

MINUTES

**ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 p.m. – August 19, 2008

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, Lowenstein, Potts, Westphal, Woods

Members Absent: Carlberg, Mahler, Pratt

Staff Present: Cheng, DiLeo, Foondle, Lloyd, Pulcipher

---

INTRODUCTIONS

---

None.

---

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

---

None.

---

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

---

**Moved by Woods, seconded by Lowenstein, to approve the agenda.**

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Lowenstein, Potts, Westphal, Woods

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Carlberg, Mahler, Pratt

**Motion carried.**

---

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

---

Lloyd provided an update on the new TrakIt system.

Potts announced that the next meeting of the Ordinance Revisions Committee would be held on August 26, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room, City Hall.

Bona reported that the DDA Partnership Committee was currently working on two separate resolutions for approval by the DDA regarding a new parking structure at the public library lot and street improvements for Fifth Avenue and Division Street.

---

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

---

None.

---

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

---

Bona announced the public hearings scheduled for the meeting of September 4, 2008.

---

REGULAR BUSINESS

---

a. Public Hearing and Action on Text Amendments to Chapter 47 (Streets), Chapter 55 (Zoning), Chapter 57 (Subdivision and Land Use Control) and Chapter 62 (Landscape and Screening) to revise the private street standards, reduce the number of parcels that can share an access easement, require a site plan for City Planning Commission approval for new or reconfigured private streets, and establish street tree and buffer requirements for private streets – Staff Recommendation: Approval

DiLeo explained the proposed ordinance amendments.

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

**Moved by Potts, seconded by Lowenstein, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the amendments to Chapter 47 (Streets), Section 4:30 (Private Streets); Chapter 55 (Zoning), Section 5:77 (Lot Accessibility); Chapter 57 (Subdivision and Land Use Control), Section 5:122 (Site Plans); and Chapter 63 (Landscape and**

**Screening), Section 5:613 (Private Streets and Shared Driveways)  
regarding private street regulations, lot accessibility requirements,  
necessity of site plan approval, and street tree buffer requirements.**

Potts stated that Chapter 55, Section 5:77(d) referred to a permanently recorded access and utility easement for up to two lots, yet the following paragraph – 5:77(d)1. – stated that the number of lots or parcels served would be determined by the minimum lot area per dwelling unit for the zoning district in which the lots were located. She questioned whether this was a conflict.

DiLeo stated that they would not want to approve an access easement without first knowing whether a lot could support three or four additional lots in the future. She stated that access through a shared driveway easement, as provided for in 5:77(d), could be used if the lots were minimum sized, but that Section 5:77(d)1. would not allow it if the number of lots could be increased.

Potts expressed concern about the landscape buffering requirement only applying to shared driveways accessing two lots, questioning the type of buffering that would be required for drives serving up to eight lots. She stated that buffering was important because a drive serving up to eight lots would experience more traffic than a shared driveway serving two lots.

DiLeo stated that a private street serving eight lots would be required to go through the site plan process.

Potts stated that a four-foot high buffer was not very effective when it was located five feet away from bedroom windows.

DiLeo stated that the four-foot height requirement was selected because this was the current standard for a conflicting land use buffer. She stated that most vehicle headlights would be shielded with a four-foot tall hedge.

Westphal spoke about adequate road width requirements in relation to fire codes and asked if the established fire code rules would surpass requirements in this ordinance. He asked if these were state-wide fire codes.

DiLeo said staff was currently researching various fire codes, noting that the City has adopted use of the 2003 International Fire Code. With regard to the proposed ordinance, she said, the amount of pavement width was focused on in relation to adequate width for operation as a fire access road.

Westphal asked if staff believed the proposed ordinance was addressing the majority of the original intent.

DiLeo replied yes, stating that staff believed private streets were appropriate in certain locations.

