

Moved by Giannola, seconded by Parekh, that the minutes be amended. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Vote on Main Motion:

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

5 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Adenekan, seconded by Woods, that the agenda be approved. 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

6-a City Council

Briere said she didn't believe there was an update from Council.

6-b Planning Manager

Rampson reviewed the July meeting calendar with the Commission. She said as soon as the Ordinance Revisions Committee sets a date for their next meeting, it will be posted on the website.

Rampson reported that the Washtenaw County Water Resource Commissioner is ready to move forward with new rules, and action would likely take place in August, which would be followed by Council taking action to include the changes in our ordinances.

6-c Planning Commission Officers and Committees

Peters reported that he and Wendy Rampson had attended a meeting with the affordable housing subcommittee of the Housing and Human Services Advisory Board. He said they are looking at solutions to create real affordable units. He said based on the last affordable housing needs study conducted they still need about 1500 more affordable housing units in Ann Arbor to meet the need, and currently each respective board is working to define questions they want answers to. He said communication from the Commission to him, Commissioner Adenekan and staff would be helpful, including definition of affordable. He said there is ongoing conversation about downtown premiums, which is one of the tools the Planning Commission may be able to work with. He noted the dates of the next subcommittee meetings.

6-d Written Communications and Petitions

[14-1001](#) Various Correspondences 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.)

Steve Thorp, downtown resident and a former chairperson of the Planning Commission, said he wanted to raise the issue of height limits. He stated that he thought coming up with the D1 and D2 zoning was a good idea. He said when he was Chair about 14 years ago, the Commission and the public were moving toward consideration of height limits, and they felt the public was receptive at the time; however, he felt the rug was pulled out from under the Commission when the Council established the Downtown Residential Task Force. He said he resigned before the report was finalized because he didn't agree with the density they were calling for in the downtown. He said he wanted the Commission to keep in mind the buildings going in downtown, irrespective of their height, are changing the density and their goals, and density is bringing other problem, and alienating some people with respect to what they remember Ann Arbor to be. He said he isn't resisting change, but we need to manage it better. He said let's not close the door on downtown height limits.

8 PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT BUSINESS MEETING

[14-1000](#) Public Hearings Scheduled for the July 15, 2014 City Planning Commission Meeting

The Chair read the public hearing notice as published.

Received and Filed

9 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

9-a [14-1003](#) The Mark Condominiums Site Plan - A proposal to demolish the existing carwash building on this 0.25 acre site and construct a 11,910 square foot, three-story, 7-unit residential building with garages below. The property is located in the Old West Side Historic District and received a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal on March 13, 2014. (Ward 5). Staff Recommendation: Approval

Thacher presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Vince Caruso, 556 Glendale Circle, Ann Arbor, Allen Creek Coordinating Committee, said there is no information in the packet indicating the location of the floodplain. He urged caution in considering this project. He noted that the Delonis Center was found to be in the floodplain after the site plan was reviewed, and they had to move the building. He said that the Near North project was also scrapped because of floodplain issues. He said that residents of the Allen Creek area want to do a study of the creek. He said there has been a Green Streets initiative to reduce impervious pavement. He said he wants to make sure we don't put people in harm's way. He noted an example of people in Ohio, drowning trying to get cars out of garages.

Lynn Borset, 322 Virginia, Ann Arbor, said that aesthetically, it's a shame that this building will be taller and provides nothing to recommend with its exterior design.

Brad Moore, 4844 Jackson Road, Suite 150, Ann Arbor, architect for project, introduced the project team and said he was available to answer questions. He explained that all of the floodplain area is below the level of the garage. He said the proposed residential units will be located over the garage. He said he worked with City staff to identify the flood elevation. He noted that the building aesthetics are a result of a long process of negotiation with Historic District Commission. He noted that the Old West Side president and vice president both spoke in favor of the project.

Steve Thorp, 124 Chapin Street, Ann Arbor, resident of downtown, said that if any part of a property is in a floodplain, it has to be addressed and not ignored. He said that this development is not compatible with the goals from the Downtown Plan for a diversity of new downtown housing opportunities since it is not affordable for median income. He asked when this was going to stop. He said this type of development is changing the character of the city. He said the Commission should emphasize diversity and protect the liveability of residentially zoned neighborhoods next to downtown. He said traffic issues are directly related to downtown development, as are property taxes. He said he walked by the site and saw that the developer's sign had graffiti that said "More Yuppified Housing for Ann Arbor."

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

Moved by Clein, seconded by Giannola, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City

Council approve the Mark Condominiums Site Plan and Development Agreement.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Clein asked about floodplain delineation.

Thacher pointed out the floodplain line on the site plan image.

Clein asked about construction in the floodplain.

Thacher said that the proposed building stays out of the corner of the site where the floodplain is located.

Clein asked whether there is habitable space in the floodplain.

Moore pointed out the entrances to garages, at grade level.

Bona asked whether residential development can be built in a floodway.

Rampson said no.

Bona suggested the petitioner make the floodplain line clear in materials for Council. She asked how the flood elevation is determined.

Kathy Keineith, Perimeter Engineering, the project engineer, said FEMA does cross sections through the floodplain and analyzes the flow data.

Bona asked what is being done for flood mitigation.

Moore said there is engineered storm water detention on the site, which will percolate into the soil.

Keineth said there is both infiltration and detention being provided.

Bona asked about the elevation of the pipe.

Keineth said the floodplain elevation is about 811 and the pipe in Liberty is not that deep. She explained that the emergency overflow out of the detention basin will go into the street.

Bona asked what level of stormwater management is being provided.

Keineth said first flush detention is being provided.

Bona asked about landscaping.

Keineth said the plan includes planting new street trees and foundation plantings. She said there will be a series of retaining walls and terraces designed to blend the grade into the site to the north.

Bona said this detail might be helpful for City Council to see, since there is a lot of grade change.

Bona asked about the Historic District Commission review. She said she understood this project did not have to go through the Design Review Board.

