



City of Ann Arbor

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Meeting Minutes City Planning Commission

Tuesday, March 5, 2013

7:00 PM

City Hall, 301 E. Huron Street, 2nd Flr.

Commission public meetings are held the first and third Tuesday of each month. Both of these meetings provide opportunities for the public to address the Commission. Persons with disabilities are encouraged to participate. All persons are encouraged to participate in public meetings. Citizens requiring translation or sign language services or other reasonable accommodations may contact the City Clerk's office at 734.794.6140; via e-mail to: cityclerk@a2gov.org; or by written request addressed and mailed or delivered to: City Clerk's Office, 301 E. Huron St., Ann Arbor, MI 48104. Requests need to be received at least forty-eight (48) hours in advance of the meeting. Planning Commission meeting agendas and packets are available from the Legislative Information Center on the City Clerk's page of the City's website (<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>) or on the 1st floor of City Hall on the Friday before the meeting. Agendas and packets are also sent to subscribers of the City's email notification service, GovDelivery. You can subscribe to this free service by accessing the City's website and clicking on the red envelope at the top of the home page.

These meetings are typically broadcast on Ann Arbor Community Television Network Channel 16 live at 7:00 p.m. on the first and third Tuesdays of the month and replayed the following Wednesdays at 10:00 AM and Sundays at 2:00 PM. Recent meetings can also be streamed online from the CTN Video On Demand page of the City's website (www.a2gov.org).

1 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Westphal called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

2 ROLL CALL

Rampson called the roll.

Present 6 - Bona, Woods, Westphal, Giannola, Clein, and Briere

Absent 2 - Mahler, and Adenekan

3 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Bona, seconded by Woods, that the agenda be approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

4 INTRODUCTIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

6 REPORTS FROM CITY ADMINISTRATION, CITY COUNCIL, PLANNING MANAGER, PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

6-a City Council

Briere reported that at the previous evening's Council meeting, the following projects were approved: 515 N. Fifth Avenue, 624 Church, and Blue Heron Pond. She said Council also approved a resolution to reconstitute the Design Guidelines Task Force, which will begin its task very quickly, because they are to report back to the Council by the end of September. She said the Council did not act on the request to the City Planning Commission for a report on the D1/D2 zoning, but postponed the item for another two weeks.

6-b Planning Manager

None.

6-c Planning Commission Officers and Committees

Bona updated the Commission on the North Main Huron River Corridor Vision Task Force, noting that the next meeting is tomorrow, Wednesday.

Westphal asked for reactions on the Age-Friendly Communities Conference, which was attended by Commissioners Wood, Westphal, Derezinski, and Briere.

Derezinski said this conference was initiated and encouraged by the City Planning Commission. He said the Planning Manager and several Commissioners had attended a Michigan Association of Planners conference last fall where they were stimulated to think about the need for planning for an aging demographic. He said Chair Westphal and himself had also been working with an alliance group of the disability community, which is pushing for more appreciation of people with disabilities and looking at the barriers they encounter in Ann Arbor. He explained that they started meeting with AARP, then other groups, such as the University of Michigan's government relations, Michigan Municipal League, Michigan State Housing Development Authority, and the Office of Services to the Aging. He said the conference agenda focused on transportation, housing and health care. He said they took AARP representatives to see examples of aging in place in Ann Arbor, rather than move to warmth, including University Commons and the St. Joseph's Emergency Room specifically designed for seniors. He said they had 200 people attend, which was a sell out crowd, with the initial response being that of enthusiasm. He said now the question is how do they follow up on this, as this will be a continuing component of our planning as these demographics set in.

Woods added she appreciated hearing about planning tools used in other communities, such as accessory dwelling units, and she would like to see this back on the City Planning Commission's radar. The other point was if they are planning for the aging community, they are planning for the entire community. She thanked Tony Derezinski and Kirk Westphal for bringing this to Ann Arbor.

Derezinski thanked staff and the Ann Arbor Transportation Authority, which provided helpful information.

