

R4C/R2A Advisory Committee Meeting

November 29, 2010, 6 pm

7th Floor Conference Room, City Center Building, 220 E. Huron

Present: Jean Carlberg, Chuck Carver, Michele Derr, Nancy Leff, Carl Luckenbach, Dave Merchant, Ethel Potts, Ilene Tyler, Julie Weatherbee

Absent: Wendy Carman, Anya Dale, Tony Derezinski, Ellen Rambo

Staff: Matt Kowalski, Wendy Rampson

Project Update

- Shifted schedule to include this extra meeting. Will assess about timing for public meeting. Objective tonight is to get closure on as many issues as possible.

Downzoning Recommendations

- Added Prospect/South Forest area for possible rezoning.
- Areas proposed for rezoning, staff started with CAP recommendations. Studied current conditions, created map based on those areas.
- It should be determined whether we are downzoning to reflect what is actually there or actually trying to decrease what is there in the future.
- Intent for is to allow flexibility in arrangements. As market changes, these houses could revert back to single- or two-family dwellings. Maintain integrity as house, rental or owner-occupied.
- A goal should be to encourage single-family housing, whether owner or rental.
- In regards to Prospect/South Forest Area, parcels should same zoning as parcels to rear.
- Big houses in this area, so they may be better suited to 6 occupants. R2A will limit to 4 occupants or convert to duplex.
- R2A changes are not minor, the intention is to downzone.
- Downzoning should be extended on Prospect – farther north on Church and Forest.

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.

Overlay

- Included example from Madison showing how district could work. Maps C & D show examples within R4C.
- Oakland parcels on Map C, there is a parking issue. Multiple-family use is not well served by scattered small green spaces. Large front lawns, back yards next to parking in other back yards.
- Advantage of overlay is that you can make overlay fit what's there, and not use standard regulations for all sites.
- Advantage to overlay is clearer idea of what can do with property.
- CLU buffer discussion, should you have to buffer between two parking lots?
 - Yes, to protect adjacent parcels if they revert back to single-family. Additional green space is good.
 - No, installing buffer will move multiple family buildings closer to street in some areas, may not fit existing development pattern. No point in green space that small, better to put extra green in front yard.
- What are trying to accomplish? Madison example looks like another historic district. Another hoop have to jump through. Seems nebulous.
- Each area would have own distinct characteristics determined by study.
- Since all areas non-conforming, make overlay that makes area conforming, not arbitrary number. In future, property owners would know what pattern is.
- CPC and Council would put on work plan to develop ordinance and create requirements for overlay districts. Could limit lot combination in some areas.
- Overlay more restrictive than general zoning? Answer: It can match more closely existing conditions.
- Maybe eliminating any parking requirement to make some projects more viable.

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.

- Where more restrictive requirements, can someone get relief from ZBA?
Answer: Yes

Minimum Lot Size

- Map E shows no minimum lot size. 6000 sf would bring 385 into compliance. Could be lower to bring more parcels into conformance, or eliminate minimum lot size.
- If eliminate, control by number of units? Answer: Yes.
- Smaller minimum lot size = similar to R1D.
- Reducing to 5,000 would bring another 300 plus into conformance for lot area.
- Concerned about unintended consequences.
- Not as worried about conformance/non-conformance, if non-conformance sections is modified to allow re-build.
- Still restrictions for addition, adding units. Multiple-Family triggers need for site plan and compliance to all development codes.
- What is downside of having no minimum lot size? Answer: Could convert to increased number of units, but still have parking and other site plan requirements.
- Many structure non-conforming due to setbacks as well. No changes proposed to setback standards.
- What is point of making conforming in one area if NC in another?
- Example of conversions in R4C neighborhood – ZBA turned down proposed conversion from SF to 2F with 6 bedrooms.
- One goal is to reduce NC lots? If had no min. lot, that would help meet that goal.
- If rezone, do overlay with it so changes are for new configurations.
- Pattern to block sizes/lot sizes. Don't think it would work to go to no minimum lot size, but support smaller minimum 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.

- They are/were unintended consequences from current zoning, so there is concern about such a big change, for lot area reduction.
- Not as if lot size is the only control – other limitations.
- Map E example- 14 bedrooms maximum too much
 - Parking has to be accommodated, other requirements.
- Major problem that could expand in number of bedrooms.
- Example of re- establishing Single-Family neighborhood is North Central, and most of those are new buildings.
- Unlikely in R4C given housing cost – based on rental income.
- Some people may be interest in being close to campus.
- Advantage to neighborhood to maintain occasional Single-Family in order to keep some neighborhood stability.
- Not looking at incentives to increase density where appropriate – where are places close to campus that allow for more students. Could envision additions in this area to increase, without impacting view from street.
- Density could be added now(under existing regs).

Density Calculations

- Maps A & B – example lots. Under proposed, regs, show what could do. Parking does not account for buffers and example does not consider additions. Map A – parking requirements constrains addition area.
- Is there required open space for proposals shown on maps? Yes, but is not shown.
- Do regulations take into account whether parking under building? No incentive to do that, but code does allow.
- New regulations make larger buildings? Possible, also 30 foot height limit still.
- Map B – NC due to 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.

- This is where setbacks become issue. Map C have larger front setbacks, so don't want to build there.
- Were the maps examined for conformance to open space? No.
- Need to decide on lot size before proceed with density recommendations

Lot Size Straw poll:

6000 – 9 -1

5000 – 7-3

4000 – 7-3

None – 5-5

- Proposal better than what do right now.
- Connected with parking requirements.
- Bedroom count for parking is best.
- What is realistic parking?
- Some 5 bedroom rentals – 2.5 parking spaces may be too much. However, 828 Green Street – 9 spaces, but need 12.
- Heard that student renting out spaces. What do tenants want?
- Tenants do have cars.
- Student survey – talked about need.
- Depends on which part of R4C area.
- Depends on essential services.
- Park in neighborhood, leave for full week.

Parking Recommendations option choice 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.

Option A Parking: 7-2

Option B Parking: 1-8

- Want more parking because allows fewer bedrooms and units, but don't want to turn into parking lots.
- Need to be a fine balance.
- Increasing percentage of open space? Does that serve anyone well?
- Don't see reason for open space. Living next to open space is difficult (ie. Parking lot better than beer pong table). Properly done parking lots are better than random open space.
- If change parking, need to change setbacks.

Straw Poll – Density with Option A(Parking): 8-1

- Increases middle level, which increases flexibility. If want to build 6 BR, makes more difficult, but can do it if it's the right thing.
- Rooming house/ parking requirement. – 1/3 Why is not increase? Neighborhood impacted.

Non-Conformance

- Interior reconfiguration allowed to add units if no additional floor area added.
- May have difficulty meeting parking.
- In order to add units, would need to meet parking.
- Effect in Historic Districts – what if require separate entry? that could create less than 6 BR unit, but chops up house.
- No objection, but if read with second, can build addition, than convert to later to additional unit? Yes, if all other zoning/parking requirements are met.
- Have mixed feelings, since chops up existing house. But likes that have more units with fewer people. More quietness.

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.

- With regards to the replacement structure – is there leeway to build something nicer? How do do this? Could require ZBA approval.
- But where do they have standards for building additions?
- Get into design guidelines.
- May be overlay thing.
- Either match or do something conforming.
- Ready for public meeting? Vote 8-1 YES!

Adjourned at 8:15 pm.

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.