

## **JANUARY 6, 2009 PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

(c) Public Hearing and Action on Wintermeyer Office Development Phase II Planned Project Site Plan, 1.87 acres, 2144 and 2178 South State Street. A proposal to demolish two existing residential structures and to construct a 10,370-square foot, two-story office building to the east of the existing 17,288-square foot office building – Staff Recommendation: Approval

DiLeo explained the proposal and showed photographs of the property.

David Diephuis, 209 South State, said that he and his wife support the development. He said that Wintermeyer had been a good neighbor, that he found the current building attractive, and that he expected that the new building would be the same. He noted that the new water retention would be underground, which he liked. He said they viewed the proposed project as a suitable and worthy State Street development.

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

**Moved by Derezinski, seconded by Carlberg, that the City of Ann Arbor Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Wintermeyer Office Building Phase 2 Planned Project Site Plan, subject to combination of parcels and payment of street escrow of \$306.80 prior to issuance of any permit.**

Carlberg said that looking at the site plan, she saw a 15-foot setback, but that it looked like the building sat several feet beyond that. She also said she saw no sidewalk in the site plan, and asked if there were an existing one

DiLeo said that there was an existing sidewalk along State. She said the building had a significant overhang, and that the 15-foot measurement was from the edge of the roof overhang. She said it was a 21.2-foot setback to the indented portion of the building.

Carlberg also asked if the petitioner could speak about the storm water retention system.

Tracy Wintermeyer, petitioner, thanked the staff for all their help. He said that the Phase II storm water retention system would be under the parking lot, and flow to the existing pond before eventually entering the storm sewer under State Street.

Derezinski said it was nice to hear neighbors come out in favor of a project. He said he recalled the two residential buildings as being unoccupied.

Wintermeyer said that there were tenants on month-to-month leases. He also said that because he was a fan of recycling, as much of the interior furnishings and appliances would be removed and reused. He said that the building to the south was not worth much, but that much of the barn shaped house would be reused.

Potts commented that there was a large retention pond on large site. She asked whether adding impervious surface raised any concerns over pond infiltration. She said that there was a problem with the capacity of old storm water pipes.

Wintermeyer said that the underground system would have impervious surface, as did the bottom of the pond. He said that rarely did the pond swell enough to reach the drainpipe to the storm water system.

Mahler asked to have planned project language explained. Specifically, he asked what the term 'traffic shall not be hazardous to neighbors' meant. He said that conceptually he

DiLeo said that in her opinion, it meant a life-threatening situation. With regard to a left turn on to State Street, she said the hazard would be more to the site, as cars would back up in the lot, but that would not be a hazard to neighbors.

Mahler asked the petitioner whether doubling size of the buildings and parking on site could create the potential for conflicts on State Street.

Wintermeyer said the only traffic issues he had seen on his site were on football Saturdays.

Pratt said that in the past, there had been concerns about rezoning on State and talk of having a study done. He said he had missed the beginning of the CIP presentation, but that he had specifically asked staff if the discussed study from Eisenhower to Stimson was in the CIP, and staff confirmed that it was. He said that typically office buildings of this size do not result in a noticeable impact on traffic, and that he was not concerned. He said that he was glad that the State Street study had made it into the CIP. He also said that at the next meeting, he would provide Commissioners with a handy traffic impact calculation chart to help gauge a project's potential daily or hourly impact on traffic.

Westphal asked if staff could provide a 30 second summary of the development's impact to trees.

DiLeo said that existing trees would be removed, but that no landmark trees were among those. She said the only landmark sized tree to be removed, to make way for a water main and hydrant, was not a landmark variety (Norway Maple).

Westphal asked whether the tree escrow fund would be used to plant trees on the strip near the road.

DiLeo said yes, and if the trees were unable to fit in the strip, that the escrow would be refunded.

Westphal asked whether there was an east entrance on the proposed building.

DiLeo said yes, and that there would be south facing windows on State Street that wrapped around from the east. She also said the building would have an east and west entrance.

Westphal asked whether the door to the east would be useful or just a service door.

Wintermeyer said it would depend on the tenant's use.

Bona thanked petitioner for going through planned project process after getting caught in middle of ordinance change. She said the proposal was an improvement to area and, and an improvement to what the original ordinance had required. She said that the building's office use designation was the reason she wasn't worried about traffic. She said she was very comfortable with the amount of increased traffic that would result from the project.

Pratt said that it was a nice looking project and that it was nice to hear positive comments from neighbors. He said he was comfortable with planned project primarily because it met ordinance goal, even though Council had yet to act on the revisions. He said he appreciate the storm water retention system and agreed with Commissioner Potts.

Bona asked Commissioner Potts if she was comfortable with the planned project standards as stated by staff.

Potts said she was, and that requirement for a public benefit was low for this project, because the changes were small and because the proposed changes to the ordinance would mirror this project.

Woods asked the petitioner what kind of tenants the building would house.

Wintermeyer said that several tenants had expressed interest, and that the prospective tenants were similar to current tenants, that is to say, professional services.

A vote on the motion showed

YEAS:	Bona, Borum, Carlberg, Derezinski, Mahler, Potts, Pratt, Westphal, Woods
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None

**Motion carried.**