Briere said one of things that was interesting to her is the 'pig in the python' or baby boomer generation moving through. She said she read an article today that many people owning homes in the next twenty years will see fewer purchasers and it will become more difficult to sell homes, adding that the Commission needs to think about these things when new housing projects come forward, and when they think

about lot sizes. She said she is not sure how they can be flexible to address these issues, but agrees that what you do for the older generation improves the community for everyone as a whole, on such issues as diverse housing, lighting, open space, cross-walks, and broad work options. She said the challenge is to figure out how to do it.

Westphal said he was struck by the issue of housing security and rising costs for those on fixed incomes, and enabling people to stay in their home by allowing Accessory Dwelling Units and the possibility for the elderly to rent out a room for financial support. He said these issues are not always presented in policy discussions, and part of the challenge is keeping the enthusiasm going. He said the City strives to have partnerships with other organizations throughout the city and perhaps those links could be stronger and more deliberate connections with organizations addressing aging issues. He said in this technological world we live in, it is good to remember that sometimes it has to be face to face, when we are looking at these demographics.

Derezinski said mixing age groups together is important; people thrive when they are in different and diverse groups.

Westphal said, as a Commissioner, he asks if there are ways to be proactive for housing choices, and other needs, as they see this wave coming. He said, just today, he heard someone was looking for a zero step entrance condo in Ann Arbor and couldn't find one, so they had to go to Pittsfield Township.

Rampson said it might be helpful to provide demographic information on the City's website, noting that according to the statistics, a housing choice of the baby-boomer generation might not be the single-family detached, and how might that need be met.

6-d Written Communications and Petitions

[13-0227](#)

Various Correspondence to the City Planning Commission

Received and Filed

7 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (Persons may speak for three minutes about an item that is NOT listed as a public hearing on this agenda. Please state your name and address for the record.)**

Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Boulevard, said the resolution was not clear whether there is a public hearing this evening. She hoped there would be another opportunity to present to the City Planning Commission regarding the Connecting William report.

Westphal said there would be a public hearing on the item this evening.

8 **PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT BUSINESS MEETING**

9 **REGULAR BUSINESS - Staff Report, Public Hearing and Commission Discussion of Each Item**

(If an agenda item is tabled, it will most likely be rescheduled to a future date. If you would like to be notified when a tabled agenda item will appear on a future agenda, please provide your email address on the form provided on the front table at the meeting. You may also call Planning and Development Services at 734-794-6265 during office hours to obtain additional information about the review schedule or visit the Planning page on the City's website (www.a2gov.org.)

(Public Hearings: Individuals may speak for three minutes. The first person who is the official representative of an organized group or who is representing the petitioner may speak for five minutes; additional representatives may speak for three minutes. Please state your name and address for the record.)

(Comments about a proposed project are most constructive when they relate to: (1) City Code requirements and land use regulations, (2) consistency with the City Master Plan, or (3) additional information about the area around the petitioner's property and the extent to which a proposed project may positively or negatively affect the area.)

ROLL CALL

Enter Mahler.

Present 7 - Bona, Mahler, Woods, Westphal, Giannola, Clein, and Briere

Absent 1 - Adenekan

9-a

[13-0224](#)

Connecting William Street Plan - A proposal to consider the recommendations of the "Parcel-by-Parcel" plan created for five City-owned properties in the downtown. In April 2012, City Council passed a resolution authorizing the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) to facilitate the process of redeveloping five City-owned properties: the Library Lot, Old YMCA Lot, Palio Lot, Kline Lot, and the first floor of the Fourth & William Parking Structure. A Leadership and Outreach Committee (LOC) made up of downtown residents, employees, business owners, and representatives from the City and the DDA has been meeting since that time to identify desired land uses and design components. The resulting strategic framework document, the Connecting William Street Plan, contains recommendations to guide future development on these parcels. The Planning Commission will consider whether to consider the Connecting William Street Plan as an amendment to the Downtown Plan.

Amber Miller, Downtown Development Authority, provided an overview of the Connecting William Street Plan.

Rampson presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Boulevard, said that she has a file on the issue of process, and that those who have been following the process found it frustrating. She said the survey was amateurish, where participants had to fill in bits and pieces, and the group meetings were set up where participants were given something to respond to, instead of being asked what they wanted. She said those who responded with "None of the above" to the survey were informed that was not a satisfactory answer. She

said for her, the public outreach was unsatisfactory, and should have asked more open questions if they want to know what the public thinks. She said the Connecting William Plan used background of existing plans, some of which are under review, and therefore not a good background.

