

MINUTES

ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

7:00 p.m. – May 16, 2006

Time: Secretary Bona 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: Bona, Carlberg, D'Amour, Emaus, Lipson, Potts

Members Absent: Hall

Members Arriving: Kunselman, Pratt

Staff Present: Foondle, Vaughn

INTRODUCTIONS

None.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

a. Minutes of April 18, 2006.

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Carlberg, to approve the minutes as presented.

Carlberg asked that the words "stated that" be inserted after "Carlberg" in the last sentence on page 20.

Bona asked that in the first sentence on page 13, the words "would look friendly" be changed to "would be unfriendly." She also asked that in the third line of the second paragraph on page 21, the word "there" be changed to "that."

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

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

D'Amour reported that the next Allen Creek Greenway Task Force meeting would be held on May 17 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Second Floor, City Hall. He said the task force continued to discuss formats for reviewing the information gathered from the first set of public workshops held in April. He stated that the second set of public workshops would be scheduled in late June or early July.

Potts announced that the May 17 Ordinance Revisions Committee meeting was cancelled, and that the next meeting would be held on May 24.

Bona reminded Planning Commission members that Commissioner Pratt had sent a memo to the entire Commission regarding the evaluation of the Planning and Development Services Manager. She stated that the manager would provide his responses to Commission questions by May 22, and that she needed Commission members to forward their review forms to her by June 1.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

None.

REGULAR BUSINESS

a. Public Hearing and Action on 727 South Forest Avenue Site Plan, 0.21 acre. A proposal to construct a 5,745-square foot, four-unit (with a total of 12-16 bedrooms), three-story apartment building with six parking spaces – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn described the proposal and showed photographs of the property.

Tom Stegeman, petitioner, stated that 12 to 14 bedrooms were proposed; three 3-bedroom units and one 5-bedroom unit. The current zoning allowed up to 24 bedrooms, he said. He stated that their intent was to develop a discreet infill project with high-quality architecture and old world craftsmanship. They were not trying to overbuild the site, he said, but improve it with a tasteful-looking building.

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

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Carlberg, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 727 South Forest Avenue Site Plan, subject to obtaining a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals from Chapter 62 (Landscape and Screening Ordinance) and subject to mitigation of sanitary sewer flow equivalent to the disconnection of one footing drain before issuance of the first certificate of occupancy.

Carlberg noticed that there were only about two enclosed bicycle parking spaces, which seemed deficient given that the renters would likely be students. She asked where students were expected to put their bicycles.

Ann Stevens, of Atwell-Hicks, representing the petitioner, stated that there would be space to store bicycles both inside and outside should a need for more bicycle parking be discovered.

Carlberg hoped the petitioner would provide additional bicycle parking spaces and a place to attach bicycles as part of this site plan. She stated that this was a flat site and asked how water would get from the roof into the rain garden.

Stevens stated that the site had a slight pitch from back to front, which would work well with the rain garden at the front. She said the roofline would have a natural pitch in all directions and the parking area would have a high point and a small dip to direct water to the rain garden.

Carlberg expressed concern that this was the second building proposed by the petitioner that had no entrance from the street.

Stegeman said they believed it made more sense to place the entrance closer to the parking, given the location of the parking at the rear of the site and the setbacks.

Stevens added that this was a long and narrow building and they wanted the communal space to be in center of the building. If that space were placed at the front of the building facing Forest, she said, it would interfere with the barrier-free apartment on the first floor.

Carlberg stated that this was a very attractive building, but there would not be much use of the front yard because of the side entrance, which was a concern of hers.

D'Amour also thought this was an attractive building and expressed his appreciation to the petitioner for using quality materials. He supported this proposal.

Enter Kunselman.

Potts was not pleased about the variance request to reduce the conflicting land use buffer. When redeveloping a site, she said, she would like it to be brought up to code.

Stevens said staff felt this variance was appropriate because what this site would be buffering was parking on the adjacent site to the north.

Kunselman wondered why the petitioner could not wrap the porch around the front to give the building the appearance that one was looking at the front of the building from Forest Street. He thought the architecture from the front of the building should be pleasing and approachable but, as proposed, the front of the building along Forest Street looked as though it were the side of the house. He also wondered where the space was for residents to recreate, stating that it was important to provide space for residents to sit outside, etc. Good urban design was providing the opportunity for residents to be outside and making people feel safe while walking down the street, he said.

