

MINUTES

ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 p.m. – March 17, 2009

Time: Chair Bona called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Potts, Pratt, Westphal

Members Absent: Derezinski, Woods

Members Arriving: Mahler

Staff Present: Bartha, Cheng, Cooper, McMurtrie, Pulcipher

INTRODUCTIONS

None.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

a. Minutes of February 19 and March 3, 2009.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Carlberg, to approve the February 19, 2009 minutes as presented.

A vote on the minutes showed:

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

Motion carried.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Pratt, to approve the March 3, 2009 minutes as presented.

Potts asked that her comments on page 20 of the March 3rd minutes be amended to better reflect her concerns regarding the proposed A2D2 Zoning Ordinance.

A vote on the minutes as amended showed:

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

Motion carried as amended.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Borum, seconded by Potts, to approve the agenda.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

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

Pulcifer explained the handout, titled "Land Division Notification Letter for Maple Shoppes (2390 Dexter Avenue)," which was distributed before the meeting.

Potts announced that the Ordinance Revisions Committee would meet on Tuesday, March 24.

Bona encouraged the Commission to give feedback to Matt Naud by April 10 regarding the model lighting ordinance he distributed.

Pratt noted that the Floodplain Committee had been reconvened and was planning to meet on March 23 from 3:00 to 4:40 p.m. in the 4th Floor Conference Room at City Hall. He also mentioned that the A2D2 Steering Committee met on March 6th to walk through the same memorandum that was discussed at the March 3 Commission meeting. The Steering Committee also discussed Design Guidelines, but no timeline was set. He finished by saying the Steering Committee discussed parking feedback from DDA partnerships, and that he expressed that the Commission was looking for feedback from DDA partners who manage parking.

Bona asked that the Commission be provided a copy of the DDA partnerships feedback when it is submitted to Council. She then explained the handout, titled "Pittsfield Township Comprehensive Plan Amendment Hearing Notice," which was distributed before the meeting.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

None.

REGULAR BUSINESS

(a) Public Hearing and Action on the 2009 City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update. The plan has been prepared to serve as the transportation element of the City's Master Plan. It is an update to the City's 1990 Transportation Plan. The 2009 Update seeks to provide "An integrated multi-modal system that will build upon the unique qualities of each part of the City." To achieve this vision, the transportation plan is focused on meeting the needs of all transportation users: pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, commercial trucking and motorists. The plan includes eight goal statements and lists recommendations for short, medium and long-term investments. The 2009 Transportation Plan Update acknowledges the community's growth anticipated over the planning period and recommends transportation strategies and actions to guide staff and decision makers on appropriate actions. A significant new component in this plan is the linkage between transportation and land use considerations (postponed at 3/3/09 meeting) – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Eli Cooper introduced the item and made a brief summary

Barbara Arens, of Parsons-Brinckerhoff, explained the updates to the plan and made a brief presentation.

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbriar, discussed employment generation caused by infill, and its impact on traffic. He expressed concerns about funding transportation improvements, and asked the Commission to consider the University of Michigan's responsibility to fund transportation.

Noting no further speakers, Bona declared the public hearing closed at 7:51 p.m.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Carlberg, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby adopts the City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update as an element of the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Carlberg, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt the City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update as an element of the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan.

Pratt asked staff to follow up with MDOT and consultants in regard to the M-17 Corridor Study's recommended road diet from Maple Road to Revena Boulevard. He also asked staff to consider a study

to explore the potential for added density along South State Street between Eisenhower Parkway and Stimson Street, and to consider reprioritizing or removing the Nixon Corridor Study from the plan. He finished by asking staff to focus on the connections between schools and transit in the gap analysis in the plan (page 33, section C).

Bona informed Commissioners that as the approving body, desired changes to the plan should be recommended as amendments.

Enter Mahler.

Potts said it was simple to take a bus into Ann Arbor, but commented on the difficulty of using the bus system to travel within the City. She asked whether there was an analysis of the transit service.

