

MINUTES

ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 p.m. – May 5, 2009

Time: Chair Bona called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL

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

Members Absent: Borum

Members Arriving: Pratt

Staff Present: Bartha, DiLeo, Kahan, Kowalski, Pulcipher

INTRODUCTIONS

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Minutes of April 7, 2009.

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

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Westphal, seconded by Carlberg, to approve the agenda.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

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

Derezinski said Council had mainly discussed the budget at the prior night's meeting. He said that Council was looking for ways to keep several recreation facilities open, despite the pending revenue shortfall this year and the larger projected shortfall next year. He said there was also some discussion surrounding the creation of one master plan.

Pulcifer said that Planning and Development Services staff recently met with the recently created Area Height and Placement Committee to discuss amendments to Chapter 55 and 59. She said staff provided background on the effort and that the committee provided good feedback. She noted that May 27 would mark the citywide kickoff for the effort.

Westphal said the Environmental Commission received a draft plan report for managing the Huron River from the Huron River and Impoundment Management Plan (HRIMP) Committee. He said the draft report was available online, and that the next meeting was scheduled for May 7 at Cobblestone.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Tom Whitaker, 444 S. Fifth Avenue, believed that the City's zoning ordinance was out of compliance with state law. He believed that recent projects had been approved after developers used false pretenses to gain support.

Enter Pratt.

Alice Ralph, 1607 E. Stadium Boulevard, thanked Mr. Whitaker for his comments. She shared his concerns, and believed there was no linkage between the recently approved Transportation Plan and the Master Plan. She was distressed by this, and asked the Commission to think about linkages between the plans.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

Bona announced the public hearings scheduled for the May 19, 2009 Planning Commission meeting.

REGULAR BUSINESS

(a) Action on Near North PUD Zoning District and PUD Site Plan, 1.19 acres, 626-724 North Main Street. A request to rezone this site from O (Office District) to PUD (Planned Unit Development District) and a proposal to construct a 39-unit (39 bedrooms total), four-story apartment building with 2,621 square feet of commercial space attached to the building, with a total of 42 parking spaces (37 parking spaces will be below the building), and to demolish five of eight existing single-family homes and to renovate the three remaining homes for commercial uses (continued from 4/21/09 meeting) – Staff Recommendation: Denial

Bona noted that this item was being continued from the April 21, 2009 meeting, and that the public hearing had been held and closed at that time.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Potts, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Near North PUD Zoning District and Supplemental Regulations, and PUD Site Plan and Development Agreement, subject to the petitioner obtaining the required floodplain permit from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) and subject to eight footing drain disconnections.

Carlberg asked the petitioner about the three houses planned to be kept on the site. She said these houses were some of the oldest and had been in terrible condition for years. She questioned why they were being kept, given their location in the floodway and poor condition. She believed it would be a significant benefit to the City if they were removed.

Bill Godfrey, of The Three Oaks Group, replied that the plan at this time was to convert these homes to office space. He said that in neighborhood meetings, preserving structures was listed as an important goal. He said he intended to work with the City to apply for FEMA grants that would help defray the cost of removing structures from the floodway. He was leaving the door open to removing the buildings, and wanted to sell the buildings to the City so they could be removed, but he said that some neighbors supported preserving them.

Carlberg asked whether the petitioner would put in writing that the houses would be removed if FEMA monies could be secured.

Godfrey replied that he had put this in his Planned Unit Development (PUD) proposal, but that staff had asked him to remove it, as it was too conditional. He believed the structures still had value, but if the City could help secure money through grants, he would remove the buildings.

Carlberg asked if the City's vision was to create a greenway.

Godfrey replied that a greenway was his vision, which was why he was moving the market to its new location within the project. He said he was also meeting with the City to discuss the removal of three more houses on Summit Street to create an Allen Creek Greenway of nearly two-thirds of an acre. He believed it would be a substantial improvement to create a neighborhood market and a new park.

Carlberg asked if the three houses on Summit Street were being removed regardless of the PUD.

