

MINUTES

ANN ARBOR CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

BUSINESS MEETING

7:00 p.m. – May 2, 2006

Time: Chair Hall called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bona, Carlberg, D'Amour, Hall, Kunselman, Lipson, Potts, Pratt

Members Absent: Emaus

Staff Present: Foondle, Lloyd

INTRODUCTIONS

None.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

a. Minutes of April 4, 2006.

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

D'Amour asked that two changes be made to the second to last paragraph on page 10, as follows: The third sentence in the second to last paragraph be amended to add "rather he considered it more as paternalism or even arrogance" after "He did not consider that to be courage." The following sentence be added before the last sentence, "He read a letter by Ray Dettter raising questions regarding defining areas of growth in Ann Arbor."

Lipson asked that on page 6, the beginning of the third paragraph from the bottom read as follows: "Lipson asked Mr. Cawley to confirm that..."

Bona asked that on page 9, the word "of" in the quote in the eight paragraph be changed to "or."

Potts asked that the following language be inserted to the beginning of the second sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 5, "Referring to packet materials she had provided the Commission...."

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

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

D'Amour reported that the Allen Creek Greenway Task Force held two workshops, and that another workshop was anticipated in early June and another in September, with perhaps one more in between that time period. He believed the Planning Commission and task force would have a joint meeting as this process moved forward. He reported that the next two task force meetings were scheduled for May 3 and May 17, both at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Potts stated that the Ordinance Revisions Committee was moving along with the review of potential ordinance revisions and suggested that the committee meet three times in the month of May. She would ask for staff's assistance in scheduling these meetings.

Bona stated that with regard to the DDA Partnership Committee, the RFP for the Kline's parking lot site was planned to be released in March 2007. She reported that three responses were received for the First and Washington lot and that a selection committee would be formed to review them.

Pratt announced that the Security and Public Space Task Force would be meeting on May 11 at 4:00 p.m. on the fourth floor of the Public Library. He also reported that students at Lawrence Tech had been assigned a class project to design a City Hall for the Public Library site. The presentations of the student projects were scheduled for May 8 at Lawrence Tech, he said. He informed Commission that he received

a telephone call from Mr. Rich Hesselschwerdt, who apologized for being disruptive at the last Planning Commission meeting. He informed Commission that he planned on attending the zoning enabling training session on May 10.

Hall reported that the Transfer of Development Rights Work Group would be meeting with staff at 12:00 p.m. on May 3, and that the Downtown Development Strategies Implementation Steering Committee would be meeting at 11:30 a.m. on May 9.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT MEETING

Hall announced the public hearings scheduled for the meeting of May 16, 2006.

REGULAR BUSINESS

a. Public Hearing and Action on Amendments to Chapter 60 (Wetlands Preservation Ordinance), Section 5:213(5)(b) and (c) to further describe the intent of the term "watershed," and Section 5:206(3)(c) to change the length of wetland mitigation monitoring from three to five years to be more consistent with the State Wetland Act – Staff Recommendation: Approval

Jerry Hancock, of the City's Systems Planning Unit, provided background information and explained the proposed amendments.

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

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Kunselman, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the proposed amendments to Chapter 60 (Wetland Preservation Ordinance), Section 5:206(3)(a), (b) and (c), and Section 5:213(5)(b) and (c), to adjust the length of mitigation monitoring plans from three to five years and to clarify the requirement to provide mitigation within the same watershed.

D'Amour expressed his appreciation for the proposed clarification and said he would support the amendments.

Potts also expressed appreciation for the changes.

Kunselman stated that State law has always had a five-year monitoring requirement for permits and asked if any local permits would still have the three-year monitoring requirement.

Hancock replied that there were perhaps three permits that fell within the three-year period. The last couple of permits that were issued also required State permits, so they fell within the five-year requirement, he said.

Kunselman asked for clarification within the sub-watershed as to how one mile upstream was measured.

Hancock explained that the actual mile was not measured, but that staff believed one mile would be adequate in order to include the Barton Pond area where water intake occurred. He said it would be beneficial to the City to provide for additional wetlands in that area.

Kunselman said he would support the proposed amendments.

Lipson asked if staff walked along the stream to determine the one-mile measurement.

Hancock replied no. He said one mile upstream was within the direct discharge area and staff believed this was adequate.

