



# City of Ann Arbor

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

## Meeting Minutes City Planning Commission

---

Thursday, January 20, 2011

7:00 PM Ann Arbor District Library, Lower Level Multi-Purpose Room,  
343 S. Fifth Ave, Ann Arbor

---

### PLEASE NOTE NEW TEMPORARY LOCATION

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. Accommodations, including sign language interpreters, may be arranged by contacting the City Clerk's Office at 734-794-6140 (V/TDD) at least 24 hours in advance. 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 5th 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](http://www.a2gov.org)).

#### 1 CALL TO ORDER

*Chairperson Mahler called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.*

#### 2 ROLL CALL

*Rampson called the roll.*

**Present** 7 - Pratt, Mahler, Carlberg, Woods, Briggs, Westphal, and Giannola

**Absent** 2 - Bona, and Derezinski

#### 3 INTRODUCTIONS

#### 4 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

[11-0057](#)

October 19, 2010 City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**This matter was Postponed to the City Planning Commission, due back on 2/1/2011.**

**11-0058**

November 3, 2010 City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

*Rampson suggested that the minutes be withdrawn from the agenda for this meeting, and be rescheduled for the next regular meeting, to allow the Commission to give their feedback on how they would like to review the minutes.*

*Rampson described the new format being used for the minutes in the Legistar software, noting that the minutes are considerably lengthier in this version due to the larger margins and section breaks that staff has been unable to adjust. She asked the Commission if they were still interested in receiving the lengthy minutes in hard copy format or if having them accessible via Legistar would suffice.*

*Commissioner Westphal said he found it helpful to have a paper copy to review or reference specifically in regards to amendments made to motions.*

*Commissioner Briggs said she was happy reviewing them on-line and asked if it would be possible to have an electronic version available to view on the screen at the meeting, as with staff's Power Point presentations, if the Commission needed to refer to them.*

*Commissioner Woods asked if previous meetings would be accessible on Legistar.*

*Rampson explained that the department is just now starting to use the same Legistar template that is also being used for City Council minutes. She said that after the Commission has approved the minutes, they will appear on the Legistar Calendar, along with the agenda and other packet items for each Planning Commission meeting. She mentioned that the department is working on getting the minutes formatted into the Legistar program going back to July 2010 to have them posted to the website.*

*Mahler said it looked like there was a consensus among the Commission to have the minutes available in electronic form at the meeting if they needed to reference them.*

**This matter was Postponed to the City Planning Commission, due back on 2/1/2011.**

**5 APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**A motion was made by Carlberg, seconded by Giannola, that the Agenda be Approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

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

**a City Administration**

*None*

**b City Council**

Rampson reported that the City Council had postponed taking action on the Medical Marijuana Licensing Ordinance until the February 7, 2011 meeting, which would move their action on the Medical Marijuana Zoning Ordinance to the following City Council meeting. She reported that Council has approved the Lake Trust Site Plan and accepted the Home Depot Grant for a sustainability framework, which would link various areas of the City's Master Plan.

Rampson reported that Councilperson Taylor had presented a proposal for the redevelopment of City-owned properties in the downtown, noting that the proposal had come out of review discussions between the City Council and the DDA through the Mutually Beneficial Committee. She explained that the review process included the development of site specific plans for City-owned developable parcels in the downtown, in which the Planning Commission would also have a role in reviewing the proposed plans. Rampson noted that Council had postponed taking action on the proposal until their March 7, 2011 meeting. She said she would be happy to forward the latest draft of the proposal to the Commission for their review and feedback.

**c Planning Manager**

Rampson brought the Commission's attention to the revised Meeting Schedule in their packets. She reminded them of the Ordinance Revisions Committee meeting scheduled for January 24 at 3:30 PM that they would be discussing the amendments pertaining to the Landscape Ordinance. She also reminded them that on January 26 at 6:00 PM there would be a Community Workshop on the R4C/R2A Advisory Committee's recommendations. She explained that the Parks and Recreation Unit has requested that the City Planning Commission hold their PROS Plan public hearing on February 1, but postpone taking action until the February 15 meeting in order to receive and incorporate the public hearing input into the plan.