Godfrey replied that he was meeting on Thursday with Jerry Hancock about FEMA's Floodway Disaster Program grants. He said this was a great opportunity, and that he was working with the property owners.

Carlberg asked whether conversations had been held with Parks staff.

Godfrey replied that he believed the response from Parks was favorable. He believed the Greenbelt Millage was a good way to fund this type of project, but he had been told that Greenbelt funds were earmarked for other projects. He believed this site could provide a key linkage in the Allen Creek Vision of greenway all the way to the river. He said that the Park Advisory Commission (PAC) had other priorities at this time, but that he would keep looking for other sources of money. He said the reason this vision had not been publicized is that a lot of other pieces had to fall into place first. He said his vision was holistic, but that the steps to achieving it were compartmentalized.

Derezinski said it sounded like a matter of timing. He believed the salient piece was the creation of affordable housing, but he was not sure this benefit was balanced out by the substantial changes being proposed in the area, such as height, setbacks, and massing. He questioned whether the PUD benefit was met by 39 units of affordable housing. He said he had heard mention of the other things the petitioner spoke of, like a greenway, but noted that they were not part of this proposal. He said he would feel better about this PUD if those other benefits were involved, but he was afraid of being duped if the other components never materialized.

Godfrey commented that he would love to do those other things, and that if PAC had said yes, then he would be having a different conversation with the Commission. He did not want to make promises without funding, stating that if PAC and private donors came up with funds, then he would be able to remove the homes and create the greenway.

Potts believed this was a difficult process and project to deal with. She supported Avalon, on one hand, but on the other hand was a proposal that had detrimental impacts on the neighborhood. She said it was ironic that the houses to be saved were the ones that should be removed. She said during the petitioner's last proposal, the Commission was told that these three houses were too damaged and too contaminated to be saved. She was disappointed that viable houses up the street were to be demolished. She was unsure whether demolition would be an asset to the neighborhood, and now she was hearing that further demolition on Summit Street was planned. She did believe that anything to enhance the floodplain was a benefit. She said she could see why the neighborhood was concerned, noting that the proposal was very different from what was there now. She was afraid once you start whittling away at the edge of a neighborhood, then the next street becomes the edge, and so on. She said she had no questions of staff, because the staff report was quite thorough. She took staff's comments very seriously.

Pratt said this was a difficult decision for the Commission. He was appreciative of all the information from neighbors and the petitioner. He said the character of the neighborhood was an issue for him, and that the same project on the other side of Main Street would be less difficult to support. He noted that all eight PUD approval standards needed to be satisfied, and that he had struggled with two in particular: B and D. He questioned whether the beneficial effects of this project, LEED certification and affordable housing, could not be achieved under any other zoning classification, although he noted that he had not seen a proposal of this critical mass in his time on the Commission. He noted that everyone claims that affordable housing is important, but struggle to find space for it. He was concerned that the proposed use of this area did not match what was laid out in the Master Plan, noting that density was greater than what was envisioned. He believed that affordable housing was a benefit, but whether the project was a benefit

to the surrounding properties was a gray area. He agreed with Commissioner Carlberg that dealing with the floodway issue would be even more beneficial. He finished by stating that Fourth and Main were very different streets, and that he struggled most with (1) did the project meet PUD standards and (2) was it up to snuff in these other areas.

Mahler asked the petitioner if, in his PUD analysis, he was suggesting that it was okay to put multiple-family where there was currently single-family housing, because the City had it backwards.

Godfrey replied that the Future Land Use Map showed most of that area as multiple-family in the Central Area Plan (CAP). He noted that the CAP was a guiding, not binding, document, but that they had taken their guidance from the Future Land Use Map. He said he was surprised by this finding.

Mahler said another issue for him was scale. He asked the petitioner how he arrived at 39 units as the break-even or target number. He asked if smaller projects were considered, and how the petitioner responded to the public when they asked for smaller scale projects.

Godfrey replied that the project had been reduced in size from 67 units to 48, and eventually to 39.

