

MINUTES
ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

BUSINESS MEETING

7:00 p.m. – June 6, 2006

Time: Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Place: Council Chamber, Second Floor, 100 North Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bona, Carlberg, Emaus, Hall, Potts, Pratt

Members Absent: Kunselman, Lipson

Members Arriving: D'Amour

Staff Present: Foondle, Lloyd, Vaughn

INTRODUCTIONS

None.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

a. Minutes of May 2, 2006.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Bona, to approve the minutes as presented.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Emaus, Hall, Potts, Pratt

NAYS: None

ABSENT: D'Amour, Kunselman, Lipson

Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Emaus, to approve the agenda.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, Emaus, Hall, Potts, Pratt
NAYS: None
ABSENT: D'Amour, Kunselman, Lipson

Motion carried.

Enter D'Amour.

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

Bona stated that she received the evaluations of the Planning and Development Services Manager and that if any Commission members wanted to discuss them at the next working session, they should contact Chair Hall so she could add it to the agenda. She reported that the DDA Partnerships Committee began working on the RFP for the Kline's lot and that she was appointed to the First and Washington RFP Selection Committee, adding that she was selected to be chair of that committee. She said the committee decided to interview the Washington Commons and the Ann Arbor City Apartments projects. She said she would inform Commission of the date selected to hold these interviews.

Pratt stated that the Community Security and Open Space Committee met on May 25 to take a tour of the Farmington Hills court offices. The next meeting of the committee was scheduled for June 8 at 4:00 at the Ann Arbor Public Library, he said. He also said he distributed this evening a copy of a report done by the MDEQ on green buildings in Michigan.

D'Amour announced that the next meeting of the Allens Creek Greenway Task Force was June 7 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall. He said the group continued to review comments from the public workshops and discussed the possibility of further workshops.

Emaus stated that a resolution was passed by City Council directing a task force to review the zoning and building ordinances to see what could be done to encourage energy conservation. He reported that the task force held two meetings and determined there was little that could be done in the City Code. He stated that a memorandum explaining this and laying out a framework on how energy conservation could be encouraged would be provided to Planning Commission for review.

Hall reported that a recent change in the state zoning enabling act was to require a Planning Commission member to be part of the Zoning Board of Appeals. She said this appointment needed to be made as soon as possible and asked that any Commission member interested in filling this appointment contact her.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier, spoke with regard to the City's desire to streamline the development review process. He was not concerned with streamlining the process as long as the City carefully considered and determined what the real problems were. He referred to a recent Council caucus session where a citizen began discussing the planning process with Council members. He expressed concern about this type of communication with City officials and the potential end result of the public not having the opportunity to make comments in a timely manner.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

Hall announced the public hearings scheduled for the meeting of June 20, 2006.

REGULAR BUSINESS

a. Public Hearing and Action on South University Avenue Rezoning. City-initiated rezoning from C1A (Campus Business District), C1A/R (Campus Business/Residential District) and O (Office District) to C2A (Central Business District) of all parcels currently zoned C1A, C1A/R and O on the east side of East University Avenue between Willard Street and South University, on the north side of Willard Street between East University Avenue and South Forest Avenue continuing north to the parcels fronting the north side of South University Avenue between East University Avenue and Washtenaw Avenue, the parcels on either side of South Forest Avenue between Willard Street and Washtenaw Avenue, except the parcel on the northwest corner of South Forest Avenue and Willard Street and the parcel on the corner of Washtenaw Avenue and north side of South University Avenue – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Lloyd explained the proposal.

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier, stated that at some point in time, City planners thought it made sense to have a campus business district and he wondered what the reasoning was for that, noting that the district restricted height and growth in this area. He asked that Commission and staff carefully consider what the ramifications of this rezoning might be.

Noting no further speakers, Hall declared the public hearing continued.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Bona, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the rezoning of the South University Avenue district from C1A (Campus Business District), C1A/R (Campus Business/Residential District) and O (Office District) to C2A (Central Business District).