Jack Eaton, 1606 Dicken Drive, urged the City Planning Commission not to include this plan in their resource documents, since it is a result of a flawed process. He said the Downtown Development Authority has refused to acknowledge the need for open space as a possibility for these five parcels, even though there was broad support for that. He said the plan approaches density, all by itself, as being good, which he stated is not the case. He recommended the book, 'Made for Walking', stating that a good vibrant walkable town requires more than density. They have to have diversity of uses and open spaces. He said it is more to this than filling vacant lots with tall, densely populated buildings. He said when this presentation was given to City Council, it received a cool reaction, and may be why this plan is not being recommended to be added to the City's master plan. He said the plan did not have the public support or Council support, and he urged the City Planning Commission not to accept the plan as a resource document. He said William Street is not core downtown, but rather the edge of downtown. He said the proposed plan has buildings placed right up to the sidewalk, which doesn't make them more walkable, but less friendly, with no room for living. He said the public process was flawed and the plan is too narrow in its recommendations. He suggested that the City wait for the Parks Advisory Commission and the Environmental Commission's recommendations.

Will Hathaway, Stowe Street, said he is not sure what it means to make this a resource document. He said as a member of the Library Green Conservancy Group they have been following the progress of this plan closely. He said it has been very frustrating because it was difficult to see how the public was being heard. He said the confused message about the public hearing tonight is unfortunate, since many more could explain how the DDA only allowed itself to hear what they wanted to hear and they screened out the public input. He said the only reason they are hearing about open space is because we wouldn't go away. He said if you rely on this document and plan, you are enshrining what was a misleading process and not a good faith effort to allow the public input. He said he believes the plan was channeled and the documents looked at by the DDA were cherry picked. He added that they did not even ask the consultant, who was involved in the New York High Line, how to make a park work.

Stephen Trendoff said he first became involved when he saw his friend speak out for the trees. He said they have come up with ideas for doing things different on the site, like pushing the building back. He stated that the DDA had a specific request for people to get involved, and the main thing the people said was they wanted more green space, which they hid under the table. He said parks will soften the downtown.

Alan Haber, 531 Third Street, said that what they are looking at is how to respond to a work product of the DDA, rather than to discuss what should be going on downtown. He said he hopes the Council will not take this plan on as a policy document. He noted that the document is flawed in that they planned a building on every property, instead of looking at how the parcels could be developed in a way that would benefit the downtown. He said the DDA took a narrow definition and vision and the historic sense of a city center has been dissolved. He stressed the need for a vision of a downtown center that is a focal point, which will be living and vibrant over the generations. He stated the only place to make this center is on the Library Lot. He said if you want a center, don't accept this report, which says to build everywhere. The other way to go is a much more creative way of using the Library Lot as an integrating factor point in the downtown.

Noting no further speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Moved by Derezinski, seconded by Bona, that the following Resolution be approved:

RESOLVED, That the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the “City of Ann Arbor Resource Information In Support Of The City Master Plan Resolution,” dated March 5, 2013.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Briere apologized for not responding to public hearing enquiries to those who asked, since she thought the item was only being discussed at tonight’s meeting.

Bona asked about a reference made in the plan to the Calthorpe Report regarding the perfect place for a green space would be a green roof on the Library Lane. She said she didn’t believe the Library Lane was known at the time of the writing of the Calthorpe Report. She asked staff if they knew what the Calthorpe Report referenced specifically on this issue.

Rampson said she did not know.

Bona asked Miller what additional information would be included in the appendix, and if the survey questions and responses would be included.

Miller said the supplementary information includes survey responses, and is available on their website.

Bona asked Miller what is meant by reference to cultural use.

Miller said the definition can be found on Page 3, and is specifically targeting a nonprofit use, which includes theater, museum, performance venue, gallery uses, community center, or civic uses may also apply.

Bona asked about the value of adding this document as a resource to the Master Plan, when the properties are all public properties and the City Council can do whatever they like, in her understanding, with such properties and don’t need to reference the Master Plan.