Mike Appel, of Avalon Housing, said the proposal was really 38 units, and that the 39th unit was comprised of storage and common space. In response to the question, he said that achieving scale or efficiency was critical for the types of funder who fund affordable housing. He said there was no magic number, but he said that whenever Avalon has taken a proposal from Ann Arbor to Lansing, they look at the cost per unit and laugh. He said the expectation from funders ran reverse to the question being asked. Whereas the Commission asks how small a project could be, he said funders want to know how large the project could be. He believed that 39 units was a reasonable size.

Mahler asked again where the number of 38 or 39 units came from.

Appel replied that it was a function of design so as not to end up with a big box. He said that he continued to work with investors to make sure that a 38-unit project would meet their needs. He said the smaller the project got, the harder it was to move through the process. He said it was not a matter of 38 units working and 37 units blowing up the project. Rather, he said it was a matter of having a project they felt was good.

Godfrey added that the directive given to the architects was to design three or four-story buildings, and that the number of units they ended up with was 39. He noted that previous plans were pulled back to include a courtyard. He said he had visited the Liberty Lofts, and that neighbors there felt their neighborhood was not negatively impacted by the development. He said his proposal was smaller than Liberty Lofts.

Mahler said he was heavily influenced by the Affordable Housing Needs Assessment from Washtenaw County, which projected an increase in high-income residents and a decrease in low-income residents in the downtown area in years to come. He said it was clear in 2007 that the demand for affordable housing in the county far exceeded even the recommendations in the study, and believed the City could not begin to plan for the projected need. He noted that PUD zoning was a tool to be used to achieve the goal of affordable housing. He believed the proposed site was one of the last places available to create affordable housing in downtown. He did not believe it would destroy the neighborhood, citing Liberty Lofts as a conceptual example of the effects. He noted the recently considered City Place project as informative, because in that case two superior PUDs were rejected, and the result was a by-rights site plan that no one liked.

He said that after visiting the proposed site, his main concern was the short setbacks and the building height facing the properties on Fourth Avenue. He respected the work Avalon does, and understood the growing need for public-private partnerships, but he asked the petitioner about the scale and whether there was a way to increase the rear setback. He also asked if there would be a resident manager.

Appel replied that there would not be a resident manager, but there would be a person responsible for clean up in common areas and light maintenance.

Mahler said he shared the same concerns as Commissioners Carlberg and Pratt. He was concerned about below grade parking.

Godfrey said the project was tucked down in a bowl. He said people facing the south portion of the building would look at the third floor, not the foundation.

Mahler replied that when looking at the sketch of the east elevation, it seemed that people would be looking at two to four stories. He believed they would lose whatever privacy they now have.

Damien Farrell, the project architect, replied that the difference in grade from the roof lines of the neighbors' properties to the proposed buildings was roughly nine feet. He said no balconies would face east toward the homes behind the project; rather, they would face south and north.

Sanders commented that the actual elevations of the houses and the proposed project were within 20 or 30 feet of each other.

Mahler said his other concern was the traffic pattern. He said it was unclear whether there was adequate and safe ingress and egress from the site, especially during rush hour.

Westphal concurred with most of what had been said, particularly the concerns about the project meeting PUD criteria. He believed staff did a thorough job and that the project's incompatibility came down to scale. He asked the petitioner if other designs were considered to maintain the rhythm of the streetscape or to preserve buildings.

Godfrey replied that after his team had tested design concepts for six years, and recently held three public meetings, this was the design they came up with. He said the consistent feedback they received was to conform to underlying zoning, but that put a lot of strain on doing affordable housing.

Appel replied that the neighborhood wanted something in the realm of 20,000 square feet with a row-house, multi-family look. He said that in his experience, Avalon could not make developments like these work as affordable housing. He said that if developers took parcels and applied by-rights designs, then meaningful affordable housing could not be created.