Lipson stated that the one-mile measurement was not the shorter distance as if walking along the stream, but more of an overland mile as the crow flies.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

b. Public Hearing and Action on Adoption of Northeast Area Transportation Plan as an element of the City's Master Plan. The plan recommends goals, objectives and actions for freeway access, non-motorized facilities, transit services and roadways and will be used as a guide for future transportation policy and infrastructure decisions in the Northeast Area – Staff Recommendation: Table

Wendy Rampson, of the Systems Planning Service Unit, provided background information, described the process and scope of the planning effort, and shared highlights of the plan.

Michael Moran, Ann Arbor Township Supervisor, stated that a great deal of the land in the northeast area has been developed on property annexed from Ann Arbor Township in the past 12 years pursuant to a policy between the City and Township. He said he was a member of the technical citizens advisory committee (TCAC) and participated in the evaluation and discussion of alternatives. He explained the importance of the M-14/Barton Drive interchange to the Township. He stated that many Township residents used this as a means to cross the river and come into the City to transact business. It was also used as an emergency access, he said. He believed there were better solutions than closing the interchange, saying he did not think sufficient study had been done of other improvements that could be made to educate motorists traveling eastbound about the approaching interchange. He stated that Ann Arbor Township was seriously concerned about the closure of the interchange, as it would be a major compromise to providing emergency services and access for residents.

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier, referred to the transit portion of the report. He expressed concern about public subsidies for riding the bus and about financing the park-and-ride program with fair increases. He was concerned that it would be the people who had no choice but to ride the bus who would be paying the fare increase.

Malcolm Powers, 901 Barton Drive, stated that the issue of the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange has been a problem for over 30 years. He has lived here that long and said he has had people lined up on his lawn more than once. He has also had to back into his driveway in order to exit safely, he said. Nothing was ever done about the problem, he said, giving the impression that the City was hoping the problem would go away. He stated that closing the eastern portion of the Barton Drive/M-14 interchange would not alleviate the traffic problem on Barton Drive. He was convinced that an access onto M-14 from Nixon Road was needed, adding that the wetland in that location was not adequate rationale for not placing it there, pointing out that the new public high school being built required a change in the wetlands. He said the residents on Barton Drive have waited years for a solution to the problem and he felt it was only fair that others start to share the load.

Terri Blackmore, executive director of Washtenaw Area Transportation Study (WATS), stated that WATS voted to oppose even a temporary closing of the Barton Drive interchange. She noted that MDOT had a long history of never reopening something once it was closed. MDOT also had an adopted policy, she said, where it involved a local cost to open an interchange or build a new one once it was closed. She said it would be a serious mistake to close this interchange, noting that adequate access to both the City and the Township would be eliminated with its closing.

Dan Walters, 2945 Newport Road, said he has heard that steps were available to help reduce the impact of employees leaving Pfizer by traveling out Nixon Road to North Territorial. He had also heard that the County was willing to install a traffic light on North Territorial to help keep traffic flowing. He thought it was common knowledge that a longer ramp from Barton Drive onto M-14 would solve a lot of the problems. He believed closing the interchange would be a disservice.

Cheryl MacKrell, representing Barton Hills Village, stated that the township provided a summary a couple of years ago of reasons why the interchange should not be closed. She referred to the recent Planning Commission working session on the Northeast Area Transportation Plan and possible mistaken impressions. She expressed concern that Commission members might have gotten the impression that everyone in the City wanted the M-14/Barton Drive interchange closed, which was not the case. A small number of people wanted the interchange closed, she said. She pointed out that the accident rate has been dropping at that interchange since MDOT made several safety improvements. She stated that Barton Hills Village was willing to help pay for additional improvements and informed Commission that MDOT has found additional State funds that might be used for lengthening the entrance ramp. She stated that residents of the village were polled as to the increase in travel time that would result if the interchange were closed. The replies were 7-minute on up to 15-minute increased commuting times, she said. She believed this would increase congestion on Plymouth Road, turning it into another Washtenaw Avenue. She also stated that it was critical that emergency providers be consulted about this change.

Bill Davis, a Barton Hills resident and former trustee of Barton Hills Village, suggested that the issue of closing the M-14/Barton Drive interchange be removed from the plan until a final solution could be found. He thought a more comprehensive debate with all governmental units, rather than with individuals as part of committees, work with MDOT to come up with a solution.