Rampson said the Master Plan deals with zoning recommendations for both private as well as public properties, as well as recommendations on transportation, park systems, etc. She said a resource document doesn’t have the same weight as the Master Plan, which would have the background for rezoning, or acquisition of land. She explained that a resource document doesn’t dictate any specific direction, but assists where there is no previously available information.

Bona said she would recommend that there are pieces of the plan that may help the Master Plan for downtown, like affordable housing. She said they have recently talked about diverse housing, such as student buildings, retirement buildings, and if there are ways to incentify such. She felt the concept of cultural use should be discussed by the Commission in order to incentify it, relative to the Master Plan. She said there are pieces of this plan that should be thought about when they review the Downtown Plan.

Bona asked about discussion that had been raised at a DDA meeting regarding street right of way, specifically for use as a bike boulevard. She noted that she did not

see this mentioned in the plan.

Miller said they referenced the Non Motorized Plan, and hadn't referenced the bike boulevard, because they think it needs more exploration and feedback from transportation staff, since there might not be enough width on E. William Street, or turning movements to accommodate bike movements.

Bona said the massing drawings were showing 400 percent Floor Area Ratio versus the 700 percent massing recommendations. She said recently, the property at Pizza House brought plans to add additional floors to that building and had earlier oversized the structure, which would allow for the additional floors. She said since we can't foresee 20 years into the future, it needs to be flexible, to allow for potential growth in the future, so she would like to see 400 percent buildings be built for potentially greater Floor Area Ratios, even if we do not support that today, because unless we tear the buildings down, there won't be that potential.

Miller noted that there was support for going to full FAR on Ashley/William site.

Bona said she would like to emphasize the floors in the other buildings to be flexible for conversion, making mention of the conversion of Sloan Plaza from office to residential use.

Derezinski said he was curious about possible flaws in the notification process regarding the public hearing notice for this evening's meeting.

Rampson said notice was made in the Washtenaw Legal News, through the GovDelivery notification, and in the Planning Commission's Agenda which specifically makes notice to a public hearing for this item.

Derezinski said that he had seen those mentioned notices, plus addition mention in various news outlets, noting that people here have been very vocal on this topic at various public hearing opportunities, which is what public hearings are intended for. He said he had questions on the plan's recommendations for open space, which included mention of Liberty Plaza.

Miller said what they have heard is that the park is not welcoming and the site isn't activated, primarily that it is not wrapped by building frontage, but rather two building sides; SPARK and the Kempf House Museum. She said they have heard that active use should spill out onto the plaza, as well as the benefit of keeping plaza space sized about the size of Liberty Plaza, Sculpture Plaza, or the Library Lot is recommended to pull people together.

Derezinski asked about recommendations for private involvement in plazas.

Miller said that the findings show that private organized events is what keeps them active, and since they don't have the resources to keep them active, private involvement would help.

Derezinski asked if they have looked at other cities.

Miller said San Francisco has code language that speaks to making privately owned public space that contributes to downtown.

Derezinski asked if there are other cities in Michigan that have done that.

Miller said she would have to look into that.

Derezinski asked how many public hearings were held.

Miller reviewed slide of process, noting that there were 30 meetings and 3 webinars.

Briere said that there have been a lot of public meetings, but public hearings are different. She said she had asked Rampson about the Commission's role in the discussion, since she was not sure what was transpiring on the issue. She reiterated her misunderstanding and conveyance on the discussion versus public hearing. She said one of her concerns is DDA's recommendation for a building on every parcel. She said it sounds like an immediate recommendation, while that change might be something that is slow paced. She asked what that concept means to those who developed this document.

Miller said it came from the goal of increasing activity downtown, providing more space to live and work downtown, and engage in more activities downtown.

Briere asked if there was a mental timeline the group envisioned for how rapidly these sites would be developed.

Miller said the timeline would be driven by City Council or the sale of the sites.

Briere said that the previous night, Council approved a brokerage firm to move forward to sell the former Y lot, and no one was referencing this document when they spoke about promoting that lot to potential purchasers. She said what concerns her is that all this work took place and this document is not considered as a reference point by City Council. Briere stated that the best part of this document, that they took away, was that potential developers would need to go to the Design Review Board twice, under these set of recommendations, which she felt was an interesting take and one that members of City Council like conceptually. Her final concern is that density isn't a goal, but a means to an end to make and keep the downtown vibrant and doesn't result in ceasing to be a draw for those who don't live here. She said the City Council may decide to sell these sites, rather than plan them, themselves, and if they are on the open market, they are governed by the zoning and Master Plan. She said the resulting project may not fit our zoning precisely, because it would be an outgrowth of the needs expressed by the City Council at that time and could differ from our zoning.

