Washington D.C., 2003 (with Kerrie L. Schattler and Tapan K. Datta).

## Letter of Support from <br> Lennox Park of Novi Condominium Association


of Novi
Condominium Association

March 18, 2015
City of Novi Planning Commission
45175 Ten Mile Road
Novi, Michigan 48375
To Whom It May Concern,
On behalf of the Board of Directors of Lenox Park Association, I would like to take this opportunity to express to you our complete support for the proposed building project that Brightmoor Christian Church has submitted to the City of Novi Planning Commission.

Our residents have received the Notice of the Public Hearing and the board of directors supports the approval of the project, including the additional building height that has been requested.

As a neighboring community of Brightmoor Christian Church, we appreciate all the past efforts they have made in making us aware of any future expansion plans that the church was planning. As an example, we were included in many meetings regarding the expansion of their parking lot and suggestions we made were taken into consideration.

Lenox Park has experienced a very positive relationship with Brightmoor Christian Church, working closely together in the spirit of cooperation and mutual benefit. We look forward to this continuing into the future.

Respectfully,


Lenox Park Association Board of Directors


[^0]:    HUBBELL, ROTH \& CLARK, INC.
    OFFICE: 555 Hulet Drive Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302-0360

    MAILING: PO Box 824
    Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-0824
    PHONE: 248.454.6300 FAX: 248.454.6312
    WEBSITE: www.hrc-engr.com
    EMAIL: info@hrc-engr.com
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