Bona said she had a conversation with Maggie Ladd, executive director of the South University Merchants Association, who wanted Planning Commission to be aware of the association's concerns regarding the C2A district and how it could be a disadvantage to smaller sites. She said the association was concerned about a blanket zoning change and how this might discriminate against small sites. A suggestion was made, she said, to send this proposed rezoning back to the Ordinance Revisions

Committee to consider all of the issues. She suspected there would be potential revisions to the C2A district that were recommended by the Downtown Plan and Calthorpe plan and suggested that Commission table this for 60 days. With regard to the motion on the table this evening, she suggested an amendment that would tie the Planning Commission's recommendation to any changes Commission believed would make the district work.

Moved by Bona, seconded by Potts, to amend the main motion by adding the following language to the end of the motion: "contingent upon the C2A district ordinance revisions and the district boundaries recommended by Commission."

Potts supported sending this back to the Ordinance Revisions Committee for further review, as she did not believe the committee had considered expanding the proposed rezoning to include a larger area. She recalled the discussion mainly involving the impact of the rezoning on two commercial blocks of South University.

Carlberg appreciated what the amendment to the motion was trying to accomplish, but she wondered if it were somewhat premature, as both were based on if the C2A district were to be revised and if the district boundaries were changed. She thought it would be more appropriate to add this amendment when Commission knew exactly what it was dealing with.

Hall understood Commissioner Carlberg's concerns, but she thought there was a concern that if tabling the motion were unsuccessful, having the amendment in place would send a signal to Council that Commission wanted to have additional discussion. It seemed to her that more work was needed on this and that there clearly was a desire from many parties for further consideration.

A vote on the amendment showed:

YEAS: Bona, D'Amour, Emaus, Hall, Potts, Pratt
NAYS: Carlberg
ABSENT: Kunselman, Lipson

Motion carried.

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Emaus, to table action for two months and to send it back to the Ordinance Revisions Committee.

A vote on the motion to table showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Hall, Potts, Pratt
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Kunselman, Lipson

Motion carried.

b. Public Hearing and Action on Millers Creek Watershed Improvement Plan. This document is a comprehensive watershed improvement plan for Millers Creek that was developed by a public/private partnership of stakeholders including businesses, community representatives, and local and state entities
– Staff Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn explained the proposal to accept the improvement plan.

Steve Capeller, representing the Millers Creek Action Team (MCAT), provided a presentation on the ten-year improvement plan for Millers Creek, which would be used as a guideline for development in the area.

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier, said he lived on the edge of the Millers Creek planning area. He believed this was a good plan and that it should be approved; however, he expressed concern about the unconventional nature of the process, stating that private-public partnerships can create tension.

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

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Carlberg, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby accepts the Millers Creek Watershed Improvement Plan.

D'Amour said he was part of the Millers Creek Action Team, having joined the team toward the end of the process. He stated that this was a comprehensive effort and he was glad to see it before Commission for approval. He suggested that perhaps a more formalized process to review all of the creeksheds in the City might be appropriate. He believed this plan should be approved.

Carlberg supported adopting this plan because of all the fine work that went into it. She said the plan recommended regional detention and asked if any areas had been identified where this would be possible.

Capeller said they used an internal site on the Pfizer property to see if regional retention would work. The outcome was that instead of regional retention, they looked at adding more sinuosity into the creek and re-establishing the floodplains.

Carlberg hoped there would be less talk about regional retention and more about other options if regional retention were not really something that could be done in the City. She asked if the action team were following or hoping to implement some of the Huron River Watershed Council's suggestions, such as streambank restoration.

Capeller replied yes. He said once there was a control of flows coming into the creek, the team could look into restoration.

Carlberg asked about a Millers Creek community oversight group to stay on top of pushing for various options.

Capeller stated that this function was primarily through the Huron River Watershed Council. He said the action team has continued meeting monthly since 2001 and said they wanted residents to attend their meetings.

Pratt thanked the action team for its persistent effort in completing the plan and for continuing to work on its implementation. He recalled at the outset of this effort that there was a concern about conflict of interest because of Pfizer's monetary contribution toward the project. He recalled that the money was donated to the Huron River Watershed Council, which then hired the consultant.

Capeller stated that Pfizer contributed money for the study, but it was clear from the beginning that MCAT was the project manager. He did not know any of the details about how the money was paid, but said MCAT was the group that drove the project.

Potts agreed that this was an excellent, important study, adding that all of the City's creeksheds needed this kind of plan.

