

MINUTES

ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 p.m. – January 22, 2009

Time: Chair Bona called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Place: Council Chamber, Second Floor, 100 North Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Potts, Pratt, Westphal, Woods

Members Absent: None

Members Arriving: None

Staff Present: Bartha, Cheng, Kowalski, Pulcipher

INTRODUCTIONS

None.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

a. Minutes of January 6, 2009.

Moved by Borum, seconded by Potts, to approve the minutes as presented.

A vote on the minutes as amended showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Potts, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Derezinski, seconded by Carlberg, to approve the agenda as presented.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezenski, Mahler, Potts, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

REPORTS FROM CITY ADMINISTRATION, CITY COUNCIL,
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, PLANNING COMMISSION
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

Pulcifer said that the City was nearing completion of a new phone system. She shared two critical phone numbers: first, the City's main line, 734-794-6000; and second, the Planning and Development Services (PDS) main line, 734-794-6265. She said that from these numbers, callers could either access the staff directory using staff last names, or enter the staff person's extension, if known. She also said that the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) or the Historic District Commission (HDC) could be reached using the PDS main line.

Derezenski said that he was in Washington, D.C., during the last Council meeting, and would have a Council report at the next Planning Commission (CPC) meeting.

Pulcifer said that the CPC retreat/working session on Tuesday, January 13, 2009 was very successful. She thanked the Commissioners for their energy and enthusiasm. She believed the retreat set a great tone for the year, and that the ideas generated would be very helpful to staff. She also informed the CPC and the listening audience that on February 17, 2009, many of the Planning and Development Services (PDS) staff would relocate to 2000 South Industrial Highway for 24 months, due to construction at City Hall that would make reaching the 6th floor difficult. She said that Building Trade Permits and Services, Right of Way and Sidewalk Occupancy Permits, Rental Housing Services, Parking Referee Services, and Construction Plan Review would move to the temporary site. She said that Planning staff would remain on the 6th floor of City Hall, and that more information would be available on the City website.

Pratt shared the traffic threshold handout with Commissioners that he mentioned at the January 6, 2009 meeting. He explained that the document illustrated which zoning uses generated more or less traffic. He also said that the A2D2 Steering Committee would be meeting on March 5 or 6, 2009 to look at the CPC recommendations to Council. Last, he said that the Huron River Impoundment Master Plan Committee would be holding a series of public meetings, to gather citizen input on issues pertaining to the use of the river, such as the possibility of removing the Argo Dam. He said the meetings would be held on January 28 and 31, and February 5.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Green Briar, talked about the possibility of AATA fare increases. He said that the University of Michigan (UM) was an employment generator, but that many UM employees used public transportation, which is partially funded by city and county residents. He questioned whether public transportation should be used as a subsidized shuttle service by UM staff.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

Bona announced that there were no public hearings scheduled for the February 3, 2009 Planning Commission meeting.

REGULAR BUSINESS

(a) Public Hearing and Action on Walgreens Site Plan, 1.71 acres, 2355 Jackson Avenue. A proposal to construct a 13,650-square foot pharmacy building with a drive-through and 45 parking spaces (postponed at 1/6/09 meeting) – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Kowalski explained the proposal and showed photographs of the properties.

David Prueter, 31850 Northwestern Highway, Farmington Hills, introduced himself as the petitioner representing the owner, Marc Levy, and thanked Mr. Kowalski for his help revising the site plan. He said he was pleased with the current site plan, and believed that the changes made were consistent with Planning Commission guidance from the last meeting. He hoped the revisions reflected the intent and comments from the January 6 meeting.

John Lagos, 2550 West Stadium Boulevard, said that any decision made regarding the alley vacation should consider long-term impacts. He said the Planning Commission had provided extended commentary on traffic patterns, parking, easements, etc. He also said that he represented three small business owners, and that all three were concerned about the loss of the alley. He said the developer had ignored their concerns, and that communication from the developer usually arrived after decisions were made. He questioned whether the developer was really concerned about the adjacent business owners' feedback. He said any site plan approval should be contingent on clearly outlining what ingress/egress access means for adjacent business owners. He suggested that the curved access loop be straightened out to Abbott Avenue, creating a 60 to 70-foot loading zone to be used by Arbor West tenants. He also asked that site plan approval include permission for Arbor West tenants to use up to six Walgreens' parking spaces. He questioned the petitioner's claim at the January 6 meeting that Arbor West tenants had been parking illegally in the alley behind the former Schlotzky's Deli, stating that tenants had taken care of the alley and kept it clean for 25 years. He finished by saying that these changes would reduce both opposition to the project as well as the likelihood of future litigation.

