

Premium Prioritization Public Input Results

5/28/2015

Process

In March and April of 2015, ENP & Associates or Planning and Development services staff attended the following events and meetings to gather input on how downtown premiums might be changed to better align with community goals.

Regular Monthly Meeting

Group	Date
Environmental Commission	Thursday, March 26
Ann Arbor Mayor's Downtown Marketing Task Force	Tuesday, April 7
Downtown Citizens Advisory Council	Tuesday, April 7
Housing & Human Services Advisory Board	Thursday, April 9
Historic District Commission	Thursday, April 9
Energy Commission	Tuesday, April 14
Design Review Board	Wednesday, April 15.

Focus Group

Audience	Time & Place	# of Participants
Affordable Housing Residents	Monday, April 13 @ 9:30 a.m. Baker Commons, 106 Packard	10

*Focus groups were held for Young Families and Young Professional but no participation

Community Coffees/Happy Hour

Time & Place	# of Participants
Monday, April 6 @ 4:00 p.m. Amer's, 611 Church Street	3
Wednesday, April 8 @ 8:00 a.m. Starbucks, 222 S. State Street	1
Monday, April 13 @ 8:00 a.m. Sweetwaters, 123 W. Washington Street.	1
Friday, April 17 @ 5:00 p.m. Bill's Beer Garden, 218 South Ashley Street	4
Sunday, April 19 @ 3:00 p.m. Zingerman's Deli, 422 Detroit Street.	4

We also conducted interviews with the following:

- 1 architect who has designed downtown buildings that received premiums
- 1 developer of downtown buildings that received premiums
- 3 Washtenaw County staff from the Office of Economic and Community Development
- 1 staff member from the Chamber of Commerce
- 2 representatives of a real estate brokerage firm marketing a downtown site for the City of Ann Arbor

A survey was conducted via Ann Arbor Open City Hall. Finally, the process ended with a community meeting in the evening of April 23, 2015.

The notes from meetings, community coffees, interviews and the community meeting are attached, as well as the results from the survey. This information will be analyzed further and presented in a summary report to the Ordinance Revisions Commission and Planning Commission meetings in May.

Interview, Meeting & Event Notes

Interview Notes

Chamber of Commerce Staff Interview

April 2, 2015

- Certainty for developers that balances development and quality of life
- Not sure if any options really fix the problem
- Broadly from local business, viewed as a good thing, but then it depends on where, who, why
- Best Results
 - Outcome that pleases developers and City Council as well as residents
 - Provides certainty to developers, but balance community side
 - Chamber interested in happy medium between downtown development and quality of life
- Harm of changes
 - Could stifle development, but probably not
 - Premiums too far slanted in one direction- needs to be a sustainable agreement
- Three Options
 - Design component has most appeal
 - Good support for other two
- Energy Efficiency
 - Most won't care
- LEED Certification refundable deposit
 - Fund would be fought, but not too hard
- City is a desirable place to build, as long as ideas make sense
- Design Review Committee mechanism
 - Mandatory DRB only practical and useful if members represent equitable, for all expertise
 - Some folks will not like extra hoop, but if decision is transparent it could be okay
 - Change will not change perception
- Affordable Housing
 - Don't know what options- economic issue
- Does price point matter?
 - Yes, but target small degree, don't expect too much for it
 - Target young professionals, seniors
 - Trying to social engineer- don't
- In Lieu fee
 - Developers would like it because it is quick and easy
 - Affordable development
 - Would still need housing and equitable fund

- Limit premium bedroom
 - Will not end the fight, respond accordingly
 - Won't make difference in the long run
 - Downtown is becoming too big, too tall, too fast
- Eliminate residential premium
 - Don't know what response will be
- Two Tier system
 - Depends developer by developer
- Menu
 - Wide ranging menu makes everyone more comfortable

Architect Interview, April 3, 2015

- Affordable Housing is a bad choice of words- invokes images
- Reduce minimum size, but further incentivize smaller units
- Greater premiums for pedestrian amenities
- Green building is tough on developers
- Design review is not strong or efficient- could do more for building materials on the street
- Best Results for downtown premiums
 - Should not reduce residential premiums
 - D1 whacked off 25 percent of residential premiums with revisions in 2009
 - No data that more people living in the core is not a good thing- more sustainable
 - 1:1 ratio Ann Arbor revised Zoning Ordinance
 - During recession- large pool of \$ to be lent for student high-rise- already changed as pool is more diverse and student high-rise market already saturated
- Harm or damage from premiums?
 - Could further limit it by # of beds
- Which of 3 options most likely?
 - Affordable Housing
 - Pursued stupidly
 - Minimum restriction based on garden style apartment- unit costs 3-5X the build over rents
 - As long as kept affordable- 50% tax reduction
 - Energy Efficiency
 - Qualifications are useless
 - Quality Design
 - No one can define it
 - 1 caveat- high quality building materials
 - High quality materials at street level- limited palette
- Energy Efficiency
 - Stop zero waste construction
 - Disincentivize metering and reporting of energy use levels
 - Makes it difficult for developer to finance building
 - Why do this- is there a penalty?
 - Why do you want the data, what is it used for?
- LEED Certification
 - Still disincentive- not put a useful purpose

- FAR premiums for Energy Efficiency
 - Menu of a dozen things- pick 3
 - Scio Township- lots of properties already built
 - When an addition is built, try to bring them as close as possible to meeting standard, don't demand to meet a standard that might be unreasonable for that situation
 - Outdoor space- green roof, terrace, patio
 - Most developers want to sell in 3-5 years- look at operating costs
- Design of buildings
 - DRC does not have consensus
 - Halfway between- if building viewed as ugly- can veto
 - Supermajority veto by DRB
- Design elements not included
 - Wedding cake construction- poor tops
 - Better design guidelines for tops
 - Go back to implied height limit
 - Planned project- limited segment- height and building placement- completely discretionary
 - Unanimous approval by DRB
 - PUD- available- clients feel the city can be unreasonable
- Mechanism for design
 - Menu is the best option
 - Process is too long
 - 12 months!
 - Cleveland is shorter
 - Dallas is 90 days
- Affordable housing
 - If did not have a minimum size for affordable units, people would be using it
 - Rent needs to justify construction- revenue neutral- financing
 - Reduce minimum size to further incentivize through tax refunds
- Price point
 - Affordable housing is a bad word
 - Example- Baker Commons- city has a mentality of affordable units overseen by public
 - Price point doesn't matter
- In-lieu fee
 - Every developer would say that's a good idea
 - Personally, mix of in-lieu and requirements
- Limit bedroom units
 - Don't have a problem with it- should go to 3 bedroom
 - All for 1-2 bedroom
 - 3 bedroom-50% credit
 - +3 – no credit
 - Montgomery House- studio, 1-2 enough demand for 3 bed
- Residential premium eliminated