Emaus said it was wonderful to see another creekshed management plan come before the City. He said this plan was different from the Mallets Creek study, stating that that study was driven by the County Drain Commissioner's office, whereas Millers Creek did not have the benefit of being a County drain and have the County take the lead. He thought it was astounding that stakeholders in this area have taken the responsibility to form the MCAT and put this plan together. He also would like to see a management plan for all creeksheds in the City and at some point this plans being made part of the City's Master Plan. He thought this especially was important because it did not make sense to continually form committees to watch over individual creeksheds.

Hall thanked MCAT for all of its hard work and dedication in developing this plan. She hoped the City would explore ways to give these important creekshed plans more weight in decision-making ability. Currently, she said, they were advisory with important policy recommendations that hopefully would be implemented, but they did not necessarily carry the weight of any law. She believed it would be important to incorporate these plans into the Master Plan. She disagreed somewhat with not having a committee for each creekshed, stating that perhaps it would be beneficial for each of these committees to be a level below the Planning Commission, soliciting input from neighborhoods and bringing forward the information to Commission. This was another way to facilitate public comment, she said.

D'Amour noted that with regard to any concerns about conflict of interest, a representative of the Drain Commissioner's Office was present at all meetings he attended and was a major partner throughout the process. He said there was a great deal of public input throughout this transparent project.

Carlberg stated that a Mallets Creek Coordinating Committee existed that involved City staff, neighborhood representatives and a Pittsfield Township representative. She said this committee reviewed every development proposal in that watershed, as well as ordinance revisions, and was helping to design a best practices manual for creeksheds. She thought this could be easily duplicated for Millers Creek.

Emaus said it was his suggestion to form a creekshed coordinating committee to look over all of the creeksheds in the City.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Hall, Potts, Pratt
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Kunselman, Lipson

Motion carried.

c. Public Hearing and Action on Fifth Third Bank Site Plan, 1.41 acres, 2090 West Stadium Boulevard. A proposal to construct a 4,117-square foot, one-story bank building with a drive-through and 23 parking spaces (tabled at 4/18/06 meeting) – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn described the revisions that were made to this proposal.

Bill Conlin, representing the petitioner, explained that following meetings with staff, the building was moved forward 30 feet. Some of the parking remained in front of the building, he said, but noted that some had been moved to the side. He stated that a walkway at the rear of the site to Liberty Street would

be provided, but said there was no easement to allow a connecting walkway to the neighborhood to the east. He believed they had addressed all of the concerns and suggestions expressed by the Planning Commission at the last meeting.

Susan Swantek, 602 Ridgewood, president of Ridgewood Condominiums, which were adjacent to this property to the east, said her comments applied to both this project and the CVS project. The last time she spoke, she said, the neighborhood supported the proposals as they were. She said their concerns were about traffic and related problems with light, noise and safety with parking in the rear. The residents were pleased that the petitioner had taken their concerns into consideration, especially with removing parking in the rear, she said, and continued to be pleased that both revised plans still had no parking in the rear and moved the buildings closer to Stadium Boulevard to make them more pedestrian friendly. She said the residents were very happy with both proposals. However, she said, the residents strongly opposed a walkway through the neighborhood to the east. She said it was not feasible, given the topography and the way the buildings were configured. She emphasized that most of the pedestrian traffic on Stadium would be from people who lived in this area and the walkway from Liberty Street along the rear of these two properties would make a pleasant walkway. She urged Planning Commission to approve both proposals.

Jeff Wagner, of Fifth Third Bank, thanked staff for excellent support in working through this process. He stated that the bank tried to be sensitive to the needs of the neighbors to the east, as it was important for them to have a good relationship with their neighbors, given that their bank locations were 30-year and more decisions. This plan had some inherent challenges, he said, noting that banks were dependent on drive-through lanes and required circulation on at least two and sometimes three sides of the building. He believed this plan presented the best balance of respecting the neighbors to the east, respecting the City's goals regarding pedestrian access, and allowing the bank to meet its functional needs.

Fred Miller, 634 Ridgewood Court, expressed his support for this proposal from a security and noise standpoint.

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

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Pratt, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Fifth Third Bank Planned Project Site Plan, subject to the approved land division of 2100 West Stadium Boulevard prior to issuance of building permits, and subject to the disconnection of one footing drain before issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.

