



CITY OF ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

100 North Fifth Avenue, P.O. Box 8647, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107-8647

www.a2gov.org

Administration (734)794-6210

Community Development Services (734) 622-9025

Parks & Recreation Services (734) 794-6230

Planning & Development Services - Building (734) 794-6267

Planning & Development Services - Planning (734) 794-

Community Services Area
6265

Meeting Summary

Date: August 24, 2010

Time: 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm

Location: Washtenaw County Building, 200 North Main Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Re: R4C/R2A Zoning Study – Advisory Committee Meeting 6

Advisory Committee – Bonnie Bona (for Jean Carlberg), Wendy Carman, Chuck Carver, Anya Dale, Tony Derezhinski, Carl Luckenbach, Ethel Potts, Ellen Rambo, Irene Tyler, Julie Weatherbee

City of Ann Arbor—Matt Kowalski, Wendy Rampson

Project Update:

- Staff anticipates 2-3 more meetings of the Advisory Committee. Staff presented revised project schedule.

R2A Districts:

- Lack of overall concerns with existing R2A districts.
- Committee concerns about enforcement of existing codes and definition of duplex.
- Non-conforming lot size still an issue, would prefer ability to build back non-conforming structures similar to proposal for R4C district.
- May have to re-visit R2A standards in more depth depending on changes to R4C district

Non-conforming Structures:

- Advisory Committee supports allowing non-conforming structures to be re-built to pre-destruction standards. The structures would be permitted to be re-built in order to match the previous building setbacks and density.
- There should be a limit on the length of time during which a property owners has the ability to re-build structures back according to the previous conditions.
- Same mass and scale is important, but not necessarily same materials.

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.

Zoning Tools discussion:

- Down zoning or up zoning of areas should be included as optional zoning tools
- Form-based codes might address design issues; however the process would be very time-consuming and require much deeper analysis of existing conditions.
- Need to address minimum lot size as a priority.
- The overall consensus is that a smaller lot size is needed to bring more properties into conformance in order to: allow for increased flexibility in the use of properties; help prevent demolition of existing houses; and help prevent combination of lots to construct out-of-scale developments.
- Don't necessarily prevent all lot combinations, but have tools in place that will require construction on neighborhood friendly scale even if lots are combined.
- If reducing the minimum lot size we need to re-calculate unit/lot area or develop a different way of calculation density (ex: beds/lot area)
- Current zoning encourages six bedroom units, these units are harder to rent to non-students.
- Density not a primary concern if setbacks, open space and parking are addressed.
- Explore alternative parking methods- ex: parking permits, satellite parking lots
- R4C area represents many different types of neighborhoods. Different tools may be appropriate for different neighborhoods; it will be difficult to create one solution for all R4C properties.