

From: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 8:33 AM
To: Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>
Cc: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>
Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Darren,

You've made good points. I second your motion regarding the problem with "10% or additions up to 10,000 SF" with regard to multiple buildings on the site. I support the idea of combining building SF in order to set a limit for the site. If this was done, the 10,000 SF number could be lowered – that's a huge addition to a building. Probably the overall percentage limit could be lowered also, if all buildings on a site could be combined.

Best,

Theresa Angelini, AIA, NCARB, Partner
Angelini & Associates Architects
200 Huronview Blvd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48103
734-998-0735

From: Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2021 9:46 AM
To: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>; Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com) <tjc@midwesternconsulting.com>; Damian Farrell (DFDG) <dfarrell@damianfarrelldesigngroup.com>; 'kathy keinath' <kjkeinath@yahoo.com>; JB It <brad@jbradleymoore.com>; Dan Williams <dan@mavendevdevelopment.com>
Cc: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>
Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Brent et al-

Thanks for sharing. My comments are below, I also highlighted areas on the attached:

- What does "exempt" mean? Exempt from site plan review, exempt from even needing to create a site plan?
- Suggest making Level 1 the lowest (planning manager) and 3 the highest (council review), just more logical.
- Depending on the answer to bullet #1, the idea of "moving a building no more than 10 feet" could get someone in trouble in a residential setting if they don't know exactly where the property lines are. Generally agree with the idea especially in a new development situation where before construction starts or in the early stages, an existing underground obstruction or utility is discovered.
- Generally don't like the idea of placing hard caps on the area of addition. Looking at "building additions, less than 300SF". Depending on the project type residential versus commercial, 300 SF may or may not be a relevant number. Generally prefer a max % increase as it will naturally scale with the development. Understand the need to have some limit, 300 SF is very small.
- "Any other building addition of 10% of existing floor area, up to 10k SF", this gets to the issue that brought me onto this committee. How is the 10% calculated in a multi-building, multi-acre development such as an apartment community? If it is 10% of a single 2000 SF building, then

this amounts to 200 SF which is not helpful. If the 10% is based on all combined area of all buildings, then this is helpful. In order to get to a 10,000 SF addition you would need a 100,000 SF building. There are few buildings that large in the city. Suggest allowing the calculation on the combined total of building area on the parcel.

- Wireless Communication Towers, I would not recommend softening the requirements for Cell Tower at all. If anything they need to be more stringent. The demand for these is increasing and if anything I would look to create new aesthetic, landscape, road and sidewalk restoration mandates on these with strict timelines and large bonds for their ROW permits. The plague of 5G is already upon us. The state legislature during lame duck at the end of the Snyder administration granted these communication companies sweeping rights thinking it would help in rural areas. The cell & fiber companies need and want to be in Ann Arbor. There is only a finite amount of space in the ROW. There is a race on right now to gobble it all up. Maybe consider a whole other committee just to study these rules. Recommend zero accommodations to this industry.
- Landmark, invasive trees. I believe this is an oxymoron. If it is invasive, it cannot be landmark by definition. I am correct?
- Accessory building & structures section, agree with Theresa on the 240 SF limit. Also, repeat my concern about residential areas and knowing where the property line actually is.
- Outdoor patio or plaza of 1000 SF seems small, prefer a % of site area or existing building area to an arbitrary area limit. Is this issue related to stormwater detention and increasing impervious surface?

Looking forward to more discussion as a group.

Darren McKinnon, PE

First Martin

[115 Depot Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104](https://www.firstmartin.com)

O: [734.994.5050](tel:734.994.5050)

C: [734.904.5044](tel:734.904.5044)

E: dmckinnon@firstmartin.com

[FIRSTMARTIN.COM](https://www.firstmartin.com)

[FACEBOOK](#) | [TWITTER](#)

From: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2021 2:56 PM

To: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com)

<tjc@midwesternconsulting.com>; Damian Farrell (DFDG) <dfarrell@damianfarrelldesigngroup.com>;

'kathy keinath' <kjkeinath@yahoo.com>; Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>; JB It

<brad@jbradleymoore.com>; Dan Williams <dan@mavendevlopment.com>

Cc: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>

Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Hello Brett,

Thank you for sharing the proposed changes to the Ordinance. I'm replying to all as some may be interested in a dialogue of the review of this. The original attachment is included for convenience.

If this is adopted, this would be a significant positive improvement over what exists. I'm in favor of much of this, but do have some thoughts on the specifics.