Westphal asked for clarification of the sale resolution that occurred at the City Council meeting.

Briere said it allowed for engaging a broker for the purpose of selling the property. She said the language included hiring a broker to present opportunities for acquisition outside the City, to be sold.

Westphal said that he thought it was more about evaluating the value of the land.

Westphal said that, as a member of the Connecting William outreach committee [LOC], he knows there was a high priority placed on using existing plans. He asked Miller which resource document was used as a starting point when the concept of shaping buildings and open space was being developed.

Miller said that as a baseline for building massing and how the building interacts with the sidewalk, they primarily referenced zoning and design guidelines, since they were most recently approved.

Westphal asked regarding incorporating open space and if they looked at what the PROS Plan had to say.

Miller said yes, they pulled quotes from the zoning and the PROS Plan.

Westphal noted that the PROS plan was fairly recently adopted, probably two years ago.

Miller said it didn't really speak to prioritizing new open space in the downtown, and that is why they have asked the Park Advisory Commission to take another look at that.

Westphal asked about the ongoing process with PAC.

Miller said to her understanding, there is a task force looking at open space in the downtown; discussing Liberty Plaza, prioritizing existing commitments and connections.

Westphal asked if this is in conflict with adoption of the Connecting William Street Plan.

Miller said this is closely aligned with the recommendations of the plan.

Westphal asked if changes should occur as a result of PAC discussion, would those get incorporated into the PROS plan, which would be incorporated into the Master Plan and would take precedence over this document.

Miller said yes.

Woods said she apologized for any confusion, and asked for clarification on the resolution that lists 13 documents, since she didn't see the PROS plan included.

Rampson said the PROS Plan is a part of the Master Plan, and the list only includes resource documents.

Woods said she was not prepared to approve the document at this point, but rather receive the document, noting that approving a document takes on different weight when they realize that other City groups or City Council will use that document as being set in stone. She stressed the need for the Commission to be very careful in making approvals noting that future Planning Commissions could pick up and apply references to particular blocks in the City. She said she would want to make sure the Commission is gathering as much information as they can, before making decisions on how to proceed. She reiterated her concern about the term in the motion to approving the document.

Rampson clarified that it was a matter of approving the attached resolution and not the plan.

Clein thanked Miller for presenting, and the speakers who spoke, despite the confusion. He said he will suggest that the Commission postpone voting until next meeting. He said the name of the plan is confusing him, and he asked what is it connecting.

Miller said it connecting Main Street and State Street along William Street.

Clein asked if there is space enough at the street level to create the streetscape developments that will be welcoming and where people will feel comfortable walking and lingering. He noted that the streets and sidewalks along William are quite narrow

and wondered how this impacts new buildings along William Street. He noted that the Huron street discussion looked at pushing buildings back to provide this additional space.

Miller said expansion of sidewalk is in the Non Motorized Plan, which speaks to taking some of street width and creating a larger lawn extension.

Clein said it is good that we are planning for the future, noting that his experience is that communities that plan for the future are more successful, more vibrant, and are more financially successful. He commented that if these properties are just being put on the auction block, then just the D1 zoning classification would prevail.

Clein asked if the plan showed desirable massing of buildings on the lots or massing under the current D1 zoning.

Miller said they reflect what they heard from public input, pointing to one exercise that queried desirable building height. She said they are recommendations, but do not override the D1 zoning.

Clein said he thinks it is beneficial to have more discussion about open space, and is looking forward to PAC's recommendations. He said he is not supportive of a central open space in downtown Ann Arbor, but sees it is important to have privately-maintained green space. He expressed his concern about the D1 zoning on Palio lot, pointing out that a five to eight story building would be inconsistent with the existing buildings along Main Street. He felt it would be helpful to have more definitions for public amenities. He said different types of open spaces are important, noting that smaller inlet plazas can be wonderful places to escape to.