Stegeman stated that this would be a tidy, discreet building and, once the rain garden and landscaping were installed, there would not be much space left at the front of the building for recreation. He reiterated that given the layout of the site and the location of the parking, the entrance on the side of the building was the most appropriate location.

Kunselman also thought this was an appropriate location for the entrance, but he believed more could be done architecturally with the front of the building. He asked if the two-way traffic flow was worked out between both of the property owners.

Stevens replied yes, stating that an easement had been recorded and was acceptable to both property owners.

Emaus stated that the entrance on the side of the building made it look like the front of the building. He was somewhat perturbed that the petitioner was taking this position when he took the opposite position for his previous proposal on Hill Street, when Planning Commission expressed concern about there being no entrance on the building facing the street. He said the petitioner noted at that time that the main entrance would be from Hill Street. He also thought the porch should be wrapped around to the front of the building, noting that there would be many residents walking to this site, especially with only six parking spaces being provided for up to 14 people.

Lipson agreed that there was not enough bicycle parking. He said bicycles would be parked all over, cluttering the site, if the petitioner did not make accommodations for them.

Pratt liked the overall appearance of the elements being proposed. He agreed that having something that gave the appearance of the front of the building on Forest Street made sense, stating that this development should be part of the streetscape. He asked if the petitioner intended on having the rain garden maintained on a continual basis.

Stevens replied that this would be a low maintenance rain garden, consisting of a bed of wet-loving shrubs surrounded by seed mix that could be reseeded as necessary.

Bona thought this project would be a positive new addition to the neighborhood. She understood why the entrance to the building was proposed for the side; however, she thought extending the porch to the front of the building was a good idea. Whether or not the porch wrapped around to the front was not as crucial to her. She did not object to the proposed variance, stating that the buffer would not be significantly reduced.

Lipson said he liked the architecture of the proposed building and was not offended by a building that did not focus on the street. He cautioned Planning Commission about redesigning projects, stating that he did not want to second-guess the architecture. He pointed out that if a porch were added to the front of the building for common use, the tenant at the front would suffer the consequences. He thought a front porch would create more problems than it would solve. He appreciated the petitioner using high-quality materials, but said it would be nice if space were provided for the residents to recreate.

D'Amour agreed with Commissioner Lipson in that a porch along the front of the property may result in undesirable consequences.

Jerry Lax, attorney representing the petitioner, asked that the Planning Commission not table action in order to redesign the proposal, stating that he was not certain the details of the design were part of the Commission's obligations of site plan review. He said this petitioner has agreed to take into account the suggestions made by the Planning Commission. There was little doubt that this was a narrow building, he said, and he was not sure pretending that the side was the front of the building would add much to the pedestrian experience. He also was not sure the Planning Commission should regard this as a reason to table and delay the proposal.

Potts stated that this proposal has been characterized as an infill development, but noted that a building existed on the property, which did not signify an infill development to her. She did not think this was an inappropriate building for this site.

Kunselman agreed that a porch in front of the building could cause difficulty for the ground floor tenants living at the front of the building. He believed something could be added for use by the ground floor tenants only at the front of the building, such as doors leading to a deck or patio. He was adamant about bringing people back into the fold of these living situations where they can watch the street, where they can talk to their neighbors, and where people can feel safe walking by, rather than hanging out in back parking lots. He was not willing to table action, as he did not want to delay this project, but said he thought architectural changes could be made.

Stegeman understood what was being said about the relationship of the building to the street and said he would seriously consider an architectural device with particular reference to first floor unit that would identify the front of the building.

Lipson believed extending the fence along the entire north side to buffer the parking on the north would improve the nature of buffer, improve the functionality of the site, and separate this site from the unattractive parking lot and building to the north.

Bona did not support tabling action, but said she would like the petitioner to take Commission's suggestions into consideration. She preferred an outdoor space at the front of the site to be used by all, rather than space for just one tenant.

Potts said she wished the motion could be separated to remove the variance, as she did not support the variance. Providing the required 15-foot setback might result in a smaller project, she said, but did not think this would necessarily be a bad thing. If left together, she said, she would consider voting against the motion.

