

MINUTES

**ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

BUSINESS MEETING

7:00 p.m. – April 1, 2008

Time: Chair Pratt 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: Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Lowenstein, Potts, Pratt

Members Absent: Bona, Westphal

Members Arriving: Mahler

Staff Present: Pulcipher

---

INTRODUCTIONS

---

None.

---

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

---

None.

---

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

---

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Potts, to approve the agenda as presented.**

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Lowenstein, Potts, Pratt,

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Bona, Mahler, Westphal

**Motion carried.**

---

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

---

Pratt reported that the A2D2 Steering Committee met on March 31 to hear an update on the historic projects related to the A2D2 effort. He said Kristine Kidorf, the consultant working with the City, explained that there was a delay in inventorying all of the structures in the Old West Side Historic District, but that it was anticipated the inventory and full report would be completed by this summer, with it then being transmitted to City Council. He also noted that the next two Planning Commission working sessions would be used to meet with Wendy Rampson, of the Systems Planning Service Unit, to discuss proposed revisions to the Downtown Plan, with the amendments then considered for final action by Commission on May 20.

Borum reported that the Ordinance Revisions Committee would be meeting on April 2, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. to discuss area, height and placement standards.

---

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

---

None.

---

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

---

Pratt announced the public hearings scheduled for the April 15, 2008 Planning Commission meeting.

---

REGULAR BUSINESS

---

a. Public Hearing and Action on FY 2009-2014 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) – The FY2009-2014 CIP is comprised of updated financial data for FY2009 contained in the approved FY2008-2013 CIP. Upon adoption by the City Planning Commission, the CIP becomes a supporting document for the City's master plan. The CIP is also used as the source document for the City's capital budget planning –  
Staff Recommendation: Approval

Cresson Sloten, of the Systems Planning Service Unit, discussed the linkage between how the City manages its assets and how the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) ties into that. He provided an overview of the CIP process and provided highlights of the specific projects contained in the plan. He said there were 13 “new” projects in the CIP, explaining that of those 13, nine were replacing projects due to phasing changes. Two of the new projects, he said, were separated from larger projects: Water Distribution System Master Plan (WDSMP) was a parent project and they were breaking it down to create an asset management plan in the water distribution area; and the Newport Creek Culvert Crossing -

project. He explained the two truly new projects: Compost Operations Expansion and Residuals Pond Improvements. He stated that the process for next year's CIP would be beginning in just a few months. The projects would again be mapped in the City's GIS, he said, to provide coordination and assist in identifying any conflicts. In an effort to improve prioritization of projects, he said, they would be using a new computer model.

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier, did not want anyone to think that people did not care about the CIP because they were not in attendance at the meeting tonight. He said people did care, but they did not know how to be included in the process. He stated that getting out into the community to inform the citizens was important. He respected all the hard work involved in preparing this document, but said it was important to think through all of the issues and to involve the community.

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

**Moved by Borum, seconded by Potts, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the following motion:**

**WHEREAS, Section 1:185 of the Ann Arbor City Code requires that the City Planning Commission annually prepare a Capital Improvements Program for the ensuing six fiscal years;**

**WHEREAS, The FY2008-2013 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP), which was adopted by the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission on January 18, 2007 and approved by the Ann Arbor City Council on February 20, 2007 provided the basis for the FY2008-2009 Capital budget;**

**WHEREAS, The second year of the FY2008-2013 CIP has been adjusted based on current conditions as the FY2009-2014 CIP to form the basis of the adjusted FY2009 Capital Budget to be approved by the City Council; and**

**WHEREAS, A duly-noticed public hearing was held by the City Planning Commission on April 1, 2008,**

**RESOLVED, That the City Planning Commission hereby approves the FY2009-2014 Capital Improvements Plan as a supporting document for the City's Master Plan.**

Carlberg stated that one thing frequently brought up in large development projects was the need to know if the sanitary sewer, storm sewer and/or water system could handle the new development, especially for larger projects. She asked how this question was answered and, if an increase in capacity was needed, how was the cost distributed between the developer and the taxpayers.