A few questions on the details –

1. What does a Level 3-Planning Manager review entail? In addition to the Planning/Zoning Staff, does this also involve stormwater detention, traffic, natural features, fire marshal, and a full review by all those departments at the city who have been involved in a typical administrative review in the past? If these items are just being reviewed by Planning/Zoning, this would be an improvement. If these items are still being circulated through a full review by all departments under the wing of Planning, I don't see any improvement.
2. With regard to the 300 SF limit for additions, what is the thinking behind this particular SF number? Among other scenarios, I'm thinking of exterior enclosed stairways where someone wants more than a fire escape, though technically the vertical chase of a stair doesn't count as SF with the city. (roughly a 10' x 20' structure x 2 floors at least minus the stairs themselves?)
3. With regard to the 240 SF limit for an accessory storage building, is that based on roughly 12' wide x 20' long for a single car garage? (which is a little short from the 21'-10" interior length per Arch. Graphic Standards and a little narrow for a 9' door plus the structure required by code for the side short front walls at the doors) If it was an adequate single car garage, that would be a footprint of approx. 23' x 14' = 322 SF.
4. With regard to the up to 1000 SF outdoor patio or plaza requiring Planning Manager Review, I'm thinking of some outdoor patios for small office buildings that want to be able to meet their staff outside for a meeting (due to COVID or whatever). Something smaller than this, probably 200 SF at most would be enough for a gathering of maybe 10-12 people and it would be nice if that was "exempt". (thinking that a grading/impervious surface permit is not required on residential projects with additions less than 200 SF) This could also be useful for small cafes with minimal outdoor seating.

Thanks for considering these items and thanks for working to improve this process.

Theresa Angelini, AIA, NCARB, Partner
Angelini & Associates Architects
200 Huronview Blvd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48103
734-998-0735

From: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>

Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 3:29 PM

To: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com) <tjc@midwesternconsulting.com>; Damian Farrell (DFDG) <dfarrell@damianfarrelldesigngroup.com>; 'kathy keinath' <kjkeinath@yahoo.com>; Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>; JB It <brad@jbradleymoore.com>; Dan Williams <dan@mavendevdevelopment.com>

Cc: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>

Subject: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Hello-

I hope you're well, and wanted to share some progress on the City Planning Commission's evaluation of potential amendments to site plan review thresholds. The next consideration of these proposed changes will be at the Planning Commission's Ordinance Revision Committee (ORC) meeting of March 23rd. The meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m., and while not televised, is available for listening and/or audio public comments.

At this meeting we will be presenting an updated/reformatted version of the site plan review requirements, which is additionally attached here. If you have any thoughts that you would like to share via email, please do so, and/or if you are interested in providing feedback to the ORC, let me know that as well, and I can make such arrangements.

Sincerely,

Brett Lenart, AICP | Planning Manager

City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

blenart@a2gov.org | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265 | www.a2gov.org

Gale, Mia

From: Lenart, Brett
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 9:15 AM
To: Theresa Angelini; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com); Damian Farrell (DFDG); 'kathy keinath'; Darren McKinnon; JB It; Dan Williams
Cc: Kowalski, Matthew
Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Hello-

I'm adding a *few responses below*, let me know if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Brett Lenart, AICP | Planning Manager
City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

blenart@a2gov.org | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265 | www.a2gov.org

From: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2021 2:56 PM
To: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com) <tjc@midwesternconsulting.com>; Damian Farrell (DFDG) <dfarrell@damianfarrelldesigngroup.com>; 'kathy keinath' <kjkeinath@yahoo.com>; Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>; JB It <brad@jbradley Moore.com>; Dan Williams <dan@mavenddevelopment.com>
Cc: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>
Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Hello Brett,

Thank you for sharing the proposed changes to the Ordinance. I'm replying to all as some may be interested in a dialogue of the review of this. The original attachment is included for convenience.

If this is adopted, this would be a significant positive improvement over what exists. I'm in favor of much of this, but do have some thoughts on the specifics.

A few questions on the details –

1. What does a Level 3-Planning Manager review entail? In addition to the Planning/Zoning Staff, does this also involve stormwater detention, traffic, natural features, fire marshal, and a full review by all those departments at the city who have been involved in a typical administrative review in the past? If these items are just being reviewed by Planning/Zoning, this would be an improvement. If these items are still being circulated through a full review by all departments under the wing of Planning, I don't see any improvement.

This would still include review by all of the applicable City departments, and would be measuring the plans against the same standards that the Planning Commission or City Council review. It typically provides a quicker, lower cost outcome.

2. With regard to the 300 SF limit for additions, what is the thinking behind this particular SF number? Among other scenarios, I'm thinking of exterior enclosed stairways where someone wants more than a fire escape, though technically the vertical chase of a stair doesn't count as SF with the city. (roughly a 10' x 20' structure x 2 floors at least minus the stairs themselves?)

This is based on a few recent applications that didn't have any impacts to change in use or site arrangement/function.