Woods believed this was a difficult project. She said no one doubted the need for affordable housing, yet this seemed to be the right building in the wrong location. She did not see the overwhelming public good that would come of it, and she said she highly regarded staff's input. She was not persuaded that the project should go forward, but understood Commissioner Mahler's concern that a future by-right project could be worse. She finished by saying she could not support the project in front of them this evening.

Bona said that in reviewing the standards in the PUD submittal, she saw green features were proposed but not articulated in the supplemental regulations. She also said she would like to see language in the supplemental regulations stating that no buildings would be in the floodway. By combining sites, she believed this was a great opportunity to remove buildings. She could not support a PUD that allowed

office where the Master Plan said no offices should be. She said that the floodway was an issue for her, as well as the conflict between the proposal and the Master Plan. She was also concerned with traffic, and agreed that moving retail from the floodway was a good thing, but not if other retail or office replaced it. She also said that parking might also be an issue, stating that she supported no surface parking for the housing. She believed the underground parking was a huge benefit, though she would also support a few more surface parking spaces for the retail. She believed that the engineering went a long way to break down the sense of mass and large building feel, and she recommended that the petitioner provide a model if the PUD went before Council. She was very uncomfortable with the driveway on Main Street, and said that an easement on Summit Street would be much better. Her biggest concern was the houses remaining in the floodway. With regard to the size of the building and density, she noted that 23 units were permissible under R4C zoning, which could result in 138 bedrooms (6 per unit), and that 12 units (48 bedrooms) would be permissible under R2A. She said total bedrooms was more important to her than total units, and for this reason, she believed the 39 one-bedroom units proposed seemed like an appropriate number.

Carlberg noted that along the North Main Corridor, a person sees a little bit of everything, and that residents seem to get along just fine. She believed the proposed use was appropriate for the area, and that in the future, Main Street would be redeveloped for more mixed use. She believed the form of a parcel could be changed without negatively impacting a neighborhood. She believed that to remove buildings from a floodway required increasing density next to the floodway. She said that 39 bedrooms were about the same density as 20 units. She noted that in 20 years, it had been impossible to get developers to build affordable housing, and that now a proposal was on the table to build single bedroom affordable housing, with Avalon willing to manage the properties. She believed that affordable housing would provide a beneficial effect for the City, and that by building larger buildings on the site, efficiencies would be gained. She believed the building configuration would help to break up the size of the buildings, and that single-family zoning was inappropriate for the area. She believed this was a better proposal for neighbors than the prior in terms of open space for residents and an interesting backyard for properties on Fourth Avenue. She wanted to support the project because of its uniqueness, the developer support, and the minimal change in grade compared to surrounding buildings.

Potts agreed with some aspects of what Commissioner Carlberg said. She agreed that the proposed architecture had done all it could to reduce the burden on neighbors. She also liked the one-bedroom units, noting the efficiencies and advantages they offered in attracting a great variety of people. She believed it was unfair that the neighbors' backyards, and not the development, seemed to serve as the buffer between the proposed buildings and the property lines. She finished by saying that aspects of the project were good, but she agreed with Commissioner Woods that it might be a case of the right building in the wrong spot.

Derezinski was very impressed by Commissioner Carlberg's devotion to the work done by the Commission. He agreed with much of what she had said, but did not believe the public benefit threshold had been met, and wished to see if more public benefit could be accomplished before putting the project to a vote. He was concerned with the scale of the project and the impact on the neighborhood. He was also impressed with staff's work, and noted that after much review, the recommendation was denial. He favored postponing the vote to see if some of the other matters, such as the greenway, might come to pass. He also hoped that some of the comments with regard to the neighborhood could be ameliorated.

Bona noted that she would like to add her previous request for additional clarification on the sizes and massing of the project to Commissioner Derezinski's request.

Woods said it would be helpful to know which houses on Summit Street were slated to be removed.

Godfrey replied that they were the homes at 110, 112, and 116 Summit Street. He said the owners were willing to sell if Greenway monies were available.

Woods asked if the bigger picture was to remove those three homes as well as the three on his site.

