CITY OF ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

Engineering / Traffic Calming Program
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107-8647
Phone 734-794-6429 Fax 734-994-1744
Web: www.a2gov.org/TCCarmelET

July 7, 2025

RE: Carmel Street between Easy Street and Towner Boulevard: Results of Final Polling

Dear Resident or Property Owner,

Thank you for your interest in Traffic Calming on Carmel Street between Easy Street and Towner Boulevard. Following an initial questionnaire, orientation meeting, and follow-up meeting, a final poll was conducted to determine support for traffic calming within the project area.

The program guidelines specify that “greater than 50% of returned final polls must indicate support (‘yes’) for the final plan”. This letter is to inform you that the results have been officially tallied and **the project has not received sufficient support to move forward**. The breakdown of the final poll results are as follows:

32	Addresses in project area
12	Final poll responses received
5	Final polls supporting the final plan
42%	of Final polls received support for the final plan as shown.

Additional project information is available at www.a2gov.org/TCCarmelET.

The Traffic Calming Project Team has enjoyed working with the Carmel Street neighborhood and appreciate your involvement throughout the process. If you have any questions, please contact Andrea Wright by email at TrafficCalming@a2gov.org.

Sincerely,

Andrea M Wright

Andrea Wright, Traffic Calming Program Manager
City of Ann Arbor – Engineering

C: Cynthia Redinger, Chris Wall, Kristy Thullen, Christina Jaenisch

Carmel Street (Easy Street – Towner Boulevard) Traffic Calming
Final Poll Response Summary

Project area addresses: 32
Questionnaire responses received: 12

This summary is a direct transcription of the Final Poll results and comments. Disqualifying votes due to missing or incorrect ID Number are tallied as 'Not indicated'.

Do you support the proposed plan, as presented in the 'Final Plan'?	
YES, I support the entire proposed plan, as presented in the 'Final Plan'	5
NO, I do not support the 'Final Plan'	7
Not indicated	0

Comments received:
The Carmel-Easy St roundabout with a tree planted in the middle and the random concrete "island" in middle of Easy St-Packard are only two examples of non-sensical "improvements" the city has made in the past several years. This new "traffic calming" initiative is just the latest dumb idea. Enough already.
This is my opinion only and based on the best of my recollection on some things. The original petition is not available for us to see to be sure the 18 signatures were from unique households. No one contacted me to sign a petition (I wouldn't have as I don't support the project). Traffic Study - If I recall correctly, the traffic study does not include time of day when speeding was most prevalent. When the traffic study was done for Easy Street traffic calming, time of day was included telling us most of the speeding was done just prior to the school day and right after school let out. For Carmel, we are not given the time of day when the speeding is happening, nor whether speeding is actually being done by folks who live on Carmel. Were delivery vans speeding? Was it coinciding with folks cutting through the neighborhood to avoid traffic issues on Platt? The traffic study did show an average speed below the posted 25 MPH, but the recorded higher speeds really dinged on the results. Exactly how many cars were speeding during the traffic study collection period? That information seems to not be shared I think device 2 (the half moon deterrent at the Carmel bend) could cause more issues than actually slowing down drivers. I drive on Carmel 8 plus times a week (travel out and travel in) and my speed is purposefully within the limits, especially if I see pedestrians with kids or dogs. But that's just me and I have no control over others. I'm most concerned with the impact of device 2. I realize my non-support of this project will unlikely change the outcome. I'm mostly responding to the polling so I can complain later. I think Carmel is too short for traffic calming and City resources (IE my property tax dollars) can be better spent.
Thanks for this well-needed improvement to safety in our neighborhood!
I still don't understand why this process has taken all this time. Why do we have to wait until 2026? Reviewing other streets impending traffic calming construction, their time lines are less than Carmel. Friday, the 30th of May, from 4-6pm, I personally counted 45 cars cutting through Carmel from Easy Street to Towner, with not ONE paying attention to the standard speed of 25 mph.
I support the calming bumps but not the device in the circle on Carmel. After seeing what was painting by the city and what materials would be used, I do not support that project.

The island proposed in the curvy part of Carmel is too large. That space is used for parking by several houses in the curve. The longer trucks/garbage trucks/city trucks use that circle to back up and turn around. The likelihood of accidents of vehicles running into the island and rebounding into un-curbed yards is high. It seems pretty unnecessary to me.
What would be the estimated timeframe for installing the recommendations if approved?
This traffic island is at the end of my driveway and impedes our exiting and entering greatly, Car's will be to close to the yard and people walking and Biking will be in dangerous situations. SPEED BUMPS as the city has on Iroquois between Stadium and Packard would be the best option. I drive a Toyota Prius and when I back out of the driveway I go into the Painted area now , very small car . In the winter How are they going to Plow the road?. Better Option s. Very BAD Design.
I support the installation of the speed bumps on Carmel. I do not support the vision for the cul-de-sac. I am confused about the outcome of that part of the project. Neighbors have said some type of bollard may surround the painted spot on the street. I"ve already noticed cars passing through struggling to navigate the markings on the road surface. Can we please come up with a more efficient idea in that area?
I strongly support speed hump 1, 3, and 4 but do not support device 2 modified cul-de-sac.