Marc Levy, 1419 Coler Road, said he would like to see evidence that Mr. Lagos and others had taken care of the property for 25 years.

Mike Forgacs, 112 North Seventh Street, representing the Jackson-Huron Neighborhood Association, said he opposed the Walgreens site plan for four reasons. First, he described the Walgreens site plan as dangerous for pedestrians and motorists. Second, he said the site plan violated many of the West Area Master Plan tenets. Third, he said the site plan failed to meet the Planning Commission's mission of "achieving the best possible development, redevelopment, improvements and preservation for the benefit of the people who live in, work in, and visit the City." Fourth, he said site plan approval was more than just satisfying a checklist of requirements. He said the Planning Commission should determine whether or not the proposed project is

beneficial, and that their judgment was essential. Mr. Forgacs submitted a packet outlining these objections to the Commissioners.

Noting no further speakers, Bona declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Westphal, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Walgreens Site Plan, subject to combination of parcels prior to issuance of permits.

Carlberg asked staff if the Huron-Jackson Neighborhood Association was within the radius limit for project notification.

Kowalski said yes.

Carlberg asked if the developer had neglected to inform the neighborhoods of the project.

Pulcifer said that there was no Citizen Participation Ordinance (CPO) public meeting requirement for this project, given that it was neither a Planned Project (PP), nor a Planned Unit Development District (PUD), nor did it have other characteristics that would trigger public meeting requirements.

Carlberg asked whether the neighborhood was notified at the beginning of the process.

Pulcifer said yes, that all property owners within 300 feet were mandatorily notified.

Carlberg said that it was problematic to first hear of opposition to the project at the meeting. She said she would like to give full consideration to all concerns, but cannot when the opposition is first shared the night a decision is to be made. She said that Mr. Forgacs and Mr. Lagos, by presenting their oral and written opposition at the meeting, deprived the Planning Commission and staff of the opportunity to react. She said this was not fair to the process, and that the public has a responsibility to share concerns early in the process. She said that the developer had complied with many of the directions given to him at the prior meeting. Most important, she noted that the building had been moved forward toward Jackson Avenue, leaving a single row of parking instead of two. She asked Kowalski whether the half-circle sidewalk on Abbott was necessary, or simply decorative.

Kowalski said he was not involved with the design of the sidewalk and that the petitioner could speak directly to that question, but that he believed it was designed to be a more direct route to the building. He believed the sidewalk was arced to reduce the probability of pedestrians cutting across the lawn.

Carlberg asked whether delivery trucks of all sizes could access the site and negotiate the curves from Maple Road.

Kowalski noted that it would be tricky for the largest trucks, but if the project proceeded to Council, then Engineering would take part in a full staff review and that this issue would be looked at in greater detail.

Carlberg said she was intrigued by Mr. Lagos's comments about shifting the south parking away from Abbott Avenue and toward the building, which would allow for a less severely curved alley into Walgreens's parking lot. She realized that staff did not have a lot of time to review this issue, but she said it was a concern for her. She did not think that Walgreens had any responsibility to provide parking to other properties. She said she was satisfied with the new location of the building.

Mahler asked whether the new ground-level lighting along the sidewalk near Abbott Avenue was decorative or for increased safety. He asked whether this lighting would illuminate enough of the periphery to allow

pedestrians to see clearly what was around them after dark. He said that decorative lighting was good, but that safety was his concern.

Prueter said the half-moon sidewalk was designed to serve the needs of pedestrians walking east or west, and that the lighting along the sidewalk was designed both to be aesthetically pleasing and to provide a safe, well illuminated path to the building. He said the photometric drawings accompanying the final site plan would show the lighting more fully. He said he would provide whatever lighting was necessary to ensure a safe and attractive walkway.

Mahler agreed with Commissioner Carlberg that the Commission's concerns from January 6 had been addressed, and that if the lighting were sufficient, he would be able to support the project.