Lipson believed the Zoning Board of Appeals was an independent body and would evaluate the requested variance independent of the Planning Commission's recommendation on the site plan.

Moved by Potts, seconded by D'Amour, to amend the main motion by removing the following language, "obtaining a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals from Chapter 62 (Landscape and Screening Ordinance) and."

Kunselman did not support this amendment. He did not believe that voting to recommend approval of the site plan meant that Commission supported the variance.

A vote on the amendment showed:

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

Motion failed.

A vote on the main motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

b. Public Hearing and Action on Barton Green Annexation, Zoning and Area Plan, 31.93 acres, west side of Pontiac Trail north of Skydale Drive. A request to annex this parcel into the City, zone it R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District), and a proposal to develop 255 residential units in 21 buildings, a community building, and 525 parking spaces – Staff Recommendation: Annexation – Approval, Zoning and Area Plan - Table

Vaughn described the proposal.

David Kwan, 218 Division Street, representing the petitioner, stated that he was present with the engineer and architect of the project. He said this property was in the Forshee family for about 100 years and was used mostly for agricultural uses. It was a difficult site, he said. The proposal was to develop both townhomes and flats, he said.

Ralph Katz, 605 Skydale, lived behind the southeast corner of this site. He was surprised when the site was clear-cut, but said the trees on the site were not very ancient, as the property had been farmed for so long. He acknowledged that this was a difficult site, as there was a depression going right down the center. His major concern was where drainage from the site would go and if it would impact the homes on Skydale.

Cloyd Peters, 355 Skydale, also living adjacent to this site, expressed a concern about whether the existing neighborhood and the proposed development would be linked with a road or if there would be only an emergency access between the two. He was concerned that a road between the two would bring too much traffic on Skydale, especially during rush hour. He believed using the link for emergency access only would be acceptable. He was also sad to see the trees removed from the site, as they had been there for about 35 years.

Kris Crona, 230 East Barton Lane, showed her property on the map and questioned the map's accuracy. She expressed concern about how this development would impact wildlife and pedestrian traffic. She did not want her privacy encroached upon and wondered if the petitioner proposed fencing. She did not want to see an attractive nuisance created.

Henry Okeke, 269 Larkspur, said he would like to see a buffer zone between the single-family neighborhood and the proposed development. He expressed concern about traffic and a thoroughfare across the green area. He feared that his neighborhood's quality of life would be impacted by the traffic that would be generated from this proposal and he also did not want to see the greenbelt turned into a thoroughfare. He pointed out that Ann Arbor was known for its parks, quality of life and neighborhoods. He also expressed concern about noise pollution and asked that all of these concerns be addressed.

Bren Quilter, 459 Skydale, stated that he was the Neighborhood Watch chairman and, in talking with his neighbors, he discovered that their main concerns had to do with traffic and noise. He would be very interested to see how the connection between the two sites would be handled.

Bryan Debbink, 2358 Hilldale, also expressed concern about traffic. His main concern had to do with this project proposing high density residential next to a single-family neighborhood, also pointing out that there were single-family homes to the south of his neighborhood as well as to the north of the subject site. When he was looking for a home to purchase in Ann Arbor, he said, he chose this area because it did not consist of a lot of condominiums, which was what the outskirts of Ann Arbor was beginning to look like.

George Jacobi, 2348 Larkspur, said he chose this neighborhood because he cherished its peacefulness and low amount of traffic. He was concerned about the density of this proposal and how it would affect the traffic in his neighborhood. He was concerned that the link connecting the two properties would result in people using his neighborhood to get to Pontiac Trail. He would favor the link for emergency access only, he said.

Dennis Mannisto, owner of the triangular piece south of this site, said he was not opposed to the annexation, but said the development proposal was problematic for him because his property was landlocked. He stated that the petitioner for this proposal was not willing to work with him on the issue of access and said he would like this issue taken into consideration. At some point he would gain access to his property, he said, either by agreement or court action. It made more sense to him to work something out through an agreement rather than have a judge decide, he said.

Ralph Katz, 605 Skydale, agreed that traffic was a major issue. He said it was not uncommon for people to drive down Pontiac Trail at 55 miles per hour and asked that this concern be addressed.

Noting no further speakers, Bona 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 Barton Green Annexation.