Clark Charnetsky, 2646 Traver Road, said he was a member of the citizens advisory committee, which consisted of people with many different opinions. He said the committee reached a good consensus, with the exception of the issue of the M-14/Barton Road interchange, adding that it was very satisfying to go

from that large of a group to something that functioned. He endorsed this plan in its entirety, especially with regard to bicycle and pedestrian components. He said the plan had little in the way of road and intersection widenings, which he thought was in keeping with what the general citizens of Ann Arbor wanted. He stated that closing the eastern part of the M-14/Barton Drive interchange would make it easier for traffic to enter northbound M-14 at Main Street. He said a Nixon Road interchange would involve heavy traffic through three public schools, two nursery schools and many more residents than the number of residents who lived on Barton, so he did not think an interchange at that location would be appropriate. He stated that the bicycle and pedestrian transit components should be given serious consideration, as it was time for them to be applied Citywide.

Ken Clark, 497 Larkspur, representing the Washtenaw Bicycle/Walking Coalition, recommended that Planning Commission adopt the plan as is. He spoke regarding three topics: transportation diversity, levels of service, and Barton Drive/M-14 interchange. With regard to transportation diversity, he said, people were addicted to cars and until there was diversity in the transit system, things would get much worse. He believed Ann Arbor had a long way to go to support diversity in the transportation network and said this plan went a long way to address that. He also thought that police needed to get involved with the issue of harassment of bicyclists, which was a problem. With regard to level of service (LOS), he said, many people thought it was a letter grade indicating the level of traffic congestion and that the grade must go higher to improve traffic. It was actually the measurement of how easy it was to travel quickly on a road, he said, essentially how friendly it was to speed and to break the law. He stated that LOS D was not a failing grade, it just meant that people had to slow down and drive the speed limit. He believed it was time to change the policy on level of service to LOS D, which this plan recommended. With regard to the M-14/Barton Drive interchange, he stated that a thorough analysis of this issue has been done over the years, addressing problems and potential solutions. The problems mostly had to do with speeding, he said, which would likely always be a problem. He thought the best solution was to close it, although he did not think it would happen right away. He stated that other jurisdictions were involved in the process and it was not like they did not have a voice at the table. He pointed out that the interchange would still be open for emergency vehicles. Considering the alternative, he thought this was the best proposal available and hoped Commission would approve it.

Braxton Blake, 1508 Longshore, said he was proud of the Northeast Area Transportation Plan process, stating that it was very democratic, with a vote taken on everything. While he would prefer that the M-14/Barton Drive interchange stay open, he would stand behind the plan with its recommendation that the interchange be closed. It was a convenient interchange, he said, but he supported the democratic will and thoroughness of the committee. He encouraged the Planning Commission to do the same. Emergency providers should be consulted, he said, but noted that townships and other sources did have input in the plan. With regard to why this plan took five years to complete, he said, a great deal of it had to do with the modeling of the transcad that WATS was doing. He believed the two most impressive features about this plan were the model of what the City should do regarding non-motorized transportation and the long-range planning and projections done by the consultant. He hoped Commission would approve this plan.

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

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Carlberg, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adopts the Northeast Area Transportation Plan as an element of the City of Ann Arbor's Master Plan.

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Carlberg, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that

**the Mayor and City Council adopt the Northeast Area
Transportation Plan as an element of the City of Ann Arbor's
Master Plan.**

Hall stated that the process the Planning Commission decided upon was to hold the public hearing this evening and then have a joint meeting with City Council in order to discuss the plan and consider the public comments made tonight.

D'Amour asked for further clarification from Ms. Blackmore as to the length of time involved in getting the transcad model.

Blackmore explained that the model was under development by another consultant and there was a long period of time during which the consultant was unable to get the model to work. As soon as WATS was informed about the difficulty the consultant was having, she said, WATS authorized that consultant to obtain assistance with the model.

D'Amour noted some of the comments made about the Northeast Area Transportation Plan (NEATP) having a better process than the Northeast Area Plan, and about how open and democratic the process was. He thanked everyone who worked on this plan. He would have been prepared to vote on the NEATP tonight, but said there was one amendment he would first like to propose. He did not propose this amendment to the NEATP citizens advisory committee, as he was reluctant to raise this sensitive issue with that group. However, he believed he had the option to propose the amendment as a Planning Commission member. He referred to pages 253 and 254 regarding the possibility of an east-west collector road north of Arborland and extending to Huron Parkway. He did not find this collector road to be desirable, given the R1C zoning put in place on the South Pond Village property, stating that it would be a public nuisance to the Woodcreek and Brentwood Square neighborhoods, regardless of them both being planned to include the collector road. He agreed that the issue of infrastructure was important, but said people needed to start weaning themselves away from the automobile. He proposed that Section 6.5 of the NEATP be eliminated.

**Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Potts, to eliminate Section 6.5
from the Northeast Area Transportation Plan.**

Potts did not recall the citizens advisory committee discussing or voting on this particular issue.

Rampson stated that this issue was discussed at the committee meeting held in March 2005. She said Commissioner D'Amour raised his concerns at that time, which were then discussed by the committee. The committee then decided that this should remain a part of the plan, she said.

Carlberg stated that the concept of this collector road was embedded in a number of City resolutions and was part of discussions related to the property behind Arborland and access to that property if it were ever developed. The City could not mandate an access road through Arborland, she said, since the City did not own the shopping center. She stated that there were about six different recommendations as to what the road structure might be in order to accommodate development of this site. While City Council has not been willing up to this point to seize property to allow a connector road to Huron Parkway, she said, Council did understand that any development would need an access road. She did not believe such a road would be appropriate through the Woodcreek neighborhood, but it would be appropriate along the southern border of Woodcreek. She said the citizens advisory committee had the opportunity to remove this part from the NEATP but decided against it. She stated that the concept of a road along Arborland was a viable concept for the future and said it was quite possible that changes in ownership could make

the concept feasible all the way to Huron Parkway. While she supported reducing the desire to drive, she stated that people would still drive cars. She did not want to see this part of the plan removed.

Lipson stated that including this road in the NEATP did not make it a reality; rather, it was a possibility, and he did not want to eliminate that possibility for the future. He did not support this amendment.

A vote on the amendment showed:

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

Motion failed.

D'Amour stated that this document contained progressive work, adding that it would be precedent-setting for the City. While many people may have disagreed with the results regarding the M-14/Barton Drive interchange, he said, no one could say their thoughts were not heard. He believed this plan met the goals of the citizens who have raised concerns regarding transportation in the northeast area and said it was his hope that it become a model for transportation planning for the City as a whole.

Kunselman asked if separating the Barton Drive interchange issue from the plan was an option.

Rampson stated that this was the Planning Commission's prerogative. She said the analysis done on the roadways assumed the closure of the east ramps, although there would likely be a minor difference in the modeling if they were left open.

Kunselman stated that because of major changes in land use, such as the new public high school on Maple Road, he wondered how this might affect the modeling that was done, such as including the boundaries of the high school and taking into consideration that there would be many northeast area residents traveling on M-14 to get to the high school site. He wondered if this data had been analyzed.

Rampson stated that the model could not take into consideration who made vehicle trips; rather, it looked at travel demand. She also noted that the model did include growth on the high school site, so the model contained vehicle trips, although specific traveling behaviors could not be identified. In general, she said, the interchange handled about 5,000 trips per day on each side, which was not a significant amount. It would be impossible to determine how many of those trips would be from high school parents or students driving to the new high school, she said.

Kunselman said he was opposed to closing the M-14/Barton Drive interchange, stating that he would have difficulty with increased commute times to school. Having lived in the Miller/Maple area, he said he used the interchange quite frequently, stating that it was a convenience to citizens. He did not think this was only a township or regional issue, but also a City resident issue. He stated that driving on this portion of the freeway was very simplistic and he did not think that closing the interchange at Barton Drive would change driving habits. Speeding problems on the freeway could hopefully be addressed with additional safety elements, he said.

Carlberg recommended that Commission table action this evening in order to hold a joint meeting with Council. It was important to make the approval process as effortless as possible, she said, so both Commission and Council could approve a document that was in the best interest of all. She said this would also help expedite the process, noting that most of the current Council members were not on Council when this study was done.

Potts agreed that a joint meeting with Council was important. She referred to the 1990 Transportation Plan and how much of it was never implemented. She stated that part of the reason was because the plan was never coordinated between Commission and Council. She believed this NEATP contained some excellent recommendations that she would like to see implemented.

Bona supported tabling action and having a joint meeting with Council. She said she would also like to consider the concept of separating the M-14/Barton Drive interchange issue from the plan. She asked if closing this interchange and not replacing it with an interchange elsewhere meant that existing entrances would experience increased traffic.

Rampson replied that, yes, incrementally traffic would be increased. She said people would use other routes, not just other freeway interchanges.