Moore said yes, the Historic District Commission had authority over the design of the building.

Bona asked if the development had to comply with character overlay district requirements.

Moore said yes.

Bona noted the comments from Mr. Thorpe about the master plan goals and said housing diversity is a continuing challenge when you have such high valued property. She said currently, there is a zoning premium for affordable housing that is not being used. She noted that the Affordable Housing Subcommittee, discussed earlier in the meeting, will be looking at how to get affordable housing across the city, not just downtown. She said this housing can't always be on site. She said relative to property taxes, most residents are concerned about development lowering their property value. She said stability is what we should be conscious of. She noted that density brings less traffic and that it is downtown's attractiveness that's bringing cars in.

Woods said she was glad the water main issue was able to be resolved. She asked what happens with West Liberty when the water main gets replaced and the extent of the street work.

Keineth said they haven't done a design for the water main yet. She said they plan to put the water main 3 5 feet at the back of curb and abandon the existing 6 inch water main in Liberty. She said there will be three tie ins; at Third Street, Second Street, and their property, so there should be little disruption.

Moore clarified that this project is a several day project.

Briere asked about the footing drain disconnect program. She asked if staff is helping the developer find properties to disconnect.

Rampson said the citizen committee evaluating the program is meeting weekly, and the development agreement language is being revised to provide flexibility in meeting the sanitary flow mitigation requirements. She noted there are a number of multiple family developments that may be available for disconnects.

Peters asked about design guidelines for new buildings in historic districts.

Thacher said the Historic District Commission applies the Secretary of Interior Standards first, then the Ann Arbor guidelines. She said the Commission looks for a design that is compatible and doesn't overwhelm historic structures in the district. She said the biggest issue for the Commission was the front setback. She said the Commission felt the new building should be pushed back so it would not obscure the adjacent Peter Brehm house. She said their objective was to preserve the viewshed, not distract from it. She said that the Commission encourages modern buildings in this type of situation.

Clein noted that the design is admirable in finding moderation between modern and historic. He said having the building pushed back helps. He asked where condensers will be located.

Moore said most of the equipment will be on the roof, with two potentially on the north side. He said this will depend on the actual mechanical design.

Clein asked about exterior materials, which he did not see labeled on the plans.

Moore showed an elevation and pointed out the labels for materials. He said they will be using brick, iron work and smooth factory painted hardipanel.

Clein asked whether they intended to use brick veneer.

Moore said the brick will be full depth brick, except on the cantilever portion.

Clein suggested this detail be included in the information for City Council.

Bona observed that it would have been good if they considered a lightweight material rather than lightweight brick.

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

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

9-b [14-1002](#)

Glendale Condominiums Site Plan - A proposal to construct six two-family dwellings (22,500 sf total) and 36 parking spaces (12 in garages) on this 2.64 acre site zoned R4B (Multiple-Family Dwelling District). Two single-family dwellings will be demolished. (Ward 5) Staff Recommendation: Approval

Thacher presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Vince Caruso, 556 Glendale Circle, Ann Arbor, Allen Creek Coordinating Committee, said he has concerns about the project and that they were pretty much taking a defacto park area. He wanted to know if the petitioner had calculated imperviousness of the earlier proposal versus this proposal. He said the developer misrepresented the facts at the citizen meeting where they said no storm water flows will leave the site, which was later corrected at the end of the meeting. He said the developer did not notify residents at Hillside Terrace. He said he is not sure about the plans since the basin design has not changed, but labels have been swapped. He said the detention pond of 7 feet is a hazard to the public and an eyesore. He said the size of the basin is indicative that there is way too much development going into this site, and these types of basins are notoriously undermanaged. He said when the fence becomes in disrepair, access to the basin will be a clear and present danger to the community. He said development lights will shine into neighbor's houses and devalue property values. He said the Allen Creek modeling has not shown to be very adequate. He said the group showed there were no flooding issues on Glendale and after he showed there was, the City came and unblocked three sanitary sewer pipes that were completely obstructed. He showed a map of the flooding issues in the Glendale area. He said Spicer, OHM, and City staff, have commented at meetings that the Allen Creek floodplain maps are lacking meaningful data and are 'loosely calibrated'. He said when Hillside Terrace was built the group sued and settled out of court for flooding damages that occurred to the homes downstream. He said to the City's credit in the new modeling, they have a 15% increase due to climate change or global warming, adding that the City of Ann Arbor had record snow fall last winter and record rain fall last year.

Libby Hunter read a letter for Charles Dunlap from 555 Glendale Circle, Ann Arbor. He expressed opposition to the proposed condo project,

stating that adding 12 units would have severe negative impact on his neighborhood and would significantly increase traffic resulting in long waits to turn on Jackson from Glendale and will only become worse when the Jackson "road diet" is completed. He said the heavy water run-off from driveways and asphalt shingles will create negative consequences for water drainage. He further said during heavy rain, there have been water back ups on Glendale Circle near Fair Street. He concluded that Glendale already has a solid mix of condos and single family homes and has already achieved the mixed use objective.

Diane Robins, 1900 Old Orchard Court, said as residents adjacent to the proposed project, they express concerns about storm water run off, flooding and sewer overflow. She said submitted plans remain inadequate and the solution of a detention pond is inadequate to meet the demand. She said they feel the project will damage their environment, which is already beyond a fragile state. She said to study the flooding issue they created a study, based on the City survey, and distributed 135 surveys with 50% response rate. She said 73% had basement flooding, 63% had yard flooding, 17% had sewage overflow into their basements, and 26% required extensive repairs due to water damage. She showed a map they created [included in meeting file]. She offered to share the spreadsheet with anyone, and requested that the City complete the stormwater model before considering the proposed site plan.

Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Blvd, said stormwater flooding is a major issue in this neighborhood, and this site retains the stormwater, given that it is totally green. She said that only 7 of the 23 major trees will be saved with the new development, and most of the grass will be covered by impervious surface and built upon. She said it will be replaced by a narrow strip and a sidewalk and retaining wall and become almost all impermeable, which is bad planning. She said the retention pond will be up higher and along the sidewalk which is bad planning. She said there are catch basins but no showing of grading towards the catch basins. She asked if the basin will work or will the major loss of green space be detrimental to the downstream neighborhoods. She said you cannot approve this project as it is too badly worked.

Keira Novacheck, 1916 Old Orchard Court, part of the Old Orchard Condo Association, said she is concerned with the retention pond in their neighborhood and that pooling of shallow water creates mosquito habitat and an increased risk of West Nile virus. She said retention ponds are often referred to as attractive nuisances, close to sidewalks, that attract interest from children and increasingly so given the foot traffic in their neighborhood, which is heavily populated with children. She said children and adults die each year from drowning and deaths in retention

ponds and any risk is simply unacceptable. She said fencing around the pond is not an effective solution. She said the Indiana Builders Association did not accept fencing as an adequate means of protection from retention ponds. She said the solution to the flooding by the creating of a retention pond causes a host of other issues.

Ian Qubit, 1916 Old Orchard Court, passed out a Powerpoint presentation and referenced it during his comments. He said the proposed use is not consistent with surrounding uses. He said the buildings are bigger than those in the neighborhood. He references page 5 and proposed snow storage, which showed putting snow at the top of the hill, which is a bad idea.

Tom O'Connell, 1805 Orchard Street, resident of Orchard Street for 47 years, asked why they are putting a retaining pond in a residential neighborhood. He said his neighbors have been threatened with water for many years and have permanent pumps that pump water every day and he thinks it's getting worse. He said before they start another problem maybe we should fix the old one first. He said he has looked all over the town and you won't find a retention pond in a residential neighborhood anywhere else.

Cathy Boris, 1726 Charlton, said she had questions about the detention apparatus and pond. She read from a prepared statement saying, the development is too large for the site, too much impervious surface from buildings and paving. She said the plans show several catch basins that will go directly to the ponds, but it was not clear that it will be graded in a way that water will be directed to the catch basin. She asked if the land will be graded to direct the water to the catch basins, and if the condos should be approved, will the development agreement stipulate the maintenance for the two ponds. She said will the maintenance include, as EPA recommends, inspecting the discharge points, removing trash and debris, inspecting the waterline for erosion, inspecting the slope for nuisance plants, inspecting the slopes for additional plantings, periodic cleaning of all pipes feeding the ponds and periodic dredging of the ponds. How often will pond inspection be done? She asked if there is a legal mechanism to insure that proper maintenance of the retention ponds will be done over time. She said they need to see which City staff is responsible for seeing that proper maintenance is being done, and should the ponds not function whom will be held accountable for their failure. She said if the ponds fail, more stormwater than ever before will come spilling down over the neighborhood.

Chris Call, 1725 Charlton, said she lives directly downstream from the proposed development and noted that even though it is so close to Jackson, when you are inside the neighborhood, it feels very quiet and

closed, and does not feel like a place that would support this type of development. She said her main concerns are the traffic and stormwater. She said currently, you take your life into your own hands when trying to turn left onto Jackson Road from her neighborhood, and adding 24 more cars will make the quality of life in her neighborhood much, much worse. She said it's worth remembering that this site is currently functioning as a park and a perfectly good house that someone would be willing to buy. She said the retention pond worries her, and the neighborhood has about three dogs per house and everyone walks them every day and she is concerned for pets drowning in the retention pond.

Dr. Josh Greenberg, 209 Glendale, said he was attracted to the neighborhood because it is very quaint with beautiful trees that have been there years and they are going to take it down for condos and a detention pond. He said they will be changing the way it has been for years for 6 more condos and he doesn't know if it's worth it. He asked if it's worth destroying the beauty for more water issues.

Sandra Burman, 588 Glendale Circle, said she thought one of our goals in Ann Arbor is to create green spaces and they have a beautiful green space; a beautiful orchard. She said it's a quiet space and she walks her dog there everyday and sees children playing in the orchard. She said they are here now thinking of creating a condo development for maybe 50-55 people, when they are hearing all these concerns from hundreds of people who are not comfortable with this. She asked why we would do it. She said she thinks it could be for financial reasons but this is really not what our town is about. She said if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Priscella Parker, 1706 Charleton, said that after reading the City's Land Use Element, the project does not meet Goals A and Goal D. She said there are serious issues related to the safety of ponds other than drowning, such as heavy metals, toxins, and mosquitoes carrying the West Nile virus. She said they pay taxes to provide green space inside the City and this is a perfect green space. She asked anyone opposed to project to stand up.

Melissa Whitney, 1808 Charlton, said she came to find out more information on the detention ponds, and she said that these detention ponds should be on industrial properties and not in residential areas and it seems like the whole site would need to be graded in order for the system to work.

Mary Cronin, 1807 Charlton, said she lives directly downhill from this proposed project and has lived there for 26 years, adding that it is a quiet neighborhood, but Charleton is a busy, thoroughfare street, since people cut through from Revena and Virginia to get to Jackson. She

said she doesn't know how adding at least 36 more cars wouldn't affect the street. She said it is a beautiful area where one looks up at the green orchard and she is disturbed how the City wants to take every green space and build something on it.

Gretchen Hahn said she lives on the corner of Virginia and Abbott. She read a letter from Rita Mitchell, 621 Fifth Street, who was not able to be at the meeting. Mitchell wrote that she opposed the Planning staff's recommendation to approve the proposed project based on the potential risk for public health, safety and welfare of immediate surrounding residents. She said the footing drain disconnects places danger to surrounding homes that are unrelated to the project. She wrote the site currently serves as green open space for water management as green infrastructure and asked if the City has considered the use of Greenbelt funds to purchase the site from the developer to create a green park that would continue to benefit the City from the perspective of green infrastructure. She questioned the effectiveness of the stormwater mitigation and asked the City to consider the established residents who have contributed through their taxes, and that the City's decision should do no harm to existing neighborhoods and the developer should be responsible for any water related problems that happen downhill from the development site. Hahn said she had issues with the 36 parking spaces on site for the proposed condo development and felt it was a ridiculous number, given the current water and flooding issues in the area, adding this was too much impervious surface. She said she also had issues with the retention pond and detention basins proposed.