Mahler asked about possible options to modify or revise the plan, or if the Commission was strictly voting up or down on what was presented.

Rampson said it was up to the Commission on how they wanted to proceed.

Mahler commented that if they want to make changes to the document, then it would be worth postponing taking action, otherwise they should approve the resolution as proposed.

Mahler said that the issues of the Library Lot have come up in the past, and are being recycled, and he feels they have not been addressed in the report. He said he feels that if they keep with privatization of open space, we will have challenges with the following; keeping it constantly active, security issues, the necessity of having open space meticulously planned, and the concern about disincentivizing people to build profit making buildings when they have to put in premiums for open space. Another concern is about the affordable housing piece, noting the need for more flexibility. He said the E6 recommendation is not clear what the goals are, other than generating funds for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. He felt the goals need to be more explicit.

Giannola asked what was envisioned for the potential mid block connection; was it publicly owned, privately owned, was it a walkway or a park.

Miller said it was intended to give an illustration of the need to connect open space, and came from a concept to connect Main Street all the way through the Arcade to the campus.

Giannola said that it is so close to William Street. She asked if it was intended for

private ownership.

Miller said it is a visual representation of connectivity.

Susan Pollay, DDA Director, stated that the Library Lane is in place, and the Ann Arbor Transportation Authority is still in discussion about acquiring a privately owned 8-foot wide walkway. She noted that the Fourth and William parking structure has an exit into the alley, and there are some publicly and privately owned parcels from Main to the Kline Lot.

Westphal asked about recommendations that a developer may not do on his/her own, and how would this be handled if these parcels go through an RFP process.

Miller said the land use economist looked through recommendations to make sure the projects are viable, and if recommendations are not what the market is supporting, then the City may need to be flexible in the asking price.

Westphal said that developers are most often interested in short term return.

Miller said yes, the recommendations are directed at long term community interests.

Derezinski wondered if the report comports with what the City Council asked for. He said in looking at the City Council resolution, which was included, it seems like it does. He said there was a lot of public input in the process, and he attended the City Council work session. He said with a project of this sort, not everyone gets what they want but that is part of the democratic process. He noted that comments are referenced for most of the issues. He agreed that this document is going to be a frame of reference along with a dozen other documents to be used as a part of reference to the Master Plan. He agreed that if they were adding the document as part of the Master Plan, then the process would be different. He felt the Commission should take and vote up or down on whether the document is what the City Council requested. He said the use of the document is not mandatory and he supports the resolution.

Westphal said, as one tasked a few years ago on the Master Plan Revisions Committee to slim down the Downtown Plan, that he felt it was a good way to provide resource without additional verbiage. He said the DDA is not prone to pat itself on the back, but he felt they deserved credit for reaching as many unique individuals as they have through this document. He said he feels it has been an extremely well-commented on plan, and it is unfortunate that so much of the discussion has focused on one site. He takes comfort in knowing that the plan is now in the capable hands of PAC, where it will be a well-vetted process. He was not as concerned with the potential of having another public hearing.

Briere asked Pollay if the City Planning Commission accepts this document as one of its reference documents, does she imagine that would complete Phase 3 and the DDA would move onto Phase 4 of the plan.

Pollay said the DDA takes its direction from Council. She said last night, the Council decided to RFP for a broker to sell a piece of land, and the DDA stands ready to help Council however they choose to move forward and when.

Briere asked when would the DDA come to Council to discuss the implications of the sale of the old YMCA lot.

Pollay said however it would be useful to the City Council, adding they could at any

point meet with the broker to help with the sale or marketing of the land. She said developers will ask if parking is available, and what improvements are planned for the area. She said they could work with Council to make land attractive with goal of sale money going to the Ann Arbor Housing Trust Fund. She said they see themselves as being 'on call' as the City Council needs them in this process. She said they will be working with the Partnerships Committee to have this dialogue.

Woods asked about image 5, Land Use, and how they came up with such a small amount of open space for the Y lot. She asked if it was based on a percentage, and couldn't it be wider or longer. She said it seems that the small amount irritates people.

