

## JANUARY 4, 2007 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

d. Public Hearing and Action on Georgetown Commons Rezoning and Site Plan, 6.52 acres, 2502-2568 Packard Road. A request to rezone this site from C1 (Local Business District) to C1B (Community Convenience Center District), and a proposal to demolish the existing structures and to construct a total of 9,1700 square feet of retail space in five buildings with 296 parking spaces (tabled at 9/19/06 meeting)  
– Staff Recommendation: Approval

Vaughn described the revisions that had been made to the proposal.

Rob Burroughs, of Hobbs + Black, architect representing the petitioner, believe that most of issues identified in the staff report were easily reconciled and said they would be addressed prior to Council consideration. He noted that another neighborhood meeting was held in November, which was well received. He said he and the petitioner were available to answer questions.

Glen Morningstar, 1388 King George Boulevard, said he could appreciate the progress this proposal would bring to the neighborhood. He stated that at the September meeting with the neighborhood, the condition of the parking lot was raised and the petitioner said he would take care of it. However, he said, nothing had been done to improve its condition. He said it was very dangerous to walk or drive through the parking lot and asked if Commission could assist in making sure this was handled.

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

**Moved by Carlberg, seconded by Potts, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Georgetown Commons Rezoning (2502-2568 Packard Road) from C1 (Local Business District) to C1B (Community Convenience Center District), Site Plan and Development Agreement, subject to addressing the comments provided by the Public Services Area/Systems Planning Unit on December 8, 2006 and the Community Services Area/Planning & Development Services Unit Land Development Review on December 5, 2006 prior to City Council action.**

Carlberg noted that the development agreement identified an association to be formed and wondered how this would work in relation to maintaining the pervious pavement over the life of this development.

Ann Stevens, of Atwell-Hicks, representing the petitioner, stated that the development agreement needed to be revised to remove the reference to the creation of an association, as this was something typically associated with a residential development. She said the owner of the property would be responsible for maintenance of the pervious pavement. She stated that the pervious pavement would consist of a mixture of aggregate and concrete, which would require maintenance similar to what was required for concrete. As it started to deteriorate, she said, it would need to be repaired. She said the secret to any good pavement was the sub-base and installation, not maintenance. She believed the proposed pervious pavement situated over the detention basin would have a long life because of the good drainage. She described the drainage as perforated petroleum pipes in a bed of aggregate that would allow water to go into the pipes and then infiltrate into the subsoil below, which was Miami loam.

Carlberg said it was her understanding that water went through pervious pavement on a continuous basis, even during light rainfall.

Stevens confirmed that there would be continuous drainage, stating that not only would the pervious pavement consist of stone, but there also would be voids in the pipes.

Pratt asked how much distance there would be between the bottom of the pipes and the pavement.

Stevens said it would vary: from 24 inches to five feet.

Pratt said he was not as concerned that water would co-mingle or back up, but he did agree with a previous concern that there would not be additional water seeping into the ground by virtue of having the pervious pavement over the detention area, and that by relocating the pervious pavement elsewhere on the site would provide additional opportunity for drainage.

Stevens said they looked into moving the pervious pavement to other sections of the site; however, the current location was best for both the pervious pavement and the detention area, as it was a flat, large area. If the pervious pavement were moved uphill and the detention system remained as proposed, water would still drain downhill into the detention basin, so nothing would be gained.

Carlberg asked if the surface of the pervious pavement would be vacuumed on a regular basis.

Stevens replied yes, as it would trap dirt and other materials. This would be part of the regular maintenance, she said.

Carlberg asked that a provision be added to the development agreement for maintenance of the pervious pavement prior to this going to City Council. She stated that she lived in this area and, while she was sorry to see these stores leave, what was being proposed was attractive and provided flexibility for stores of different sizes. She thought this would bring life to the area. She asked if water running down the driveway from Packard to Page would be intercepted.