- Disincentivize the very thing that keeps urban core safe, vital, viable- force Downtown business to rely on folks driving to it
- PUD- very little being developed- says to development world- don't come here- don't go back to 1977
- Two-tier system
 - Anything discretionary tells builders to go somewhere else
- Premiums for one thing or a menu
 - Menu- idea of choice
 - List good, but further incentivize
 - Pedestrian amenity should be doubled or tripled
- Suggestions
 - Bigger carrot- pedestrian amenity, affordable housing (reduce minimum size, greater incentives)
 - Incentivize parking? Provide FAR for private spaces, revisit on-site parking as a premium- gets to a point where providing beyond what is required- not an incentive

Washtenaw County Office of Economic and Community Development Interview, April 3, 2015
3 staff members

- Affordable housing as a community benefit
- Link residential premiums with affordable housing- not an either/or
- Affordable for the life of the unit
- Leverage current economic growth for affordable units
- Growth in downtown been a lost opportunity- resulted in lots of benefits- but also entrenched inequity and economic separation, must find a way to leverage the growth
- Best results
 - Leverage growth in downtown to create affordable units downtown
 - Rules crystal clear
 - Affordable housing is a community benefit
 - Clear process that staff administrate
 - Clear rules about what is expected of development
 - Link affordable housing to a residential premium
- Harm of changes?
 - If we miss the mark by being too aggressive
 - Limit market pressure- not harness energy
- Three options
 - Housing affordability is most significant
 - Energy efficiency is second
- Energy Efficiency
 - Evolution in requirements
 - Affordability more of a factor- lots of support through market trade
 - Public perspective- energy efficiency hard for lay person
 - LEED base expectations simplification
- Design
 - Should be well done, accessible beyond cars, relate to pedestrian
 - Affordable units need to be same finish and distributed throughout to get a true mix of income

- Street frontage- no parking on first floor
- Affordable Housing
 - Targeted families- 0-60% AMI County or below
 - Housing affordability- higher priority in menu of bonuses
 - Link with residential premium development
 - Square footage vs number of units- more flexibility for affordable units
- Targeting range for affordable housing
 - For the life of the unit
- Duration of affordable housing
 - Covenant units- language wasn't great, still not perfect
 - Clarify rules for developers
 - How to advertise availability- grad students versus workers downtown
 - Partnership to provide services and list of residents
 - Doesn't segregate affordable and market rate
- In Lieu
 - Alternative to units
 - Not a great option
 - Figure out how to build into, and get units downtown
- Suggestions
 - 25% GFA affordable housing
 - Pro-formas from developers to help guide construction of premiums
 - Residential bonus- blend market and affordability
 - % of GFA- not separate size units for affordable, but be comparable size and variety
- Other comments
 - Think about commercial office aspect
 - Act 226 of 1988- local government with property interest
 - Less parking

Developer Interview

April 6, 2015

- Make it clear what the City's goal is and what kind of developments they are looking for.
- Eliminating the residential premium or altering the 1 to .75 ratio will stop development
- Premiums are needed in order to afford the development
- Larger developments provide a larger tax base to provide the types of amenities that Ann Arbor residents desire. The Landmark building provides \$1 million to the tax base instead of the \$20-\$30,000 that would have been provided with a smaller building that did not use premiums.
- Economics of office alone do not work well and parking is an issue.
- In order to provide adequate parking for residents/tenants and public parking, the height restriction would have to be eliminated
- The height restriction could be increased or removed all together
- The LEED certification premium square footage allotment is not equivalent to the large penalty if LEED is not reached. The penalty should be reduced or more in line with the value add of the square footage. A refundable payment is the same as a penalty it just comes at the beginning of the project instead of the end.

- Interview John Newman of Newman Consulting about LEED certification and the impacts of tying premiums to LEED 4.
- LEED 4 is going to be too stringent.
- The perception by developers is that the City wants to stop the development of 4 – 6 bedroom units. If so, change the premium to incentivize 1 to 3 bedroom units.
- It is unlikely that developers will use wind and solar in Ann Arbor’s climate.
- Developers cannot easily meet zero waste construction, but they could probably reach a high percentage if needed.
- Energy (electrical and water, but not gas) reporting can be done if the information desired can be pulled from 1 meter (not individually metering each unit, especially since you cannot control individual users) once per year.
- What percentage of the roof would need to be “green,” white roofs are technically green, can rooftop amenities like terraces be incentivized?
- Design is too subjective and design by committee with 7 people that may or may not agree is difficult. Required design review will stop development because the cost to continually change designs is prohibitive.
- The process should allow for designs brought forth to be “grandfathered in” based on the date they are submitted (like the building department) because changing ordinances mid-stream and requiring expensive changes will halt design for the 6 months that the process is under development.
- Affordable Housing is possible to explore if:
 - There were partner organizations. It is too difficult to document for the developers.
 - Comparable units is difficult, but micro-units or efficiencies could be easier
 - 5% of total square footage could be assessed
 - More palatable if financial incentives were offered by the Housing Trust Fund
 - An in-lieu fee would not be enforceable because unlike parking, it does not provide a direct benefit to the developer in exchange for the cash payment.
 - 1 to 3 bedrooms (don’t limit it to 1 – 2)
 - It is clear that it is 60% AMI – workforce housing. Saying affordable housing brings Section 8 to mind and it would become difficult to market the other units.
 - It does not require PUD process

Real Estate Services Professionals Interview
April 8, 2015

- There is a gap between affordable and market place housing
- Premiums should be linked to design guidelines to ensure best design
- If the FAR requirement is reduced, then the density of the building goes down and makes property more difficult to market
- Of options, design premiums are most likely to be taken followed by energy efficiency and then housing affordability
- People are interested in certainty
- On housing affordability, make sure it is integrated throughout the project.
 - Could do percentage of units or gross floor area. Per unit is easier to explain to the public

