

MINUTES

ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 p.m. – October 17, 2006

Time: Chair Pratt called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Lipson, Potts, Pratt, Westphal

Members Absent: None

Members Arriving: Kunselman

Staff Present: Foondle, Vaughn

INTRODUCTIONS

None.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

a. Minutes of September 19, 2006.

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

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Lipson, Potts, Pratt, Westphal

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Kunselman

Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Borum, seconded by Potts, to approve the agenda.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Lipson, Potts, Pratt, Westphal
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Kunselman

Motion carried.

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

Potts announced that the Ordinance Revisions Committee would be meeting on October 20 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. at City Hall.

Pratt announced that the A2D2 (Calthorpe implementation effort) status report was available on the City's website.

Emaus reported that the Urban Design Guidelines committee would be meeting on October 19 at 7:00 p.m. at the Ann Arbor Public Library. Another meeting would be held on the following Thursday, he said.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

None.

REGULAR BUSINESS

a. Public Hearing and Action on Crisler Annexation and Zoning, 2.82 acres, 2999 Override Drive.
A request to annex this site into the City and zone it for single-family residential use – Staff
Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn described the proposal.

Louise Fligel, 2945 Override Drive, wondered how water issues between the City and the petitioner would be addressed, noting that there was a culvert that ran through this site and ended in a pond. She said this was a major flow of water and could impact the location of new homes. She also expressed concern about the water pressure in the area every time any work was done on Override Drive. She did not think this fell under the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission, but she wanted to bring up the issue and explain the impact on residents. She also was curious as to who made the determination about whether or not the pond on the site was a wetland.

Jon Wardner, 2921 Override Drive, also shared the concern about water drainage, stating that there were a number of homes that could possibly be built here and drainage was an issue. He also expressed concern about how utilities would be provided at the rear of this property and any short or long-term impacts on service. He brought to attention the different types of wildlife that lived in this area and how this proposal might impact that. He stated that adjacent to this property were 170 homes that were a part of the Ann Arbor Hills homeowners association, which required a minimum of 60 feet of street frontage per lot. This property was not part of that association, he said, although it was adjacent to it, and he questioned whether land usage would have an impact on how this land would ultimately be developed. He said there were concerns about how many houses might be developed on this property, where the access drive would be, and how construction might disrupt the life of existing residents. He understood that all of the township property here would eventually be annexed and he wanted to make sure that the land was zoned and developed appropriately, so it would be consistent with the character of the neighborhood and sensitive to the natural features and drainage issues.

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

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Emaus, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Crisler Annexation and R1A (Single-Family Dwelling District) Zoning.

Pratt pointed out that no proposal for developing this land has been presented to the City. He asked for clarification as far as what the City had in place to regulate wetlands.

Vaughn stated that if the development of this property were site planned, the entire Natural Features Ordinance would apply for wetlands and woodlands. If lots were created through the land division process, he said, the City would have less control. He stated that any wetlands on the site would not prevent a land division, but any new construction would not be allowed to disturb or encroach upon a wetland.

Pratt stated that drainage and water main issues were not part of the Planning Commission's annexation and zoning review. He stated that if any homes were built on this property, residents could call Planning and Development Services if any concerns arose during construction. He asked if staff were aware of any rules the homeowners association might have that required annexation in order to join the association.

Vaughn was not aware of any such rule, adding that the City did not enforce private covenants.

Potts asked how many houses could fit on this property and on what basis would there ever be a site plan.

Vaughn replied that the size of the property would allow five lots. He said the development of five new homes would require a site plan; however, four or less homes could be done through the land division process.

Potts stated that the property owner must have the intention of doing something with the land at some point, so it was difficult for her to think in terms of annexation and zoning without having certain information, such as knowing where the access would be.

Vaughn stated that new parcels could not be created through the land division or site plan process without first providing appropriate access.

Carlberg stated that this land was clearly due to be annexed and zoned, adding that R1A was the zoning of the other parcels in this neighborhood. She said there already was a variety of home placements and different-sized lots in this area and she thought it was reasonable to expect that the owner of this property would, at some point, decide to split off a piece of it. She said it was entirely appropriate to annex and zone this property and any issues dealing with access and/or utility easements would be addressed in the future when an effort was made to divide the property. She said there was no way the Planning Commission could deal with any of those issues until a proposal was formally submitted.