Moved by , seconded by , that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Barton Green Zoning to R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) and Area Plan.

Carlberg believed the annexation should be approved so it could be forwarded to the State for processing.

Kunselman was not convinced that R4A zoning was the appropriate classification for this property, stating that the neighborhood to the south was zoned R1C and the North Sky development to the north was zoned R3. There seemed to be a disruption in the zoning, which did not make sense to him. He did not understand why this site could not be zoned R1C and developed with single-family homes. The site did not contain a great deal of natural features, so that was not a factor, he said. He said he would like to see a layout for an R1C subdivision and information as to why it could or could not work. He said it was good that the residential portion of the development was located away from the expressway and he encouraged that vegetation adjacent to the expressway be increased.

Potts thought it was important to annex this property as soon as possible so the City could gain legal control. She was hesitant about the zoning and area plan, though, and said she would not like it to come back to Planning Commission until there was some kind of remediation proposed for the damage that was done to the high quality woodland. She would like to see it contained in a development agreement, she said. She also asked that the discrepancy in the maps, as noted by a speaker this evening, be resolved before this came back to Commission.

Lipson stated that the proposed zoning was consistent with the site specific recommendations contained in the Northeast Area Plan. It was a balancing act, he said, as he wanted to preserve as much open space as possible and provide density as well. The neighborhood to the south appeared to consist of 75 to 80 houses, he said, yet it used up all of the land. This proposal would use the same amount of land and still provide open space, he said. He was not opposed to the zoning, noting that the property was on a bus line, was close to a medical complex, and seemed to be appropriate for this type of development. He agreed with the neighbors that an access link between the two neighborhoods would have a negative impact and said this needed to be examined. He stated that he was extremely disturbed about the premature removal of the woodland. He was appalled, he said, noting that this was the second one of these situations to happen just before applying for annexation. While he agreed that the property should be annexed into the City, he was livid about rewarding the type of action that occurred on this site by approving the annexation. He told the petitioners that they needed to adhere to the City's rules if they wanted their property to be annexed into the City.

Pratt said he took a request for annexation as a desire to receive the benefits of being in the City. In this situation, he said, it was apparent there was a desire on the part of the petitioner to live by the favorable rules and not the unfavorable rules, referring to the petitioner removing the woodland. He questioned moving forward with the annexation because of that behavior. In general, he said, good points were made relative to traffic. In looking at the aerial photograph, he said, the area south of Skydale clearly indicated the intent to link this property to the adjacent neighborhood. The roads have been aligned for that and it was important for people to understand it, he said. He also noted that the Northeast Area Plan contained a great deal of interconnection for future development on both sides of Pontiac trail. He stated that the Intent has generally been to encourage residents to get from one place to another without having to drive out onto primary roads. Traffic calming was always an option, he added. If everyone agreed with an emergency access only, though, he said he would be fine with that. He requested information from staff, and the City Attorney's Office if necessary, relative to the landlocked parcel, particularly an understanding of the history of when the present owner purchased it and if it were landlocked at the time

of purchase. He also stated that a summary of a traffic impact report would be helpful in reviewing this proposal. He pointed out that it was typical of the Planning Commission to ask that the petitioner and neighbors have formal meetings to work through concerns.

D'Amour stated that non-motorized linkages were important and must be considered. With regard to the Northeast Area Plan, he said, he received a communication from Kate Pepin, a member of the citizens advisory committee, in which she shared her concerns about increased traffic in the Skydale area and about natural features. He agreed with the concerns regarding traffic and would favor that the stub off of Skydale be considered for emergency access only, even though connectivity was very important. With regard to natural features, he said, he was very angry and disgusted about the petitioner clear-cutting the woodland. He did not believe the trees were removed in order to survey the property and said this was a cynical way of getting around the rules. He said the petitioner was familiar with the City's rules and knew better. He sometimes wondered if natural features were merely a bargaining chip to some in the community and stated that if someone wanted to develop in a community, that person needed to respect the values of the community. Ann Arbor valued natural features, he said. He did not know how he would vote on the annexation, but said he would like to see serious remediation for the clear-cutting presented to Commission.