Prueter addressed Commissioner Carlberg's question about neighborhood notification. He said this project was initiated prior to the adoption of CPO requirements, but that notice had been sent to property owners within a 500-foot radius, rather than the mandatory 300-foot radius. In addition, he said a letter from him accompanied the notices encouraging property owners to contact him directly with concerns.

Derezinski asked whether the petitioner received any comments from the neighborhood associations.

Prueter said he had not.

Derezinski said he could not help but notice discrepancies between the photographs provided to the Commission from Mr. Forgacs and Mr. Lagos. He thought the petitioner did a fine job of turning around quickly with new site plans and addressing the Commission's concerns. He said the new specifications showed a great improvement, and that moving the building closer to Jackson was a substantial change. He commended the petitioner. He said that insofar as buildings like this can be made safe and attractive, the petitioner had succeeded.

Pratt asked the neighborhood association representative to provide staff with contact information to ensure that such information is up to date. He believed that the issues he was most concerned about were addressed in concept and that any details would be worked out during full staff review.

Potts expressed concern about whether a walkway from the building to Abbott Avenue would be of much use. She believed that pedestrians would most likely come from Jackson Avenue, and that traversing the site in bad weather would be difficult. With regard to the earlier comments on the West Area Plan, she believed this area would be a good candidate for review in the near future. She said there were opportunities for redesign with regard to shopping and houses. She also said she did not believe that the neighborhoods included in the West Area Plan extended as far as this site, but that projects like Walgreens were incompatible with residential neighborhoods. She believed this project was an improvement to what was currently on the site, but that the design of the curved driveway concerned her. It looked like it had been designed to discourage use, she said, adding that she would like to hear other comments on this.

Bona believed that the parking in back of the building was for employees. She said the Commission's request to have the project back in front of them after only two weeks was the reason a full staff review of the curved driveway had not taken place. She said the first site plan had a full review, but that the two-week postponement did not leave staff time for a second full review.

Kowalski said the driveway in the original site plan did not have the curve, but that the current driveway met the width and radius requirements of a two-way driveway, and that passenger vehicles would be fine. He said he had not had the chance to ask Engineering if the radius of the driveway met requirements for delivery trucks. He said the petitioner was aware that full plans would have to be submitted and fully reviewed before Council could act, and that the basic plan would not move forward without being fully developed.

Potts expressed concerned that the site plan would progress in a way the Commission did not like.

Preuter said there was a full review of the first site plan, and that the driveway in question had been expanded from 16 to 18 feet from the first site plan to the second. He also said the driveway was expanded to 25 feet at the point it opened onto Walgreens. He said the narrower driveway had been approved in the first review, and he believed the now wider driveway would also be approved. He would be shocked if a wider driveway somehow diminished maneuverability.

Bona asked staff what type of vehicular access would be reviewed for the driveway.

Kowalski said Engineering would look at radius, width from curb to curb, and width from edge of pavement to edge of pavement. He stated that Engineering would likely use the truck turn-template for Walgreens, but not for offsite turns, such as the alley.

Bona asked whether the Commission was looking for passenger vehicle or truck access in the alley.

Woods said she assumed it would be used by passenger vehicles, and that trucks would not use the alley. She believed trucks would come from Jackson Avenue, where the delivery bay and wider drive were.

Carlberg stated that initial discussion about this driveway had to do with access for all businesses and, because the pictures in the packets they received tonight showed large trucks in the alley, she assumed that trucks would use the alley to access Maple Road. She said access was important for future development as well as for traffic moving on and off of the Walgreens site.

Potts recalled the same discussion and said she believed trucks needed access to the alley.

Borum reminded the Commission that an ingress/egress amendment to the motion had been approved at the last meeting, and asked why the amendment was not included in the current motion.

Bona suggested that the January 6, 2009 ingress/egress motion be moved again.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Potts, to amend the main motion by adding the following language, “and subject to recording at a minimum an easement for ingress and egress across the parcel for adjacent property owners.”

Potts said that the amendment did not specify types of vehicles, just ingress/egress for adjacent property owners.

Carlberg said she assumed that if adjacent property owners had truck deliveries, then those trucks would need ingress/egress through the alley.

Derezinski believed the language of the new amendment needed to be consistent with the prior amendment.

Bona said the Commission could entertain a second motion, in addition to the first.