[11-0061](#)

January 2011 Meeting Schedule

**Received and Filed**

**d Planning Commission Officers and Committees**

None

**e Written Communications and Petitions**

[11-0063](#)

Communication from Gerald Serwer re: University Bank PUD

**Received and Filed**

[11-0064](#)

Communication from Matthew Schultz re: Sander Annexation and Zoning

**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.)**

None

**8 PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT BUSINESS MEETING****11-0050**

Notice of Public Hearing for February 1, 2011 City Planning Commission Meeting; The City of Ann Arbor has completed a draft update to the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan (PROS Plan) - The Plan is an element of the City's master plan and the City's vision for parks and recreation in Ann Arbor. The Plan provides an inventory of existing parks and facilities, describes the relationship between the Parks and Recreation system and surrounding municipalities and recreational providers, identifies parks and recreation needs and deficiencies, and proposes major capital park projects for existing and new parks. The document was last updated in 2006.

*Mahler read the Public Hearing Notice as published.*

**Received and Filed**

**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](http://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.)**

**11-0055**

Resolution to Approve the Sander Annexation, 0.82 Acres, 1575 Alexandra Boulevard (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 9 Yeas and 0 Nays)

*Mahler read the Public Hearing Notice as published.*

*Chris Cheng presented the staff report and explained the proposed project, noting that the Water Improvement Charges to the property were inaccurately listed in the staff report at \$25,539 and should have been approximately \$15,000.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Public Hearing Opened at 7:17PM.*

*Noting no public speakers, Mahler closed the Public Hearing at 7:18PM.*

**9-1****11-0055**

Resolution to Approve the Sander Annexation, 0.82 Acres, 1575 Alexandra

Boulevard (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 9 Yeas and 0 Nays)

*COMMISSION DISCUSSION:*

*Westphal referenced an email the Commission had received regarding an impression that the proposed new parcel was not developable. He asked if staff had further insight into the matter.*

*Cheng responded that the parcel did meet the minimal required lot size and it did have access, which had been approved through an easement over city parkland.*

*Rampson explained that the parcel in question was not included in the Riverwood PUD when it was annexed and divided approximately ten years ago. She noted that the parcel had a well house for the adjoining properties and therefore was kept in the township and wasn't included in the Riverwood project. She thought that perhaps the impression came from the fact there is parkland on both sides of the parcel, but explained that the parcel had always been in private ownership.*

*Rampson explained that the easement was granted by the City Council not too long ago. She mentioned that there are some limitations as to what can be done in terms of the Park's access, but reiterated that the parcel has been a developable parcel in the township.*

**A motion was made by Woods, seconded by Briggs, that The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Sander Annexation and R1A (Single-Family Dwelling District) Zoning. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.**

**Yeas:** 7 - Evan Pratt, Eric A. Mahler, Jean Carlberg, Wendy Woods, Erica Briggs, Kirk Westphal, and Diane Giannola

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Bonnie Bona, and Tony Derezinski

**11-0051**

Resolution to Approve 1500 Pauline Boulevard Site Plan (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 7 Yeas and 0 Nays)

*Mahler read the Public Hearing Notice as published.*

*Chris Cheng presented the staff report and explained the proposed project.*

*Public Hearing Opened at 7:24PM.*

*Gladwin McGee, 1500 Pauline Blvd, Ann Arbor, spoke as a resident of the complex that is slated to be demolished. He asked why the buildings would be demolished so soon after they had been extensively remodeled in 1999. He also asked why there would be a reduction in the amount of proposed units from 48 to 32 units, since there was a need in Ann Arbor for affordable housing units. He asked how many 1 bedroom units there would be in the new complex.*

*Jim Mogensen, 3780 Greenbrier, Ann Arbor, spoke on behalf of himself and of the need for affordable housing. He stated that the site was special in that it had been allocated to affordable housing and it was important to keep it as affordable housing. He said that the layout of the housing needs to stay the same with an open courtyard in the middle and the closed housing units built around the courtyard. He asked that they review the layout knowing that that impacts whether a development thrives or not. He mentioned that it was important for affordable housing projects to try*

constructing two and three bedroom apartment units since there was a need for large units at affordable rates in Ann Arbor.

Michael Appel, Associate Director at Avalon Housing, spoke as a representative of the petitioner. He stated that Avalon currently manages the property that is owned by Washtenaw Affordable Housing, a non-profit organization that acquired the property in 1988 and did the renovations in 1999. He explained that over the years it has been managed by a series of private management companies. He stated that Avalon Housing became involved in 2009 at the request of the Office of Community Development and the board of Washtenaw Affordable Housing Corporation. He noted that over that decade the property had suffered from operating losses and significant deferred property maintenance.