Lipson agreed that the property should be annexed so the City could gain control of the land as quickly as possible. Because the trees were no longer on the site and there no longer was a certainty as to what natural features existed, he said, he would be looking at the possible reduction in the proposed density. He said he may find it very difficult to support 255 residential units because of what had been done to the woodland.

Kunselman said he also was upset about the clear-cutting on the site and suggested that Commission begin right now with considering a lower density, by amending the motion to consider R1C zoning instead of R4A zoning.

Moved by Kunselman, seconded by Potts, to amend the main motion by changing the R4A zoning to R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) zoning.

Lipson thought R4A zoning may be more appropriate in this location, as it provided potential for clustering and required a larger amount of open space. He said he would support the annexation this evening, but was not prepared to make a recommendation on the zoning.

Potts said she was not ready to make a recommendation on the zoning until she had more information on how the development would fit on the land. She would like to see how R1C could be developed on this property with the protection of natural features.

Carlberg agreed that it was premature to place a zoning classification on this site. She would need information as to where important natural features were located on adjacent sites so density could be maximized and the greatest quantity of natural features could be protected. She also thought alternatives should be provided for Planning Commission review, showing how housing could be placed on the site to maximize the protection of natural features. She pointed out that stacked flats were likely less expensive to purchase than single-family homes.

Kunselman thought there was an opportunity here for a single-family subdivision on this property, one that would be compatible with the neighborhood to the south. The neighborhood was obviously intended to be expanded with the linkages, he said. He was talking about workforce family housing with small yards for children, he said. He said the City talks about providing a diversity of housing, yet no new

single-family homes were being developed. He stated that the situation here involved a petitioner who disregarded the City's principles and, while Commission could exert its anger about it, the important thing was what was going to be done about it.

Emaus did not support the amendment for the R1C zoning. He stated that the Northeast Area Plan envisioned higher density housing on these developable parcels, adding that there were plenty of single-family homes in this segment of the City. He also stated that a density of eight dwelling units per acre was not very high for a city environment.

D'Amour thought there was a place for all types of housing in the northeast area, and in the City as a whole, including single-family dwellings. He stated that the zoning and area plan would be tabled and staff would be taking all of the comments made this evening into consideration while working with the petitioner. Even if the property were zoned R1C, he said, he would hope the housing would be clustered for greater protection of natural features.

Bona did not think using R1C as a way to mitigate for natural features was the right approach, although she did agree that the petitioner should be held responsible for mitigation. She thought R1C zoning was counter-productive and said she would not support the amendment.

Kunselman strongly believed there was a place for R1C zoning on this property and in this area. He was not proposing the R1C zoning to punish the petitioner, he said. He stated that developing the periphery of Ann Arbor into multiple-family, stacked housing was sometimes going too far in one direction. He thought this should be considered in terms of the growth patterns of the City, noting that soon there would be no more parcels left to develop.

A vote on the amendment to R1C zoning showed:

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

Motion failed.

Carlberg expressed concern about the roundabouts shown on the area plan, questioning whether they were the best use of space. She asked staff to find ways to minimize the amount of pavement in the development.

Bona stated that she generally favored interconnecting neighborhoods, but not to create a shortcut. She thought the curves and angles of the roads in this proposal created an odd path for a resident to take to enter or exit the site, which would encourage residents to use Skydale instead, which she opposed. She thought the residents of this development should be able to use their own entrance and exit, whereas interconnectedness would be to allow someone from one neighborhood to visit another neighborhood. She was supportive of R4A zoning as it allowed the density recommended in the Northeast Area Plan, adding that the City tended to follow its master plans.

Lipson agreed with Commissioner Bona regarding the issue of linking the two developments. He referred to the speed humps that were installed in his neighborhood as a street calming feature, stating that this might be a possibility on Skydale.

Emaus said he supported traditional neighborhoods with interconnections. Unfortunately, he said, connections were not implemented in this area as originally intended because of the Huron Parkway

extension that did not happen. In this situation, he said, there would be about 20 households that might cut through if the two were connected, which was not a significant amount of traffic. He thought the benefit of interconnecting the neighborhoods was much greater.

A vote on the annexation motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

Moved by Lipson, seconded by D'Amour, to table action on the zoning and area plan.