Godfrey confirmed this, stating that seven structures – the six houses and the current party store – were targeted. He noted that at least one representative from the Allen Creek Greenway was excited about the possibility. He said there was no shortage of enthusiasm, only money. He said Council had a two-third outside/one-third inside policy for Greenway funds, but that it was within the City's jurisdiction to allocate funds to create this vision. He was concerned that to wait for all financing to be in place would delay the construction of affordable housing.

Kowalski showed images of the floodway to the Commission.

Moved by Derezinski, seconded by Pratt, to postpone action to the meeting of June 16.

Mahler asked what benefit an additional five weeks would offer, noting that the petitioner might simply return to say that time and money were still issues.

Derezinski said that if a specific proposal, in writing, that the Greenway would be part of the project were added, he would be satisfied. He was looking for more public benefit, so that he would not have to vote against the project.

Pratt said he would be looking for the Secretary to prepare a summary of issues to be addressed. He did not believe the petitioner needed to take action on every point raised by Commission, but he was looking for some action and evidence of consideration on others.

Mahler opposed postponing the item to ask for more public benefit without asking the public to weigh in on what would be beneficial from their perspective.

Bona believed that the issues raised by the Commission were not that different from the issues raised by staff in the staff report.

Mahler believed the petitioner expected the Commission to say yes or no to his project, not to postpone.

Potts was unsure that postponement would change her concerns about the project.

A vote on the motion to postpone showed:

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

Motion carried.

(b) Public Hearing and Action on Nursing Facility Addition (Riverview of Ann Arbor) Site Plan, 3.3 acres, 355 Huron View Boulevard. A proposal to renovate the existing building and to construct a 36,245-square foot, 2-story addition – Staff Recommendation: Postpone

DiLeo made a brief presentation and explained the proposed project.

Noting no speakers, Bona closed the public hearing at 9:24 p.m.

Moved by Derezenski, seconded by Pratt, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Nursing Facility Addition (Riverview of Ann Arbor) Site Plan and Development Agreement, subject to Zoning Board of Appeals approval of necessary variances.

Moved by Derezenski, seconded by Pratt, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve an alternative method to storm water detention by donating land to the City that is equal in value and as beneficial as the required volume not provided on site.

Potts saw no downsides to this project, stating that she had been to the facility and it needed help. She believed the facility was a valuable asset to the community, and she praised staff for their work to negotiate with the petitioner for park access. She believed receiving valuable land was a good trade off for a lack of storm water detention.

Bona asked about the discrepancy in the report under land development, noting that the 15-foot buffer between the development and the parkland was not marked on the plan.

DiLeo replied that it was in the original plan, but that a conflicting land use buffer could be provided. She said the petitioner could also seek a landscape waiver, noting that the Commission could consider the waiver. She said a solution to this had not been finalized.

Bona asked whether the waiver would come back to the Commission as a motion.

DiLeo replied yes.

Bona asked whether a separate motion for waiver would trigger a second fee. Bona said she would prefer to vote on both motions at once. She said the donation of land led her to believe that the waiver was not an unreasonable request. She said Commission could approve the motion and let staff work out the details.

DiLeo said a retaining wall could be installed along the existing pond to increase its depth, and that while some of the water on the site was un-detained, it would still be strained before entering into the storm pipes.

Potts asked if the petitioner, instead of a waiver, could ask for a variance from the landscaping ordinance at the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

DiLeo replied that this was a possibility.

Carlberg believed there was no practical hardship for the ZBA to review. She preferred adding an amendment to the motion before the Commission allowing the variance. She also believed it would be helpful to provide Council with a description of the storm water detention plan, and hoped the petitioner would use pipes that allowed infiltration, if possible.

Derezenski asked if there was a time issue at hand warranting an expedited motion and whether the item would be prepared for consideration at the next available Council meeting.

Blair Reese, one of the project's consultants, said that postponement would be fine if that helped the Commission feel okay with the outstanding issues. He said his team was meeting with staff on Thursday to discuss these issues with Engineering. He quoted his engineer, who could not make it to the meeting, that there were no issues related to the project that could not be addressed. He also said staff had been very helpful throughout the planning and design process.