Appel explained that their architect had found hundreds of thousands of dollars of code items that would need immediate attention in order to bring the property up to code. He noted that the property had been passing code-inspections only with the assistance of large subsidies put into the property from the City of Ann Arbor. He explained that when the Michigan State Housing and Development Authority walked through the existing buildings they stated that they were not willing to invest in the rehabilitation of the existing structures.

Appel said that working with the funders, they felt that redeveloping the site made the most sense. He explained that they are working with the existing tenants on relocation issues in accordance with the laws. He noted that the timeline for the project is very tight, because the MSHDA tax credit application deadline is March 1, 2011, which is the significant funding to redevelop this project. He said that hopefully they would end up with a much nicer place for the tenants to live after it was completed. He said he would be available to answer the Commission's questions.

Wendy Carty-Saxon, Director of Housing and Development with Avalon Housing, spoke about the overall goals that they were hoping to achieve through the site plan. She mentioned that they had held citizen participation meetings as well as two community meetings and two tenant meetings where they received positive feedback on their proposal. She stated that their overall goal was to open up the site to the neighborhood, noting that the existing layout has a closed courtyard which didn't give any visibility of the street and isolates from the surrounding community, which also created security issues. Carty-Saxon explained that the new site plan opens up the layout with visibility along Pauline Boulevard. She stated that the scale of the building will also shift from an apartment building to 2-story townhouses with separate entrances.

Carty-Saxon stated that the decision to bring the number of units down from 48 to 32 was a very difficult one to make, but they had to look at what would be sustainable for them to operate into the future. She mentioned that the density fits the current zoning and is very similar to Carrot Way Housing, which they also operate. She said they were also looking to preserve scarcest units, since the 2 and 3 bedroom units are the hardest for affordable housing groups to find and often require the City to acquire or obtain through built-new options.

Carty-Saxon explained that the site plan also incorporates a modest Community Center which they have seen, in their other developments, becomes a real focal point to reach the residents with the services they need to connect with. She said that the new site plan will have barrier-free access to the facility as well as to the ground floor of the units, which the current building doesn't so easily afford. She responded to a public enquiry that there would be six 1-bedroom units in the new complex.

*LeKendrick Levi Murphy, 1500 Pauline, Ann Arbor, said he has lived in the complex for three years and as a single person is concerned with the reduction of 1 bedroom units in the area. He said that he does support the project, as it is important to have suitable living in a low crime area.*

*John Milroy, 970 Northwood, Ann Arbor, spoke in support of the project and stated that he has lived just north of proposed project for ten years. He said he has gone to one of the community meetings and it seems that Avalon Housing wants to do the right thing. He realized that it will be difficult for the tenants to have to move during the construction, and he mentioned that it would be nice to have a house to look at across the street instead of an unsightly crumbling parking lot.*

*Noting no further public speakers, Mahler closed the Public Hearing at 7:43 PM.*

9-2      [11-0051](#)

Resolution to Approve 1500 Pauline Boulevard Site Plan (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 7 Yeas and 0 Nays)

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

*Commissioner Woods asked for the petitioner to clarify the proposed mix of unit sizes.*

*Carty-Saxon responded that there will be 6 one-bedroom, 14 two-bedroom, and 12 three-bedroom units.*

*Woods asked what the current mix of unit sizes is.*

*Carty-Saxon said that there are 21 one-bedroom, 14 two-bedroom, and 12 three-bedroom units, and one former three-bedroom unit which is serving as a community space.*

*Woods said that she remembers when Avalon was to build the Near North on Main Street, the persuasive argument for the development was the need to provide one-bedroom units in the community. She asked for the petitioner to help the Commission to rationalize that previous argument with the proposed reduction in this project.*

*Appel said that the difference between the two projects is the location. He explained that the Near North location was much closer to downtown in an area that doesn't have immediate easy access to open green space and is located directly on North Main Street, and they felt this would not be an ideal location for larger family-sized units. He said this project is in a different neighborhood and has more green space, making it more amenable to family units.*

*Appel said that the proposed reduction in the one-bedroom units came out of discussion with Office of Community Development staff who felt strongly that the two- and three-bedroom units were the highest priority in this particular area. He explained they also took a look at the density issue for the site, and realized that some of the past problems of the site has been related to density.*