Stevens replied yes, stating that there were intermittent storm inlets and a storm sewer along the parking lot. In addition, she said, the green area between the parking lot and adjacent houses would be swaled.

Bona stated that this proposal contained many of the components that Commission liked to see. She said the pedestrian connections were simple, strong and straightforward. The architecture was interesting, she said, and did not appear to be random or arbitrary. By providing retail frontage on both sides, which was something Commission liked to see, she asked how they would be serviced, such as where loading and unloading would take place and what the backs of the retail spaces would be like.

Burroughs stated that they have attempted to maximize the amount of storefront along the main street corridor and a greater amount of frontage to activate the secondary storefront. While there was a need for privacy, security and back-of-house operations for the stores, he said, the goal was to have interconnectivity between the front and back of the stores. He said this was not a traditional retail center concept and that they wanted to downplay the service component without eliminating it. They proposed to stripe or indicate with signage the specific areas for short-term loading, which would occur prior to or after business hours.

Bona asked how people living in the neighborhood off of Page would access this retail center.

Burroughs replied that both a ramp and stair system would be provided.

Bona expressed excitement about this project. The only drawback she could see was that it did not have a second floor, but she believed this retail center would be an architectural amenity and significant improvement to the neighborhood.

Potts hoped this would go back to being called "Georgetown Mall," stating that the mall had a good reputation in town. She said this was a very interesting project that had improved greatly, adding that the frontage on all sides was exceptional. She asked that the Planning Commission be apprised of the changes made to the site plan prior to it being considered by Council.

Westphal asked if any thought had been put into planting trees right next to Buildings A and B on the east side.

Burroughs said there was a limited amount of green space at the front of the building for trees. He said they could look into this, but suspected that a portion of the building space would be lost to create adequate space for trees. He said they were providing lower scale plantings along the retaining wall so the views of the retail center were not compromised.

Westphal asked if residential units above the retail center had been considered.

Burroughs replied yes, but said market factors and other reasons precluded residential.

Lipson stated that Paragraph P-17 on page 3 of the development agreement should be deleted, as the AATA shelter was no longer going to be on this site. He was glad to see the improvements to the Page access and the pedestrian demarcations. He was disappointed that there would be no green roof. Although he knew it was not a code requirement, he said it would have been a nice addition to this development. He asked if there were any other energy efficiencies proposed.

Burroughs stated that the difficulty in providing a green roof over this retail center had to do with a certain degree of turnover that would occur with this type of retail center, which likely would involve building modifications, affecting service to and maintenance of a green roof. He said this development would comply with State energy codes, adding that canopies would be provided for sun-shade effects, the concentration of building mass would reduce the overall building envelope, and the minimum amount of lighting would be used.

Lipson said he would appreciate anything else that could be done to increase the energy efficiency of the building. He assumed that the lighting would be night-sky compliant and asked if lighting that was directed downward had been explored.

Burroughs replied no, but said they could look into this.

Emaus asked if the rear of Building C would be wheelchair accessible.

Burroughs replied no, stating that this portion of the building was predominantly storage space.

Emaus stated that the awnings on the south side of Building B would receive a great deal of sun and asked if they would be 60 percent transparent. He also asked how many handicapped parking spaces were proposed.

Burroughs replied yes, the awnings would be transparent. He said eight handicapped spaces would be provided.

Emaus was pleased that this new design would allow bicyclists to ride up to the building, park their bikes, and walk around. He was also pleased with the layout of this site, adding that the parking had been reduced and there would now be storm water management. He said the rezoning request was to C1B, which was the community convenience center district, adding that there was a large community that surrounded this site and it was his hope that the retail center would become part of and serve the neighborhood. While the proposed drive-through function seemed to fit in nicely with the design, he did not see how a drive-through could be present in the C1B district.

Pratt expressed his appreciation for the time and energy put into making the revisions to the site plan.

A vote on the motion showed:

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

**Motion carried.**