- Concern from development perspective is how much is the cost per square foot and if numbers don't work, developers won't take advantage
- Additional units or height helps offset the cost of a percentage of required affordable housing
- On energy efficiency, adding components adds costs as does adding rules
- If it is too onerous, it may restrict development
- Like a deposit approach for LEED certification but there is a cost to LEED, lots of time and money to file the paperwork
- Better to unlink energy efficiency features from LEED. Prioritize and pick a few things that are truly important
- On design, further clarification on design materials and windows is hugely important
- Would be better to allow more design leniency
- Indianapolis Historic District has clear rules but are subjectively applied to the point where developers don't want to build there due to the time and cost of drawings
- Public space is a challenge to developers if it is a requirement since it increases costs
- Better to clearly outline rules rather than subjective approval by an appointed body. Provide as much clarity up front rather than through the design review process. When there is a board approval, it becomes a negotiation and that adds cost
- For creation of affordable housing using premiums, the market is speaking and it is a little unrealistic. It is a bit of carrot but no stick.
- There is a negative conation to affordable housing versus to where tax credits are available
- Might be more acceptable if call it workforce housing
- The in-lieu fee would be better since you can build it into the pro forma. It adds flexibility but needs to be known up front.
- Did not believe limiting credits to 1 or 2-bedroom units would affect the market. Looking at the demographics, not getting a lot of families downtown.
- If the residential premium was eliminated entirely it would have an impact on the market in a less density unless the base FAR is bumped up.
- Broader list of premiums is better

Focus Groups

Young Professionals Focus Group

April 8, 2015

- None in attendance

Affordable Housing Residents Focus Group

April 13, 2015 at 9:30, Baker Commons

10 participants

- Megan Masson-Minock went through educational packet
- Grocery stores should be here
 - closest store is on N. Main
 - many cannot afford Busch's,
 - Would be nice to have a reasonably priced grocery store

- Argus Farm Stop too far of a walk in the winter
- Would like their own shuttle to the grocery store to take a whole group
- Used to be two A&P stores on Huron and White Market on State Street
- Need a clothing stores with affordable prices and that clothes that fit
- Everything is out by the mall and it is hard to get there
- Have to catch the bus for everyday needs but the bus does not drop off right by where they are going. There is a quarter or half mile walk from the bus stop to the movie theater
- Better design for buildings would be good
- One resident lived in Berkeley and shared how they got rent control and changed the process so people had more input in what was being put up
- Don't feel they know the neighborhood. Have yet to meet their City Council representative or the mayor. Why don't they come here? We would like to meet them.
- Desire for 2-bedroom units and larger units. For those with vision impairment, walkers or wheelchairs, it is hard to navigate the smaller units.
- Developers cater to students. They know they will get money from them.
- When something new goes up, it is for the university or because the university wanted it.
- Rents downtown are ridiculously high
- Look at Madison and Appleton, Wisconsin and how they do affordable housing
- 3 top concerns of the group: need affordable housing for residents other than students, must be affordable for the lifetime of the unit (many concerns about being kicked out), and when the units come, they want to know about them right away.
- Could have a garden at Baker Commons through Ann Arbor Project Grow
- Need good, inexpensive restaurants
- Downtown does not have good places to be outside
- Amount of buildings going up is crazy
- Talked about bus excursions they used to have and how they would like those again
- Think about the future for the kids and old people when making changes

Young Families Focus Group
April 15, 2015

- None in attendance

Meetings

Environmental Commission
March 26, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

- The Premium Powerpoint Presentation was provided to the Commission by Megan Masson-Minock
- Greenhouse Gas- more parking is not wanted
- Pedestrians, transit, biking encouraged
- Vary residential based on type of housing
- Not students, yes to families
- Agree to pay attention to design guidelines
- Green roofs/ white painted roofs/ solar arrays above a certain height

- Protection of built solar array from adjacent building
- Review process seems necessary- evaluate premiums every so often
- Escrow or fund for something down the line- interesting
- Current menu- green building unique because you would like everything to be LEED certified- make it as a qualification
- Revealing energy data for 10 years- smart meters
- Natural features regulations in chapter 57 of the City's Ordinance should be looked at
- Allison Skinner- construction recycling ordinance
- Living/Building Challenge- requirement for beauty- building look good is part of sustainability

Mayor's Downtown Task Force
April 7, 2015 at 8:30 a.m.

- The Premium Powerpoint Presentation was provided to the task force by Megan Masson-Minock
- Remove parking requirements for premiums
- Transit premiums for buildings
- In lieu fees and reliance on transit
- Use workforce housing, not affordable housing
- DRB should be more inclusive, transparent, and have stronger guidelines to follow so there are not big, boxy buildings
- Height limit is a block on premiums
- Strip parking requirement- we push that need for parking- parking into public creation- get rid of parking requirement for premiums
- Need more office- don't have sufficient parking
- Green Building- encourage transportation option, bikes, transit, zip cars
- Looking at new developments- transit demand management measures. Proximity to bus stop, adopt a bus stop, gain points to building
- Premium for not building parking
 - Need to encourage downtown users to use transit
- Process to reexamine every few years
- With height limitation can't get to 900 FAR because height limitation is substantial
- 30-50% AMI another aspect comes into play- developer needs to partner with non-profit to manage these affordable units- puts a lot of stress on for profit developer. Workforce housing is a better term
- Think it is a falsehood for a family of 4 60-80% AMI is workforce housing. Downtown is an expensive place to live
- used to be payment in lieu because is it the right place
- Why tying this to the developer? Taxpayers should pay- yes to workforce as term, stay away from affordable housing
- 30-50% AMI- singles or couples. Can be able to work up to a non-affordable unit, can work and move on, but also artists and musicians, not family of 4 to forever be there- young businesses need it

- Downtown is the engine- portion could be in lieu, but not necessary to have folks downtown because of transit
- Transfer of Development Rights to go elsewhere out of downtown, perhaps using the PUD
- Only 39% of downtown is buildable. Pedestrian amenities, how often they don't work. Ongoing financial obligation to the space. 5-10 year responsibility to keep the things looking nice. City can replace trees with taxes.
- Public space is tough when you tie to abutting up to sidewalk
- Community not supportive of bigger building
- Nature of design- principal operation- no project should be approved by right that has negative impact on historic neighbors but then questions from group on how to define that in the code?
- Design is more of a guideline- what looks attractive to one and not attractive to another
- ML: Personal experience- our area surrounded by student housing, concerned that give power to people who aren't in the neighborhood don't want to give power to people
- Look at design reviews- materials to see, rules. DRB want to design your building for you, how can community have final say? DRB needs to have broad representation. Give DRB a guideline to follow. Can't make it mandatory
- With height limit, got the same building over and over
- ORC meetings should be public