3. With regard to the 240 SF limit for an accessory storage building, is that based on roughly 12' wide x 20' long for a single car garage? (which is a little short from the 21'-10" interior length per Arch. Graphic Standards and a little narrow for a 9' door plus the structure required by code for the side short front walls at the doors) If it was an adequate single car garage, that would be a footprint of approx. 23' x 14' = 322 SF.

Yes, however the majority of new accessory garages we see in the City are component to single family homes, which remain exempt from site plan review.

4. With regard to the up to 1000 SF outdoor patio or plaza requiring Planning Manager Review, I'm thinking of some outdoor patios for small office buildings that want to be able to meet their staff outside for a meeting (due to COVID or whatever). Something smaller than this, probably 200 SF at most would be enough for a gathering of maybe 10-12 people and it would be nice if that was "exempt". (thinking that a grading/impervious surface permit is not required on residential projects with additions less than 200 SF) This could also be useful for small cafes with minimal outdoor seating.

Currently if under 240 square feet, they are exempt as accessory structures, but your question points out that this needs to be clarified so it is better communicated.

Thanks for considering these items and thanks for working to improve this process.

Theresa Angelini, AIA, NCARB, Partner
Angelini & Associates Architects
200 Huronview Blvd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48103
734-998-0735

From: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 3:29 PM
To: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com) <tjc@midwesternconsulting.com>; Damian Farrell (DFDG) <dfarrell@damianfarrelldesigngroup.com>; 'kathy keinath' <kjkeinath@yahoo.com>; Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>; JB It <brad@jbradley Moore.com>; Dan Williams <dan@mavendevlopment.com>
Cc: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>
Subject: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Hello-

I hope you're well, and wanted to share some progress on the City Planning Commission's evaluation of potential amendments to site plan review thresholds. The next consideration of these proposed changes will be at the Planning

Commission's Ordinance Revision Committee (ORC) meeting of March 23rd. The meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m., and while not televised, is available for listening and/or audio public comments.

At this meeting we will be presenting an updated/reformatted version of the site plan review requirements, which is additionally attached here. If you have any thoughts that you would like to share via email, please do so, and/or if you are interested in providing feedback to the ORC, let me know that as well, and I can make such arrangements.

Sincerely,

Brett Lenart, AICP | Planning Manager

City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

blenart@a2gov.org | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265 | www.a2gov.org

Gale, Mia

From: Lenart, Brett
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 9:05 AM
To: Dan Williams
Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

They have not evaluated this yet, I anticipate this type of review will be part of the next portion of this work.

Brett Lenart, AICP | Planning Manager

City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

blenart@a2gov.org | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265 | www.a2gov.org

From: Dan Williams <dan@mavenddevelopment.com>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 4:16 PM
To: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>
Subject: Re: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Bret,

Thanks for the info.

I may have overlooked but are they doing anything to change conflicting land use buffer? As we mentioned if you built a new multi unit (6 max) residential project next to a residential property it should be not any different than if you built a large duplex next to a residential property. In building a large duplex not conflicting buffer is required.

Thank you,

Dan Williams
Principal
Chief Development Officer
544 Detroit St. #1
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
office: 734-369-4266
Cell: 734-945-3603
Fax: 734-527-6048
dan@mavenddevelopment.com
www.mavenddevelopment.com

On Mar 19, 2021, at 3:29 PM, Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org> wrote:

<DRAFT Amended Site Plan Review Thresholds ORC 3-23-21.pdf>

Gale, Mia

From: Lenart, Brett
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2021 9:32 AM
To: Darren McKinnon; Theresa Angelini; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com); Damian Farrell (DFDG); 'kathy keinath'; JB It; Dan Williams
Cc: Kowalski, Matthew
Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Hello-

Similarly to previous email, sharing *responses* below.

Sincerely,

Brett Lenart, AICP | Planning Manager
City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

blenart@a2gov.org | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265 | www.a2gov.org

From: Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2021 9:46 AM
To: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>; Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com) <tjc@midwesternconsulting.com>; Damian Farrell (DFDG) <dfarrell@damianfarrelldesigngroup.com>; 'kathy keinath' <kjkeinath@yahoo.com>; JB It <brad@jbradley Moore.com>; Dan Williams <dan@mavendevlopment.com>
Cc: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>
Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

This message was sent from outside of the City of Ann Arbor. Please do not click links, open attachments, or follow directions unless you recognize the source of this email and know the content is safe.

Brent et al-

Thanks for sharing. My comments are below, I also highlighted areas on the attached:

- What does “exempt” mean? Exempt from site plan review, exempt from even needing to create a site plan?

Both, it means work is done by building permit only.