Lloyd stated that part of the primary intent was to help provide for more orderly division of properties in the City. He stated that the proposal to site plan private streets would be beneficial in many regards, such as the provision of storm drainage, noting that many times problems are created off-site when storm drainage is not adequately provided. He said the proposed amendments would also allow for natural features provisions. A downside, he said, was that there would be wider street requirements for fire access. Overall, though, he stated that the intent was still being met and that staff would continue to work through the issue of minimum width requirements for fire access and looking at other codes and ordinances to determine if there were a better way.

Woods asked where provisions were located regarding the type of materials used for private streets, such as concrete or gravel.

DiLeo replied that this was contained in Chapter 47, Section 4:30(2), where it stated that private streets must be designed and constructed in accordance with the Public Services Standard Specification Manual. She said this would be applicable to private streets serving three or more lots.

Woods noted that the language contained in Section 4:30(2) referred to the design and construction requirement when a private street served more than eight lots.

DiLeo stated that it was intended to require curb and gutter if more than eight lots. She said this could be revised for clarification.

Woods said it would be important for this to be accurately understood. She could see where this might be an issue in the future related to proper access for fire trucks.

Borum understood the history of the proposed amendments, but wondered if it may be more appropriate for a shared driveway to serve a maximum of three or four lots, not just two, as a way to mediate the shift from shared driveway to private street. He suspected that there may not be an interest in changing the grading for that level of shift. With regard to a cul-de-sac, he said, if there were three parcels sharing a private street, a 44-foot cul-de-sac diameter would be required per Chapter 47. He thought this seemed excessive for a small number of lots. With regard to Chapter 55, he stated that if a property owner were not dividing large lots to the maximum allowed, there already were provisions in the ordinance that listed what had to be done to upgrade access for additional lots that were divided in the future. Therefore, he did not think the proposed amendments needed to require the maximum size because a property owner could go through the existing process to upgrade if desired.

Bona clarified that what Commissioner Borum was suggesting was the removal of Section 5:77(1)(d)1., which was how the number of lots served would be determined, but that Section 5:77(2) would remain, which stated that as soon as a parcel was divided into the third lot, it would have to be upgraded to a private street.

Potts said she would support removing Section 5:77(1)(d)1., as long as the requirement for the private street remained.

Lowenstein asked if an easement would be necessary to be retained for a future upgrade to a private street if there were a separate property owner of a landlocked lot.

Bona stated that an easement would be the same for a shared drive and for a private street.

Lloyd added that approval from everyone sharing the easement would need to be obtained.

**Moved by Borum, seconded by Potts, to amend the proposed ordinance by removing Section 5:77(1)(d)1.**

Westphal confirmed that timing was not a factor in this. He asked if another shared drive would be required if there were a division with a shared drive and years then pass until another parcel was divided.

Bona stated that it was not a time issue, but the number of lots the drive was accessing. As soon as a drive accessed three or more lots, she said, a private street would then be required.

A vote on the amendment showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

Bona stated that discussions have been held regarding the use of “lot” versus “dwelling unit.” She noted that a duplex could be four dwelling units and wondered if “dwelling unit” should be used instead of “lot.”

Potts also suggested use of the word “structure”.

DiLeo stated that both “structure” and “dwelling unit” were used in the Zoning Ordinance. In this case, she said, a lot was a dwelling unit, noting that this requirement was solely for single-family residences in the R1 zoning districts. She said parcels in the R2 zoning districts would not be eligible.

Bona thought she had also seen a reference to eight lots.

DiLeo stated that the reference to eight lots was in Chapter 47, Section 4:30. If private streets were proposed that served less than eight lots, she said, it only exempted them from curb, gutter, sidewalk and on-street parking requirements. She stated that a private street going through the site plan process would still be required. Eight lots were chosen for consistency with the previous ordinance, she said.

Bona referred to the recommendation to eliminate a street parking for less than eight lots so there wouldn't be 30-foot wide private streets accessing eight houses. She asked if there were specific language for that.

DiLeo stated that new language was proposed in Section 4:30(5) where a minimum of one parking space would be required for more than eight lots.