Pollay said the intent was not to get granular, but rather suggest ideas and elements, showing a rendering of how to break up massing of frontage along William Street and not have that damaging rectangular look. She said they worked with Professor Kelbaugh's class, which showed examples of two buildings on the site with a large courtyard. She said they are suggesting the need for open space to the building, such as a courtyard; however they are not being proscriptive. She said potential developers could also work with the neighboring AATA to use some of their air rights.

Woods said that they might need asterisks on the plan to indicate not actual buildings. She noted that on page 31, there was parking shown on top of buildings, and she wanted to know if green roofs were part of the discussion for rooftop greenspace.

Miller said yes, this was explicitly called out in the Fourth and William structure recommendations.

Westphal asked if that gets developers credit for LEED certification.

Miller said yes, adding that they spent a lot of time looking at premiums.

Westphal said he hoped that the PAC recommendations would inform future proposals.

Miller said yes.

Bona asked staff about the Y lot and if the City zoned it D1, it could be taller, with premiums, which would allow for more open space.

Rampson said yes, the desired maximum height would be 180 feet.

Bona said the City Council should realize that the FAR could go to 900 percent with affordable housing premiums, and she would recommend that they wait until completion of the evaluation of the D1 zoning district and the Design Review Guidelines before rezone this parcel to D1.

Bona said they have a sustainability framework that includes fiscal responsibility. She said she doesn't know how much city owned parkland the City has, but is more concerned with designating parkland, which is taken off the taxrolls. She referenced the flood mitigation plan which shows many properties in the greenway, but may end up off the tax roll. She said they need to think of parkland in the whole City context. She said she is excited that PAC is pursuing looking at downtown parkland in context with the whole City. She said another concern she has is all of the parkland on North Main, and yet, every parcel they look at, more suggestions arise to create more parkland. She pointed out that the latest PROS Plan sets a high priority on connectivity and connecting downtown with all the parks. She noted that the High

Line is a connector and a good reference to connecting all park parcels. She added that all of the resource documents were typically accepted as written and she won't take offense if her interests aren't included directly. She said it would be a shame not to incorporate the document as a resource document, and she supports the inclusion.

Woods said that one of the issues we have to grapple with is more density in the downtown area while priding ourselves on access to open space, which will be a conflict. She said it will be incumbent to find open spaces for people as density increases, which we talk about being a more walkable community, we have to provide amenities to those living in the downtown to access green space.

Westphal said the important thing is, while he would like to incorporate everyone's comments, he is happy to include the plan as a resource document. He said he would hate to have William Street develop like Huron Street and feels the need to demonstrate community values. He said he also wants to make sure everyone is comfortable process wise and bring any comments if there are still concerns.

Clein said he believes this is a detailed and balanced plan and he is okay with moving forward.

Westphal asked staff what happens procedurally once the motion is read. He asked if it would move on to City Council.

Rampson said no, it would not go on to City Council, unless the Commission requested specifically that it be forwarded to them as a correspondence. She said it would become a Planning document and a link on our website would be provided to the document.

Briere asked staff to explain to her how the Planning Commission and the Planning staff uses these type resource documents.

Rampson responded that they would mostly be used on an individual basis and referenced in staff reports under 'planning background' information. She said staff would also use it when meeting with potential developers in advance of any new proposals to give them an idea of what the community sentiment is to a particular approach to development.

Briere asked staff for examples of when the 1988 plans was referenced in connection to the North Main Street corridor.

Rampson said they used the plan about 7-8 years ago when guiding development in the area to emphasize the need for river access in that particular area.

Briere said her hesitation was lack of clarity from Parks on their desired use for this land, since if the DDA recommends building on every lot, and Parks recommends open space on some, that is her hesitation.

On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Vote 8-0; Passed

Yeas: 8 - Bonnie Bona, Eric A. Mahler, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Kenneth Clein, Tony Derezinski, and Sabra Briere

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Eleanore Adenekan

10 **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (Persons may speak for three minutes on any item.)**

Alan Haber, 531 Third Street, said that the one thing that the Commission received in the report from the DDA that he would endorse and like them to send on to City Council, is the mention of the one parcel on the library lot that cannot be built on and is designated for parkland. He said they should begin to allow marshaling of forces to begin design on that designated lot. He shared concern with representation of the public input and suggested that the Commission should also accept the Library Green report as a reference document, since they too did their own analysis of the data received and since they went through a tremendous process. He said they are looking for a center, as well as looking for more green on each site with more amenities, which wasn't looked at. He said they should ask for the citizen report. He added that there are many ideas, such as the public plaza over the road.