Downtown Citizen's Advisory Council

April 7, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

8 participants

- Participants did a trivia quiz on premiums and then brainstormed the following:

Limit/Remove Premiums

- Setback in D2- 10 feet min. if on secondary street
- Make premiums more dependent on community approval
- Not by right
- Limit the extent of some premiums
- Encourage planned projects because premiums are like PUDs without public benefit
- Don't want more development- don't have the drain infrastructure
- Historic preservation credit should reward adjacency to historically designated districts/buildings

Qualifications

- Must abide by design review board
- Compliance with design review board recommendations
- Follow design review board recommendations and guidelines
- Requirement to abide by design requirements
- No negative impact on nearby residential
- No negative impact upon nearby residential and/or historical neighbors

Smaller FAR

- Smaller FAR for housing units over two bedrooms
- Smaller FAR for residential with more than 3 bedrooms
- Green building way less generous
- Historic preservation make less generous
- A number of premiums tightened up

Larger FAR

- Open premium or PUD that development goes to neighborhood and they will tell you what they want
- Workforce housing- better target for FAR
- Inverse relationship to % income to FAR premium
- Greater height allowed if increased pedestrian amenity, but not increased FAR- protected landmark trees
- Include AIA 2030 along with LEED in green bonuses
- Bigger incentive for affordable housing
- Add preservation of large and landmark trees
- Are too generous currently
- More emphasis on renewable energy system under green systems
- Residential premium should privilege family housing and daycare
- Accommodation and second maintenance parking of bicycles

Not Sure

- Larger setbacks for taller buildings
- Greater FAR must be in tower form- the taller the building the more it has to be setback
- Not convinced we need to offer premiums
- Tax credits reward long-term benefit
- Make some building amenity not tied to premiums, but to tax breaks so as to appeal to long term ownership as opposed to develop/flip
- Make pre-premium limits more restrictive in order to incentivize using premiums
- Lower FAR as permissible- make small enough that it can't screw up the block

Historic District Commission
April 9, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

- Alexis DiLeo presented introduction to premiums and the process
- The Commission was quite bothered and offended by the “façade-ectomy” done for the Bus Depot to get the historic preservation premium credit.
- Suggests that the historic preservation premium be required to preserve the entire historic resource, not just an element of it, and to be tied/linked to the National Park Service technical bulletins
- An overall theme was that new development has poor quality (first and foremost) and bad design.

- Incentives are needed to get better design and get developers to use the higher quality, more expensive materials. Building lifespans and longevity, and how historic buildings were generally intended to last forever while new buildings don't seem to have that same goal, was discussed.
- Want to encourage developers to build to a longer lifespan, be more durable, and use the historic "little things" that helped prolong the life of a building. Little things like a water table and cornices to shed water away, thick walls, real stuff instead of veneers, etc.
- Sites immediately adjacent to historic districts both should not be eligible for premiums and should be required to meet design guidelines. If not both, then should definitely be required to meet design guidelines.
- Discussion on whether the design guidelines should be the Downtown Design Guidelines, or the Historic District Guidelines, or both, or whether the DRB or the HDC should be reviewing and approving for the "design guidelines".
- John Beeson had many thoughts on strengthening the energy and efficiency components of the premiums that the Commission agreed with:
 - Everyone is already doing the 2 energy & atmosphere points as a matter of course, the pre-requisite bar is way too lenient.
 - Premiums/incentives are still needed because right now only highly motivated developer/building owners are pushing for LEED 4.
 - Requirement for energy modeling.
- Downtown condo market was ridiculously skewed toward the luxury end, and it's out of reach for a large segment of potential buyers. The average price for a condo unit was shamefully far too high.
- Need to have incentives to achieve better designed development, higher quality/durability/longevity buildings, and more sensitive and respectful projects.

Health and Human Services Advisory Board
April 9, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.

- The Premium Powerpoint Presentation was provided to the Board by Libby Levy
- General agreement that the current premiums are not effective, especially in terms of creative housing affordability
- Questioned if cash in-lieu is legal since it is used in parking, parks and PUDs. It appears that the issue is that premiums are "by right" and therefore "in-lieu" payments may be seen differently. Concern was expressed that if developers could "buy their way out of providing more affordable housing options" the result would likely be no affordable housing downtown in private developments. There was desire to explore the cash in-lieu option further.
- As the Board thought about past projects, the following concerns were raised:
 - Cyndico project in Washtenaw County was not sustainable because the condo association fees became a burden on the residents
 - While new funds into the Housing Trust Fund are useful in maintaining affordable housing across the city, it was never enough money to build affordable units.

- City Apartments was cited as a good example. It includes 16 affordable studio units; 10% of the overall unit mix.
 - Best practices in other cities suggest the best mix is between 15 and 20%
- Desire to understand what affordability mix is desired by the HHSAB. The Board expressed interest in the following:
 - Tie housing affordability to the residential premium as a qualification (i.e. if you are going to build housing, x percentage must be affordable).
 - Require 25% affordability. This could either be 25% of the units or 25% of the residential square footage. Tying it to square footage could be more palatable to developers.
 - The housing should be permanently affordable using “long-term affordability agreements”
 - Affordability should be defined as up-to 60% Area Median Income based on Washtenaw County’s AMI. (This would typically include teachers and hospital workers earning \$25,000 to \$50,000 and affordable rents are calculated at around \$1,000 per month).
- It was questioned what would happen if the base FAR were reduced, forcing developers to use more of the premiums. If developers can build the buildings they want with only the residential premium, we should look at other ways to provide the community benefits desired.
- Council is going to suggest removing the super premium
- It was questioned if height restrictions could be increased or removed
- It appears that meeting 2 points on the LEED credit is too low
- Residential will happen (vacancy is at 2%) unless the bar is set too high. What is too high?
- It was suggested that an affordable housing developer be interviewed.
- It was reiterated that the market demand and expected growth of 1,500 households should be leveraged. Premiums are designed to provide what the market doesn’t already provide and what the studies show we need downtown is:
 - 1 to 2 bedrooms
 - 30 – 60% AMI as a residential qualification
 - 25% affordable
 - Increase the “Green” qualification

Energy Commission

April 14, 2015 at 6:00pm

- The Premium Powerpoint Presentation was provided to the Board by Libby Levy
- Staff recommends a joint meeting of some members of the environment committee; energy committee and planning commission to further determine premium preferences.
- The commission feels that density in downtown should be encouraged, as it will lead to less waste and energy consumption. Therefore, the height restriction could be eliminated.
- If developers are able to achieve buildings they want by just using the residential premium, it should be adjusted in order to gain the energy community benefits desired.
- The general consensus was:
 - Increase the qualifications related to energy consumption

- Remove height restrictions and encourage downtown density

Design Review Board

April 15, 2015 at 3:00 p.m.