D'Amour appreciated the bank's parameters in terms of design and security issues. He was glad to see that the bank worked with staff and the neighbors in considering revisions and was pleased that the building had been moved closer to Stadium Boulevard to become more pedestrian oriented. He believed the neighbors' concerns should be respected, stating that he was not sure a pedestrian easement connecting to the neighborhood to the east was warranted here. He expressed his support for this proposal.

Potts thought the original proposal was fairly good and that the revised plan was greatly improved. She believed the revised design would help steer the City in the direction of making Stadium Boulevard more pedestrian oriented. She agreed that a pedestrian connection to the neighborhood to the east was not feasible because of the steep topography, but said there would be a pedestrian walkway to Liberty from the rear of the site. She asked if any drainage problems were anticipated because of the topography.

Vaughn stated that the current situation was not good because the entire site was impervious and there was no detention. This proposal would reduce the impervious surface considerably and add full 100-year storm water detention on the site. He said no drainage problems were anticipated.

Carlberg stated that if someone were to walk from Liberty Street to this site, there did not appear to be a sidewalk along the driveway. She asked if a clear pathway for pedestrians could be provided to allow safe access.

Conlin replied that they could look into providing a sidewalk.

Bona asked how residents from the east would walk from their homes to access the bank and the CVS sites.

Swantek stated that the residents would walk west along Liberty Street, turn left going into the driveway behind the CVS site, and follow the driveway to both CVS and the bank.

Bona suggested a sidewalk from Stadium Boulevard all the way to the back of the site to provide access for pedestrians coming from the rear. She thought most people tended to take the shortest route when walking and could not imagine residents not cutting through the neighborhood, even if a sidewalk were provided from Liberty to the rear of the site. She was not pleased that there was no pedestrian connection to the rear.

Swantek stated that the topography of the land would not be very pedestrian friendly and would not lend to pathways that could be navigated by people.

Bona appreciated that and said she would not vote yes or no on this project because of that issue. However, she said, there must be a point in the middle where the two properties were at the same elevation.

Vaughn stated that this was correct.

Bona asked if staff saw any opportunity for a pedestrian connection through the neighborhood to the east.

Vaughn stated that there was not a good access point at that location, as it was behind private residential space. He said an easement would need to be obtained to get a connection.

Bona thought the site plan had been improved since it was last before Commission. However, she was struggling with both proposals because a goal of the West Area Plan was to have buildings closer to Stadium Boulevard with no parking between the buildings and sidewalk. She believed this was an ordinance issue; though, and that it should be taken from the master plan and incorporated into City Code. She did not think it was right to penalize the petitioner for this. She thanked the petitioner for improving the proposal and for providing a pedestrian connection to Stadium, which was very important. She said she would reluctantly support this.

Emaus was still concerned that residents to the east would have to walk a long way to get to the bank and to CVS. He did not believe they would walk to Liberty and then around the rear of the properties to the front entrances. He thought they would get in their cars and drive. At some point, he said, properties needed to be made accessible enough to reduce the number of automobile trips. He still thought the buildings should be moved all the way forward to Stadium. He liked this configuration the best so far, but said he would like to see the buildings with no parking in the front. He would like to see something done to make it clear that there was a pedestrian crossway to these two establishments.

Hall said the rationale for this being a planned project was that the relocation of the building improved pedestrian orientation. She asked how much this revised plan further reduced impervious surface, because there did not appear to be a significant reduction.

Vaughn stated that an additional 10 percent impervious surface was eliminated on the CVS site, but he did not have a figure for the bank site. However, he said, a reduction was not required because the planned project standards allowed one of the standards to be achieved, not more than one.

Wagner stated that there was a modest reduction in impervious surface on the bank site.

Hall appreciated what the petitioner was attempting to do, but she did not find that the planned projects standards had been met. She said she could have characterized the site as having a significant amount of open space if usable open space in excess of the minimum had been provided.

Wagner stated that less than 50 percent of the site was impervious and that this proposal greatly exceeded the required open space.

Vaughn stated that the C2B zoning district did not require open space, so there was no minimum required.