A vote on the amendment showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Potts, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

Bona returned to the original motion and said that with regard to the alley issue, she would ask the petitioner to consider straightening the alley into the Walgreens lot, as proposed by Mr. Lagos.

Preuter said he would look at that, but that it would not be an equal driveway slot. He said he would need to increase the depth of the parking spaces along the drive-thru. Such a move would diminish the 51 feet of landscaping by two or three feet.

Bona said that was fine, so long as the 40-foot setback was met.

Preuter said their original plan, which he preferred, was to run the alley straight to Abbott Avenue, which would result in a second curb cut on Abbott Avenue. With regard to the alley situation, he said he was trying to design a site for other people to access the site with their trucks. He said the alley was as wide as possible when it entered the Walgreens site, and that the alley off the Walgreens site had parking lines drawn in it. He said the alley was only 16-feet wide when it left the Walgreens site, and that he believed the most appropriate solution was a second curb cut along the back of Mr. Lagos's shops.

Bona said that considering the lack of traffic on Abbott Avenue, she would not be opposed to second curb cut.

Pratt agreed with the petitioner's point, and said that although he normally opposed more curb cuts, he supported this idea.

Kowalski mentioned that the original plan had a second curb cut on Abbott Avenue, but that the site lacked the required frontage for three curb cuts. For this, he said, the petitioner would need a Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) variance.

Bona said the Commission could not control variances, so they would not require one. She said one solution would be to parcel off a piece of the site and to have the driveway go straight through the other parcel. She said that either a new curb cut or straightening the driveway would be satisfactory. She also said that a parking island on each end of the area in question would shorten the length of sidewalk across the driveway, reducing total sidewalk. She finished by saying that the other changes to the site were all very good improvements.

Potts said that a straight shot down to Abbott Avenue would be very good solution for the driveway. She said trucks want quick exits and this would solve that. It seemed like the obvious answer, she said.

Westphal voiced support for either of those solutions. He said that a north-south alley, as a service driveway for future development, could be a positive move. He was not concerned about an additional curb-cut on Abbott Avenue and said he appreciated the changes.

Woods said she appreciated the movement of the building. She also said she had no initial concern about the curb cut, but that it may be a concern to neighbors. She said that the neighbors who were concerned about the driveway would probably attend the public hearing at the City Council meeting, and she encouraged the petitioner to reach out to the neighbors proactively to get their support, prior to going to Council. She said that the more feedback the petitioner could get before going to Council, the better it would be for everyone. She believed that this project enhanced the site and prevented further blight

Borum voiced support for the north-south curb cut for future development. He said this would minimize the truck traffic moving through the Walgreens site.

Bona summarized the Commission's comments for staff and the petitioner. First, she said that the ingress/egress amendment needed to be addressed, to ensure that adjacent property owners had access to

the alley, whether through a new turning radius, a straightening of the alley, or a new curb cut on Abbott Avenue. Second, she said that there needed to be verification of adequate lighting on the sidewalk near Abbott Avenue.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezhinski, Mahler, Potts, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously, and reads as follows:

That the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Walgreens Site Plan, subject to combination of parcels prior to issuance of permits, and subject to recording at a minimum an easement for ingress and egress across the parcel for adjacent property owners.

(b) Public Hearing and Action on 930 Church Street Planned Project Site Plan, 0.20 acre. A proposal to construct a 7,828-square foot, three-story, four-unit (21 bedrooms total) residential townhouse apartment building – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng explained the proposal and showed photographs of the properties, noting that all corrugated metal had been removed from the façade after a public meeting was held in December, during which time neighbors expressed concern over the material.

Borum said that the petitioner was a former client, but that they had no current work or contracts. He offered to recuse himself from the discussion.

Potts said she did not feel Commissioner Borum needed to recuse himself.

Bona and other Commissioners agreed.

Al Weisz, 93 Hudson Street, Somerville, Massachusetts, introduced himself as the architect and said he believed the proposed building was smart looking, and an efficient use of space. He said the 21 bedrooms were an efficient use of a corner lot, and that the proposed site plan called for the removal of an energy inefficient building and replacing it with an efficient building. He said that 14 covered bike spaces would be installed, as well as a green roof. He said the green roof would keep the building cooler in the summer, provide a microclimate for birds and insects, and keep water out of the storm sewer system. He said that each unit would have a distinct outdoor space, and that the building would feel more like a townhouse than a colossal student housing building. He noted that zoning code required six parking spaces, and that they provided six with the option for two more, if students required them. He said that 300 square feet of outdoor space was required for each unit, but that they opted to provide 950 square feet instead, complete with lawn and decks. He also said the project provided an excessive buffer from the street, and that the project was in scale with the neighborhood. He said that the landmark tree on site would hopefully be preserved, and that more trees would be planted on site. He finished by saying that the project proposed a livable, inhabitable house.