Cooper replied by reporting an earlier phase of work accomplished under the same procurement for the City Plan was an AATA Service Review. The earlier report compared the hub system in Ann Arbor with a possible "Grid" service. The report concluded that current service design was appropriate, but it did recommend adjustments, which AATA has made since completion of the earlier effort. He also noted that signature corridors, if adopted in the plan, would be connected by feeder services, which would improve the bus network and address some of Commissioner Potts' concerns.

Carlberg said the concept of queue jumping seemed difficult without adding new lanes.

Cooper replied that it would vary by intersection, but that existing right turn lanes could be converted to queue jumping points by modifying overhead traffic signals. In other areas, he noted there would be a need for modest adjustments to configuration to accommodate busses.

Carlberg said the Northeast Area Transportation Plan concluded that light rail was prohibitively expensive. She asked staff to comment on the fact that the plan lists it as a possibility.

Cooper replied it was a matter of scale or magnitude, noting that Bus Rapid Transit or Streetcar technology, which in broad terms is a form of light rail, appears to be better fits for Ann Arbor. He agreed that heavier rail service, which seemed to be the focus of the Northeast Area Transportation Plan, were only suitable for metro areas that are larger in size and have a larger critical mass than Ann Arbor.

Potts expressed interest in seeing more park and ride lots installed, as recommended in the 1990 Transportation Plan.

Cooper replied that a park and ride study was also part of the overall procurement for the City and AATA's transportation planning process. AATA completed such a report and the ideas have been considered as part of the City's plan update. He agreed that park and ride was important, and said he would get a copy of the AATA study to Commissioner Potts.

Potts expressed an interest in seeing more high density nodes throughout the City, instead of focusing all density on the downtown.

Cooper replied that density without systems to support it is not something that will maintain the high quality of life in Ann Arbor. He also noted that the draft plan talked about intensity of use along corridors, and also talked about design. He encouraged the Commission to revisit the sections of the plan that speak to transit-oriented development.

Bona shared draft plan comments attached to the end of an online Ann Arbor News article about the plan. The first comment noted the fact that the City had not grown much between 1980 and 2009. The Chair asked staff to explain the difference between residential and employment growth.

Cooper replied that the blogger was correct, from the 1980s to late 1990s Ann Arbor was a stable community, but society had seen changes since then. He noted rapid increases in the health care sector, and the higher education and technology sectors. These are the core drivers of Ann Arbor's anticipated growth into the first half of the 21st century. He noted that 20,000 new jobs were projected in Ann Arbor before 2025, and that housing and transportation for these new employees needed to be planned for.

Bona shared a second comment: what happens after the plan is adopted, what would staff do between now and the next plan.

Cooper replied that once the plan is adopted, staff will begin working on the plan's action items, project management, and securing funding sources.

Bona said the Commission recently forward Area, Height and Placement (AHP) to Council, and asked staff to comment on the links between the proposed AHP (once adopted) and the Transportation Plan Update.

Pulcipher noted that Council approved the formation of an AHP Advisory Committee on March 16, 2009, and said it would be a while before Council took action.

Bona believed the strength of the plan was that it was not oversimplified. She asked staff for a brief explanation about why the City would reduce lanes, and whether this was possible.

Cooper replied that many people choose to drive within the City, and that their choice must be respected. He said staff looked for areas where anticipated future volume, identified using traffic volume studies in partnership with MDOT, did not warrant as many lanes as are currently used. He offered Jackson Avenue as an example for possible lane reductions, assuming traffic on the roadway stayed below 20,000 trips per day. Doing so, he said, would allow for reduction from 4 to 3 lanes, which would enable pedestrian crossing islands, safer traffic flows and the installation of bike lanes, which make travel safer for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians.

Bona shared a final comment from the blog: how can we fund such grandiose transportation projects when potholes go unfilled.

Cooper noted that the City had a road maintenance millage that was used to maintain roads, potholes, resurfacing, etc. He replied that many of the potential funding sources for transportation projects were not available for maintenance, and vice-a-versa. He offered to report back to the Commission with historic road investments and maintenance funding figures.