Susan Sobolski, 2107 Charlton, said she agrees with all her neighbors who spoke and she feels the project is a really bad idea and she will be sad to see the orchard lost. She said she wanted to speak for the residents of Hillside Terrace, since her mother lived there until she passed away in June. She said as a caregiver to her mother, she became a big part of the community and it was unfortunate that none of the residents could be at the meeting. She said there are about 80 residents who are elderly and infirm and wouldn't be able to be at the meeting. She said the majority of them are shut-ins and it is unfortunate that their voices can't be heard. She said the residents of Hillside Terrace have a beautiful view of the Orchard and given that most of them are shut-ins this is the only access to nature that they have and when the project happens that will change. She said some residents knew about the project and were really disappointed and she learned that when the City sent the meeting notice only 4 units received the notice as well as one that went to the overall community and she felt it was inadequate notice of the meeting. She expressed her concern that the voices of the ones that live the closest to the proposed development are not being heard.

Steve Thorp, 124 Chapin Street, said he lives downstream from the proposed development and after rain events they are flooded. He said for 30 years he has never had water in his basement but FEMA thinks the flood elevation needs to be higher. He said he talked to Jerry Hancock about it who told him it is because of all the development that is causing more run-off and raising the flood elevation. He said from now on the City should think about noticing all those who live downstream from a proposed development and the developer should foot the bill, because property owners have to be noticed on developments that could potentially increase flooding for them. He said when he was chair of the Planning Commission they allowed applause, discretionally and he used the remainder of his speaking time to show appreciation through applause.

Edward Vielmetti, 1210 Brooklyn Avenue, said he is not directly affected by this project, except that they are all citizens of Ann Arbor and they are all affected by what goes on. He said he wanted to speak about sump pumps and drainage, noting that there are many sump pumps throughout the City that run continuously and when they break or wear out, they cause tremendous damage to basements. He said the City has mandated that people disconnect their footing drains and as a result of pump failure it is on the citizen to mitigate. He said unlike our City's traffic system that is monitored 24/7 by traffic engineers, we don't have a City sump pump system that is monitored 24/7 so they can get a hand when their infrastructure fails. He said he didn't believe there was any notice that one could receive, such as a text or notice when one's sump pump fails and it may be something the City or the Planning Commission can do to help citizens manage stormwater, especially in the case with new development worsens the situation.

Alexander Pertosa, 1808 Abbott Avenue, said he wanted to voice his opposition to the Glendale Condominium project, adding that he has the same concerns about the issues as stated by the neighbors, especially traffic and water run-off. He said he had personally had three major basement floodings caused by water run-off and believes that the sewers under Abbott Avenue may be inadequate and during the past 5 years during construction projects there have been major replacements of pipes. He said he has concern about the damage that heavy equipment might cause to the already weak infrastructure and he urged the Commission to listen to the concerns that his neighbors and he have brought.

Lynn Borset, 322 Virginia, representing Virginia Park Neighborhood Association, said there is a document in the Commission packet from last year, dated July 16, 2013, titled "Speaking for the trees" that is still

relevant. She referenced staff reviews on the trees shown in the site plan noting that staff had concerns about the impact construction could have on a landmark butternut-hickory tree. She referenced a document provided to the Commission titled Traffic and Impact of Safety Concerns, dated 2013. Last year, staff recommended a driveway connection between Glendale Drive and Hillside Terrace. She read from the site plan, Note 2 on SP1.00, stating that in future, if Hillside Terrace desired, connection would be acceptable to the Glendale condominiums. She said, if it's acceptable, why aren't they doing it now. She referenced Page 4 of the staff report, regarding zoning and open space and said the 80% is an incorrect figure for open space and doesn't take into account the driveways or parking. She said all of the impervious surface will create a great big heat island. She said the pond will have standing water in it after rain events and the fact that the developer has to go to such lengths of building a retention pond and a detention pond underground, indicates over capacity for this site. She said solving the stormwater management issue creates health and safety issues for other through the ponds. She said the density of neighborhood is too great and that there are already five apartment complexes among single-family residences.

Gus Teschke, 313 Montgomery, Ann Arbor, said on Slide 8 – Dumpsters, that there are no dumpsters in residential neighborhoods and screening does not hide dumpster or the smell from dumpsters. He said the Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner reviewed and approved the plan noting that it meets the requirement but the requirement is that it will not create additional water run-off, which it will given the added impervious surfaces. He said the Sierra Club has come out against this project and requests that the Commission reject the project unless the issues of stormwater flooding can be addressed. He said you can see the concerns have not been met and the Commission should reject this and at least require the developer to come back with a better plan that doesn't include a retention pond.

Scott Bowers, Bowers and Associates, architect for the petitioner, said they did not take neighborhood comments lightly, as evidenced by the time taken between meetings. He showed that they had reduced the number of buildings by 2, and the City met with the Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner and the ponds were a direct result of that discussion; they told them that is what they needed to do. He said they are holding a 100 year flood event, and the retention pond is the first pond where the clean water goes, and if it gets too high, it goes into a second system which is open on the bottom. He said they must hold post development to pre development; the retention pond. He said the proposed site is the best spot to put it on the site and they have put a decorative fence around it. He said they added parking to address

concerns about parking off site and along Glendale. He said they eliminated buildings to protect the slope and natural features on north side. He said they have pushed the sidewalk into the site to maintain vegetation that runs along the street. He said they have gone to great lengths to preserve and protect the existing trees and are grading the site to drain to the catch basins. He said they started with four-plexes and changed them to ranch duplex styles to preserve the greenspace.