**Moved by Potts, seconded by Borum, to amend the proposed ordinance by adding the following language to the beginning of Section 4:30(5): “Where a private street serves more than 8 lots.”**

A vote on the amendment showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

Bona stated that these amendments would affect access for lot divisions and said she had a question regarding timing. When lot divisions were submitted, she said, they showed new lot lines. However, there would be no road shown because the site plan process did not occur until later. She wondered if this would affect the placement of lot lines once natural features, storm water and other elements of a site plan were required to be shown.

Lloyd said there may be situations that result in an adjustment to lot lines, but stated that as staff was working with petitioners, these standards would be taken into account so the plan was designed accordingly. This would all be part of the review for that process, he said.

Bona believed road widths were excessive and she thought it would be a good priority to enforce more progressive widths for the City's streets. With regard to buffers, she asked if there were buffer requirements for share drives, but not private streets. She asked if the buffers could be required when adjacent to a neighboring property line.

DiLeo stated that this could be added.

**Moved by Potts, seconded by Westphal, to amend the proposed ordinance by amending Section 5:613 of Chapter 62 to apply the same buffering standards for private streets that apply to shared drives.**

A vote on the amendment showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

Bona expressed concern about site planning for lots that were more than two units, stating that this would be eliminated if the threshold were raised.

DiLeo replied that if a threshold of four were chosen, it would not really capture any more developments than what were currently captured to go through the site plan process. She stated that current amendments only allowed up to four divisions before requiring a site plan. She said the threshold of two would allow some landlocked parcels, which sometimes was the most efficient use.

Westphal asked staff to comment on serving more than eight dwelling units versus lots.

DiLeo said staff believed that focusing on lots or parcels was the more enforceable and straightforward approach. She said there were no guarantees that lots in R2 districts would be two-family uses, nor lots in R3 districts would be townhouse uses.

Westphal noted that a few sections used the term "dwelling unit".

DiLeo stated that off-street parking requirements were based on the number of dwelling units and that what staff was seeking here was the requirement for on-street parking. She said staff believed the general design of the road should be based on lots.

A vote on the main motion, with amendments to the proposed ordinance, showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

b. Public Hearing and Action on 133 Hill Street Site Plan, 0.20 Acre. A proposal to demolish the existing building and construct an 8,150-square foot, three-unit multiple-family residential building, with a maximum of six occupants per unit, and five parking spaces – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Bona recused herself from discussion and voting, as she works for Bona & Kolb Architects, representative of the petitioner.

DiLeo described the proposal.

Diane Hall, owner of the property behind this parcel and resident of Adams Street, stated that she has lived here since 1984. She highlighted points from a letter sent to the Planning Commission by Julie Weatherbee, another resident in this area (letter on file). She expressed appreciation for the design of the building and the petitioner's environmental approach; however, she did not support this proposal because each unit would contain six bedrooms. This configuration would not be feasible for renting to under graduates, she said, adding that expensive six-bedroom units were not the easy money developers thought they would be. Empty units would not be good for the neighborhood, she said. She noted that the same type of building was built two years ago at 828 Greene Street and said it has never been fully rented during the school year, despite rental reductions and other incentives. She added that there were other buildings in the neighborhood that also contained vacancies. She stated that five parking spaces for 18 tenants would be inadequate, noting that this area already experienced a lack of parking.

Susan Bareis, 121 Adams Street, a nearly lifelong resident of this neighborhood, continued highlighting points from Ms. Weatherbee's letter. She said the target market for residents would likely be marching band members and athletes, with most of them needing cars to get to practices and events. She was concerned that the petitioner did not contact the neighbors for their input, stating that they would like to work with the petitioner to come up with a building configuration that worked for the neighborhood, as it would benefit everyone. She stated that parking on Adams Street was a serious issue, as well as the floodplain issue with Allen Creek. She stated that they were not opposed to the property being developed, but said the residents would like consideration of their concerns.

John Floyd, 519 Sunset, believed that anything that did not help the residents of downtown neighborhoods needed a second look. He stated that the old homes in the downtown merited preservation, adding that these homes were part of what gave Ann Arbor its character.