*Woods asked the petitioner to explain if they were looking to have less density for the site because they had experienced some problems in the past.*

*Appel said that Avalon Housing has managed the current apartment complex, known as Parkhurst Apartments, for two years. He said some of the difficulties the complex has dealt with in achieving stability, safety, and having low turnover rates is due to a very high density when comparing the unit per acre or bedrooms per acre. He*

*explained that the current density at Parkhurst is much greater than other similar sites, such as Carrot Way and the co-ops, and they want to develop for the long run with a project that will be sustainable and manageable but wouldn't suffer some of the current problems that the project had.*

*Woods requested clarification on the formula used to determine the density. She asked if they were looking at persons or bedrooms in determining the density factor.*

*Appel responded that density is usually counting units per acre, but a three-bedroom unit has a much different impact than a one-bedroom unit. He said in order to get a feel of how many people would be living on a site, they compared bedrooms per acre instead of persons with comparable sites.*

*Woods commented that there would be 15 less one-bedroom units in this project and how the rationale of needing more single bedroom units isn't the same for the proposed project. She stated that she understands the concerns of the citizen who lives in a single unit but may be out of luck in getting back into the complex after it's built because there aren't enough of them at this site.*

*Appel said that their decision to preserve low-income housing on this site wasn't based solely on the discussion of need. He explained that they were faced with the choice to redevelop the project or lose the site, since keeping the buildings isn't an option anymore. He stated that without reinvestment, the project isn't sustainable and will go bankrupt, and they had to look at what the overall needs were for the site as well as the community at large.*

*Carol McCabe from Avalon Housing explained that Avalon's options are limited with the site, and no one wants to lose the affordable units that currently exist, since the waiting lists are full for single bedroom units as well as three-bedroom units.*

*Carlberg said that it was troubling to think of the relocation efforts that would need to be done for the residents. She asked if the limited number of single-bedroom units would mean that the Office of Community Development would need to find more permanent housing for the displaced residents.*

*Appel responded that due to the federal funding they plan on using, the relocation process is mandated by the Uniform Relocation Act, which obligates them to work with existing tenants to find them alternative housing, moving expenses, and provide an alternative housing subsidy for up to five years. He stated that they plan on offering as many tenants that want to move back to the new complex to apply for and go through the screening process to enable them to move back. He explained that since the tenants have federal rights and the process will be overseen by the Office of Community Development, he can't tell any of the current tenants how things will play out after the project is completed in one to one and a half years.*

*McCabe said that Avalon Housing will work with the Office of Community Development to get as many tenants to move back who feel they want to do that. She said that Avalon Housing has more one- and two-bedroom units than larger units, and they would try to find units in their other Avalon Housing complexes if possible.*

*Carlberg asked if they were confident that they would find adequate one-bedroom units available throughout the City for the dislocated tenants.*

*Appel responded, yes, because they had planned for this and they have available units in their Avalon Housing stock.*



*Pratt stated that the discussion has been about the loss of affordable housing units and not so much about the site plan, which he felt was important for the Commission to discuss.*

*Rampson responded that it might be helpful in understanding the project to know that the existing complex is non-conforming due to density under the current zoning.*

*Pratt said that he wanted to raise the fact that they have lost units due to the City's standards and requirements. He asked if the amount of proposed units is what they are allowed to have under the current zoning.*

*Cheng and Rampson responded that the proposed project is at the limit of the maximum allowable at 32 units.*

*Woods asked for a clarification that the existing buildings are non-conforming structures, but the proposed building would be conforming.*

*Rampson responded that was correct.*

*Westphal said he appreciated the detail that was included in the citizen participation report. He asked if the project had originally been proposed as a PUD project.*

*Cheng answered that in the early planning stages, they had discussed the possibility of a PUD, but the applicant had not submitted any plans in that direction.*

*Westphal commented that there are many places that are very safe even though they have a higher density than the existing buildings, and he thought the new design would help with the safety issue and looked great. He also stated that the City is more than amenable to affordable housing PUDs and he thought it would be far better to have the building rebuilt with available funding than to have the existing building become unlivable.*

*Westphal asked if the playground was proposed to be a public playground, and if so would there be signage indicating such.*

*Cheng responded that staff had discussed with the petitioner having the playground open to the public, which would call for barrier free access to the playground.*

