



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Sumedh Bahl, Community Services Area Administrator
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Wendy Rampson, Planning Manager
Colin Smith, Parks and Recreation Services Manager

CC: Steven D. Powers, City Administrator

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: 11/17/14

C-3 – An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning), Section 5:10.20.A Downtown Character Overlay Zoning Districts Building Massing Standards

Question: Has planning commission reviewed these proposed changes? If so, are there minutes available? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The Planning Commission has not formally acted on the Ordinance Revisions Committee's (ORC) recommendations. The ORC reported this information to the Commission instead of scheduling a formal discussion in order to get the recommendation back to Council before the end of the year. There are no minutes taken at ORC meetings.

Question: Are there planning staff comments available beyond the cover text? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The only additional information is that the ORC felt the 120 foot height limit is appropriate for the Main/William corner because it is similar to the 122-foot height of the Ashley Mews building across the street. If Council members have additional questions about the ORC discussion, the Planning Manager will be available at tonight's meeting to answer questions.

Question: In either case, does the 6-3 planning commission vote referenced in the title refer to the original proposed amendment or the current proposed amendment? (Councilmember Warpehoski)

Response: The 6-3 Planning Commission recommendation in the title refers to the original proposed amendment.

Please note that Planning staff received the following communication today from the property owner of 425 S. Main:

“I respectfully request that we postpone our matter on tonight's City Council Meeting until the next available meeting. Scott Bonney of Neumann Smith Architects is on vacation this week with his family. Having Scott at the meeting is important to articulate the architectural considerations as well as produce the required renderings which have been so productive in representing and explaining the zoning issues. Having been working with the City for many, many months, I would greatly appreciate this postponement so that we may be available with the necessary materials to articulate our concerns as the property owner of this very important parcel. Thank you very much, Andy Klein”

If Council wishes to postpone first reading, staff requests it be scheduled for the December 15th meeting to provide adequate time for these materials to be generated and distributed.

Question: Both this action on the specific massing standards and the re-zoning to D2 for the 425 S. Main property passed first reading previously. I'm assuming the re-zoning of 425 S. Main will come back for second reading at the same time this does and there would be public hearings on both – is that correct? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Correct. If passed at first reading, the second reading and a public hearing for the revised Main Street Character overlay zoning district amendment as well as the second reading and public hearing for the rezoning of 425 South Main Street will both be held on the same date.

Question: Has the full Planning Commission reviewed/endorsed the Ordinance Committee recommendation and, if not, is that planned? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The full Planning Commission has not reviewed/endorsed the ORC recommendation, however, the ORC reported their latest recommendation to the Commission instead of scheduling a formal discussion in order to get the recommendation back to Council before the end of the year.

Question: Also on C-3, do you have drawings/renderings of what the building would look like with this part 120 foot/part 60 foot height limit and, if so, could you please share them? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The property owner of 425 S. Main provided massing scenarios for the ORC of what a 100-foot tower would look like on the northern 150 feet and a 60-foot height limit on the rest, but none are yet available for the currently proposed 120-foot tower height limit. Please also note the previous response regarding the property owner's request to postpone action.

Question: Also, have there been any reviews with, or opportunities for input from, the adjacent neighborhood residents on this new proposal? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Ordinance Revisions Committee meetings are open to the public and the ORC dates, times and locations are advertised on the Planning website and on the Legislative Information Center. No adjacent neighborhood residents attended the three ORC meetings on this topic, but several downtown and near-downtown residents did, and had opportunities to share their comments at each ORC meeting.

DS-1 - Resolution to Approve Fuller Park Parking Lot Land Lease with the University of Michigan (8 Votes Required)

Question: Item DS-1 on Monday's agenda is a resolution to approve a lease between the University of Michigan and City of Ann Arbor to allow the University to use parkland for employee parking during certain hours of the day. Exhibit A to the lease includes terms governing the parties' responsibilities for providing maintenance for those parking lots:

I. Maintenance

Lot A; South Parking Lot – University, at its own expense, shall provide all winter maintenance for snow and ice removal concerning the parking lot. City will pay for all other maintenance of the parking lot including, without limitation, asphalt repair and replacement and lighting costs.

Lots B & C; North Pool Parking Lots (Paved and Unpaved Lots) – City, at its own expense, shall provide all winter maintenance for snow and ice removal concerning the parking lots. City will pay for all other maintenance of the parking lots including, without limitation, asphalt repair and replacement and lighting costs. City will periodically inspect the unpaved lot for pedestrian hazards due to drainage issues and provide mitigation when possible. University will provide, if needed, and with prior approval by City, temporary lighting in the dirt portion of the parking lot. Temporary lighting shall not be provided earlier than 5:00 am and later than 6:00 pm Monday through Friday.

Please provide me with information regarding the City's maintenance costs. (1) How much does the City spend each year to maintain these parking lots? (2) What is the source of those funds? For example, does the maintenance funding come from general funds or the parks budget?

Separate from the funding of parking lot maintenance, I would like to know about the application of our standards for landscaping and screening for parking lots. Is there a

reason why the City does not comply with the Chapter 62 Landscaping and Screening requirements for parking lots with regard to the Fuller Road lots? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Winter maintenance at the North Parking lot generally costs about \$3,000 per season. This expense is a Parks general fund expense from the Fuller expense operating budget.

Asphalt repair and lighting maintenance repairs vary annually but are in the region of \$5,000. These expenses can be funded by either Parks general fund or Parks millage.

The South parking lot site plan was reviewed by City staff, approved as substantially meeting private development standards by the City Planning Commission, and shared with City Council in 1994 when the South parking lot was built. The intent was to meet interior landscaping requirements by providing tree islands, along with meeting right of way tree requirements between Fuller Road and the parking lots and through berms presently in place.

DS-5 – Resolution to Approve a Professional Services Agreement with Tetra Tech of Michigan, PC for Water Treatment Plant Manchester Tank Coating Project Test (\$127,780.00)

Question: Can you please clarify exactly what the term “authorizes” means in the 2nd resolved clause (Council authorizes the inclusion of public art into this project.) Also, can you please provide the following information:

- Type of art project envisioned
- Estimated total public art cost
- Estimated total project cost with and without public art component
- Funding source for the public art component
- Review and approval process of the public art
- Timeline for project with and without public art component
- How much was spent for the artwork for the water tower on Plymouth Road? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response:

The purpose of the resolution besides approving the consulting contract to undertake the recoating of the Manchester water tank is to seek City Council’s approval of the concept of including public art in the recoating. It is envisioned the process followed would be similar to that used for the Plymouth Road tower painting.

- Type of art project envisioned - The project would result in a water tower coating incorporating some form of painted art.
- Estimated total public art cost - \$30,000 – 60,000
- Estimated total project cost with and without public art component – Cost to recoat is currently estimated to be \$500,000 – 600,000 without art
- Funding source for the public art component – Fund 0042, Water Supply

- Review and approval process of the public art – Overseen by the Public Arts Commission
- Timeline for project with and without public art component - Project is currently planned for Summer/Autumn of 2015 with or without the art component
- How much was spent for the artwork for the water tower on Plymouth Road? The coating on the Plymouth Rd tower was undertaken in 2003 and the art portion of the project cost \$25,000.