Pratt asked if the soils were suitable for infiltration, if they were sandy or clay.

Reese replied that he was unsure.

Pratt noted that it was a little more expensive to detain underground, and believed it made sense to work on a land donation. He asked Mr. Reese if his engineer had an idea of what was feasible with detention on site. He noted that the staff report listed between 25% and 60%, which was a wide range. He asked if the petitioner would know by Thursday whether the un-detained amount was closer to 10,000 or 20,000 square feet.

Reese replied that he could confidently say that his team could resolve any issues that were raised. He said his civil engineer could work through any problems. He said it was an existing site, and that since the 1960s, there had been no water related issues. He said his team would be improving the existing site.

Pratt said he was inclined to move the project on to Council.

Woods asked staff who owned the other land around the site, and if it was City owned.

DiLeo replied that the Make-a-Wish Foundation owned property across the street, and that beyond the cul-de-sac was a private street. She said there was a small office park to the east, and parkland to the south.

Woods commented that DiLeo had mentioned in her presentation that the cul-de-sac could be a parking place to allow access to bluffs nature area. She asked if the Park Advisory Commission (PAC) had discussed what that would mean in terms of more vehicular use for the area. She asked if there were potential future problems.

DiLeo replied that she did not believe that PAC has discussed this matter of access. She noted that at the staff level, there were no concerns about access. She said all units of Parks were in favor of this plan.

Woods asked if a private road was just beyond the site.

DiLeo confirmed that this was true.

Carlberg believed a second motion might not be necessary to move the item along to Council with outstanding issues. She noted that pages 4 and 5 of the staff report documented the issues needing to be addressed.

Pulcifer replied that staff would advise a new motion to deal with the landscape waiver.

A vote on the motions showed:

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

Motions carried.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Derezinski, to waive the requirement in the landscaping ordinance for a 15-foot landscape buffer between the parking and the wooded area to the west.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

(c) Public Hearing and Action on Federal Building Complex Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval, 4.56 acres, 3971 Research Park Drive. A proposal to expand the existing south parking lot by eight parking spaces at the east end of the parking lot – Staff Recommendation: Approval

DiLeo made a brief presentation and provided a summary of the proposal.

Noting no speakers, Bona closed the public hearing at 9:52 p.m.

Moved by Mahler, seconded by Woods, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Federal Building Complex (3791 Research Park Drive) Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

(d) Public Hearing and Action on Eleven Parkland Rezoning: (1) Pittsview Park, southwest corner of Packard Road and Pittsview Drive. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (2) Windemere Park, north side of Windemere Drive between Markbarry Drive and Charter Place. A request to rezone this site from R1B (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (3) Waymarket Park, north side of Waymarket Drive east and west of Signature Boulevard. A request to rezone this site from R4B (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (4) Turnberry Park, east side of Turnberry Lane, south of Ailsa Craig Drive. A request to rezone this site from R1D (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (5) Stapp Nature Area, south side of Huron Parkway east of Tuebingen Parkway and west of Traverwood. A request to rezone this site from

R4D (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (6) Redbud Nature Area, west side of Parkwood Avenue, north of Edgewood Drive. A request to rezone this site from R3 (Townhouse Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (7) Maryfield Wildwood Park, southwest corner of Arbana Drive and Linwood Avenue. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (8) Oakwoods Nature Area, west of Dunwoodie Road, north of Green Road. A request to rezone this site from R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (9) Molin Nature Area, south of Columbia Avenue, between Kimberley Road and Colony Road. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (10) Foxfire West Park, south of Hickory Point Drive. A request to rezone this site from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use. (11) Crary Park, northeast corner of Washtenaw Avenue and Cambridge Road. A request to rezone this site from R2B (Two-Family Dwelling and Student Housing District) to PL (Public Land District) for public park use – Staff Recommendation: Postpone to June 2 meeting