*Westphal expressed that the playground would be more inviting if there were a direct access walk from Pauline to the playground.*

*Briggs concurred with Westphal's comments on the playground access. She asked about issues with adjoining parkland and if there had been any efforts put into making the park more appealing for use by residents.*

*Cheng said that staff had discussed the issue involving Fritz Park and had decided that it was infeasible to have any direct link between the development and the parkland given grade differences.*

*Briggs asked for the applicants to explain the difference between Supportive Housing and Affordable Housing.*

*Carty-Saxon explained that 35% of the proposed units would be set aside as Supportive Housing Units.*

*Carlberg said that if the public will be using the playground they will be making a path between Pauline Boulevard and the playground, so she suggested that the applicant might as well put in a path so that the public could use it to access the playground as well as the residents to access Pauline Boulevard. She mentioned that there was a large available space for a path and some people might be reluctant to walk on other people's grass.*

*Mahler added that the path should be ADA accessible as well.*

*Giannola agreed with Commissioner Pratt and said she was very much in favor of the project and turning a nonconforming site into a conforming site. She felt that it would be a benefit to the neighborhood.*

*Woods asked about curb cuts and access from Pauline back to Northwood Street or would people have to go through the parking lot?*

*David Esau, Architect with Cornerstone Design, explained that there is an existing drive off of Pauline that would be two-way up to the rear parking and then becoming one-way all the way out to Northwood Street, noting that one could drive all the way through the site. He showed that they had also added another one-way drive around the development that would give access out to Pauline or to Northwood Street.*

*Woods asked if the drive into the development from Northwood would be one-way.*

*Esau responded, yes.*

*Mahler said that the plan was short of detail about the design materials and the layout as to what was proposed in the buildings and asked the designer to explain to the Commission some of those details.*

*Esau stated that in designing the project, they had hoped in keeping it more in line with the residential character of the neighborhood, such as one and two-story homes with brick, siding and asphalt shingles, and this is similar to what they propose to use for this project. He said it would be similar to the Carrot Way site. He said they hadn't discussed construction material in detail but it would be typical residential with upgraded energy components.*

*Mahler asked if there would be any steps taken towards energy saving techniques that the residents could benefit from.*

*Esau responded that they had talked about the possibility of using insulated structural panels for the wall construction, but he wasn't sure how that would fit into their budget. He said they would be using 6-inch studs for maximum insulation and double glazed windows.*

**A motion was made by Carlberg, seconded by Pratt, that The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the 1500 Pauline Site Plan, subject to recording of ingress/egress and utility easements before issuance of building permits. On a roll call vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

**Yeas:** 7 - Evan Pratt, Eric A. Mahler, Jean Carlberg, Wendy Woods, Erica Briggs, Kirk Westphal, and Diane Giannola

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Bonnie Bona, and Tony Derezinski

11-0056

Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity Special Exception Use and Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval - A request for Special Exception Permission to utilize the property at 630 Oxford Road as a fraternity house for 24 occupants and pave an existing parking lot in the rear. - Staff Recommendation: Approval.

*Mahler read the Public Hearing Notice as published.*

*Chris Cheng presented the staff report and explained the proposed project.*

*Public Hearing Opened at 8:14PM.*

*Alan Lutes, representing Michigan Alpha Housing, petitioner for the proposed project, said that the applicants had selected the site carefully so it would be supportive of the current R2B zoning and in concert with the neighborhood and the City's Master Plan. He noted that the current requirement is for 350 sq ft/person for this proposed use. Lutes explained that they had sought parcels that would have minimal impact on the one and two-family residential neighborhoods in the R2B district.*

*Lutes stated the changes that will be made to the property will bring it into conformance with the zoning ordinances and site plan requirements so it won't be necessary to ask for any variances. Lutes explained that the proposed house is well placed since the surrounding area has high density student housing such as fraternity and sororities. He handed out a color-coded map showing parcels in the area that were currently used for fraternity, sorority or cooperative housing (red colored), UM owned parcels (yellow colored), and school or church uses (blue). He explained that if one were to draw a radius of 400 yards around the proposed project, there would be 29 other fraternity, sorority or cooperative housing parcels within that radius.*

*Lutes said that the additional density they were requesting should not be an additional burden on the neighborhood. He stressed that they have been very cognizant of the neighborhood and are not proposing to construct a large high-density building, rather maintaining architecture of site. He said they are proposing to have the parking, bicycle storage and trash at the rear of the building where it will not be visible from the street.*