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

**Moved by Lowenstein, seconded by Potts, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 133 Hill Street Site Plan.**

Potts stated that this was her neighborhood and what the residents have said about parking was true. She said there either was no parking along streets, or parking on just one side. She did not know how it would work with 18 tenants and only five parking spaces, but said it appeared as though the property was large enough to hold more parking. She appreciated the fact that some of it would be used for storm water retention and landscaping. One alternative, she said, could be to have fewer residents, such as two or three people per unit, or two units instead of three. If the property were not large enough to hold adequate parking, then she did not think it was large enough for the project. She stated that these central neighborhoods really struggled with too many people being put in small spaces.

Lowenstein stated that the parking issue was a little worrisome. She also was concerned about bicycle parking, not just vehicle parking. She asked what the code required for both.

DiLeo stated that the code requirement for multiple-family zoning districts was 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit, resulting in 4.5 spaces required for the three units, which was rounded up to five spaces. For the bicycle parking, she said, one space was required per five dwelling units. She noted that one Class A space was provided, as well as numerous hoop spaces.

Lowenstein suspected that even though hoop spaces would be provided for bicycles, the bikes would likely end up on the front porch because tenants would not want to leave them out in the open. She wasn't sure what could be done about this, although it was a concern. She noted that Fingerle Lumber Company has been advertising parking spaces for rent and said this may be a possibility for parking for residents in the area. Although concerns could be voiced and she was worrisome about this use exceeding the requirement for both bike and car parking, the proposal did meet the code requirements.

Potts agreed that this proposal met code requirements, so she suggested there was a flaw with the code. She stated that she has been wanting the Ordinance Revisions Committee to address the issue of parking requirements, noting that the cities of Ypsilanti and Lansing both required parking per bedroom rather than unit.

Borum asked if the apartment building next door was counted in the front setback averaging calculation.

DiLeo replied that it was counted, but noted that, when averaging, there was a setback cap of 40 feet and the apartment building was set back further than that. In this case, she said, the 40-foot setback distance was used in the averaging.

Borum stated that the Planning Commission could not ask the petitioner to provide more parking than the code required, noting that this situation has arisen a number of times. He stated that these areas were within walkable areas of the City and it was a goal to encourage more pedestrian use, rather than focusing everything toward the car. To address the speakers' concerns about whether six-bedroom dwelling units were feasible in this market, he stated that the Planning Commission did not have any jurisdiction over that issue. He said they could not dictate or predict what the market could or could not sustain. The Planning Commission reviewed proposals based on code requirements, he said.

Woods asked the petitioner to speak to some of the concerns that had been expressed.

Miguel Vargas, of MVP Engineering, representing the petitioner, stated that he could speak to the storm water concerns. He stated that the property had a high point at the southwest corner of the lot and everything currently sheet flowed to the northeast area of the site. When the proposed development was in place, he said, the driveway would have curbing, which would capture storm water from the pavement and downspouts and route it into underground drain tiles. Water would also be directed to the rain garden, he said, adding that there would be less storm water runoff with this proposal.

Woods asked about provisions to make sure the rain garden did not fill up with trash and stagnant water.

Vargas stated that the soil on this property was sandy loam, which leant itself to natural percolation. This percolation would occur when the garden filled with water. He also stated that there was a below-surface overflow pipe that would direct water to the storm sewer, so there would be no stagnant water.

Woods asked if the petitioner has had any meetings with the neighbors.

Vargas said it was his understanding that the petitioner distributed letters to the neighbors providing the opportunity to voice concerns prior to planning the proposal.

Woods asked the petitioner's representative if this was the first time he had heard of the neighbors' concerns.

Vargas replied yes.

Woods stated that the Planning Commission did not have leeway with a proposal that met zoning and other code requirements, yet the concerns raised this evening gave her pause about voting in the affirmative. In particular, she was concerned about there being two points of view regarding communication between the petitioner and neighbors. She wasn't sure of the need for this type of housing, although she understood that students liked to live in newer, more modern facilities. She could not speak to whether this development would always be full or run into problems with vacancies. She asked what the petitioner would be doing for LEED certification.