Lipson stated that the Ordinance Revisions Committee was currently discussing some of these issues and hopefully there would be more tools to address these issues by the time these lots were developed. He agreed that those issues were not in front of Commission at this time, pointing out that this area was planned to be annexed and zoned consistent with the area. It would be good, he said, if this property were site planned in order to spare the natural features.

Potts asked if each of the two lots met access requirements.

Vaughn replied that both lots currently had access, as they were owned by the same person and that person could drive across his/her property to access the lot at the rear. However, he said, a change in ownership of the rear parcel could not happen without an appropriate access easement.

Bona agreed that this property should be annexed and that R1A was the appropriate zoning. She calculated six lots to fit on this property, as it was over 120,000 square feet. She stated that while the City had a certain amount of control during the building permit/construction stage over storm water drainage, the retention of water was not covered under the residential zoning district. Unless the property owner decided to develop five or six homes on this property, which would require a site plan, she noted that the Planning Commission would not be seeing this again.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Lipson, Potts, Pratt, Westphal
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Kunselman

Motion carried.

Enter Kunselman.

b. Public Hearing and Action on Platt Road Center Planned Project Site Plan, 0.81 acre, 3100 Platt Road. A proposal to construct a 13,704-square foot, two-story retail/office building and a 47-space parking lot – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn described the proposal and showed photographs of the property.

Anna Harless, 3110 Platt Road, stated that she lived adjacent to this site to the south. She expressed concern about the proposed building being situated so close to her home and how it would be the only view she had from her dining room window. She stated that this site has had maintenance problems for the past 17 years, which were still present today. She said she has been unable to get them addressed, even after many calls made to the City. She also expressed concern about the traffic on Platt Road, especially during rush hour, and said it was impossible to make a left turn onto Platt from her driveway. She did not oppose the proposed use on this site, but objected to the design.

John Stacy, 3148 Wolverine Drive, expressed concern about the traffic in this area and how this new commercial and office development would impact it. He also questioned how conclusions were based in the traffic impact study based on probabilities.

A resident of the neighborhood stated that when he purchased his home, he was informed that this was a residential area. He expressed concern about how the proposed curb cut on Rosedale would affect the traffic and noise in this neighborhood. He also thought the proposal and the effects it would have on the neighborhood would make it difficult for homeowners to sell their homes if necessary, as many people would not want to buy a home next to a commercial area.

Bill Goodreau, of Civil Design Services, representing the petitioner, stated that they have been working with City staff on this project. He believed the height of the building fit in with the architecture of the area and with the Platt Road streetscape. He said he, the project architect, and the petitioner were available to answer questions.

Rebecca Shatz, 3040 Rosedale, expressed concern about the heavy traffic in the area and the speeding cars on Rosedale and how this has affected the safety for riding bikes and walking on Rosedale. She pointed out that there were no sidewalks on Rosedale and children had to use the street when walking home from school. Providing sidewalks would be an issue, she said, because many of the residents were elderly and they were unable to afford sidewalks. She also noted that it was impossible to make a left turn onto Packard from Rosedale. She stated that all of the new development in this area was causing people to use the neighborhood streets as short-cuts. The condition of St. Aubin was an issue, she said, because it was a dirt road. She requested that the curb cut onto Rosedale from this proposal be removed and that speed bumps be installed on Rosedale and a four-way stop be installed at Rosedale and Redwood. If the paving of St. Aubin was not an option, she suggested that it at least be paved to the area where cars stopped at the intersection to reduce the potholes. She agreed with progress, but said the safety of children and the elderly needed to be considered.

Sherry Burkheiser, 3031 Wolverine, said she was not necessarily opposed to this project, stating that she favored anything that improved the neighborhood. However, she did have some concerns that should be addressed. She did not think access from Rosedale should be provided for this proposal, stating that the neighborhood already shouldered the burden of people using the residential streets as a shortcut, driving fast on the streets. She was concerned about the overall impact on traffic in the area, stating that this area has seen about five major, new projects in the last five years. She believed any traffic impact study should take all of those developments into consideration. She also questioned how the lighting on this site would affect the neighbors, how many and what type of businesses would be located here, how the second floor of the building would be accessed, and adequate parking. She recommended that Commission table action until the neighbors could meet with the petitioner to discuss all concerns.