- The Premium Powerpoint Presentation was provided to the Board by Megan Masson-Minock
- Suggestion that if a small portion of a parcel is in the floodplain, that it could be eligible for premiums if impact on floodplain mitigated
- Do not want to become a regulatory body
 - If a regulatory body, folks will design to what can get approved. Seattle is an example of cloned buildings, where design creativity is not incentivized.
 - Have already seen that a bit in Ann Arbor with path of least resistance seen in Zaragon and ArborBLU
- Think they are effective now as an advisory body
- Design is subjective and hard to be definitive
 - Sometimes, they have disagreed amongst themselves whether something met a guideline
- Sometimes a design meets code, the Planning Commission's area, when it is problematic from a design standpoint. Some changes to code, like using diagonals to limit height rather than a height limit, could help.
- Process needs to change with a 2nd meeting for developers with the Design Review Board
 - One meeting earlier in the process, when they can really influence site placement, context and massing
 - Second meeting later after through Planning Commission and City Council to influence materials and elements
 - Also could have a pre-construction meeting
- Have discussed having a member of the DRB shepherd each development through the process, being a resource to Planning Commission, City Council and staff.
- If touch the Allen Creek Greenway, incentivize specific things project by project
- For the developer, all those things have to be financially feasible, something has to subsidize the difference.
 - Building additional units on the most expensive land in the city with the most expensive building methods may not be the method, especially for housing affordability
 - Better to do at 2-4 stories, where wood construction is possible
 - Ashley Mews had affordable units in the buildings under 4 stories
- Administration of LEED is expensive
 - LEED is good to have to chase underneath drywall issues
- Like to see menu of premiums for discrete green building or sustainability items that are easy to see if done:
 - Green roofs
 - Better landscaping
- Perhaps incentivize sustainability overall rather than energy efficiency specifically
- Premiums should focus on what we want as a community
- The tool of premiums should be adaptable

- Megan offered suggestion from architect that the DRB have a veto power. Not discussed so inferred as not something they would feel comfortable with
- Other things premiums could incentivize:
 - Design for activity for better health
 - Durable design materials
 - Design is adaptable for the future – not tailored to a single use

Ann Arbor Preservation Association Meeting

April 20, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

10 participants

- The Premium Powerpoint Presentation was provided to the Association by Megan Masson-Minock
- Historic rehabilitation is inherent in the marketplace with boomers and millennials attracted to historic areas like downtown Ann Arbor
- Considered the historic preservation premium given to the Marriot as flying the face of good preservation
 - The insult is that the developer gets a pat on the back and can use it for publicity when they are showing how to do historic preservation poorly
 - Need a better set of standards if keep premium for historic preservation, perhaps linking it to tax credits or the Secretary of Interior standards
- Premiums have very little value/not the best way to go
 - Better to require all buildings to be energy-efficient across the board
 - since due to climate change it is a matter of survival
 - LEED should be required or another standard, maybe energy modeling & buildings have to be 30% more efficient than those meeting the State Energy Code like new University of Michigan buildings
 - Reward of a streamlined approval process might be better
 - Do not like the offering of the carrot
 - Set the envelope you want and then require all development to meet it
- A build-out analysis and visualization is needed to really see what the impact of policy changes. Otherwise, it is hard to see the “what if”
- With the zoning change in 2009, wasn’t one of the pushbacks that D2 was not enough of a step down?
 - Also, that Huron abutting Ann should be D2
- For design
 - Should have some minimum requirements
 - Make Design Review Panel required or more enforceable
 - Should not separate public art from design, some of the most well-liked buildings have public art
 - Make it clear what is wanted
- Suggestion for ENP to speak with Jill Thatcher at one point in the process

Community Coffees and Happy Hours

Community Coffee

April 6, 2015 at 3:00 p.m., Amer's on Church Street

3 Participants

Near downtown homeowner (married to other homeowner)

- Discretion in decision-making, don't like the by-right, no leverage is left
- Doesn't always work out
- Tall buildings have impact on the surrounding properties
-

Near downtown homeowner (married to other homeowner)

- Sticking point- 413 S. Huron with historic district- someone has to weigh competing interests or HDC/trees/ Parks Dept., mitigation, landmark trees resulting in pot of money going to

Developer

- Had to pay park contribution
- Downtown Ann Arbor not friendly to office – parking an issue

Discussion between participants on design

- Some judgment, design review is advisory, can tie design to giving premium
- Challenge- ArborBLU- went through design review, but made changes, it will be ugly
- With design, design review board- worthwhile because of the suggestion design is in the eye of the beholder
- Some pretty good guidelines, proportions within context of what is going on
- ENP staff: Super majority veto on design by DRB?
- Developer: Development community probably won't go for it
- Big buildings near neighborhoods- out of proportion
- In order to have thriving downtown, need density, need to go higher
- Disagree with need for density/height
- Don't see linkage between design review and premiums. What mechanism for affordable housing- get rid of resident premiums altogether

Participants' discussion on density

- No development of S. University in 1970's- Landmark and Zaragon- 1st new developments- not friendly to office
- Residential doesn't seem to benefit
- You do. Increased tax base, infrastructure improvements, help create consumer capacity

Discussion amongst participants on housing affordability

- Needs to be known at time of planning commission- if decide to get rid of affordable housing premium. Affordable housing is priority- what is the mechanism? Affordable housing- student housing and mixed-income.

Discussion green building by homeowners

- Nervous about green building, heard promises and didn't see follow through.
- No way of doing it. What are the standards?
- That is the point- to have an outside organization. Piece that is tied to the owner and building- have the same goals. Some things will pay for themselves- raises some complications if not holding. Will buyers value LEED certification?