Kevin Kolb, of Bona and Kolb Architects, representing the petitioner, stated that the full architectural details had not yet been finalized, but he said they would be using recycled building materials and the building was in close proximity to public transportation.

Woods asked if there were a possibility of adding more bicycle parking spaces.

Kolb stated that the requirement for this development was one Class A space, which has been provided. He said the petitioner also requested that they find room for an additional ten Class C spaces, which they have done. He noted that the bicycle spaces would be screened with a four-foot wall.

Potts knew that many bicyclists did not care for open bike hoops for overnight storage in inclement weather. She wished the City would change its standards to require more covered spaces at residences.

Westphal asked staff to comment on the concern raised about the floodplain issue.

DiLeo stated that while this site was near the 100-year floodplain, it was not actually located in the floodplain.

Woods wondered at what point during the process the LEED certification issues were addressed.

Westphal stated that LEED certification was not a requirement at either the Planning Commission or City Council level.

Potts believed that this project met code requirements; however, because 18 tenants were proposed for the site, she did not think it was in the community's best interest. She would not be voting in favor of this proposal.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

**Motion denied.**

c. Public Hearing and Action on 326 West Liberty Street Site Plan, 0.42 Acre. A proposal to construct an addition connecting the two existing buildings for a total of 6,914 square feet with office, beauty salon and residential uses and 17 parking spaces – Staff Recommendation: Approval

DiLeo described the proposal and showed photographs of the property.

John Floyd, 519 Sunset, stated that this appeared to be something that would enhance the character of the site.

Steve Dykstra, of Hobbs and Black, representing the petitioner, stated that he and the petitioner were present to answer any questions.

Michael LaShuto, and Maria Hahn, owners of Blue Karaoke, which was located in the building at the rear of 402 West Liberty, which was adjacent to the subject site, stated that they have invested a great deal of money in their business and they welcomed new neighbors on this site. He expressed concern about the staff report, which seemed to contain some inaccuracies. He asked that the Blue Karaoke not be referred to as a “bar” in any part of the report, stating that it did not function in that manner. He also noted that the portion of the staff report that contained a description of the project omitted the fact that the existing driveway was used for access by at least two other lots, one of which was Blue Karaoke. He said this may or may not be important, but said it should be clear which lots the access would serve. He asked the Planning Commission to consider including his address in the motion for access. He wanted the tenants of the subject site to be aware that the Blue Karaoke was open 24 hours a day and that customers would be leaving at odd hours, adding that they made their customers aware of this issue.

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

**Moved by Borum, seconded by Westphal, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 326 West Liberty Street Site Plan, subject to the recording of a permanent access easement with the adjacent property (402 West Liberty Street) prior to issuance of building permits.**

Potts said it was difficult to tell which buildings the driveway accessed and where the parking spaces were located. She asked if the parking lot would be striped for parking and if there were an easement between the three property owners for shared access.

DiLeo stated that the parking lot serving 326 West Liberty, the subject site, would be repaved and restriped for 17 spaces. She did not think any pavement activity would be occurring on the adjacent parcel. She stated that approval of the motion included requirement of a permanent access easement being recorded.

Bona asked about the properties to the west.

LaShuto stated that his property was 404 West Liberty, which was located behind the attorney’s office at 402 West Liberty. He stated that his building used the 326 West Liberty driveway for access through an existing access agreement. There was a building at 406 West Liberty that contained three storage units and an apartment, he said, which was located behind 408 West Liberty, adding that a separate driveway existed to serve those uses.

**Moved by Lowenstein, seconded by Westphal, to amend the main motion by changing the language regarding the access easement to read: "...subject to the recording of a legally appropriate permanent access easement with the adjacent properties prior to issuance of building permits."**

Bona supported this amendment and suggested that staff notify the adjacent owners to determine the appropriate properties.