Panos Tharrouniatis, 514 N. Seventh Street, introduced himself as the developer said that no neighbors were in attendance at the Commission meeting, but that several had raised issues regarding the façade at the December public meeting. He said that he wanted to share their concerns, which had been resolved, with the Commission. He said that in the parking area in the alley, pavers had been installed to help reduce runoff. He noted that four parking spaces were in the alley, and that two more were located just around the corner, on

Oakland Avenue. He noted that tenants would get two spots, one behind the other, and that two additional spaces were possible in the ramp on Oakland Avenue.

Noting no further speakers, Bona declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Mahler, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 930 Church Street Planned Project Site Plan, subject to a minimum use of open space of 60 percent, payment of street tree escrow of \$81.60 prior to issuance of permits, and mitigation of sanitary sewer flow equivalent to the disconnection of one footing drain before issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.

Carlberg asked whether the window wells in the basement were egress windows, how someone would get out, and what prevented people from falling in. She said it looked like there was landscaping near the windows.

Weisz said that the window wells were for egress, and that ladders were to be installed in the wells. He also said a guard rail with gate would be installed around the window wells. He said they would augment the landscaping to allow egress.

Carlberg said there would need to be a three-foot guard rail around the well.

Bona noted that the window wells and egress were building code issues, and that the landscaping was a Commission issue.

Carlberg asked about the proposed façade material and about the material that the neighbors had opposed.

Weisz said the proposed siding on both floors was clapboard siding, in 2-inch and 6-inch board-width. He said galvanized steel had been proposed originally, but was changed after the December public meeting.

Carlberg said that the site was a great use of space, that the proposed density was very energy efficient, and that the site, like other properties in the vicinity, was clearly targeted to students. She said she found the building and outdoor space configuration to be very nice. She noted that keeping the onsite bushes and shrubs free of student debris, such as red plastic cups, would be a challenge for maintenance, but that the site would be attractive initially. She said that tandem parking was not a problem, and that having 8 spaces instead of 6 was great. She said the proposed project was a great design for a corner property.

Derezinski asked whether the awnings on the different levels were decorative or functional.

Weisz said that they were both. In summer, he said the climbing vines on the trellis would provide shade to the windows. When the leaves fell in autumn, he said that more sunlight would enter the units, providing some natural heat.

Derezinski asked whether there was access to the second and third floors.

Weisz said that each unit had two doors. He said the secondary doors for each unit were in the alley, and that the primary doors faced streets.

Potts asked if the site plan showed contour lines. She recalled there being an elevation change on the site, meaning that much of the green space would be on a slope. She believed the green space would be attractive, but unusable, and that much of the green space would be taken up by balconies.

Weisz said a one to two-foot exposed retaining wall would be installed to create a break between the slope, near the street, and the flatter lawn, by the house.

Woods asked the petitioner to talk about the green roof.

Weisz said the roof would be installed by a company from western Michigan. He said the design consisted of row after row of trays, each filled with soil and drains. He said the plants would be indigenous to Michigan, and of a hardy variety. He also said that a roof hatch would allow maintenance to access and water the trays, but that tenants would be prohibited from accessing the roof.

Woods asked whether there would be lighting on the site, other than street lights.

Weisz said that there would be some lighting on the building and along the pathways.

Woods asked whether leases would be per bedroom or per unit, and whether the bedrooms would be limited to one occupant.

Tharrouniatis said the building would be rented per unit, with one person per bedroom, in other words, there would be 21 people in 21 bedrooms.

Derezinski asked Mr. Tharrouniatis to talk about his other projects in the area.

Tharrouniatis said that 909 Packard Street was his latest. On that site, he said that all water had been retained, although not required, and that a wooden front porch blended the lawn and the building. He said he felt it was the right thing to do, and that give and take was the way to build a city. With regard to the project in front of the Commission, he said that the lawn on the front of the site would provide excellent space for sunbathing, and that outdoor outlets would be installed for students to plug in their laptops while enjoying the outdoor space.