Discussion of what premiums align with community goals by homeowners

- Green building, housing affordability- Residential premiums brought bigger buildings with no benefits
- I like to live downtown. I don't want to live in high-rises, don't agree with density in downtown. Wolverine Tower- dense development down there.
- Downtown- greenspace might be worthwhile, good idea to have green buildings, good idea to have parks, good idea to building up to sidewalk and need sidewalk interest
- Where the screaming has occurred, it's where it's about residential- 413 Huron, Landmark, edges- what's next to it? Neighborhoods.
- By right stuff when adjacent to neighborhoods, needs discretion

Community Coffee

April 13, 2015 at 8:00 a.m., Starbucks on S. State

1 Participant

- City Council needs to develop long range plan, premiums will not work
- Zoning and regulation need to force developers to make a vision of downtown that city wants to see
- Look at entire build out of downtown with existing zoning and determine where to make adjustments
- Vancouver is a good case study
- DRB should have more regulatory power
- Zoning premiums- offer folks good set of design guidelines
- Thoughts on premiums
 - The more straight forward, the better
 - Less negotiation, the better
 - Why leave it up to the developers to decide
 - Why use it? Why not zone it that way?
 - Protect historic character
 - Why if we don't want parking- just tell them
 - Why should we leave it to developer to say what downtown looks like?
- Premiums offer fallback position, city can be in strong position

- I need policy makers to justify at least one premium
- City doesn't know what the city should look like
- If you do a build out analysis at maximum zoning, what would it look like?
- Most developers have a desire to max out, then adjust accordingly
- Why not just zone as residential?
- Affordable housing is different- developers will buy out- city needs different tack
- Getting rid of premiums
 - Don't incentivize- just say it has to be
 - Student group when in architecture school- student asked to justify its existence every year. While tiring, it was a good exercise. Should apply the same thing here
- Initial assumption is to keep premiums
- Vancouver is a wonderful example
 - Say what you want parcel by parcel
- Tighten menu to what we can't get through zoning ordinance
 - Deal with it in a different way
 - City Council needs to budget affordable housing, where, how
 - City Council needs long range plan
 - Nothing to do with downtown premiums
- Fallback position is to rely on premiums and developers
- Studies show relative shadow impact- have some concerns
 - 413 Huron impact is much greater than study showed
- Design Review Board- don't want to be regulatory, want to be advisory
 - Was on the committee that set up design guidelines
 - Understanding was after a year group would reconvene and reassess
 - Need regulations rather than guidelines
 - City Council won't give regulatory power to DRB- hates when HDC makes a decision they disagree with
- Sandra Arlinghouse made 3-D drawings of downtown, should check to see if she has done a build out or just a model of existing downtown

Community Coffee

April 13, 2015 at 8:00 a.m., Sweetwaters on Washington

1 Participant

- Long-time homeowner near 618 S. Main
- Very concerned about pressure on the floodplain
 - Her house is in the floodplain and insurance keeps going up. Won't be sustainable for her soon
 - Development of property on the edge of the floodplain can put pressure on the floodplain
- Portlandization of Ann Arbor keeps her up at night
- 618 S. Main is too close to the street and questions if room for street trees
- Trees are need to mitigate storm water
- Grew up in NYC and noticed that poorer neighborhoods had less trees and green
- Terraces on tall buildings not amenities. Due to wind, folks do not sit on them and use them as outdoor closets. Terraces are not a substitute for public green space.

- Too many students concentrated in too small of an area
- During the recession, her neighborhood became student rentals
- For 618 S. Main, the neighborhood asked for the developer to keep students out, but is doubtful about whether they will be able or will do that.
- Seen a hollowing out of her neighborhood of long-term residents since the 1980's. The less time a resident will be in a house, the less maintenance, so don't encourage too high of a turnover.
- Encourage people to stay long-term
- Edges are fragile
- On design, Zaragon Place is not bad but 413 E. Huron was a travesty, it is so massively out of scale
- Feels like developers more likely to take parking premium over pedestrian premium
- Likes idea of energy efficiency
- Need more sidewalk
- Graffiti is an issue, wish landowners would be more responsive
 - Neighboring property regularly has graffiti and owner waits for the City to take care of it and pays the fee. She thinks the fee needs to be raised.
- Three big concerns: churn (turnover), floodplain pressure and parking
- Sooner or later need to address public transportation. Need a car to truly get daily needs in Ann Arbor
- Neighborhood feels unsettled, she and her neighbors are afraid, they have put a lot of money in their homes

Happy Hour

April 17, 2015 at 6:15 p.m., Bill's Beer Garden

4 participants

Ann Arbor resident & architect

- Affordable housing needs to be done better
 - What has gone up is not affordable
 - Social motivations has changed. Ashley Mews designed for 9 penthouses. Two of those units were bought by a family that combined it to one unit as a third home and use it for home football games only.
- Premiums should be offered to a green building or some other public amenity
- What hangs people up, who don't own the property, is what gets built is the sum choice of choices and that sum choice must make the bucks fall (make money)
- On energy efficiency
 - Do not use LEED as a standard, certification comes at the end but have a similar problem with any credit
 - University of Michigan requires new buildings to be 30% better than ASHRAE (state energy code).
 - Uncouple green aspects from LEED and reward those
 - Green roof easy
 - Wind energy
 - Photovoltaic

- Premium would need to link the amount of money needed and give more space accordingly to make the bank happy
 - Green technologies are not seen as assets by banks, they don't see them as bringing a return
- Density more important than green washing to get the bang for your buck from a sustainability point of view
- Having people live close to where they work is far more energy efficient than any green building technology
- Hardest premium to prove is design
- Design a really good base. When walking by a building, if the pedestrian level is done well, folks really don't care how high the building is.
- Not every site can be built up. For example, the southwest corner of Ashley and Washington is known as the "core building lot" by in town architects because you can only fit the core (steel skeleton, elevator & stairs, area for utilities) of a tall building on the site and nothing else.
- Historic preservation needs to be emphasized more and done better
 - Do it by a site by site basis
 - The few relevant sites were identified in the mid-2000's
 - Keep in mind anything older than 50 years is considered historic by state and federal regulations

Downtown Business Owner

- Interested in the redistribution of property
- What drove the two outdoor businesses was they went for things that did not deal with any codes
- Wanted to deeded public access through the alley next to City Apartments but was not made a walkway
- A problem for some buildings is that the architects designing the building don't ever come to Ann Arbor

Member of the public

- Wanted more information about the process
- Wondered what the agenda was
- ENP staff answered questions, encouraged him to take the survey and come to additional events

New Near Downtown Homeowner

- Likes dense urban places and thinks there is room for it in Ann Arbor
- Left in 2006, lived in NYC and moved back recently. He and his wife work from home
- Sees being against downtown as a classic Ann Arbor townie reaction
- If the downtown does not go up, affordability goes down
- Tradeoff is denser cities allow open space and no sprawl

