

R4C/R2A Advisory Committee Meeting

March 16, 2011, 6 pm

Lower Level Conference Room, County Administration Building, 200 N. Main

Present: Jean Carlberg, Wendy Carman, Chuck Carver, Michelle Derr, Carl Luckenbach, Dave Merchant, Ethel Potts, Ellen Rambo, Ilene Tyler, Julie Weatherbee

Absent: Anya Dale, Tony Derezinski, Nancy Leff

Staff: Matt Kowalski, Wendy Rampson

Project Update

Schedule: MK reported that the Advisory Committee will meet one more time. Staff will finalize recommendations and provide report to the Planning Commission. Will be asking for volunteers to reconvene after CPC reviews to respond.

Objective: Review summary of main issues and proposed responses.

Committee Feedback

EP – Get questions that can't answer, for example, reducing number of non-conformities. Need information. Is overlay practical, feasible?

WC – Format of what we will use to report to CPC?

MK – Final report format similar to draft report format we have been working with.

WC – Group has varying viewpoints. Don't think have consensus on detail. Haven't had substantive discussion on issues. Didn't spend much time discussing pros and cons. Want to make sure discuss. Recommendations shouldn't be misinterpreted. Make sure that reflects majority of committee.

CC – Have Matt write report, then committee discuss.

IT – Response to Summary Issues – Which issues?

MK – The 'Response to Summary Issues' is staff responses based on citizen comments from the January public meeting.

WC – It looks like the lot size 6,000 sq ft. was preferred, based on straw poll?

If this summary does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting please advise the City of Ann Arbor in writing within seven days of issuance; otherwise, we will assume this document is accurate.

IT – Straw poll, looked at each option and took votes.

EP – Enforcement of code. Not enforceable or mechanism missing.

WR – Have copies of enforcement actions if want to see it.

MK – Moving on to Public comment summary.

MK – Staff summary. Took comments and provided summary with response for purposes of discussion. Should go through?

Nonconformance – Could keep language about “diligently pursued to reconstruction.”

CC – If takes longer, could ask for extension from ZBA.

JC – Why couldn't be done administratively?

WC – If applicants lie to staff, could be problem.

WC – Need to add to non-conforming section recommendations that provision forbidding reconstruction if more than 70% destroyed is removed.

Downzoning

JW – Worry about using CAP to guide rezonings now. Do we match what's there? Random pockets, but several may not be the ones want to look at.

MK – Several areas in CAP decided not justified pursuing. Took two, added Prospect/Michigan area based on some AC members recommendations.

JW – Are there other places need to look at? Feel like downzoning not based in much.

CC – Didn't discuss Prospect are much. City put in this area.

JC – That area was added by Committee.

EP – Many more owner-occupied residences in this area 20 year ago. Now rental. Over time, move in this direction. City encouraged this area to become rental through zoning.

JC – This area primarily student rental. Makes no sense to downzone this area.

If this summary does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting please advise the City of Ann Arbor in writing within seven days of issuance; otherwise, we will assume this document is accurate.

WC – The issue is whether or not we want this to be combined together and made into high-rise apartment buildings. Haven't thought much about this area.

ER – Looked at this area because surrounded by R2A.

EP – Many of the rental units are one house. If get new apartment units for students, may revert back to other uses. Future is unknown, flexible.

IT – Biggest change is occupancy per unit. Go from 6 to 4 unrelated. Makes sense for 4 unrelated in all R districts.

WC – Assuming that vote to downzone, 6 unrelated will still be grandfathered. Wouldn't have ability. What is rationale?

JW – When we talk about overlays, don't want to be specific. Here, talking about specific action. Would like to say areas that need to be downzoned or upzoned, rather than have specific recommendations.

IT – If reduces occupancy from 6 to 4 across the board, my goal. Would eliminate pressures on area.

WC – My goal, too.

JC – Not my goal.

EP – Has effect on housing stock. Lot of houses all one unit. Could go back to families. When start breaking up into two units, harder to go back.

CC – If reducing from 6 to 4, going to convert more single-family to rentals, which is not the intent of this effort.

IT – Nothing that supplanted this.

CC – Oppose going from 6 to 4 in R4C.

JC – Council asked for Committee to review downzoning

WC – Might vote for R2A to accomplish. Wherever put minimum lot size, things that are under that threshold need special attention. Will be lot of non-conformities, so one way to deal with this is to rezone properties to new categories. May need different zone for small lots in which expect multiple occupants. Owners will say that won't be able to fix up because of non-conforming.

If this summary does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting please advise the City of Ann Arbor in writing within seven days of issuance; otherwise, we will assume this document is accurate.

IT – See that 4000 sf was what was originally proposed in 1963.

WC – Don't have to downzone – create new zoning district.

EP – Still need Housing Code limits.

ER- Can table Prospect/Forest?

MK – Need to get issues in advance. Already discussed.

WC – Collected comments since January. Thought things agreed with from meeting 3 or 4, that aren't being addressed.

EP – Combining lots. This issue given in charge. Do something to respect streetscape.

IT – No specifics. Brought up by committee. Talked about.

ER – Could lot combinations be avoided with maximum lot size?