Bona commented that it looked like roadways were not being expanded in the plan, so there would be no new miles to maintain, just improvements to existing routes.

Cooper replied that the 2009 plan was in lock step and continued to build on the values expressed in 1990, keeping Ann Arbor at the forefront of maintaining quality of life and economic development without being inundated with new roadways.

Pratt commented that the City strategy with regard to road projects was to wait until matching state or federal funding was available, usually at a 50% or 80% match level, to leverage existing local resources.

He asked staff to comment on the plan's reference to research on converting the Allen Creek Greenway to a shared use path.

Cooper said the study was related to the Non-Motorized Plan of 2007.

Westphal asked for explanation of the traffic congestion scale, which labels congestion from A to F.

Arens replied that A means less congested, F means gridlock, and that Ann Arbor currently stands at C. She noted that many cities with successful transportation that have a lot of density and congestion, like Chicago, sometimes have a D, E, or F score at peak hours, yet are still considered successful. She said as density increases, you can never get back to C without widening roads. The goal, she said, was to give transit an advantage in high density areas. She believed C was a score found in smaller cities, like Ann Arbor.

Pratt said most communities lack the money to build anything at a grade of A. He said the goal was to find an economical way to achieve a desired level of congestion 20 years from now.

Westphal believed that vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and CO2 per capita was an important statistic, because density and overall VMT and CO2 increase together, even though per capita numbers may be falling. He offered New York City as an example of a city with extremely high overall VMT/CO2, but very low VMT/CO2 per capita. He asked staff to comment on using a more regional approach to prioritizing corridor studies, and offered the State/Plymouth Corridor as an example.

Cooper replied that the same comment was made by Washtenaw County. He noted that short-term recommendations were to add capacity to heavily used routes, and then to use the Signature Corridor Studies to assess future needs and possible investments and recommendations. He said the draft plan recommended planning only for the State/Plymouth Corridor in the short-term.

Mahler asked for staff comment on funding sources for specific short, medium, and long-term projects.

Cooper replied that there was a lot of uncertainty in the funding of projects. He noted that some federal and state funding streams were set to expire this year, but that once the new federal Reauthorization Legislation bill was passed, it would be easier to identify potential funding streams for specific projects. He noted that the next Reauthorization Bill was being discussed at levels ranging from \$500 billion up to \$1 trillion dollars. He said adopting the plan was critical to qualifying for federal funds, as projects that have planning completed are in better position to receive priority consideration for funding.

Pratt asked what percent of the short-term recommendations were not included in the current Capital Improvements Plan.

Mahler noted that a 20% match would have a much different impact on local resources than a 50% match, and asked what local sources besides the CIP were being discussed.

Cooper replied that the current statutory framework requires we rely on local millages or taxes. He identified major changes occurring in transportation finance at the federal and state levels. He noted that it was difficult to predict where the tug of war for state and federal resources would end up. He said there was consideration of new local options tax authority in the Michigan Legislature's last session. He noted that the State of Michigan was very interested in transportation financing, and that in addition to the state, regional groups had roles to play in funding transportation projects. He finished by saying that staff could create hypothetical funding scenarios for the Commission.

Mahler said that might make sense after the Reauthorization Bill was passed.

Potts was disappointed with the 2003 SEMCOG map on page B26 of the draft plan because it failed to show rapid bus lanes between Ann Arbor, Detroit, and the Detroit Metro airport.

Cooper replied that the map was historical, that SEMCOG and MDOT had recently concluded in a report that there was insufficient ridership on those corridors to justify a major investment, but that rail service relying on existing trackage was supposed to be operating by the end of 2010.