A vote on the amendment showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

Potts thought this was a beautiful building and was glad it was going to be preserved. She said many times additions to an historic structure could do damage and it was her hope that this new addition would be an improvement to the building at the rear. She supported this proposal.

Bona also supported the proposal, stating that staff could address the comments about the staff report properly identifying the name of the use located adjacent to the site.

A vote on the motion as amended showed:

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

**Motion carried, reads as follows:**

**Moved by Borum, seconded by Westphal, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 326 West Liberty Street Site Plan, subject to the recording of a legally appropriate permanent access easement with the adjacent properties prior to issuance of building permits.**

d. Public Hearing and Action on Muhleman Annexation and Zoning, 1.25 Acres, 3055 Dover Place and Vacant Parcel. A request to annex these two parcels into the City and zone them for single-family use – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng described the proposal.

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

**Moved by Woods, seconded by Potts, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Muhleman Annexation and R1B (Single-Family Dwelling District) Zoning.**

Potts asked if both lots had the same street address.

Cheng replied that the two lots were under the same ownership with two separate addresses.

Potts noted that some of the properties in the surrounding area were zoned R1A and some were zoned R1B. She asked why R1B zoning was recommended for this site.

Cheng stated that following staff discussion and review of the R1A and R1B zoning classifications, it was believed that the R1B zoning, with a 10,000-square foot lot size requirement, would be most appropriate for these parcels.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

e. Public Hearing and Action on Willing Annexation and Zoning, 0.45 Acre, 1545 Chalmers Drive. A request to annex this property into the City and zone it for single-family use – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng described the proposal and showed photographs of the property.

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

**Moved by Westphal, seconded by Borum, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Willing Annexation and R1B (Single-Family Dwelling District) Zoning.**

A vote on the motion showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

f. Public Hearing and Action on Anthony's Plaza Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval, 0.56 Acre, 1251 North Maple Road. A proposal to add seven parking spaces, an apartment unit on the second level and an entry to the building, and to enclose an area for a stairway – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cheng described the proposal and showed photographs of the property.

Sahba La'al, architect representing the petitioner, stated that he was available to answer questions.

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

**Moved by Woods, seconded by Borum, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Anthony's Plaza Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval.**

Potts confirmed that the development of this site was nearly complete and that this site plan consisted of few modifications.

Cheng replied that this was correct.

Woods stated that this area of town has long been an area of first impressions, with people entering the City from both the north and west. She was happy to see something being done with this site, which has been in a state of semi-development for quite a long time. She was glad to see that there were plans in place to make it a vital entrance into Ann Arbor. She supported the proposal.

Westphal asked if 100-year storm water detention was met with the additional paving.

La'al replied that the parking lot was providing the required storm water detention.

Potts stated that this seemed to be an almost entirely paved lot and asked if this amount of paving was necessary for the use.

Cheng stated that the petitioner has had difficulty leasing the space because of the parking and that they believed the proposed amount of parking was necessary.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

---

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

---

John Floyd, 519 Sunset, spoke regarding proposed downtown zoning changes. He stated that Michigan needed to reinvent its economy and Ann Arbor could be the catalyst for that invention. He talked about what made Ann Arbor an attractive place and why big businesses preferred locating in other cities coast to coast and overseas, where business resources were much more plentiful. He stated that those who have stayed in Ann Arbor have told him that what they love about the City is its small town feel and big city vitality, adding that this niche has been working. He said they would be put off by a large scale downtown. He stated that people who want a big city experience would not be satisfied with an out-of-scale Ann Arbor. He lived in Chicago for nine years, he said, and the vibrant parts of town were not the high rise neighborhoods, but the brownstones, courtyards and back porches.

---

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

---

None.

---

ADJOURNMENT

---

Bona declared the meeting adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

---

Mark Lloyd, Manager  
Planning and Development Services

---

Kirk Westphal, Secretary

Prepared by Laurie Foondle  
Management Assistant  
Planning and Development Services