Bona did not feel qualified at this time to make a judgment on the different options for the M-14/Barton Drive interchange. Generally speaking, she was not in favor of closing the interchange unless something else opened up. She did not favor taking existing traffic and putting it into fewer interchanges within the City. With regard to interconnection, she thought there was a piece missing from the NEATP, although she did not have an amendment to propose. She stated that the interconnection of neighborhood streets, which she thought was critical in relieving traffic on arterials, was not contained in the plan. She stated that the Miller-Maple-Newport Traffic Study indicates that the City supports neighborhood links and the recently adopted Northeast Area Plan encouraged interconnecting neighborhood streets. She thought this should be contained in the NEATP as well. She said she would provide Commission members with proposed language to add prior to the next meeting on the plan.

Pratt stated that in the interest of respecting the efforts put into the creation of this plan, he would propose an unusual amendment to the motion to essentially move everything forward with an acknowledgement that a vote on the M-14/Barton Drive interchange would be taken at a later time.

Moved by Pratt, seconded by Lipson, to amend the main motion by adding the following language: “with the exception of the recommendation to close Barton Drive for which a separate resolution and recommendation to Council will be provided after a joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting.”

Potts stated that this report was created by the joint efforts of staff, a consultant and a committee, and was presented to Commission as a whole. There would be various issues that would need discussion, she said, and she preferred dealing with the plan as a whole.

D’Amour believed the recommendation for Barton Drive tied into the whole document and he would not recommend separating it. He said he would support tabling so a joint meeting could be held to discuss the issues and then decide how to proceed.

Carlberg believed the motive here was to send a signal to Council that this might be an appropriate way to proceed in order for part of the plan to be adopted and leaving the more contentious issue for future deliberation. If this were correct, she could see merit in that and could support the amendment with the understanding that this is not what eventually would be voted on, considering that this would still be tabled this evening.

A vote on the amendment to the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

Pratt asked if the additional SEMCOG crash analysis data would be added to the final draft of the plan.

Rampson stated that the Planning Commission would need to decide if it should be incorporated into the document. Currently, it was part of the document in the form of a memo, she said.

Pratt expressed his appreciation for all the effort that went into preparing this plan. He believed that closing the M-14/Barton Drive interchange would be closing a door that currently was open and would limit access points to the north side of town. He thought the closure would have a negative, long-range impact. The purpose of his amendment to the motion was not to make a determination that the interchange be left open or closed, but to move forward with adoption of the plan. He mentioned the following points regarding the interchange: (1) The issue of safety had subjective components; estimates were on the right side of the equation and he wondered what the benefit gained would be. (2) It was fortunate that there have been no fatalities since 1997, but what was unfortunate was that a dollar value was assigned to the fatality; otherwise, it could not be measured. (3) With regard to the long-range impact, he questioned whether there had been a thorough analysis of what would happen 20 to 30 years from now. (4) Economic impacts were making it more difficult to spend money and one of the two options would make it impossible to reverse the situation. If the interchange remained open, he said, changes and improvements could be made. If it were closed, that would be final, he said. He questioned whether he could justify closing the interchange when the benefits would not outweigh the impacts.

Hall supported tabling action. She said there were so many good points in the plan and was disappointed that they were not being discussed because one major issue was overshadowing everything else. She was pleased that this particular planning effort led into the City's non-motorized plan and that recommendations were being made for non-motorized transportation and improvements to the bus system. With regard to the crash data, she did not think it was possible for staff to make changes to the plan; the changes had to be made either by Commission or Council. She said it would be a good idea for the plan to contain the correct data. She was undecided about closure of the interchange, saying she had personal reasons for wanting it to stay open. She was not convinced with the data, but said she stood behind the process, as there was a great deal of study, thought and discussion involved in coming up with the recommendation. She supported a joint meeting with Commission and Council.

D'Amour stated that perhaps some felt they were not initially qualified to make a decision on the interchange, but he believed it was the Planning Commission's responsibility to make the decision in the form of a recommendation on the master plan after weighing all of the information. He agreed that the plan should be discussed with City Council. He did not have a strong viewpoint on the interchange, but said there was a great deal vested in terms of the process and the time people spent on this. No matter what the City decided about the interchange, he said, it was ultimately MDOT's decision, taking into account all governmental decisions.

Lipson stated that one of the functions of the Planning Commission was to solicit public input and take into consideration what was said. This was part of his decision-making, he said. It appeared to him that, overall, the public was in favor of keeping the interchange open, noting the input from large groups such as WATS, Ann Arbor Township and Barton Hills.