Potts believed the Stadium Bridge was a real problem and that it should be a high priority in the Transportation Plan.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Potts, to amend both motions by adding the following text to the end of the motions: "...subject to making the following four amendments to the short-term recommendations in table 3-1: (1) remove or reprioritize the Nixon Corridor Study and add a State Street Corridor Study (Eisenhower Parkway to Stimson Street) for the purpose of determining system improvements needed if density recommendations are made on State Street; (2) have staff work with MDOT on the road diet for Jackson Avenue from Maple Road to Revena Boulevard; (3) establish a line-item in the CIP for gap improvements in the sidewalk system, with priority to gaps from neighborhoods to schools, and to transit; and (4) adding another location to the recommendation "Assess Potential for Place Based Tax Increment Funding...": the Jackson Avenue/Maple Road Intersection, primarily west along Jackson Avenue to Wagner Road and north along Maple Road to Dexter Avenue, also considering appropriate segments to the south and east where zoning is currently non-residential."

Mahler asked how Commissioner Pratt envisioned having staff work with MDOT.

Pratt replied that Cooper had always spoken to MDOT about this, and that he just wanted to add the amendment to be specific.

Mahler asked if anyone had ever looked at tax increment funding, as mentioned in amendment four.

Pratt replied that he saw budgets for the other three that were a total of \$25,000, and thought one more would be easy. He felt the limits should be flexible.

A vote on the amendment showed:

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

Amendment carried.

Westphal commented that the plan listed a corridor improvement authority as the lead agency for place based taxes, and asked staff to clarify who would comprise this authority and where it would be housed.

Cooper replied that it would be the City of Ann Arbor, as there is no corridor improvement authority.

Westphal asked if there was any consideration given to a road diet or to the addition of bicycle facilities on Fuller Road.

Cooper replied that, where appropriate and where road volume warranted consideration, road diets with bicycle facilities made sense. He noted that mid-block pedestrian crossings with islands and bike lanes can increase safety for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. He stated the primary point of a road diet is to transition from a roadway design that is not fully utilized and is unsafe.

Bona asked Ms. Arens to comment on speed limits in the city in relation to cyclists. She note that bicycle accidents above 35 miles per hour tended to be fatal, and that Ann Arbor had several 45 mile per hour areas. She asked if there was a reason this was not covered in the plan.

Arens noted a recent Michigan State Police study, which indicated that a lot of communities have found that lowering speeds actually creates more accidents, because people have a propensity to drive their "natural speed," rather than lower, posted speeds. She said the study recommended establishing speed limits appropriate for the type of roadway, and that cities should then plan for other types of transportations. She said their work did not focus on traffic speeds and bike lanes, but that they did rely on a lot of information from the Non-Motorized Plan.

Bona asked if recommendations encouraged narrower lanes, which naturally slow down drivers.

Arens replied that there were no recommendations to change lane widths, but acknowledged that much of the way people drive has to do with road design.

Bona was curious about why the intersection of Huron Street and First Street, not Huron Street and Third Street, was marked with a star in the plan as a difficult intersection.

Arens replied that starred intersections were those that showed abnormally high numbers of all types of accidents during the three-year study.

Bona commented that Third and Huron was a difficult intersection for pedestrians, and that more people would cross there if it were easier or safer.

Cooper replied that the City was pursuing an experimental pedestrian signal for that intersection from MDOT. He said the device would allow pedestrians to cross as needed without major disruptions to the flow of traffic. He believed the City had a good chance of receiving one of the experimental devices, called Hawks.

Pratt praised Cooper's efforts to get this.

A vote on the main motions, as amended, showed:

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

Motions carried, read as follow:

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Carlberg, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby adopts the City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update as an element of the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan, subject to making the following

four amendments to the short-term recommendations in table 3-1: (1) remove or reprioritize the Nixon Corridor Study and add a State Street Corridor Study (Eisenhower Parkway to Stimson Street) for the purpose of determining system improvements needed if density recommendations are made on State Street; (2) have staff work with MDOT on the road diet for Jackson Avenue from Maple Road to Revena Boulevard; (3) establish a line-item in the CIP for gap improvements in the sidewalk system, with priority to gaps from neighborhoods to schools, and to transit; and (4) adding another location to the recommendation “Assess Potential for Place Based Tax Increment Funding...”: the Jackson Avenue/Maple Road Intersection, primarily west along Jackson Avenue to Wagner Road and north along Maple Road to Dexter Avenue, also considering appropriate segments to the south and east where zoning is currently non-residential.”