- Owns historic home near downtown but also pro-development
 - Would have a problem if an 8-story building went next door to his house
 - Enthused about what is being built
 - Best places for larger buildings needs to be identified
- Know there is a high demand for residential, since just found and bought a house here
- Miss the tech center, the incubator space, added a cultural edge to the city. No access to cheap raw space for experimental or maker's space but don't know how to make that
- Affordable housing programs are like the lottery. They help the individuals that get the units but does not solve the larger issue
- Need lots of space and market to address affordability of housing
- Density is the green thing
- Green building and energy efficiency is cool and great things but like to see cool architecture, not just glass buildings.
 - These are things he would look for if shopping for a rental apartment
 - Market should go in that direction
 - Knows the exact calculation for investing in energy efficiency technologies. For his new house, a 10-year timeline makes economic sense, but a three-year does not.
- Does not have an idealized aesthetic. Some streets or buildings just feel right.
 - Condos on Main near Kingsley are okay, could have been bigger
 - Likes Ashley Mews
 - Doesn't like the new City Hall – gets it, but don't like it, but not offended by it
 - Thinks what University of Michigan has built recently is great

Conversation between architect and new homeowners

- Curious to see how many property owners have the lots where new, larger buildings are possible
- Shadow and solar blocking difficult in Michigan. Even if adjacent building is 2 stories, house would be in shade in the winter. Has sympathy for summer shadow.
- Asking the downtown to absorb too much, such as affordable housing & parking
 - Affordable housing is appropriate other places too like S. State Street
 - Parking minimums are a problem. Parking can be provided by DDA off-site
 - Maybe too used to NYC, but parking is not that bad, it is what you get for trading off is a much livelier city

Community Coffee

April 19, 2015 at 3:00 p.m., Zingermans Deli

4 participants

Historic Neighborhood adjacent to downtown resident

- No premium should be awarded to a project that has a negative impact on a historic or residential neighborhood in or adjacent to the downtown

Married homeowners of historic home near the downtown

- Consider themselves stewards of their home
- Agree that no premium should have a negative impact
- Even New York City has low-scale neighborhoods
- Got involved because of 413 S. Huron
- Problem with 413 S. Huron was the mass of the building

Ann Arbor Resident

- LEED is the biggest shill around, certification costs tens of thousands of dollars
- Don't think the City should have LEED certification but require green building standards for all development
- In favor of no incentives at all
- One of the reasons stayed in Ann Arbor after leaving Chicago was the small town feel. You can sit on Main Street and see the sky. Tall buildings don't add to the character of the city and have created a wind tunnel on William between State and Thompson
- Do not like the "Connecting William Plan" because it calls for large buildings between 3-story buildings that would detract from the character of the area
- Purpose for maximizing development is to create money for the DDA. Their funding sources of parking and TIF are not covering their spending and poor decisions, and they have deficit budgets for multiple years. Real pressure for density is the DDA's need for money.
- Would like the city to decide what they want for it parcel by parcel and then issue RFP's like for the Library Lot.
- Does not believe in "build it and they will come". Bankruptcies of Ashley Terrace and Liberty Lofts are evidence that you can build in Ann Arbor but won't always be successful
- Best thing is if developers would have to prove they have viable business tenants before receiving approvals.
- Height of downtown should be 6-stories maximum
- Developers want to build to the maximum, in part to earn as much of their 2% fee on financing. The more they build, the more is financed, the more reward for the developer.
- To sum up, build to need, rather than desire

Community Meeting
April 23, 2015 at 7:00 at the Workantile, 118 S. Main Street

Question 1: Should there be a menu of premium options or a focus on one priority?

	Menu of Premiums	One Premium	Consensus
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different vehicles offer different options • What works for 1 may not work for others • We have different/multiple priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make a more livable city, could get more of those things • Each gets same end result • Different story- if premiums are done correctly too many choices de facto increase 'normal' FAR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure premiums so each equally valuable to developers, same financial return...
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -Greater flexibility • -Creativity of differences • -Fits developers budget and marketing plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -Should be a number of options- more premiums on the menu • -Developers are not taking options- change options to make this work- we could get the options wrong
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -Menu, only plausible to address height limitations • -Would like a menu, but not sure what would be on it and it could be short sighted • -If design and something else (design is more important) • -Fine with menu as long as design is on it 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -No one made it to height limit • -How do we make menu work? • -Some things should be required like energy efficiency • -State building code update • -Don't like pedestrian amenity- better if green space • -2 don't like buildings right up to sidewalk

	Menu of Premiums	One Premium	Consensus
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dynamic place, lots of goals, need flexibility • We have problems now, still solving old problems and what's to come? Can address problems as they come • Developers can't game the system as much • Put quota/cap on each menu item (larger or smaller) • What's on the menu? • Quality, long-lasting materials, timeless • Conveyance, less cars, easier pedestrians and bikes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have priority of problem re: cars- too many cars downtown • Less burdensome, more focused 	

Question 2: Should the city prioritize energy efficiency or housing affordability for premiums?

	Energy Efficiency	Affordable Housing	Comments
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discretionary? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentivize affordability • Pedestrian amenities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Room for improvement, it will all shake out in land value • If we get it otherwise, no more premium
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A component becomes efficient • Economy polarization has & will continue • Climate change is pressing • Lower energy costs • Lower costs of housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on circumstance • Makes city efficient (housing & transportation) • Work and live in city- helps energy efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both goals are admirable • As a group, support affordable housing

	Energy Efficiency	Affordable Housing	Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More systemic change • Immediate, powerful, long-lasting • Market may incentivize energy efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be considered social engineering • Do we have a gated downtown? 	
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does energy efficiency pay for itself? • Depends little things and... • Biggest problem is LEED paperwork (\$10,000's) • Should be part of code • Developers do it anyway? • Designing a building should qualify for LEED certified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can it be rent control? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do both • Neither- ridiculous choice
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easier for developers • Downtown food desert and other issues • Easier to 'sell' • If developers paid water bills (like NYC) they'd be inclined to reduce use • Storm water management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketing issues • Would need better amenities downtown • Is it too expensive to build? • Do 60% AMI folks want to live downtown? 	

Question 3: Under what circumstances could building height restrictions be uncapped or made higher?