Stephen Trendoff said he is a City resident for over 20 years said when the library parking lot was carved out, it left 35% unused space. He requested green space on that portion, stating that people overwhelmingly support green space. He challenged Commissioners to ask for the report and not to flip flop and make political votes. He vowed to continue to work towards more green space in the downtown.

Mary Hathaway, 1407 Wakefield Drive, said the plan provided by the DDA isn't very thorough. She compared the Calthorpe Study that was far more thorough with much more input. She said the Commission shouldn't have voted tonight as they don't have the information, and their decision is regrettable.

Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Blvd. stated that the Commission's vote is potentially dangerous, because now the document has official standing from one City body as being accepted as a resource. She asked the Commission is they are willing to settle for this one document before seeing the other documents being talked about all over town. She said the City Council had this plan presented to them without an official public hearing, and this Commission has not had an official public hearing. She said the Commission is taking a plan from the DDA and not from the public, since the public input is not included.

11 **COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS**

Woods said in light of information just received at Audience Participation, she would like to ask that the Connecting William item be brought back to be reconsidered.

Moved by Woods, seconded by Councilmember Briere, to reconsider Agenda item 9-a.

COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

Briere said that what was troubling for her was when she left the last Planning Commission meeting, she wasn't aware there were any public hearings that would happen at this meeting. She said many people rely on several weeks of public notice. She said they may have heard different voices from the public, noting that the purpose of public hearings is to hear from public. She had concerns about accepting this document as a reference point for future planning. She stated that the City Council was lukewarm to the document.

Giannola said she is looking at this document as a Council sanctioned project that was done by DDA to collect input, and she is not supportive of people who say their input is more important than others.

Woods said she is in favor of reopening the vote, since she doesn't think the Commission hurts themselves through allowing the public to have their say and postponing the item for two weeks would not harm anyone, but give an opportunity for additional voices to be heard.

Mahler said the Commission is not asking Council to do anything. He explained that the Commission is passing a Planning resolution that the documents shall be used by the Planning Commission and staff. He said he is not in favor of reopening the issue, since he was satisfied that notice was given, and the public input has been going on for a long time and has been had.

Briere said that this document does not need to go to Council, however if this body relies on this document on items that they send on to City Council, then it does concern the Council. She said she would like to think through thoroughly. She said if we reopen this, we can determine whether we are going to use this document today.

Bona said the only concern is whether or not this plan includes enough open space, but at the same time, it turns that decision back to PAC, which is where this belongs. She said she doesn't see anything in here that overrides the Master Plan. If PAC recommends that sites should be open space, then that would prevail. She doesn't think reopening the vote will change that.

Clein agreed with Bona that the amount of open space is the primary concern. He said he has a number of small items, but doesn't want perfect to be the enemy of the good. He stressed that it is up to Council at the end of the day, and Council could sell off any lot without any of this.

Westphal said that he feels comfortable that they have had adequate public input, given the scope and number of people this has touched.

Woods said there are a number of times when residents have come to the Commission saying a developer has not gotten enough public input. She said she has seen the public input lists presented by the DDA, but she is not convinced that they have heard everything that needs to be heard about this issue. She asked what was the hurry in approving this document.

On a roll call, the vote was 2-6, with the Chair declaring the motion defeated.

Yeas: 2 - Wendy Woods, and Sabra Briere

Nays: 6 - Bonnie Bona, Eric A. Mahler, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Kenneth Clein, and Tony Derezinski

Absent: 1 - Eleanore Adenekan

12 **ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by Mahler, seconded by Clein, that the meeting be adjourned. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Kirk Westphal, Chair
mg

Community Television Network Channel 16 live televised public meetings are also

available to watch live online from CTN's website, www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>).

Live Web streaming is one more way, in addition to these listed below, to stay in touch with Ann Arbor City Council and board and commission actions and deliberations.

- Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/VideoOnDemand.aspx
- Cable: Watch CTN Channel 16 public meeting programming via Comcast Cable channel 16.

The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>), or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.