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

COMMISSION BREAK

Moved by Briere, seconded by Parekh, that The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Glendale Condominiums Site Plan and Development Agreement.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Briere asked about the streets in the development, if they are standard width or private.

Thacher said they are private drives.

Briere asked if the developer would be responsible for trash collection and how will it be collected.

Thacher said yes, and that there are 2 proposed dumpsters at the end of each drive stub.

Briere asked about compost.

Thacher said she wasn't sure if it would be handled through a separate dumpster.

Briere asked about stormwater at the northeast corner of the site. She referred to a photo and asked if there is any topographical change to deal with run-off.

Adenekan asked about proposed snow storage areas on the site.

Thacher said they are shown on the landscape plan; at the top of hill and near the pond.

Adenekan asked about the trees.

Thacher said there are 23 landmark-sized trees on the site, and 7 would

remain.

Giannola asked how long the water would stay in the retention pond.

Thacher said it would depend on the size of the storm.

Clein asked about internal roadways, noting that there were some paved areas for emergency vehicle turnaround. He asked if the Fire Marshall had reviewed the site plan.

Thacher said yes, and showed on the site plan where the developer was required to install a turnaround area. She pointed out the area that was intended to be permeable pavers and not intended to be parked on.

Clein asked about parking issues mentioned, noting 24 garage spaces and 12 surface parking spaces, which would be double the amount of spaces required by ordinance.

Thacher said that the developer wanted to keep overflow parking off Glendale so they redesigned the site to add the extra parking.

Clein observed that additional parking keeps cars off the street but increases imperviousness surface which then in turn brings concerns with the stormwater detention.

Clein asked about the height of the retaining walls on the north end of the site.

Thacher said she did not know.

Clein asked if soils were suitable for infiltration.

Thacher said yes, that Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner's review did determine that the soils were suitable.

Clein asked if there had been discussion with the developer for other suitable systems that were more underground and less pond.

Rampson explained that the jurisdiction for the stormwater review was Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner, and City staff was not part of the review and therefore didn't have detailed answers to questions related to the review.

Clein asked about the impacts to the natural features and the critical root zone of the tree mentioned by the public.

Thacher said the City Natural Features Coordinator, Kerry Gray, signed off on the natural features impacts and felt that the proposed measures they were taking were adequate to protect that tree. She referenced details on the landscape plan on the second sheet that spoke to the need for protection of the trees during construction.

Bona asked to review the image of the zoning districts, noting that 39 units are allowed on the site with 12 being provided. Per her calculation that would allow 15 units per acre or 2,900 square feet per unit.

Thacher said yes, based on the parcel size.

Bona observed that the parcel is surrounded by various zoning districts; R2A [to the north] which allows half as many units as what is on the site. R1D [Everything across Glendale and immediately south of the site] which allows one unit or 5,000 square feet. R4B [this site is zoned same as Hillside Terrace site] and R1B [not shown on map provided but in the vicinity]. She said she was trying to get at the density of this site which is half the density of the surrounding neighborhood [R1D and R2A districts] versus what's allowed. She asked what is included in open space and what is not included.

Thacher said what is not included are all structures, all drives [including driveways leading into garages], and all parking spaces. She said the sidewalks count as open space and all of the remaining green space around the buildings and ponds count.

Bona said it would be helpful if the petitioner would provide the calculations on the open space.

Parekh asked how often are ponds used in similar projects.

Rampson said in the downtown, most recently, all of the stormwater detention has been below grade, but when there is land area available (almost all of the post 1973 development) whether residential or non-residential have incorporated ponds. She referenced the Briarwood Mall ponds, noting that a lot of times they are dry ponds and look like depressed swales in the development. She explained that this has been the state of the art for 20-25 years and recently we have moved to below-grade type facilities, which is becoming more popular.

Parekh said this project has both types and asked if there was a reason why the below grade wasn't extended.

Rampson said she believed it was a matter of design, noting that the site is constrained by the slope.

Parekh asked how many surface parking spaces were provided in the earlier version site plan.

Susan Bowers said eight surface, in addition to garage parking spaces.

Woods asked about the difference between detention versus retention.

Rampson said detention is a pond that is designed with a structure that detains the water in a large storm; the water comes into the pond, it stays there until it reaches the pipe and then it gradually goes into the underground storm pipe system. She explained that the idea is to try to hold it on site as long as possible before putting it into the system so all of the sites in the City feed into the storm system. She said a retention pond is actually a pond where you retain water, where it will infiltrate and evaporate, but the idea is that water stays in it, such as the Briarwood Mall ponds, or Traverwood Lakes system.

Woods asked what Geddes Lakes would be.

Rampson said they are retention ponds and they may have, when built, had detention ponds that attach to the retention ponds, which allows them to remove silt and improve water quality before going into the retention system.

Peters asked if the property has ever been a legal park.

Thacher said no, it was annexed in 1987 and wasn't zoned until 1994, when it was site planned as a part of an extension of the Hillside Terrace. She said the site plan was never constructed and expired in 1999, but it has been in private hands since that time.

Peters asked about the oversight of the detention facility.

Thacher pointed to the language in the draft development agreement about requirements for stormwater management to be maintained and noted that there is staff in the Public Services Department who are looking at these.

Westphal asked if a resident nearby had questions regarding how the pond is functioning, who would they call.

Thacher said the Public Services Department in City Hall.

Westphal asked if the pond fails, is there a redress for the community.

Thacher said the City can make the developer repair it or the City can repair it and bill the developer, in order to make sure the stormwater is functioning properly.

Westphal clarified that the City Planning Commission's charge is to respond to developments in regards to the existing codes and Master plan. He said this site is a private development that has been maintained and they have allowed the residents in the neighborhood to enjoy the pastoral site. He said it was not in their purview to decide whether the site should be developed or purchased as park. He asked if people have concerns regarding stormwater requirements and open ponds, whom should they contact.