Jill Leslie Price, 3540 Platt Road, president of the Platt Road Neighborhood Area Association, stated that their initial reaction to this proposal was positive, as the neighbors did not object to building and improving

the neighborhood. However, she said, residents had some concerns and did not think the project should be approved in its current form. She stated that access onto Rosedale and how it would change the character of the neighborhood was a major concern. As traffic in the area has increased, she said, this section of the neighborhood has become an access route from Packard to Platt, stating that it would only get worse and happen more frequently. She said residents were concerned about the traffic impact in the neighborhood from having an access on Rosedale and noted that in looking at the aerial photograph of the site when it was used as a church, there was a circular drive with two curb cuts on Platt. She saw no reason why this could not be done for this proposal as well. She questioned whether the traffic study took into account both current and proposed traffic patterns, stating that it was difficult to believe that this development, the proposed Rite Aid development and the 85 condominium units that have been approved on Platt Road would not have a discernible traffic impact. She did not think this proposal adequately addressed lighting, stating that every car leaving the Rosedale access would be shining its lights into someone's home. She said a meeting between the petitioner and the residents would be helpful and asked Commission to table action until a meeting could be held and until issues and concerns could be addressed.

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

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Potts, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Platt Road Center Planned Project Site Plan, subject to mitigation of sanitary sewer flow equivalent to the disconnection of one footing drain prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy.

Pratt summarized the main concerns: existing and post-development traffic impact, particularly if there were a curb cut on Rosedale; zoning on the east side of Rosedale; residents meeting with the petitioner to offer input and express concerns; public improvements unrelated to this proposal; on-site lighting and off-site lighting impacts; height and how the project would look from the south; maintenance of the site; and how traffic studies were done.

Potts asked about the side setbacks.

Vaughn stated that an 11-foot setback was provided on the south side of the property and a 69-foot side setback was provided on the north side. He also noted that side setbacks were not required for this site, which was zoned C1.

Potts presumed that the no side setback requirement existed for areas such as the downtown, where there were a number of commercial uses. Perhaps more of a setback should be required for sites like this where the commercial zoning was adjacent to residential use, she said. She asked what the landscaping requirement was for the south side of the site.

Vaughn stated that there was no landscaping required because it was not a buffer area, but said the petitioner proposed a significant amount of landscaping nonetheless.

Potts questioned why landscaping was not required to buffer the proposed commercial use from the existing residential use to the south.

Vaughn replied it was because the residential house to the south was zoned C1 (commercial).

Borum recalled having to obtain a variance for a project and having to provide a buffer zone because the vacant house adjacent to his parcel had last been used as a residence. It was not based on how the property was zoned, he said.

Vaughn stated that this was correct: if a parcel were used or zoned for residential purposes, then a 15-foot wide conflicting land use buffer would be required.

Pratt asked what the distance was from the proposed building and the south property line.

Goodreau stated that the dormer in the center of the building was 11 feet from the lot line, and the rest of the building was 16 feet from the lot line. He said they were providing extensive landscape buffering along both the south and west property lines, with a mixture of evergreens and flowering trees.

Potts said there appeared to be a sidewalk in the conflicting land use area on the south.

Vaughn said staff would check to see if a sidewalk were allowed in this location.

Potts stated that however desirable a sidewalk may be, she did not believe it should be placed in the buffer area.

Pratt said it appeared that Commission needed clarification from staff as to what was allowed in the conflicting land use buffer area, adding that it appeared there was room for adjustment.

Potts expressed concern about traffic from a commercial building exiting onto a residential street. She said it sounded as though the neighborhood already had problems with cut-through traffic and she would not want to add to the problems with a curb cut from this development.

Kunselman stated that he was a neighbor to the residents who spoke this evening and said he could vouch for them stating the truth. He asked if the curb cut on Rosedale was required by code.

Vaughn replied no. Although the curb cut was permitted, it was not required, he said.

Kunselman indicated to the petitioner that the neighbors have made it clear that they were opposed to the Rosedale curb cut. It was his hope that action would be tabled this evening so the petitioner could meet with the neighbors to discuss the issues.