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Carlberg, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the City Council adopt the City of Ann Arbor Transportation Plan Update as an element of the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan, subject to making the following four amendments to the short-term recommendations in table 3-1: (1) remove or reprioritize the Nixon Corridor Study and add a State Street Corridor Study (Eisenhower Parkway to Stimson Street) for the purpose of determining system improvements needed if density recommendations are made on State Street; (2) have staff work with MDOT on the road diet for Jackson Avenue from Maple Road to Revena Boulevard; (3) establish a line-item in the CIP for gap improvements in the sidewalk system, with priority to gaps from neighborhoods to schools, and to transit; and (4) adding another location to the recommendation “Assess Potential for Place Based Tax Increment Funding...”: the Jackson Avenue/Maple Road Intersection, primarily west along Jackson Avenue to Wagner Road and north along Maple Road to Dexter Avenue, also considering appropriate segments to the south and east where zoning is currently non-residential.”

Bona asked the Commission to make a motion to move Agenda Item 8(e) to between Agenda Items 8(b) and 8(c).

Moved by Mahler, seconded by Potts, to move Agenda Item 8(e) to between Agenda Items 8(b) and 8(c).

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

(b) Public Hearing and Action on Amendments to Chapter 55 (Zoning Ordinance) and 57 (Subdivision and Land Use Control Ordinance) to describe requirements and facilitate placement of commercial recycling dumpsters and related enclosures – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng explained amendments and made a brief presentation.

Noting no speakers, Bona declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Potts, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the amendments to Chapter 55 (Zoning Ordinance), Section 5:92, Zoning Compliance Permit Required, and Chapter 57 (Subdivision and Land Use Control Ordinance), Section 5:122, Site Plans, addressing placement of commercial recycling and related enclosures.

Potts asked whether this amendment would regulate private recycling containers.

Pulcifer replied that Planning staff was aware of that issue, but that it was not connected to this amendment.

Westphal asked whether the 100-square foot threshold was sufficient space.

McMurtrie replied that a standard dumpster was six feet by six feet in size, and that size had not changed in 20 years, nor was it likely to change. He said the goal was to place hundreds of these containers across the City to capture much of the recyclable waste currently going to landfills.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

(e) Public Hearing and Action on Zahn Medical Office Building Site Plan, 0.42 acre, 2207 Jackson Road. Proposal to demolish the existing building and gravel parking lot and to construct a new one-story, 2,840-square foot dental office and 13-space parking lot – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng explained project and made a short presentation.

Rick Meader, of Washtenaw Engineering, showed the Commission blue prints of the project.

Dean Kahremanis, of Dean Kahremanis Architects, LLC, commented on the project's design, and showed the Commission pictures of the proposed building's elevations.

Noting no further speakers, the public hearing was closed at 9:44 p.m.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Pratt, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Zahn Medical Office Building Site Plan, subject to payment of street tree escrow of \$362.70 prior to issuance of building permits.

Carlberg stated that the petitioner was only required to provide for first flush water on site, but she asked what would happen to excess water off the roof.

Meader replied that the rain gardens would collect runoff water and that some water would enter the storm sewer via pipes to the street.

Carlberg said if the rain gardens were larger, then more water could be retained onsite, with less going into the storm sewer system.

Meador said it would be possible to change the design to reduce flow into the storm sewer.

Carlberg asked if the petitioner would consider increasing the size of the rain gardens.

Zahn said he was worried about the steepness that would be required to expand the rain gardens, noting that the gardens would have to be deeper, given the lack of space to make them wider. He was concerned about liability and maintenance issues.

Carlberg asked the petitioner to discuss the issue with staff.

Zahn said he would be happy to, so long as a balance could be struck between liability and water retention.

Carlberg praised the improvements to the landscaping and the site.

Potts shared Commissioner Carlberg's opinion about water retention, and said the proposed changes were a significant improvement to the site.

Borum asked the petitioner to talk about the plantings between the proposed building and the house to south of the site.