Rampson responded that the Washtenaw County Resource Commissioner is the body that sets the rules that the City uses.

Westphal said he wanted to discuss the flooding issues in the neighborhood. He asked if there has been previous flooding in the area, how would the City handle such situations with new developments.

Thacher said this plan will hold the site to a slightly higher standard because of past neighborhood issues, and that's why there is to be no net increase in water leaving the site and thus the need for the 'beefed up' stormwater system. She said they have taken the neighborhood concerns very seriously and made the developers put in extra precautionary measures because of the issues.

Westphal asked about a public comment about added run-off caused by impervious surfaces on the site.

Thacher said all run-off will be captured on site and not run off site.

Rampson explained that with new developments all run-off is captured into the system to try to keep it from being a nuisance downstream.

Briere asked the petitioner about the driveways lining up with the street and discussion from last year's meeting, when they spoke about the desire for headlights not to go into neighboring windows. She asked why the driveways are lining up with the street.

Bowers said there were issues with the grade and this is the area where the retention area ended up being located, on site, as required by the WCWRC.

Briere asked if the water that is draining from the Hillside Terrace onto this parcel would be detained also.

Bowers said they will capture all water draining across the site, and one of the reasons why it took WCWRC so long was because they had to design a system that would retain all water on the site and not allow it to leave the site at all. He said the first pond allows for percolation into the ground as well as evaporation, which helps it much faster than putting it all underground into a percolation system. He said the second system pushes all that water that is still in the pond, back out into that detention pond, which has an open perforated bottom and leaches out at pre-development stage, back into the ground, but it also has a mechanism that allows it to go into the City system at the pre development rate.

Briere asked whether the system was designed for retaining 1 percent storm on site.

Bowers said yes.

Briere asked if all of the water from roofs and driveways will be entering their system and how will it get there.

Bowers said, correct, water will get there through the stormwater piping. He showed a development plan pointing out the swales and catch basins along the drives.

Briere asked about snow storage and how they would deal with melt water.

Bowers said if it becomes an issue, there are other open areas on site where the snow could go, or they can eliminate parking and place snow piles elsewhere. He said the one on the hill could be moved but it is currently proposed to drain down the hillside.

Briere said it would eventually cross the sidewalk and that would mean ice build-up, which is not good.

Woods asked how deep the retention/detention pond would be.

Bowers said the dimensions would be 80 x 80 feet and the depth would be 7 feet deep at the lowest point.

Woods asked if the WCRWC had given them the dimensions.

Bowers said their engineers had calculated the volume and provided that to the WCWRC, which was then discussed by them together before their engineers designed the system.

Woods said she had a safety concern with a seven foot deep pond, and asked how the developer had attempted to mitigate for those safety concerns.

Bowers said they had left it fairly open so one can see in with a 6 foot high decorative fence with a locked gate for access. He reiterated that their system and plan was mandated to them by the WCWRC.

Woods asked if the fence would have barbed wire at the top.

Bowers said it would be a security fence that couldn't be climbed.

Woods said she had concern regarding the safety of the pond and children accessing the pond and she couldn't get past the issue to vote for the project.

Bowers said it's a vertical, security fence.

Giannola asked if the pond would have a grassy area.

Bowers said there will be water in the system because the purpose is to retain the water on site and not allow the water to move on, except if it gets absorbed by the vegetation, percolates or evaporates, which is a requirement of the system. He said the water levels will constantly go up and down depending with the weather.

Giannola asked if it will ever be empty.

Bowers said he is hoping it will perk, but believed it wouldn't be empty.

Clein asked if the open pond design was mandated by WCWRC.

Bowers said sort of, and that the last time they were before the City Planning Commission, the Commission had sent them back to the WCWRC, who then met and discussed the mitigation downstream with Ann Arbor City staff. He said they then walked through every detail on-site. He said originally they had proposed having everything underground, but what came forth was that they needed to be able to hold the water until it percolates and evaporates and for them to be able to hold every bit of water on site. He said the water from the existing site was ok but the water created by the development had to be stored in a pond and that was the system they wanted to be able to filtrate it. He said it was an expensive system, and not one that they chose to do, but they were directed.

Clein said that typically above ground systems are less expensive.

Bowers said they have to have both because they are held to a higher standard and had to eliminate two units in order to be able to do it.

Clein said it would be interested in seeing comments from WCWRC and he wasn't comfortable moving forward.

Susan Bowers said the WCWRC is requiring them to hold double. She said it was originally designed underground to hold a 1 percent storm but that wasn't enough because of all the water issue in the neighborhood. She said the WCWRC met with the City staff, in a closed meeting, where Bowers was not allowed to attend, and where they discussed what they wanted Bowers to do in order to address this issue, with the above ground system being the answer. She said they didn't change the size of the underground system but added more.

Clein said the Commission has heard a lot of concern from residents in the neighborhood and putting a pond in this neighborhood would be inconsistent with the fabric of the neighborhood. He said it is different from larger developments on South State Street, but a pond with a 6 foot fence around it will look out of place. He said he would like to get more information from staff from the WCWRC.

Westphal asked staff if they had more information they could provide on the discussion.

Rampson said the Commission could ask the WCWRC for written communication about their decision making process, adding that City staff had only received comment that they had reviewed the plan and it was acceptable to them.

Clein said the Commission is hearing a lot of concern about the open detention/retention ponds and he is empathetic to those and he was unclear as to how the decision was made in relation to the direction or suggestion from the WCWRC. He said how the decision was made makes a difference in how the Commission looks at the issue.

Westphal asked for confirmation on the clarification desired.

Clein asked for the standard that the County is holding the developer to and if they mandated an open system, or is that the choice of the petitioner's engineer. He said it the City/County asked them to do something and then turned them down, that isn't fair to the petitioner, but on the other hand if there was a misunderstanding and the petitioner thought it was a direction versus a suggestion then he felt the

Commission could request them to have it done differently.

Rampson asked if it would be more direct to ask WCWRC if an underground system would be acceptable to them.