Carlberg thought some discussion about the Rosedale curb cut was desirable, stating that the curb cut would allow people who live in this neighborhood to access these businesses without having to drive out onto Packard or Platt. She said this was similar to the issue of the Georgetown Mall proposal where the residents asked for the access to the shopping center so they did not have to drive onto Packard. She informed neighbors that if they were interested in traffic calming on Rosedale, there was a separate process to go through with the City's Public Services Area. She thought there was a real concern about what happened at the intersection of Rosedale and Packard and expressed concern about safe access into this development because of the traffic at Packard and Platt. She did not think the traffic from this proposal would have a significant impact, but said there was nothing mentioned about what impact there might be by changing Platt to a three-lane road to allow left turns. She thought this information was necessary before Commission accepted the conclusion that there would be no impact. She asked what the hours of operation would be in the morning.

Goodreau stated that this was yet to be determined. However, he said, if one of the tenants were a coffee shop, the shop might open as early as 6:00 a.m. He said this development would be geared

toward neighborhood retail and he did not think any of the uses would operate 24 hours a day. He noted that they hired the same traffic consultant who performed a traffic impact study for the Rite Aid proposal to the north. Relatively speaking, he said, the impact to the existing traffic conditions would be minimal. He believed the other developments in this area were taken into account when the traffic study was done.

Pratt said it would be helpful to get peak hour and average daily traffic information from the traffic study. He said the left turn issue also should be addressed.

Lipson believed the traffic generated by this development would be minimal, although people making left turns onto Platt Road would be challenged. The difference between this proposal and the Georgetown Mall proposal was that Georgetown Mall had Pine Valley on one side and King George Boulevard on the other side as main thoroughfares, he said. For this proposal, he said, an access onto Rosedale would almost guarantee cut-through traffic through the neighborhood, about which he expressed concern. However, he said, there were advantages of having a neighborhood access, which would be more convenient for the residents of the neighborhood. He wanted to make sure that the issue regarding the conflicting land use buffer was resolved, as he did not want this project to interfere with the neighbor to the south. He did not think the extra four feet of building height was a concern and said he thought this project would be an improvement for this area.

Emaus agreed that the sloped roofs were more in character with the neighborhood and said he did not oppose granting a planned project modification for the building height. He thought the proposed placement of the development on this site was more desirable than other designs and said it would blend in better with the neighborhood as more extensive C1 development occurred to the north. He pointed out that this whole block would be developed in the near future. He thought an access onto Rosedale would serve as a shunt if the development had attractive retail tenants, adding that he did not think traffic on Rosedale from this commercially-zoned area could be prevented. He suggested traffic calming measures for the neighborhood to the south and said the residents could petition for it. One of the unfortunate things about this neighborhood, he said, was that it did not have sidewalks. If there were sidewalks, residents would be able to safely walk to this development, he said. If the access onto Rosedale were eliminated, he said, residents would have no recourse other than to drive either onto Packard or Platt to visit the development. He did not want to see these types of extra trips encouraged anywhere in the City and said he believed it was important to have the access onto Rosedale. He would like to see a sidewalk provided from Packard, past the Rite Aid property and along the frontage of this site. It was his wish that the petitioner would extend the sidewalk south along Rosedale on both sides of the street to the first intersection.

Pratt said it appeared that it was about 800 to 900 feet along Rosedale from Packard to the first intersection.

Emaus stated that if the petitioner met with the neighbors, they might want to discuss what could be done to provide sidewalks. He stated that the C1 zoning district was supposed to be a district to which neighborhood residents could walk. With regard to lighting, he said, if the lights at the rear of the building could be turned down after 11:00 p.m., it would reduce the impact on the house to the south. He did not have a concern with the parking lot lighting.

Pratt believed the City had a program for which residents could petition for a special assessment for a sidewalk along the street.

Bona asked what the ceiling height was in the retail space.

Goodreau said it was about 10 to 11 feet.

Bona stated that this was reasonable and that she wanted to be sure that the center would not have 14-foot ceilings that were pushing the roof higher. She asked how far away the proposed building was from the neighbor's house to the south.

Goodreau replied that there appeared to be 20 feet on the neighbor's side and 16 feet on this development's side, so a total of about 36 feet.