Hall stated that the minimum usable open space standard shall be established by the approval of the planned project site plan. In order to do this, she said, she would need additional information. She said the area proposed for open space was going to be a lawn, noting that it would not actually be used by anyone, such as by employees if picnic tables were provided. She did not agree with the planned project standards of reduced impervious surface and improving pedestrian access that were identified by the petitioner and staff. Moving parking 20 feet closer to Stadium Boulevard did not actually improve the pedestrian experience, she said. She agreed that if the rear driveway were going to be relied on as a pedestrian corridor, then it needed to be made more safe for users. She stated that the redevelopment of West Stadium Boulevard was identified in the West Area Plan and the City needed to follow through with what the plan envisioned, which was a more walkable environment in this location. If efforts were not made to try to get to the point, she said, then it would never happen. She would support tabling action this evening if the petitioner would continue to work on efforts to achieve these goals, but, if not, then she did not support this proposal.

Carlberg agreed that it was important to have a clearly defined walk from the rear of the site to the front door for pedestrians. She was glad to hear the petitioner say that he would provide a sidewalk at the rear, but noted that there also needed to be a walk from the rear to the front. She stated that the different needs of the bank presented a challenge in locating parking and drive-through lanes. She believed staff worked hard to remove parking from the front of the site, but found it impossible to do, noting that the side of the building was necessary for a traffic aisle. She did not get a sense that the petitioner was unwilling to look at other layouts. With regard to usable open space, she said, the Ordinance Revisions Committee has been working on this, but noted that the definition included just plain open space which was a respite from parking and business activity. She stated that people did not visit a bank to sit outdoors, and the employees of the bank might use the green space to sit and eat lunch, so she did not think the objection regarding usable open space was accurate. She did not see a way to accomplish the perceived goals of the West Area Plan.

D'Amour agreed with Commissioner Carlberg regarding open space. With regard to a more pedestrian-oriented West Stadium Boulevard, he thought it was important to move in that direction. He believed there were some constraints on this site and that Commission needed to be responsive to the concerns of

the neighbors. He was prepared to support this proposal, although he would be willing to table action if it moved in the direction of accomplishing what the Planning Commission wanted to see.

Pratt thought the pedestrian access from Liberty Street appeared to be quite simple. With regard to open space, he clarified that whatever amount of open space was shown on the planned project site plan would become the required open space for this site.

Vaughn replied yes, the amount of open space shown on the site plan would become the standard.

Hall did not necessarily feel that the open space needed to be usable, but she said the petitioner did not even identify open space as one of the standards being met in the planned project application and she thought there needed to be quantification to offer to the community in order to allow the planned project. She believed there might be some opportunities that could sway her in terms of meeting the standards, such as providing walkways at the rear of the site. She did not think the reduction of impervious surface applied, noting that there were still four drive-through lanes, and pointed out that she has not seen any data showing that the four drive-through lanes were necessary. It seemed to her that this was a large number of drive-through lanes and she would have to understand the need. She understood that there were constraints on this site and that staff worked hard with the petitioner, but she thought more could be done to improve the proposal.

Vaughn stated that with regard to the planned project standards, the petitioner was originally planning to request a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, but staff encouraged the petitioner to go with the planned project since there was direction from staff and the Planning Commission to move the building forward. He said staff provided direction that the proposal would likely not meet the open space standard because there was no minimum open space standard for this site.

Potts said she was ready to vote on the proposal this evening, stating that she did not see what could be achieved if it were tabled. She thought this was the best proposal for this site.

Bona still believed a pedestrian connection was needed at the back of the site and thought it was reasonable to request one. She did not want to have pedestrians walking in the driveway.

Conlin stated that they would provide a sidewalk, but said they would be unable to do so on private land.

Wagner stated that there was sufficient open space and he was sure they could develop something that tied in with the sidewalk on Stadium. He said they did not control the private property of the residents to the rear and he was sure there would be concerns with a connection to that neighborhood.

Carlberg said she visited the site and did not see any physical way to build a path to connect this site to the neighborhood to the east. In addition to it being private property, she noted that the land was too steep and not a good place for a pathway.

Bona stated that she was suggesting a sidewalk to the driveway to the rear, not a pathway through the neighborhood to the east.

Emaus did not think the petitioner was taking full advantage of the zero side setbacks in this zoning district in order to move the building to the front. He believed there was still a configuration that would allow that. He would rather see the building come forward and parking put between the two buildings. He was not interested in moving parking to the rear.