Clein said yes.

Westphal added that another item to ask would be if the proposed project falls within County code and if the Commission was permitted to recommend denial of the application.

Rampson said the City's Stormwater code, Chapter 63, states that projects must meet the WCWRC's rules so it is a code requirement, and if the project meets code, they are obligated to approve it.

Clein noted that the City is ultimately responsible for the system, if it is something they mandated together with the WCWRC. He said his experience in working with the County is that they haven't mandated the design.

Woods said she agrees with Clein that it would be good to have that answer, and if it meets code along with their charge related to health and safety they will have to make their recommendation and send it on to City Council, but it caused her concern.

Bona said when she sees a fence around the pond it indicates to her that there is a requirement when there is a certain depth and slope to the pond. She asked if the fence was required because of that.

Bowers said yes.

Bona asked if they had more land area, would they make it shallower and then it wouldn't require a fence.

Bowers said true.

Bona said that would also be true if it were underground, given that it takes more land area to evaporate.

Bowers said true.

Bona pointed out the difference between what allowed in terms of units and building height and what was provided. She asked if they had looked at combining units to free up area on site.

Bowers said they looked at that but it wasn't desirable to the developer.

Bona said she didn't have a problem with more density on the site than proposed, because it is less dense than the surrounding area and land is scarce and precious in this community. She said if they were to stack units, there would be less impervious surface to accommodate. She said assuming the item gets postponed, she would like the developer to address why they can't make the units taller, noting that she appreciates the financial balance with the marketing balance.

Bowers said their first proposal was for 4 smaller buildings that were 2 story units, side by side, and that got blown out of the water because the neighbors didn't like that.

Bona said she understood the neighbors concern since they were proposing to construct on an old orchard.

Bowers said they went to ranch style, because of the feedback.

Bona said she wanted the developer to re-consider, realizing that there is no solution that everyone is going to like but it might be the best solution for this site.

Adenekan said she was a little scared of the retention pond with the fence around it because there are pets and children in the area. She asked if Glendale is a public road and if the developer would be willing to put a traffic light at Glendale and Jackson.

Gerald Spears, representing developer, said he believed it would be a consideration for safety issues and not out of the realm of consideration. He said this project has been a two-year effort since the project started and they have met with every individual at the County and the City. He said this project was going to be a much denser project and the engineers on this project have never developed an engineering project this extensive for such a small project. He said they have doubled their efforts to make this project a safe project. He said he has built many projects in this town and he takes pride in what they do. He said the units are only 1800 square feet and he felt they have come full circle. He said he believed they have met every requirement with the County and recommended that the Commission either deny or approve the project this evening.

Peters asked if it is theoretically possible to design a system completely underground that could meet the outflow requirements of the WCWRC.

Bowers said yes, but it takes more land mass, since it has to be able to hold the water and it could only perk.

Peters asked those could be placed under units.

Bowers said typically you don't want the systems under buildings for maintenance reasons and therefore are better when constructed in open areas.

Briere said the City has been using detention systems under streets and she asked if they could do an underground system under their streets.

Bowers said yes.

Giannola asked if the proposed pond locations are the only two areas where they can put the systems due to slopes.

Bowers said the locations are because of the grade changes and slopes.

Giannola asked if it could be where Briere suggested.

Bowers said it needs to be in that front corner or could be put under the entrance way.

Giannola said she didn't have as many concerns about retention ponds, adding that she thought they were ugly and she had some hesitation with the depth of the proposed pond. She didn't like the way it looked with a fence but understood the need. She said she really liked the way the buildings looked; ranch condos with garages, noting that Ann Arbor doesn't have many of them and it is a great design. She thought townhouses would also work for the site and if they moved them to the one side it would give them the whole south side for the detention pond. She said she liked the project and felt it fits in the neighborhood.

Parekh, asked how many parking spaces were provided in the plan from last year.

Bowers said they were all single stall; 24 spaces for 16 units.

Parekh asked if they would consider reducing parking spaces thereby reducing impervious surface.

Bowers said they would like some guest parking and they could look at a reduction.

Bona said with parking behind the garages and in drives it would give them added spaces.

Bowers said on one side of street, the drives were too short to allow

parking.

Bona said she was supportive of reducing on site parking, while accommodating the needs of the tenants.

Bona said a public comment was made about heavy metals in the stormwater ponds; she asked what would be in the water.

Bowers said everything from vegetation debris, sand, dirt, and petroleum products from cars in the street.

Bona asked how often sediment gets cleaned.

Bowers said typically every two years, but this one would be annually.

Bona asked about the dumpsters and how they are accommodating recyclables.

Susan Bowers said there are recycling and trash (300 gallon containers) in separate areas of the site. She showed the proposed location on the site plan.

Bona asked how many trees are being added.

Bowers said 104.

Bona asked what kind of trees would be added.

Susan Bowers listed the trees to be added.

Clein asked about the retaining wall along the sidewalk.

Bowers said 5 feet at the highest point and would be a dry stack.

Westphal said this type of detention system is unusual and he would be in favor of getting more information since the community has shared their concerns he wants to make sure they are able to get solutions to the concerns.

Moved by Woods, seconded by Councilmember Briere, to postpone taking action.

DISCUSSION ON POSTPONEMENT:

Woods said she moved to postpone, because she wants to make sure her decision is based on getting information from WCWRC.

Briere said when they hear back, she wants the Commission to have a clear understanding of the options that the developer has to chose from.

Thacher said staff can request this information.

Clein said he was in support of postponement, and said he has little doubt that the design meets the requirements. He said he was not sure it was the most appropriate solution for this location, given the depth of the pond and in thinking that the project was to fit into the neighborhood. He brought up concerns with there being no other entrances into the buildings except through driveways, reading Goal B and Goal D. He said he had no issue with the density and the general layout.