Slotten discussed the three utility systems separately. With regard to sanitary, he said, they currently use a computer model for the City's full sanitary sewer system, which was completed about two years ago. He said they used it to actually review larger development proposals and those projects in the downtown. They analyzed the projects, he said, in terms of the use and density and calculated what the sanitary sewage flow would be from the site. He said they put this information into the model, which then identified whether there would be a capacity issue. With regard to storm sewer, he said, they were heading toward that same point, with a project for it contained in the CIP. First they would gather all of

the locations of storm water utility facilities in the City, he said, and then build that into a GIS layer, which would then be used as the basis for the model to analyze new developments. Completion of this was a few years away, he said. In terms of individual development proposals, he said, there were a couple of different processes in place to address sanitary and storm water capacity. He stated that storm water retention requirements for development projects have been in place for years and the footing drain disconnection program for sanitary sewer was also a requirement. He stated that with regard to water distribution, there was a project contained in the CIP to update the Water Distribution Master Plan, which would include an updated hydrologic model of the water system that would look at sizing needs and flow characteristics. This tool would soon be available to use for new development proposals, he said.

Carlberg recalled a specific project in the downtown area where a determination had to be made as to whether there was adequate capacity in the system.

Pratt stated that during review of a couple of downtown projects, Commission was informed that the model could not be used to guess which projects might need capacity and in which locations. He said the sewer lines were run down the streets on a block-by-block basis and the issue was that there was a time lapse between when a new project was submitted and it was reviewed by Systems Planning and submitted to the consultant doing the modeling. He said it took a couple of weeks to do the modeling, during which time the project was before the Commission. If he understood the process correctly, he said, most cases where a development project created the issue, the development could not proceed until the issue of capacity had been resolved. The City did not normally fund those projects, he said, although there may be situations where the City would advance a CIP project if it made sense to upsize with that particular project. Although, he said, this did not happen very often.

Potts said she did not understand the background for the modeling of the sanitary sewer system. She has seen maps and understood that the size of the pipes allowed staff to arrive at a capacity estimate, but she wondered if the model, when applying a certain use and density with the present use of the pipe, could then be used to determine the capacity that could be added. She also asked if there were any way of modeling the effects and benefits of the storm water detention and footing drain disconnect program.

Slotten stated that the size and slope of the pipes were key factors in making capacity determinations. Staff also needed to know what the pipes were carrying. He explained the upcoming modeling for the footing drain disconnect program.

Emaus wondered to what extent the City cost-shared with the University of Michigan. He expressed concern about the first developer on a block paying a great deal of money to increase capacity, with subsequent developers then paying a much lower amount or nothing at all. This extended toward the cost of upgrading all infrastructure, he said. He said developers seemed to be paying for footing drain disconnections, while residential property owners were not paying their share. He was interested in more equity among developers and residential property owners.

Potts stated that the payment for upgrading infrastructure should be a policy matter.

Carlberg noted that the South Main Street Pedestrian Access for Michigan Stadium was still in the plan, stating that there has been a great deal of opposition to this project.

Lowenstein referenced MDOT moving up the Washtenaw/Huron resurfacing project to 2008 and wondered how coordination with other jurisdictions/agencies was handled.

Slotten stated that the City works to inform and coordinate its capital plans with other agencies whenever possible. He added that the City recently became aware of MDOT's plan to move up the Washtenaw/Huron resurfacing project.

Mahler questioned why the Newport Creek Culvert Crossing and the WDSMP were separated from their parent projects. He also inquired about funding for other projects.

Slotten stated that the Newport Creek Culvert Crossing was previously included in a project with the State Street Culvert Crossing work, and was being separated as it was now being done as a separate project on a different schedule. He noted that the funding for the project was from the storm fund and this money was available due to the moving back of the storm system improvements along Stadium Boulevard. He stated that the WDSMP–Asset Management project was separated from the Water Distribution Master Plan project, as it will be completed through a separate project and schedule.

Pratt noted the State/Stimson project and the importance of working with the Planning Commission for land uses in this area. He said access management recommendations should be implemented.

Potts was interested in the Fifth/Division project and when it would be implemented. She believed it should be moved to the next fiscal year per recommendation by the DDA.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

b. Resolution to Adopt City Planning Commission Meeting Schedule for FY2008-2009 – Staff  
Recommendation: Approval

**Moved by Potts, seconded by Carlberg, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adopts its meeting schedule for fiscal year 2008-09, with business meetings occurring on the first Tuesday of each month, working sessions on the second Tuesday, regular meetings on the third Tuesday, and Commission committee meetings, as needed, on the fourth Tuesday.**

A vote on the motion showed:

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

**Motion carried.**

---

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

---

None.

---

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

---

None.

---

ADJOURNMENT

---

Pratt declared the meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

---

Mark Lloyd, Manager  
Planning and Development Services

---

Jean Carlberg, Secretary

Prepared by Laurie Foondle  
Management Assistant  
Planning and Development Services