Bona stated that more complete information on that distance would be helpful when this came back to the Commission. In a planned project, she said, there were certain standards that needed to be met. She asked the petitioner to provide an explanation as to why it was believed this project would reduce the need for infrastructure, which was one of the standards to meet. She also questioned the merit of the pedestrian orientation and side setback benefits, noting that the setback from the parking was required, so she would need to see where side setbacks were provided elsewhere. In order to be truly pedestrian-oriented, she said, this development would need to give priority to pedestrians over vehicles, stating that the pedestrian should be able to walk straight through the site. The one parking space could be eliminated to straighten out the sidewalk and, if that were done, she would then be able to consider the project to be pedestrian-oriented. She concurred with Commissioners Carlberg and Emaus about the drive onto Rosedale. She said one benefit of retail development on this site was that it would have different hours of traffic than office uses, so the retail uses would not have as much of an impact on rush hour traffic. She also noted that of the 14,000 cars that traveled on Platt Road, most of them were not from this neighborhood, so it was the commuters who were causing traffic problems on Platt. Because of this, she did not think this project would have a significant impact on neighborhood traffic. She stated that it would be important for the petitioner to discuss lighting with the residents, saying she thought the City's requirements for lighting were quite vague and she preferred a reasonable agreement be worked out with the neighbors.

Borum observed that this proposal and the Georgetown Mall proposal were the same in that both neighborhoods were resistant to change. He said most of the comments coming from the public on development proposals were consistently resistant to that level of change. Another observation of his was that some of the best buildings in town had flat roofs, stating that the proposed gable or pitched roof on this size building would not fit in with a neighborhood of 1,200-square foot homes. However, he did not have a problem with this proposal, as it would serve as a buffer to the neighborhood and he did not think it needed to look like a house. He did not think the sloping roof would create a significant visual impact. The sidewalk on the south side of the property was bothersome, he said. He questioned whether approval of this planned project meant that the setbacks were being written for this property and that parking was allowed in the front setback.

Vaughn stated that the planned project section of the ordinance indicates that once a setback was established, that was the new setback. However, he said, this has never been interpreted to mean that parking was allowed in the setback.

Pratt stated that if vehicles were already using Rosedale for cutting through, they would continue to do so. He did not think the removal of the curb cut on Rosedale would change the behavior of the cut-through traffic. It seemed to him that if there were a curb cut on Rosedale, people who were already inclined and willing to cut through the neighborhood would be on Rosedale for a shorter distance. He asked people who brought up the concern of the curb cut on Rosedale to think about that. If this were tabled tonight, he was hopeful that in addition to seeing more traffic volume information for Platt Road, that a better understanding of the traffic patterns on Rosedale and what kind of turning movements were occurring on Redwood would be provided.

Kunselman stated that there was a difference of opinion regarding the cut-through traffic and driveway on Rosedale. If a retail center with a coffee and bagel shop were built with an access onto Rosedale, he said, it would create the incentive for people who may not be cutting through the neighborhood now to use it as a cut through. He believed this would increase the cut-through ability on Rosedale, which was also what he was hearing the neighbors say. He did not think the neighbors needed an access from Rosedale, stating that they could park on the public street and walk up to the center. What Commission was hearing was that the neighborhood did not want to the access on Rosedale, he said, adding that this curb cut was not a requirement, nor was it being provided for safety reasons. He did not see the benefit of a curb cut on Rosedale, stating that it would not be a convenience for either the retailers or the residents. He wondered about signage for the proposal.

Potts thought the neighbors needed to think about their preferences, stating that there may turn out to be something desirable in the retail center that the neighbors would want to visit. She suggested that the neighbors think about that.

Pratt stated that from a traffic-calming standpoint, there was some logic going from four or five lanes to a three-lane road. For 14,000 cars per day, he said, it made sense to have fewer lanes to cross over. He generally agreed that the height differential was not a concern. He asked that the hours of operation and maintenance of the building be addressed. With regard to the curb cut on Rosedale, he thought the majority of people here were looking for the residents and petitioner to address that issue. It would likely be easier if there were no curb cut, he said, but if there were going to be a curb cut, he thought it made sense to move it over so it was not a straight shot from Platt. He thought this might assist in traffic calming. He also suggested that traffic humps might be helpful for traffic calming. He noted that there was not much that could be done legally to address existing traffic in a traffic impact study, adding that the bottom line here was that Platt was a major arterial road in and out of the south side of the City, so the traffic problems would only increase and the City ultimately would have to address it.

Carlberg asked that information be obtained from the City's traffic engineer as to how much the traffic lights could be adjusted to allow entering and exiting maneuvers on this site.