A vote on the motion to table showed:

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

Motion carried.

c. Public Hearing and Action on Ann Arbor District Library Northeast Branch Rezoning and Planned Project Site Plan, 4.34 acres, southwest corner of Huron Parkway and Traverwood Drive. A request to rezone this site from ORL (Office/Research/Limited Industrial District) and M1 (Limited Industrial District) to O (Office District) and a proposal to construct a 16,987-square foot, one-story building with 89 parking spaces (34 below the building) – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn described the proposal and showed photographs of the property.

Josie Parker, director of the Ann Arbor Public Library, introduced the project to Commission.

Cory Lavigne, of Vantine Guthrie Studio of Architecture, representing the petitioner, explained the approach taken in designing this proposal. He stated that natural features and the reduction of impervious surface were major factors. A fair amount of dead or dying ash trees were identified, he said, stating that they were committed to reutilizing the trees within the library building. He said they were installing as much new landscaping as possible to try and integrate the site back in with the existing natural features.

Parker explained that the entry to the building was at the corner of the site, which would allow for public access from all directions. There also would be access from underneath the building, she said, adding that the parking below the building would have day lighting. She said the library was very excited about the ash tree reutilization, stating that they were awarded a \$30,000 grant for this. It was their goal to develop this site as unobtrusively as possible, she said.

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

Moved by Kunselman, seconded by Bona, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Ann Arbor District Library Northeast Branch

Rezoning from ORL (Office/Research/Limited Industrial District) and M1 (Limited Industrial District) to O (Office District), and Planned Project Site Plan, subject to Washtenaw County Drain Commissioner approval prior to City Council approval and subject to mitigation of sanitary sewer flow equivalent to the disconnection of one footing drain prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy.

Parker added that ash trees would be cut down and hauled out by draft horses to protect the root systems of the landmark trees within the interior of the site.

Lipson stated that this proposal exemplified the planning principles Commission has talked about and has hoped that others would incorporate into their developments, such as reducing impervious surface, protecting natural features, providing on-street parking, making the design pedestrian friendly, minimizing setbacks, and providing a green roof.

Carlberg thought a planned project was appropriate for this proposal, stating that on-street parking would help to soften the effects of traffic. She asked if the southern parking lot, which would mainly be used by employees, would be restricted to patrons.

Parker replied no. She said patrons could park in the southern parking lot, but people generally parked as close to an entrance as possible. She said the drive from the southern parking lot and then under the building and to the northern parking lot would be one-way, stating that there was no way they could have afforded the expense of making it two-way because of the structural costs involved.

Carlberg asked if the library would be interested in providing an access to the adjacent park if a way to do so were possible.

Parker stated that the library board discussed this issue at length and determined that the library was not interested in providing a pathway to the park. However, she said, they would not object if people used the parking lot to access the park.

D'Amour referred to the high quality natural features in the adjacent park and asked if the library envisioned any future expansion.

Parker replied no, the library was not anticipating any expansion, noting that the building was not designed for expansion. More library space was needed in this district, she said, but not this particular location.

D'Amour expressed concern about this site being remote from major nodes of transportation and asked how the library would address the issue of accessibility for non-motorized transportation.

Parker stated that bus routes would provide direct access to the library. She said the library anticipated that it would retain all users from the current mall location and that new users would be added as well. The library believed it was using tax dollars very wisely, she said.

D'Amour said he was very happy with this proposal and that he would vote to approve it; however, it was his hope that the impact the library would have on the adjacent park would be very minimal.

Bona complimented the library and the library board for this project. She thought putting parking below the building and using the street for more parking was very important in reducing impervious surface.

With regard to the street parking, she asked staff to verify compliance of the two adjacent streets with the City's non-motorized plan, which did not take on-street parking into account. She would also like to know what the City could do regarding the long, seldom-used center turn lanes as far as reducing the amount of imperviousness on these two streets. She stated that the energy-conserving measures in this proposal were extremely important but, when it came to conserving energy in the City, she said, land planning was far more effective. She thought something that attracted as much traffic as this should be placed closer to other retail uses. This was not a fault of the library, she said; rather, the City had not yet caught up to that principle. With regard to the woodland and access to the park, although she understood the library's position, she would like to see that connection continue to be pursued. She asked if the library had second thoughts about developing an invasive species control plan.