(e) Public Hearing and Action on Dicken Woods Nature Area Annexation and Zoning, southeast corner of Pauline Boulevard and South Maple Road. A request to annex this site into the City and zone it PL (Public Land District) for public park use – Staff Recommendation: Postpone to June 2 meeting

Bona continued the public hearing.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Pratt, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Dicken Nature Area Annexation and PL (Public Land) Zoning Petitions.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Pratt, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Pittsview Park, Windemere Park, Waymarket Park, Turnberry Park, Stapp Nature Area, Redbud Nature Area, Maryfield Wildwood Park, Oakwoods Nature Area, Molin Nature Area, Foxfire West Park, and Crary Park petitions for Rezoning to PL (Public Land).

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Derezinski, to postpone action to the meeting of June 2.

A vote on the motion to postpone showed:

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

Motion carried.

(f) Public Hearing and Action on Master Plan: Land Use Element. This document is the result of consolidating the four City Area Plans (South, West, Northeast and Central) into one document. The intent of this consolidation is to create a document that includes all substantive information from each area plan that can be updated more regularly and include goals and objectives that can be applied more broadly. No substantive information has been added during this consolidation process; major changes

will be proposed in the second phase of this planning effort, which may be initiated in 2009 – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Kahan made a brief presentation and explained the proposed changes.

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Green Briar, spoke about the master planning process.

Lou Glorie, of Brooks Street, was concerned that consolidation would reduce the points of opportunity for citizen input. She also commented on the master planning process.

Ray Detter, of the Downtown Citizens Advisory Council, supported the consolidation of plans and spoke about the master planning process.

Bona declared the public hearing closed at 10:13 p.m.

Moved by Woods, seconded by Pratt, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adopts the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan: Land Use Element as an element of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan.

Moved by Woods, seconded by Pratt, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council adopt the City of Ann Arbor Master Plan: Land Use Element as an element of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan.

Bona asked Kahan to clarify someone's earlier question about the difference between agenda items 8f and 8g.

Kahan replied that 8f referred to the document before the Commission (Land Use Element) and that 8g referred to an annual administrative decision that Commission makes.

Bona asked whether Allen Creek was covered in the Non-motorized Plan.

Kahan confirmed this.

Pratt asked if there would be substantial public involvement. He asked staff to describe the process.

Kahan replied that the public process had not been flushed out, but that it would be extensive. He said that feedback would be elicited regarding corridors, land use, design guideline recommendations and other issues. He said that Council and the Commission would be actively involved.

Pratt asked if neighborhoods would be able to engage in discussions specific to their area.

Kahan replied that this was yet to be determined. He said it was possible that the group may want to grapple with idea of discussing areas individually, but it was unclear at this point.

Woods asked whether any information was being added or removed from the various plans being consolidated.

Kahan confirmed nothing had been changed, removed or added.

Potts praised Kahan for all his hard work on this project. She believed she found new material in the consolidated document, on pg. 123; and, she asked whether the Elks Lodge on Sunset Road was in the West or Central Area Plans.

Bona replied that the Elks Lodge was on the West Area Plan.

Kahan replied that the language on pg. 123 that Commissioner Potts referred to was taken verbatim from the Northeast Area Plan.

Potts said she was not ready to endorse some of the recommendations.

Carlberg said she was looking for a mention of the Allen Creek Greenway. She believed there ought to be mention of the Greenway somewhere.

Kahan said he would be happy to take that as a motion and find language to make sure it was added.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Derezinski to add language to the consolidated Master Plan that made reference to Allen Creek Greenway.

Westphal was concerned about complicating the document, making it difficult for staff when updates were made.

Carlberg replied that she was just looking for a reference to it as a concept.

Bona asked staff to clarify the intent of Land Use Plan as opposed to other plans with respect to the Allen Creek Greenway.