Kunselman stated that with regard to lighting, some retail centers had wall packs on the outside of their buildings which directed the light out and not down. He was opposed to this, he said. He suggested that the petitioner look into dimming or turning off some of the parking lot lighting, adding that this was also an energy conservation issue. He questioned what the difference was between this as a planned project and what could be submitted under the C1 zoning, stating that the planned project standards in this case were weak. He would like to see a stronger case for the planned project modifications. He thought this was a good project and he expected that he would support a coffee or bagel shop or other neighborhood-based retail service in this location. He stated that the retail community along Packard was proud of its diversity and the opportunities available to retailers and he hoped this retail center would extend those opportunities. He asked what would be going in on the second floor.

Goodreau stated that professional offices would be located on the second floor, adding that there would be an elevator.

Pratt stated that with regard to the south side of the building and lighting, he wondered about the possibility of providing lighting closer to the property line that shined toward the building, rather than lighting on the building itself. He said the resident to the south had a suggestion about the fence and said it would be good if the petitioner and neighbor could work together on that. He said it was difficult to see the pedestrian orientation on the site plan, stating that if someone could not easily access the sidewalks on the site, it would not be very pedestrian oriented.

Vaughn stated that staff talked to the City's traffic engineer this afternoon about the curb cut on Rosedale, who was supportive of the access. He said staff would analyze the pros and cons of the access based on what the petitioner and residents came up with.

Moved by Potts, seconded by Lipson, to table action.

A vote on the motion to table showed:

YEAS: Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson, Potts, Pratt, Westphal
NAYS: None

Motion carried unanimously.

c. Public Hearing and Action on 344 South Ashley Street Site Plan, 0.04 acre. A proposal to remove the existing garage and to construct additions totaling 1,121 square feet – Staff
Recommendation: Approval

Bona stated that she was the architect for this project and, therefore, she would recuse herself.

Vaughn described the proposal and showed photographs of the property.

Martin Schwartz, representing the petitioner, stated that he and the petitioner, who used one of the units as a salon, were present this evening. He said this project was designed so the proposed additions would complement the existing architecture of the building. He said the site plan contained the stipulation that the petitioner would repair any damaged sidewalks and disconnect footing drains if footing drains for the existing building were connected to the sanitary sewer system. He also said the petitioner intended to install pervious pavers in the driveway.

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

Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Kunselman, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 344 South Ashley Street Site Plan.

Carlberg asked where the downspouts would end.

Judy Splitt, petitioner, stated that one of the downspouts currently drained into yard space. The downspouts on the other side of the structure were connected to the storm sewer lines that were connected when the William Street townhomes were built, she said.

Schwartz added that it was their understanding that drains were connected to the storm sewer; however, if it were determined that they were not connected, they would connect them during construction.

Carlberg said it was important that the sidewalk was not impacted. She wondered if drains might be located at the front of the building where there was more yard space. She thought this proposal would make this building even more attractive than it was, adding that it would provide additional living space and would fit in well with the downtown.

Potts thought the architecture of the proposed addition would enhance the building. She said there would be almost no green space along William, so the building tenants would have to make the most of what

existed. She thought this was a good project, making it more suitable for the downtown. She noted that the drainage would have to be monitored.

Lipson asked if the existing parking space on the site would be eliminated.

Schwartz replied no, that it would remain in the new garage.

Lipson stated that the landscaping at the front of the building was very charming and it appeared that it would be removed with this addition.

Spitt stated that if they followed through with Phase 2, they would plant a new tree to the south of the porch.

Lipson said a new tree would be good, as the landscaping contributed to this site enhancing the downtown. He had no objections to this proposal as long as the drainage issue was addressed.

A vote on the motion showed:

YEAS: Borum, Carlberg, Emaus, Kunselman, Lipson, Potts, Pratt, Westphal
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: Bona

Motion carried.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

Pratt stated that he emailed Commission members a summary of ideas regarding land divisions with the idea that the Ordinance Revisions Committee would review them.

Potts stated that she has searched the new state laws and has found nothing to prohibit the City from doing certain things relative to land divisions. She said she intended to provide her comments to the City Attorney's Office for review.

ADJOURNMENT

Pratt declared the meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

Mark Lloyd, Manager
Planning and Development Services

Bonnie Bona, Secretary

Prepared by Laurie Foondle
Management Assistant
Planning and Development Services