MK – Yes.

IT – Density explanation was confusing. Not talking about number of bedrooms, talking about occupants.

MK – Clarifying – question was specifically about bedrooms.

JW – Six bedroom unit pretty clearly six occupants.

IT – Concern that not getting enough parking when getting 3 bedrooms with 6 occupants.

WC – If nefarious owner of property, can build one big bedroom and put many students in.

MK – Jump to lot size. Majority agree on 4,000 sf foot lot size? Yes. Lot width? No minimum supported by AC.

WC – AHP setback change affect R4C?

MK - No

EP – Why lower lot size?

If this summary does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting please advise the City of Ann Arbor in writing within seven days of issuance; otherwise, we will assume this document is accurate.

JC – Removes non-conforming. Fits much better with what's in R4C area. Rational, realistic situation.

EP – Why not rezone to R1 or R2?

MK – Historical lot patterns, in 1965, 4,000 sf, 40 feet.

WC – Not opposed to 4,000 sf, but opposed to minimum lot width.

JC – Lot width is what they are.

WR – Then still stay non-conforming

WC – But still have non-conforming setbacks.

EP – One factor had to do with maintaining neighborhood standard/pattern. Want them to go through hoops with ZBA. Want to keep control over what is happening on all lots on the block. Should put limitations on them.

JC – Unfair burden. Established property.

EP – Don't want major disruptions. What is advantage if have to abide by setbacks.

IT – Already agreed on this. AC already discussed in detail.

ER – Even if build additions, there would be parking considerations.

EP – Would like to add required open space in R2.

JW – Had voted on parking. Community meeting noted that did not go far enough. Two objectives – make conversion undesirable and provide more parking.

MK – Raising parking standards?

EP – One space per resident – may be too high.

IT – Staff response refers to landscape buffer. How is enforced? Buffer on three sides? Not providing quality open space. Does makes sense in R4C zone? If abutting other rental properties. Land too valuable, not usable open space.

MK - Only if exceed 4 parking spaces.

If this summary does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting please advise the City of Ann Arbor in writing within seven days of issuance; otherwise, we will assume this document is accurate.

IT – Buffer area not working currently.

JW – 15 feet buffer is important.

MK – Can't change with this study, can recommend future review.

JC – If look at aerials, see backyards full of parking.

CC- Conflicting uses?

WR – Could recommend that CLUB reduced when next to another parking lot.

IT – Useless open space. Rather have that space elsewhere. Could be fence.

EP – In R4C or R2A, problem is pave back yard. House next door will never become family house.

WR – Can remove requirement for paving.

EP – Seems illogical to buffer.

MK – Regarding numbers, raise?

MK – 1/1.5/2.0 – Current proposed, majority of AC supported with vote, move forward.

JW – Rather have 5-6 bedrooms have most, since least desirable.

MD – If now saying that 2 BR needs 1 parking space, why not 2 for 3-4 BR and 3 for 5-6.

CC – Voting on this each meeting?

IT – Not sure need to take another vote.

JW – Added more information from community meeting. Still okay with Options A & B. Don't want large acreage of parking. More reasonable than what currently have.

JC – Did get sense from property owners that recommendations were too low?

MK – No feedback.

WC – Landlords wanted to change what constitutes a parking.

If this summary does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting please advise the City of Ann Arbor in writing within seven days of issuance; otherwise, we will assume this document is accurate.

IT – Can make recommendation.

WR- Create “chunks” of recommendations, like relax parking to allow flexibility, increase incentives for small unit, allow reconstruction.

MK – Next steps, touch base with Council rep. Been working on a long time.

MD – Don't see how can complete in one meeting.

IT – Draft out narrative in report.

EP – Things have changed since discussed.

IT – Write without options. General options. Encourage things that bring R4C lots into conformity. To do this, reduce minimum lot size, width. This would accomplish.... Goal: Encourage smaller residential units. Objective: Change to bedrooms so more accountable. Put into language with each issue moving forward.

MK – Send issues. Can group together to send out. Look at different ways to present information.

CC – Come out with tentative report and have group decide whether or not support it.

MD – Leaving options adds to confusion.

IT – Clarify what needs further study, what should be changed? When talk about lot size issue, address lot combination or maximum lot size.

CC – On R2 or R1?

IT – Just worried about combination.

Public Comment:

Ann Eisen – live in R4C. Hearing a theme that wasn't a general public concern. In public meeting, concerns were that maintain streetscape, which would be achieved through setbacks and what could be added. Also concerns regarding parking. Even lot combination was an interest. Theme that don't remember hearing is the discussion about reducing occupancy. Don't remember what public wanted. Seems like an effort to get students out of this area. Public seemed less concerned about what goes on inside of houses.

If this summary does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting please advise the City of Ann Arbor in writing within seven days of issuance; otherwise, we will assume this document is accurate.

Faramarz Farahanchi – Had conversation with bank. Way that things are going, staying away from financing in Lower Burns Park. Only things they will finance are student housing and Section 8.

DRAFT

If this summary does not agree with your records or understanding of this meeting please advise the City of Ann Arbor in writing within seven days of issuance; otherwise, we will assume this document is accurate.