Westphal said he was curious about the relationship between the decks and the green strips of open space near the roads with regard to circulation.

Weisz said that the decks and open space in front of each unit were intended for the use of tenants in those units. He noted that the site had common stairs from Oakland Avenue and Church Street, and that all of the units connected to a walkway behind the building.

Westphal asked for a definition of active open space, and believed that the open space on the south facing portion of the site would be useful. He said he was much more comfortable with this project than one like the City Place petition. He noted that the Central Area Plan talked about maintaining the scale of neighborhoods, which often puts the Commission in the position of determining what the scale within a neighborhood is. He commended the petitioner by saying that the proposed project was an efficient use of allowable density. He praised the project's reduction of impervious surface, which would reduce the pull on infrastructure, and said that the project was beneficial, overall.

Pratt said that the site plan met Planned Project standards, noting that what was being asked of and offered by the petitioner, in exchange for something minor, was sufficient. He said that the requested setback was only three feet and on a corner, so the effect would be muted. He believed the City was getting a positive, energy efficient development, and was pleased that the façade issue had been resolved. He commended the petitioner for provided a succinct summary of the December public meeting, and told staff that the summary might serve as a good template for future petitioners. He finished by praising the petitioner for airing the neighbors' concerns, even though they had not appeared at the meeting.

Potts questioned the timing of the December 19th public meeting, saying she was surprised that even 5 people showed up. She was disturbed by the reduced setback, and believed that because it was a corner parcel, it would stand out. She believed the current building was good in scale and architecture. She noted that the requested reduction to the setback was small, but that it would be noticeable. She believed that the City paid a high price for density, with too little parking for that many people. She said the Ordinance Revisions Committee had talked for some time about revising the parking requirements. She said she was unhappy about using older standards for Planned Projects, and that she believed the City was pushing it with this much density in this area. She said the Central Area Plan talked about scale and character in existing neighborhoods, and that while strict imitation was unnecessary, she said that projects should not be sticking out farther on two streets. She said the building would be more conspicuous, and that it should be set back farther from road. She said the project did not meet her standards for a Planned Project.

Borum believed that this project met Planned Project standards, and that it served as a model for when Planned Projects worked well. He said that what the City gained far outweighed the 3-foot setback exception. He said this project increased energy efficiency, increased density, and was a better use of space.

He said that relative to other projects, this proposal operated in a sensible way and met all of the Commission's goals. Regarding neighborhood scale, he noted that across the street on Church Street were apartment buildings. He finished by saying that the return on the loss of the current building would be a great gain for the City.

Bona answered Commissioner Westphal's question about the definition of active open space, stating that the minimum area in order to be considered active open space was 6 feet by 10 feet. She concurred with Commissioner Borum that the east elevation of the project was a good example of meeting scale. She believed that because this project was on a single lot, as opposed to an assemblage of lots, it was in keeping with scale. She said the only comment she heard from the Commission was to make sure that landscaping was clear of the egress windows.

Pratt said the petitioner would need to include the building materials on the final site plan elevation drawings.

Potts said that the south elevation along Oakland Avenue had lots of windows, and that she would like to see more windows along the back of the building. She said she did not see as many on the north-side or the ends of the building, and that more windows would improve the appearance from the street. She also said that the current site layout changed the orientation of the building from Church Street to Oakland Avenue.

Bona said that the scale and character of the proposed project fit with the neighborhood, and encouraged the petitioner to listen to the Commission's aesthetic comments, but to do with them as they pleased.

Woods asked whether the small windows on the back of the building were bathroom windows, in which case they should be small.

Weisz confirmed that they were windows for bathrooms, laundry and stairwells.

Borum said that typically the six-bedroom, four-unit buildings like these were for students only. He said that the proposed building could easily accommodate non-students. He also noted that with buildings like these, the City typically saw bedrooms jammed out to the max, which this proposed project did not do. He finished by saying that while this building would likely house students, it could easily be used by other people.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS: Potts

Motion carried.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Bona declared the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Mark Lloyd, Manager
Planning and Development Services

Kirk Westphal, Secretary

Prepared by Steve Bartha
Management Assistant
Planning and Development Services