Meador replied that there were white spruces, an arbor vining hedge, six to eight-foot tall lilacs, red maples, red oaks, and honey locusts, all of which obscure the view from the neighbor to the south.

Borum was concerned about headlights in the neighbor's windows. He asked if there was a fence.

Meador said there was just vegetation.

Bona asked if the neighbor was happy with the plantings.

Meador said the neighbor was in attendance at the meeting, and was satisfied.

Westphal noted the absence of a door on the north façade, and asked if people would arrive from that side.

Zahn replied that the back (north) side was for staff and that there was no access.

Westphal noted that the footprint was smaller than required.

Cheng confirmed that the maximum footprint was 40% of the site, and that the petitioner was proposing a footprint of 20%.

Westphal asked if there had been plans to build bigger.

Zahn replied that the economy and a lack of tenants prohibited a larger building.

Bona asked if the kinked sidewalk at the east entrance was an existing sidewalk.

Cheng confirmed that it was.

Bona said she would rather see that sidewalk curve more gently, even if it meant reducing the size of the rain garden on the east side of the building.

Pratt appreciated the new façade.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

(c) Public Hearing and Action on 12 Parkland Rezoning: (1) Dolph Nature Area, 440 Park Lake Avenue. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (2) Devonshire Park, Devonshire Road west of Hickory Lane. A request to rezone this site from R1A (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (3) Mary Beth Doyle Park (2 portions), west of Cardinal Avenue and south of Verle Avenue. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (4) Foxfire South Park (portion), south of South Foxridge Court. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (5) Lakewood Nature Area (portion), 3230 Central Avenue. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (6) West Park (portion), 215 Chapin Street. A request to rezone this site from R4C (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (7) Argo Nature Area (portion), south of Long Shore Drive & Railroad, west of Swift Street. A request to rezone this site from M1 (Limited Industrial District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (8) Riverwood Nature Area (portion), at intersection of Victoria Circle and Alexandria Boulevard. A request to rezone this site from PUD (Planned Unit Development District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (9) Oakridge Nature Area (portion), south of Glazier Way, east of Huron Parkway. A request to rezone this site from PUD (Planned Unit Development District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (10) Cranbrook Park (portion), 300 West Oakbrook Drive. A request to rezone this site from R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (11) Brookside Park, northeast corner of Baylis Drive and Stone School Road. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (12) Farmers Market, 312, 318 and 322 North Fourth Avenue and 315 Detroit Street. A request to rezone this site from C2B/R (Business Service/Residential District) to PL (Public Land District) and continue the existing use (postponed at 12/16/08 meeting) – Staff Recommendation: Approval

(d) Public Hearing and Action on Narrow Gauge Property Annexation and Zoning, south side of Narrow Gauge Way. A request to annex this site into the City and zone it PL (Public Land District) for public park use (postponed at 12/16/08 meeting) – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng explained the annexation and rezonings and made a brief presentation.

Pulcifer noted that two more groups of park rezonings were still to follow to the Commission.

Noting no 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 Narrow Gauge Property Annexation and PL (Public Land) Zoning petitions.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Mahler, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Argo Nature Area, Brookside Park, Cranbrook Park, Devonshire Park, Dolph Nature Area, Foxfire South Park, Lakewood Nature Area, Mary Beth Doyle Park, Oakridge Nature Area, Riverwood Nature Area, and West Park petitions for Rezoning to PL (Public Land).

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Mahler, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council amend the A2D2 Downtown Zoning Amendments to include the Farmers Market PL (Public Land) District.

Potts was glad to see park rezonings move forward, but commented that some people were concerned about designating the parks as Public Land without specifying their use. She said people feared non-park uses, like roads, and that there was no way to reassure them that it would never happen.

A vote on all three motions showed:

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

Motions carried.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Pulcipher noted that there would likely be a Commission meeting on April 7, 2009, but that because it was more than 15 days away, no public hearings had yet been scheduled.

Bona declared the meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Mark Lloyd, Manager
Planning and Development Services

Kirk Westphal, Secretary

Prepared by Laurie Foondle and Steve Bartha
Management Assistants
Planning and Development Services