Parker said it was important to understand that the library did not decline to do this, but because of the cost associated with this project, the library would not be able to accomplish it within the budget. She said the library agreed to enter into negotiations to allow parks staff to work on the property.

Bona thought there should also be a discussion about conveying the woodland to the City as a park. She did not think it was a good idea in this case as it would result in an extremely narrow piece of property along the street and she would not want to create a situation that was too restrictive for the future. However, if the library decided to keep it, she thought there was some responsibility on the part of the library to address the issue of invasive species because of the tendency to encroach onto the park property. Perhaps this could be addressed through a voluntary effort of the Friends of the Library, she said. She expressed her support for this project, stating that it was a great asset to the neighborhood with good bus and pedestrian access.

Potts said she also would be supporting this project. She understood the value of the library having its own site, but said a location in more of an urban setting would reduce parking duplication.

Edward Surovell, library board president, noted that the library district served parts of Ann Arbor, Lodi, Pittsfield, Scio, Superior and Webster Townships, in addition to the City of Ann Arbor, so there were many patrons who would not be within walking distance.

Kunselman was pleased with this proposal and said he would be supporting it.

Emaus was pleased with the entrance at the front corner, saying he thought it would be inviting to pedestrians and bicyclists. With regard to invasive species, he was a park steward and he believed that anyone who owned property, especially around a nature area, should be responsible to make sure invasive species were removed from their property and from the periphery of a nature area. He urged the library to make efforts to protect the adjacent nature area, perhaps advertising a park steward position.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

d. Public Hearing and Action on Mallett's Wood PUD Site Plan, 3.77 acres, west of Cardinal Avenue, between Sharon and Redwood Drive. Two motions: (1) To allow disturbance of the 25-foot natural features open space for a 0.032-acre wetland and (2) To allow alternative mitigation for 50 percent of the woodland tree disturbance by conveyance to the City of 1.32 acres of parkland containing a high quality woodland – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Bona stated that she would recuse herself from discussion and action on this proposal as she has worked on this project.

Exit Bona.

Vaughn described the proposal.

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

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Emaus, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby authorizes disturbance of the 25-foot natural features open space, per Chapter 55, Section 5:51(5) and (6).

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Emaus, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the alternative mitigation plan to allow the conveyance of 1.32 acres of parkland to the City in lieu of providing 434.5 caliper inches of replacement trees on site.

Kunselman said it was understandable that the tree information was required, but said this was a high quality woodland and there probably would not be much of a gain by providing the information on paper. He supported the proposed motions.

Lipson agreed, stating that the City would be receiving such a high quality woodland in exchange for the trees that would be removed. He believed this conformed with tree mitigation requirements.

Carlberg said there was a previous concern that building the wall across one end of the 25-foot buffer area would impact the way the wetland functioned. She did not believe there would be an impact and said she was very comfortable agreeing to allow this. She noted that the petitioners have protected so much more of the woods, which was the greatest benefit.

Emaus asked what the electrical company's right was for accessing the utility easement area through the wetlands.

Peter Pollack, of Pollack Design Associates, representing the petitioners, showed the Detroit Edison easement and said the petitioners did not have control over it. He said Detroit Edison had the right to go into the easement to fix anything. He said it was the petitioners' intent to put cable and telephone lines outside of the easement area to minimize access to the easement area.

Pratt asked if the City's Parks and Recreation staff would have to deal with any invasive plants in the high quality woodland.

Pollack replied that there were invasive plants and that they would be starting the process of invasive management with the wetland area and coordinate it with the City's Natural Area Preservation staff.

D'Amour expressed concern about the utility easement and how work done within the easement by Detroit Edison might affect the high quality woodland.

Pollack explained that the utility easement took up about 10 percent of the woodland area and that there were no trees within the easement. He said no new utility easements would be created with this development.

Kunselman asked that documents containing the name "Brown Park" be changed to "Mary Beth Doyle Park."

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Peter Pollack, speaking in regard to the Mallett's Wood 2 motions, explained the value of the land in relation to the value of the replacement trees. He stated that the trees were being given to the City for free along with the land being donated. He also noted that the petitioners were planting trees totaling 435 inches DBH.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Pratt declared the meeting adjourned at 10:46 p.m.

Mark Lloyd, Manager
Planning and Development Services

Bonnie Bona, Secretary