*Lutes explained that there is additional screening being proposed to the north of the property to provide an additional barrier between the sorority house to the north. He noted that there is a heavily landscaped buffer area to the south and east that would buffer the single family houses that are on the south east side of the proposed site.*

*Lutes said the floorplan of the existing building lends itself to a fraternity and their activities. He said the basement would be used for a gathering space since it qualifies as useable space and it would buffer noise favorably. He added that they had received five letters of support from neighbors.*

*David Frayn, 45798 Turtle Head Dr, Plymouth, MI, spoke as a Board Member and Alumni of Phi Kappa Psi. He stated that their organization has been attempting to obtain permanent housing on campus for many years, and they have been a part of the University of Michigan for 134 years. He said his fraternity represents 900 living alumni members of which 40% live within the state of Michigan. He noted that they are currently leasing a fraternity facility on State Street but are looking forward to having a place of their own that they can be proud of. Frayn said they have plans of having a resident director that would be living on site to oversee the property and residents. He said they look forward to addressing any concerns the City might have in regards to bringing the property up to standards.*

*Mary Higgins, 626 Oxford Street, Ann Arbor, spoke as a representative and house*

director (for the last 12 years) of the Delta Gamma Organization. She said they are the neighbor to the north and they are opposed to the proposed fraternity project that would come into their neighborhood. She stated that they are not opposed to Phi Kappa Psi but to the idea of having a fraternity move in as a neighbor, since she feels that currently the neighborhood is very quiet and given the current tight traffic area on their street any additional traffic would be create additional problems. She said she also was speaking on behalf of Knight Wallace which was a current neighbor of the proposed project. She expressed that they are opposed to noise, garbage and parties that are loud and unruly and they don't anticipate having such activities next door to them, and want to go on record stating that they prefer not having a fraternity as a neighbor. She believed that the building had been a rental for the last eight years and they hadn't had any issues with it being a rental property.

Phelps Connell, 707 Oxford Street, Ann Arbor, spoke as a board member of Phi Gamma Delta located down the street from the proposed project. He stated that they support and welcome the project to their neighborhood. He said their house has been in the same location for over 100 years and their board has been around for over 100 years. He explained that there are already 8-9 fraternities in the neighborhood so this wouldn't be anything new to the area.

John Gray, 426 Hill Street, Ann Arbor, spoke as a representative of the Undergraduate Chapter of Phi Kappa Psi, as a member of the Housing Core Board as well as the former vice president of the fraternity. He spoke on the character of the undergraduate chapter and any possible stigma of fraternities. He said they were ranked # 1 in the Inter-Fraternity Council for community involvement last year and # 2 for risk mitigation. He noted that in the past four years they have also been accredited with honors from their National Fraternity. He said they strive for excellence among themselves and in society and look forward to having a good working relationship with any neighbors as they currently have at the 700 S. State Street location.

Carol Makielski, 2905 Brandywine Drive, Ann Arbor, spoke as the President of the Delta Gamma Alumni Board. She asked if there would be a house director at the proposed location since her experience at the sororities is that the director can set the tone of the behavior and monitor what goes on when on site.

Noting no further speakers, Mahler declared the Public Hearing closed for this evenings meeting at 8:31 PM.

**Motion made by Westphal, seconded by Carlberg that, The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission, after hearing all interested persons and reviewing all relevant information, finds the petition to substantially meet the standards in Chapter 55 (Zoning Ordinance), Section 5:104 (Special Exceptions), subject to building occupancy of no more than 24 persons; and, therefore, approves the Phi Kappa Psi Special Exception Use.**

**And**

**The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby approves the Phi Kappa Psi Site Plan, subject to satisfaction of all code requirements prior to issuance of building permits.**

**COMMISSION DISCUSSION:**

*Carlberg asked the petitioner who was going to be the resident director of the fraternity who would ensure that Standard 4 [Will not be detrimental to the use, peaceful enjoyment, economic value or development of neighboring property, or the*

*neighborhood area in general] of the Special Exception Use would be adhered to by the fraternity.*