Hall stated that after all the discussion about a rear access for the residents, she was adamant that the building needed to be moved forward. She did not understand what the problem was with having parking at the rear when Commission has been told that neighbors from the east would not walk through the rear neighborhood because of the topography. People who would park in the rear would not be walking into the neighborhood, she said, so there would be no disturbance to the residents. She believed that issues of noise and light could be easily mitigated by the placement of lights and tall fencing. She credited the petitioner for working with the neighbors to provide a design that was satisfactory to them, but she thought there were other opportunities here. She did not support approving a plan that satisfied the needs of one element of town while it sacrificed pedestrian orientation along Stadium Boulevard for the rest of the town.

Carlberg stated that if Commission believed the shape of the building could be changed and the parking reconfigured, then the site plan should be tabled to send back to staff and the petitioner to see what could be done.

Bona believed that if the building were moved all the way to the lot line on the south, there would be more than enough room for parking and a driveway on the side. She felt strongly that this was the best design for the site and said she would support tabling action.

Wagner stated that it was necessary for them to have the proper circulation and said customers would not park in the rear of the site and cross drive-through lanes to get to the building.

A vote on the main motion showed:

YEAS: D'Amour, Potts
NAYS: Bona, Carlberg, Emaus, Hall, Pratt
ABSENT: Kunselman, Lipson

Motion failed.

d. Public Hearing and Action on CVS Pharmacy Site Plan, 1.78 acres, 2100 West Stadium Boulevard. A proposal to construct a 12,900-square foot, one-story building and a 49-space parking lot (tabled at 4/18/06 meeting) - Staff Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn described the revisions that were made to this proposal.

Kathy Keinath, of Atwell-Hicks, Inc., representing the petitioner, stated that the site currently was almost completely paved, so the improvement from the existing condition would be significant. In addition, she said, approximately 10 percent of additional reduction of impervious surface was achieved with the revisions made to the site plan. A row of parking and drive aisle were eliminated to move the building forward, she said. She stated that they would be amenable to providing a crosswalk for pedestrian access at the rear. She said she would be available to answer questions.

Susan Swantek, 602 Ridgewood, president of Ridgewood Condominiums, expressed support for this proposal, stating that it met neighborhood concerns, specifically relative to the neighbors' property lines. She noted that the West Area Plan promoted more than just buildings closer to Stadium Boulevard. She reiterated how strongly the residents opposed parking at the rear of this site and asked Commission to keep in mind the statement in the West Area Plan that healthy, residential neighborhoods were of paramount importance to the continued desirability of the west area.

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

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Potts, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the CVS Pharmacy Planned Project Site Plan, subject to preliminary approval of the storm water management system from the Washtenaw County Drain Commissioner's Office prior to City Council approval, and subject to the approved land division of 2100 West Stadium Boulevard prior to issuance of building permits.

D'Amour thought the petitioner had made a good faith effort working within the different parameters. Sensitivity to the needs of the adjacent residents was a major value, he said. With regard to front setbacks and moving buildings closer to the street, he said, the City needed at some point to move away from automobile-oriented designs to a non-motorized future. He thought the Planning Commission was sincerely trying to move forward with that value. He was willing to table action if more work on this proposal was needed, but said he was ready to support the proposal this evening.

Potts believed this proposal was an improvement over the previous plan, with the building being moved closer to Stadium. While there may be other configurations for this site, she said, Commission normally considered a proposal made by a developer, with then perhaps making small adjustments. She stated that Commission has made small adjustments in this case and she was satisfied with the revised plan. She was prepared to vote on this tonight.

Pratt said it was obvious that any development on this site would be an improvement in terms of imperviousness since almost the entire site was covered with impervious surface. Although the building was now closer to the road than in the previous proposal, he questioned how much of an improvement it was. He said the building clearly was set back further from existing buildings to the south, but said he was sensitive to the residents' concerns, stating that they have made it clear that the closer buildings and parking were to their homes, the less desirable it was. He thought getting the buildings closer to Stadium improved the appearance of the corridor. He noted that the aerial photograph highlighted the fact that the homes at the rear were purchased at a time when cars were parked all along the rear property line and said he was not sure there would be much of a different impact if the building were moved closer to the street and the parking moved to the rear. He knew the amount of parking proposed was typical to many CVS stores, but he questioned whether the proposed amount of parking was needed, adding that he could not recall ever seeing the CVS parking lots filled with cars.