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

A vote on the motion to table showed:

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

Motion carried.

b. Public Hearing and Action on Master Plan Review (whether elements should be studied for possible change or new elements added to the Master Plan).

Lloyd described the process.

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier, spoke to Commission about updating and putting the General Development Plan back as a part of the Master Plan. He thought it was important to have a plan that looked at how the City worked as a whole, which is what the General Development Plan was intended to do. He also noted that the Community Development Plan needed to be updated.

Noting no speakers, Hall declared the public hearing closed.

Moved by D'Amour, seconded by Carlberg, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the "City of Ann Arbor Master Plan Resolution," dated May 2, 2006.

D'Amour asked if the Library Block Planning and Urban Design Study was for City Hall. He also asked if the North Main Street/Huron River Corridor Summary Land Use Policy were still active.

Lloyd replied that all of the plans listed in the resolution were active.

Carlberg stated that the Library Block study was done in the early 1990's for potential development plans of that block. It was a good document, she said, and was not part of the current study underway to consider a new City Hall in that location.

Potts believed the Library Block study was being used as a resource by the committee working on the issue of a City Hall on the Library block. This was how the plans listed in this specific resolution were intended to be used, she said, as a resource.

D'Amour asked about the validity of the 1973 General Development Plan and if it should be included with this master plan resolution.

Potts stated that the General Development Plan, while out-of-date, was the only policy plan the City had. It was different from the land use plans, she said, as it dealt with issues such as transportation, economics, and other issues related to planning. She thought it was important that the plan be reviewed to see if it were of any value.

Hall stated that the General Development Plan was listed on the Commission's work program as an item of importance, but lower on the priority list. She was certain Commission would re-evaluate this as work on the next work program began.

Kunselman believed there was a light commuter rail study underway and wondered if it should be part of the Citywide master plan.

Lloyd stated that it could ultimately become a part of the master plan once it was completed. He said this resolution contained a list of completed plans.

Carlberg stated that the Consolidated Strategy and Plan needed to be updated, but said it would not be done until June.

Lloyd stated that next year's resolution would be revised to reflect the updated plan.

Lipson thought revisions to the land use plans would be much easier if the City had a General Development Plan in place. For example, he said, the Northeast Area Plan contained a great deal of excellent policy information that could be added to the General Development Plan. If that was done, it would make updating the land use plan much easier, he said. He said this might be something the Master Plan Revisions Committee could begin discussing, now that the Northeast Area and Northeast Area Transportation Plans were finished.

Lloyd pointed out that over the last year, staff has been working to put together an approach to present to Commission for a more consolidated general planning document. He said staff may be in a position relatively soon to discuss this with the Master Plan Revisions Committee.

Pratt stated that he has had occasion to reference the Fifth/Division/Huron Study in the past and suggested that it might be valuable to list as a resource document at some point.

Lloyd stated that staff could look into whether this should be included as resource information.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

Motion carried.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Cheryl McKrell, a resident of Barton Hills, said she received an email from the head of MDOT in Brighton regarding the question of whether MDOT would recommend closing the M-14/Barton Drive interchange. She said MDOT's position continued to be that it would not close any ramps at M-14/Barton Drive unless there was a local consensus to do so. She said MDOT was not aware of any local consensus that supported the closure of any ramps at that interchange. She questioned how much time and money the City would want to spend on this issue if MDOT's position was to not close the interchange.

Jim Mogenson, 3780 Greenbrier, stated that with regard to a regional transit millage, which was previously brought up, transit tended to be in urbanized areas. This was one of the reasons enabling legislation for planning was enacted in 1945, he said. He said it was difficult to do planning and zoning at a regional level.

Terri Blackmore, representing WATS, spoke in favor of changing the Level of Service to D, stating that this level has been used at the County level for quite some time. She wanted to express her support for

all of the non-motorized improvements in the Northeast Area Transportation Plan, adding that it was an exceptional plan. She also expressed appreciation for all of the hard work that had gone into the plan.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

Carlberg stated that Julie Weatherbee's suggestion of emailing residents when tabled items were coming back before Commission was an excellent idea and said she hoped staff would follow up in order to implement it.

ADJOURNMENT

Hall declared the meeting adjourned at 10:07 p.m.

Mark Lloyd, Manager
Planning and Development Services

Bonnie Bona, Secretary

Prepared by Laurie Foondle
Management Assistant
Planning and Development Services