Bona said she felt if they moved the project forward, they would be passing the buck to City Council. While there might be technical adherence to the code, she preferred, through the postponement, to get the developer to take one more look at this. She empathized with the developer for having gone through all the changes almost to their own detriment. She said it seems that all the empty sites close to town are difficult.

Parekh said he too favored postponement since after hearing responses to the questions he didn't feel more confident that this is the best solution. He would also like to see fewer parking spaces that would reduce the amount of impervious surface and maybe make it less costly to create the stormwater system. He asked for more knowledge to help him make the decision on the project.

Westphal said he agreed, adding that occasionally they see a disconnect between language in Master plan and code. He said when that happens they try to go back and fix the code to make sure people's expectations are met. He said given this a detainment system they don't see in residential neighborhoods, he was supportive of postponement to allow them to gather more information from the Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner, in hopes that they were following their approval.

Peters said it was not necessarily that they were not following the recommendation or approval of the WCWRC, but rather that they are just interested in seeing what options were presented to the developer and in forwarding Goal D, he felt it was within their purview to ask question in hopes of getting the best options. He said with that thought he was also in favor of postponement.

Adenekan said she supported a postponement and asked if the postponement would be to a certain date.

Rampson said no.

Giannola said she felt it was important to be clear on the questions they had for the WCWRC. She said she felt the question should be if the proposed storm system is the only system that works for this site plan with this density.

Westphal said if this was acceptable for this site, then they should prepare themselves that it would be acceptable for other sites as well.

Clein said his original question was if the WCWRC mandated this system. He said a follow-up question should be whether an all underground system also could work. He said he didn't have various layout scenarios in mind to be included with the system questions.

Westphal said he didn't want to retread these same issues with other projects.

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried and the item postponed for further information.

COMMISSION BREAK

A motion was made by Giannola, seconded by Adenekan, to continue the meeting. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

10 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.)

10-a 14-1004 Delta Chi Fraternity Site Plan and Special Exception Use - A proposal to

demolish the existing fraternity chapter house on this 0.71 acre site located at 1705 Hill Street and construct a new 12,760 square foot, three-story chapter house. The occupancy is proposed to increase from 23 to 34 persons, which includes a resident manager. The existing driveway and parking lot will be relocated to the west side of the parcel, accessed from Hill Street. (Ward 2) Staff Recommendation: Approval
Thacher presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

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

Moved by Adenekan, seconded by Giannola, 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), and, therefore, approves the Delta Chi Special Exception Use for a fraternity use, subject to building occupancy of no more than 34 persons including the resident manager.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION ON THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE:

Woods asked about the petitioner's response to the City's request for parkland contribution. She noted the report contains a statement about why they feel the park contribution is not needed. She encouraged the petitioner to rethink this position.

John Levinson, president of Delta Chi, the landowner, said he believed that their students do not use City parks and recreation facilities.

Woods asked whether the students did not use Gallup Park or Argo Pond.

Levinson said this is his opinion, and he believes that most of the students' activities are intermural facilities sports.

Woods said it would be highly unusual for a resident or student not to make use of a City parks facility.

Levinson said the students do use the golf course. He said the reasoning expressed to them about the requested contribution did not seem to fit their situation.

Woods said the parks are a public good.

Levinson said he would consider coming back and paying a park contribution once he knows the costs of their project.

Bona noted that City golf courses are subsidized by the City, as are Argo Cascades and the Rock.

Levinson said that their project would not be adding residents.

Bona said they would be adding residents to their site. She agreed this is a very nice project.

Levinson said they are trying to fix problems, such as the lack of a sprinkler system.

Woods observed that now she really wants to see this house down and a new one up.

Briere said she appreciated the fraternity's efforts to retain the charm of the existing house. She said while the design would not be appropriate in a historic district, she appreciated the desire to retain some of the original tradition.

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

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

Moved by Briere, seconded by Clein, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Delta Chi Site Plan, subject to disconnecting the footing drains of one home, or flow equivalent, prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy to mitigate the sanitary sewer flow from this proposed development.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION ON THE SITE PLAN:

Clein asked if there is any open retention/detention pond on the site.

Alan Lutes, the petitioner's representative, said no, it is all underground.

Clein asked if there is a route accessible to the building from the parking.

Lutes said there will be a ramp from the parking lot with a lift to the first and second floors. He said the first floor unit is designed as an accessible unit.

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

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

Moved by Peters, seconded by Giannola, to continue the meeting. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

10-b **14-1005**

Gift of Life Rezoning and Addition Site Plan - The Gift of Life proposes to rezone two parcels from O (office) and RE (research) to ORL (office, research, and limited industrial) to accommodate an addition to their facility. The two lots will be combined into a single 6.54 acre site. The site plan proposes to construct a three-story, 40,786 square foot addition that will connect the two existing buildings. An additional 38 parking spaces are proposed at the rear of the site. Four curb cuts are proposed to be reduced to three. Additional storm water detention will be provided. (Ward 4) Staff Recommendation: Approval

Thacher presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Kirk Penney, Eckert Wordell Architects, representing the petitioner, was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Moved by Peters, seconded by Woods, that The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Gift of Life Rezoning from O (Office) and RE (Research) to ORL (Office/Research/Limited Industrial) and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Gift of Life Building Addition Site Plan and Development Agreement, subject to combination of the parcels prior to issuance of permits.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Woods thanked the petitioner for waiting so long during the long meeting and said she appreciates the work of Gift of Life. She asked staff if this petition is successful, and the current owners were to sell the site, the new zoning would remain in place.

Thacher said yes.

Peters said they don't usually see reduction in curb cuts, but he was glad to see the reduction, since they always want to promote pedestrian traffic.

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

Yeas: 9 - Bonnie Bona, Wendy Woods, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Paras Parekh, and Jeremy Peters

Nays: 0

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

12 COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

13 ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Peters, seconded by Parekh, that the meeting be adjourned at 11:40 p.m. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Kirk Westphal, Chair
mg

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).

The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at www.a2gov.org/ctn, or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.