Kahan replied that one of the intents of the Land Use Plan was to provide current best practice information with regard to language regarding Allen Creek Greenway. He was unsure of precisely where or in which plan the reference to Allen Creek originated. He stated that it was referenced in the Non-motorized Plan, and said he would be happy to research the Central and West Area Plans for language on the Allen Creek Greenway. He said he would share the information prior to going to Council.

Westphal asked whether the Non-motorized Plan should be called out as a separate plan on page 10 of the consolidated document.

Kahan replied that this could be done.

Bona asked staff to confirm that the Non-motorized Plan was not getting added to the Transportation Plan.

Pulcifer replied that this was true.

Potts did not support adding new material regarding the Allen Creek Greenway. She said the intent was to consolidate information, not add new information.

Pratt said he had already seen a reference to the Allen Creek Greenway in the Central Area Plan. He believed it was a broad enough concept that the Commission would not box itself in by acknowledging it.

Bona said a reference to the Greenway might also be in the PROS Plan.

Carlberg said she found a reference to the Greenway on page 57 of the Central Area Plan.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

Westphal had a vocabulary related concern regarding use of the word interface. He noted that the Central Area Plan did not recognize that we would someday name something an interface zone. He proposed replacing the word interface with transition in two places on page 60 and in one place at the top of page 61 of the consolidated plan, replacing the word interface with transition. He said his motivation for recommending the amendment was to let people know how the City was using the term interface: to describe the downtown and central area.

Moved by Westphal, seconded by Derezinski, to strike the word interface and replace with transition in two places on page 60 and in one place on page 61 of the consolidated plan.

Woods said she would be okay with or without the amendment. She was concerned about wordsmithing the document, which she believed would be a bad thing. She said interface was a word that was very much in use right now, and she saw no need to change the word.

Potts believed that interface had become a key term in downtown planning. She noted that when it was used in a different way, it would just confuse people. She believed abutting might be another good word to use.

Bona believed it was an important distinction to make. She said that Near North claimed their project was in an interface zone, when it was in no way near the interface area. She believed, unfortunately, that interface was the best word, but she hoped the word transition would lead to less confusion.

Derezinski said he was okay with the amendment, but he agreed with Commissioner Woods that wordsmithing could lead the Commission into a swamp. He supported this one change.

Bona noted that the word transition would replace interface once in each of the first three paragraphs.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

Westphal also proposed that the reference at the bottom of page 60, in the last line, to “three very different kinds of areas,” be corrected to read “two very different kinds.”

Moved by Westphal, seconded by Derezinski, to replace the word “three” in the last line of page 60 of the consolidated plan with the word “two.”

Potts asked if both core and interface zones were in the downtown area.

Kahan replied that this was correct, stating that these areas were referred to as D1 and D2.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

A vote on the main motions showed:

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

Motions carried.

(g) Public Hearing and Action on Master Plan Review (whether elements should be studied for possible change or new elements added to the Master Plan) – Staff Recommendation: Postpone

Pulcifer explained the purpose of the review and the reason for requesting postponement.

Noting no speakers, Bona continued the public hearing.

Moved by Derezinski, seconded by Westphal, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the “City of Ann Arbor Master Plan Resolution” and the “City of Ann Arbor Resource Information In Support Of The City Master Plan Resolution,” dated May 5, 2009.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Mahler, to postpone action.

A vote on the motion to postpone showed:

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

Motion carried.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Green Briar, suggested that large documents and plans be burned to CD to avoid printing costs and to make them more accessible to public. He also suggested that hardcopies of documents like these be available in public libraries for review.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

Pratt said the A2D2 Steering Committee was meeting on Monday, May 11. He also requested that staff prepare a resolution for the May 19, 2009 Commission meeting to put a moratorium on demolition in R4C zoning districts. He noted that he had mentioned this idea previously, and that the Ordinance Review Committee had recognized inconsistencies with R4C. He asked staff to schedule the resolution formally as part of the next agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Bona declared the meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Mark Lloyd, Manager
Planning and Development Services

Kirk Westphal, Secretary

Prepared by Steve Bartha
Management Assistant
Planning and Development Services