*Allan Lutes answered that the alumni group intends to have an adult live-in resident at the house who is not an undergraduate. He explained that the building has a separate suite at the rear of the building for the live-in manager. He explained that his company, Alpha Management Group, currently manages 12 fraternity facilities on campus, with staff inspecting the facilities several times a week along with overseeing capital improvement and maintenance programs. Lutes said that they have an office that is open Mon-Fri that addresses complaints, and he hoped that Phi Kappa Psi would use his management company to manage this particular facility.*

*Lutes noted that this fraternity is also a member of the Inter Fraternity Council of Michigan, unlike other fraternities located on the same block as this proposed site. Lutes explained that when groups are members on the Inter Fraternity Council, they agree to stand by specific risk management policies that limit visitors and guests to fraternity parties with strict sanctions placed on fraternities if they don't abide by the policies.*

*Carlberg asked how the applicant had decided that 10 cars would be sufficient for the 24 residents.*

*Lutes responded that the current plan is for 8 car parking, and the current zoning only required 4-5 cars. He said that 8 cars are consistent with current parking needs at their existing location. He said that their current location houses 31 people and 10 of those individuals have vehicles, so they feel that with the added bicycle storage and public transportation nearby they will be able to cover 100% of the need.*

*Pratt asked if the resident manager should be listed separately in the motion for the total number of persons on site.*

*Rampson responded that the Commission could specify the resident manager in the motion for clarification.*

*Pratt asked if the additional living space would come from the basement area, given that the current duplex layout is only for 8 persons.*

*Lutes responded that there may be two bedrooms constructed in the lower level to house the total 24 residents. He said that, if they were constructed, they would be on the north side of the building where there already are egress windows.*

*Pratt said he was interested in knowing if there would be enough living space in this existing building to house the proposed number of residents, since it seemed it would be tight for room.*

*Lutes answered that the proposed housing was designed as students desire to live; in single and double rooms rather than triple and quad rooms. He stated that he believed that under the City's Housing Code the proposed property would qualify for even more occupancy than the proposed 24 load.*

*Pratt said it would be interesting to know if the City sees this type of density in housing as common or if it is a rarity.*

*Rampson said that the department could certainly take a look into the inquiry and noted that one of the reasons staff had recommended postpone of the item this evening was that they were still waiting for information to come back to them.*

Woods asked for clarification if the Special Exception Use would be decided on by the Planning Commission and not go on to the City Council.  
Rampson said that was correct.

Woods stated that it would be helpful to have a floor plan of the building, showing the proposed basement bedrooms as well. She asked what the maximum allowable occupancy would be during parties, since that is when problems often arise for neighbors.

Lutes stated that he couldn't speak to that, since the occupancy load during social events is dictated by the Fire Code and maybe the Fire Marshall could give that information.

Woods asked staff if they could provide that information to the Commission.

Rampson responded that staff could gather that information and provide it to the Commission.

Woods asked Lutes if they had notified the neighbors regarding their proposal and if they had received feedback and input from them.

Lutes responded that according to the Citizen Participation Ordinance notification requirements, they had sent out letters to all residents within 500 feet of the proposed site and had held a meeting. He said they had only had one neighbor attend that meeting who was a board member of the Oxbridge Neighborhood Association. He said that the person had provided neutral feedback and she was definitely not opposed to their proposal.

He said that they had sent out more information to the neighbors than was required, including a site plan and contact information of the petitioners and they hadn't received any feedback other than from the one member of the Oxbridge Neighborhood Association. He said that they had found out from a third party just yesterday about the concerns of Delta Gamma and they were working to address those issues.

Mahler asked staff what information they were still waiting for.

Cheng said that according to the staff report the petitioner still needed to provide revised site plans addressing code issues and location of landmark trees and plantings, a soil erosion and sedimentation control plan, as well as sewer flow data and various other corrections.

Rampson asked all interested individuals to sign-up for email notification when the item would return before the Commission.

[Delta Gamma said they didn't receive a notice from the petitioner regarding their meeting.]

**A motion was made by Carlberg, seconded by Westphal to postpone taking action until the information requested has been provided and reviewed.**

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

**Yeas:** 7 - Evan Pratt, Eric A. Mahler, Jean Carlberg, Wendy Woods, Erica Briggs, Kirk Westphal, and Diane Giannola

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Bonnie Bona, and Tony Derezinski

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

*None*

**11 COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS**

**12 ADJOURNMENT**

*Unanimously adjourned at 8:45 PM*

**Eric Mahler, Chair**  
**mg**