Bona said she had the same concerns for this proposal as she did for the Fifth Third Bank proposal. If a reduction in the front setback were to be encouraged, she said, she would rather see a reduced setback for a building, not for parking. She believed that placing a building close to a street created a positive effect on the pedestrian experience, as traffic naturally slowed down, making it more comfortable for pedestrians. She believed sensitivity was needed in planning for development along this corridor. She found it ironic that many of the buildings along Stadium Boulevard were situated close to the street with parking in the rear and did not understand why these two petitioners did not want signage and building visibility closer to Stadium. Trying to force these two developments on this site made her question the appropriateness of these two uses in this location.

Carlberg said the truck delivery area presented a challenge in locating parking at the rear of the building. She asked if staff came up with any alternatives that would allow the building to be moved forward and all parking put on the side.

Vaughn stated that CVS was reluctant to have a building with no parking in the front. He said there also was the physical challenge of the two properties working together, as a result of the land division, that further complicated the issue.

Carlberg said she could think of other locations throughout town where parking was located next to a drive area, with a small landscaped area separating the two uses. She did not know if the proposal could be redesigned to move the building to the front of the site, but said she would willing to give the petitioner a chance to do so. Even though the parking standards were being met, she said, it was hard for her to believe this much parking was needed.

Keinath said the petitioner would prefer not to be tabled this evening.

Emaus stated that this site was being designed in a way that would not facilitate safe conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians, which he did not believe was appropriate for Ann Arbor. He did not support this proposal and said he would rather see the building moved to the front of the site, about five to ten feet away from the sidewalk.

Moved by Emaus, seconded by D'Amour, to table action.

A vote on the motion to table showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus
NAYS: Hall, Potts, Pratt
ABSENT: Kunselman, Lipson

Motion failed.

Hall did not believe this proposal met the planned project standards. She thought many of the concerns would be addressed if the two buildings traded sites and said she also agreed that perhaps these were not appropriate uses for these sites. She has paid close attention to CVS stores and their configuration, she said, stating that there were some that were built right up to the setback or within the setback with parking on the side. She thought that could work here. She was glad that there was a ten percent decrease in imperviousness and it seemed that there was more efficiency on the site, but she still believed the amount of parking could be reduced.

D'Amour assumed the motion to table failed was because other Commission members did not have chance to make more comments, so he said he would make another motion. He said banks had certain parameters within which to operate and he was certain CVS had security issues to take into consideration, but he thought CVS could provide greater flexibility in the design of the site. If this were tabled this evening, he said, he would like to see continued consideration of the neighbors concerns.

Pratt said perhaps there was some miscommunication at the last Commission meeting as far as what the Planning Commission asked and what the petitioner believed was asked. He did not believe this proposal fit in with the character of the area, stating that what Commission was striving for was more buildings closer to the street. He did not think it made sense for both parcels to meet the maximum parking standards.

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Emaus, to table action.

A vote on the motion to table showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus
NAYS: Hall, Potts, Pratt
ABSENT: Kunselman, Lipson

Motion failed.

A vote on the main motion showed:

YEAS: Potts
NAYS: Bona, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Hall, Pratt
ABSENT: Kunselman, Lipson

Motion failed.

Moved by Bona, seconded by Carlberg, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby directs the Ordinance Revisions Committee to review the C2A zoning district requirements and the boundaries of the South University Area District and to bring a recommendation back to the Planning Commission within 60 days.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Hall, Potts, Pratt
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Kunselman, Lipson

Motion carried.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier, think what happened tonight should be bookmarked and processed to see how to avoid a lengthy public process. He said there would be those who make a strong case about getting through the planning process and he thought it was important to avoid the lengthy part of the process.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

D'Amour stated that he would like to see on Commission's next agenda the proposed revision to Chapter 55 regarding the definition of high-water mark.

Pratt asked about a presentation to Commission on the Allens Creek Greenway.

D'Amour thought July would be an appropriate time for a presentation and discussion.

Hall distributed a proposed resolution regarding communication that she would like added to the next Commission agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Hall declared the meeting adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Mark Lloyd, Manager
Planning and Development Services

Bonnie Bona, Secretary

Prepared by Laurie Foondle
Management Assistant
Planning and Development Services