	Circumstances	Comments
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No circumstances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height restrictions: if none downtown, segregation of income

	Circumstances	Comments
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No circumstances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why have height restrictions? Wind tunnels, shadows If the town is more livable, then height restrictions Height limit is based on subjective ideas- if height legitimately impacts health, keep cap or make it lower- otherwise subjective
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lived in DC, don't want squat buildings More interested in design- height limitations result in bad design Mass is the issue- back to diagonals- would rather have slender Debate massing of Landmark Requirement to keep to the street is challenging Don't want give and take- want it to be right Fine with uncapping as long as design is respectful A2 is going to grow- would rather grow up than fill in parks or sprawl Already built up, don't want bell tower and Hill Auditorium to be overshadowed
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No circumstances Uncap height 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep height restrictions Too much mass Too close to sidewalks Not pedestrian friendly Ensure sunlight Limit shadow Ensure pedestrian friendly Scale using ratio to reduce full-block, squat buildings

Bike Rack (Topics not pertinent to the discussion but important to participants)

	Topic
Group 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High rise affordable housing proven doesn't work
Group 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assume that downtown zoning is working

	Topic
Group 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why building up to the sidewalk• Income- 60-80% AMI- Don't like• Design- what is it?• Building size, shape, and footprint• How it relates to buildings around• Birmingham has a good design review process• Greenspace and sidewalks, arcades, courtyards• Plazas should be part of design• Homeless might use plazas- city could do more to help address• Zoning, federal philosophy
Group 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Restrict or charge for the construction trucks & equipment that are 'temporarily' closing lanes

Survey Results

There were 43 respondents to the survey regarding zoning text amendments to better align downtown zoning premiums with community goals. Below is a summary of survey results.

ENERGY EFFICIENCY:

FIVE YEAR GOAL	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Lower energy use in new buildings	17
Larger percentage of certified green buildings	13
None of the above	7
Premiums should not be offered	4
Other	2

QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Minimum for energy performance of overall building	22
Energy efficiency standards for appliances	17
Reduction of indoor water use	13
Metering and reporting of energy use levels for 5 years	12
None of the above	11
Zero waste construction	11
Metering water usage at a building level	11
Indoor air quality performance	8
Other	4
Premiums should not be offered	3

ENERGY EFFICIENCY CONTINUED:

SMALL CARROT INCENTIVES	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Sustainable energy source such as solar array, geo-thermal heat or wind generation	26
Storm water recycling	22
Green roof	20
Reflective roof	20
Wastewater recycling	16
Premiums should not be offered	3
None of the above	3
Other	1

BIG CARROT INCENTIVES	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Green building certification such as LEED silver, gold or platinum	29
Sustainable energy source such as solar array, geo-thermal heat or wind generation	25
Green roof	23
Storm water recycling	23
Wastewater recycling	16
Reflective roof	13
Other	5
Premiums should not be offered	4
None of the above	4

DESIGN:

FIVE YEAR GOAL	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Encouraging quality design through premiums	13
None of the above	11
Requiring “design excellence”	9
Buildings receiving premiums follow design guidelines for “design excellence”	5
Premiums should not be offered	5
QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS	
QUALIFYING REQUIREMENTS	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Pedestrian-enhancing sidewalk level features	23
Façade visual rhythm	20
Location, size, and percentage of first floor windows to allow views	14
Design matches historical character of adjacent buildings/district	12
Corner gateways	7
Clear definition between base, upper, and cornice	6
SMALL CARROT INCENTIVES	
SMALL CARROT INCENTIVES	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Pedestrian-enhancing sidewalk level features, like benches, public art, landscaping or historical markers	30
Cycling and transit amenities	26
Active first floor use such as a store or restaurant	24
Pedestrian connections (sidewalks, alleys and arcades)	22
Preservation of historic aspect of existing building	19
Premiums should not be offered	5
None of the above	2
Other	2

DESIGN CONTINUED:

BIG CARROT INCENTIVES	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Urban open space, parks or plazas	29
Underground parking	23
High-quality materials	21
Discretionary amount of FAR awarded by Design Review Board for “design excellence”	12
Premiums should not be offered	5
None of the above	3

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY:

FIVE YEAR GOAL	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
The number of units affordable to households making \$25,000 to \$50,000 in Ann Arbor has grown	10
A certain number of units affordable to households making \$25,000 to \$50,000 are built and occupied in downtown	7
None of the above	7

MOST IMPORTANT FOR CREATING AFFORDABILITY	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Requiring housing units affordable for households making \$25,000 to \$50,000 be constructed as part of a building project with premiums	15
Incentives tied to type of units (for example limit to 1 or 2-bedrooms)	5
Premiums should not be offered	5
None of the above	5
Other	5
Incentives tied to housing prices for first occupants (affordable to \$25,000 to \$50,000 income)	3

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY CONTINUED:

PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR:	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Incentives tied to housing prices long-term to guarantee that those working downtown can live there	20
Requiring affordable housing units for projects receiving premiums (affordable to \$25,000 to \$50,000 income)	15
None	8
Premiums should not be offered	6
None	3
Offering in-lieu fee to Affordable Housing Trust Fund	1

PRIORITIZATION OF INCENTIVES:

TOP QUALIFICATIONS	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Energy Efficiency	24
Housing Affordability	22
Quality Design	19
None	6
Other	3
Premiums should not be offered	2

TOP INCENTIVE	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
Energy Efficiency	13
Housing Affordability	12
Quality Design	7
Other	5
Premiums should not be offered	3
None	3

OTHER:

- Make premiums easier to get, not harder
- Incentivize more, require less
- Remove premiums and require energy, design and affordability
- Reduce minimum size of affordable units
- Allow design review to reward design excellence with discretionary FAR
- Provide tax rebates to incentivize affordable housing
- Badly flawed and biased survey
- Increase residential premiums (restore 1:1)
- Limit height, too many tall buildings downtown
- Remove height restrictions
- Remove parking requirements
- Workforce housing is critical
- Do not compromise for developers
- LEED is too costly
- It is costly to build in downtown Ann Arbor including inspections, utility hookups, and various reviews
- Enlarge sidewalks and step back buildings
- Match historical details
- City should not be involved in affordable housing or manipulating markets
- Relax regulations (especially related to affordable housing)
- Keep premiums as carrots, not sticks

WORD CLOUD:

Below is a word cloud of the most common words used. The larger the word, the more often it was used.

Affordability **affordable** build building
development downtown
efficiency **energy** good housing
market more people
premiums requirement
residential zoning