- Suggest making Level 1 the lowest (planning manager) and 3 the highest (council review), just more logical.

That’s where we started, but switched order as it seems more likely that future amendments (level 4?) would happen on the lower end of the scale, vs. something higher than City Council, so for consistency thought this approach made sense.

- Depending on the answer to bullet #1, the idea of “moving a building no more than 10 feet” could get someone in trouble in a residential setting if they don’t know exactly where the property lines are. Generally agree with

the idea especially in a new development situation where before construction starts or in the early stages, an existing underground obstruction or utility is discovered.

As proposed, many smaller residential developments would be exempt from site plan altogether.

- Generally don't like the idea of placing hard caps on the area of addition. Looking at "building additions, less than 300SF". Depending on the project type residential versus commercial, 300 SF may or may not be a relevant number. Generally prefer a max % increase as it will naturally scale with the development. Understand the need to have some limit, 300 SF is very small.

Will share this feedback with the Commission.

- "Any other building addition of 10% of existing floor area, up to 10k SF", this gets to the issue that brought me onto this committee. How is the 10% calculated in a multi-building, multi-acre development such as an apartment community? If it is 10% of a single 2000 SF building, then this amounts to 200 SF which is not helpful. If the 10% is based on all combined area of all buildings, then this is helpful. In order to get to a 10,000 SF addition you would need a 100,000 SF building. There are few buildings that large in the city. Suggest allowing the calculation on the combined total of building area on the parcel.

Will share this feedback with the Commission.

- Wireless Communication Towers, I would not recommend softening the requirements for Cell Tower at all. If anything they need to be more stringent. The demand for these is increasing and if anything I would look to create new aesthetic, landscape, road and sidewalk restoration mandates on these with strict timelines and large bonds for the their ROW permits. The plague of 5G is already upon us. The state legislature during lame duck at the end of the Snyder administration granted these communication companies sweeping rights thinking it would help in rural areas. The cell & fiber companies need and want to be in Ann Arbor. There is only a finite amount of space in the ROW. There is a race on right now to gobble it all up. Maybe consider a whole other committee just to study these rules. Recommend zero accommodations to this industry.

Will share this feedback with the Commission.

- Landmark, invasive trees. I believe this is an oxymoron. If it is invasive, it cannot be landmark by definition. I am correct?

The intention was an accommodation of previously protected large trees, which were later listed as invasives. This occurrences probably is less and less likely to apply with time.

- Accessory building & structures section, agree with Theresa on the 240 SF limit. Also, repeat my concern about residential areas and knowing where the property line actually is.

Property lines in residential areas can be challenging, but for smaller residential uses, such work is exempt from site plan review.

- Outdoor patio or plaza of 1000 SF seems small, prefer a % of site area or existing building area to an arbitrary area limit. Is this issue related to stormwater detention and increasing impervious surface?

Will share the feedback with the Commission. The limit was intended to identify a limit that would be appropriate for outdoor seating areas, but not so large that it would drastically change site layout.

Looking forward to more discussion as a group.

Darren McKinnon, PE

First Martin

[115 Depot Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48104](#)

O: [734.994.5050](tel:734.994.5050)

C: [734.904.5044](tel:734.904.5044)

E: dmckinnon@firstmartin.com

FIRSTMARTIN.COM

[FACEBOOK](#) | [TWITTER](#)

From: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 20, 2021 2:56 PM

To: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com)

<tjc@midwesternconsulting.com>; Damian Farrell (DFDG) <dfarrell@damianfarrelldesigngroup.com>; 'kathy keinath'

<kjkeinath@yahoo.com>; Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>; JB It <brad@jbradleymoore.com>; Dan

Williams <dan@mavendevdevelopment.com>

Cc: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>

Subject: RE: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Hello Brett,

Thank you for sharing the proposed changes to the Ordinance. I'm replying to all as some may be interested in a dialogue of the review of this. The original attachment is included for convenience.

If this is adopted, this would be a significant positive improvement over what exists. I'm in favor of much of this, but do have some thoughts on the specifics.

A few questions on the details –

1. What does a Level 3-Planning Manager review entail? In addition to the Planning/Zoning Staff, does this also involve stormwater detention, traffic, natural features, fire marshal, and a full review by all those departments at the city who have been involved in a typical administrative review in the past? If these items are just being reviewed by Planning/Zoning, this would be an improvement. If these items are still being circulated through a full review by all departments under the wing of Planning, I don't see any improvement.
2. With regard to the 300 SF limit for additions, what is the thinking behind this particular SF number? Among other scenarios, I'm thinking of exterior enclosed stairways where someone wants more than a fire escape, though technically the vertical chase of a stair doesn't count as SF with the city. (roughly a 10' x 20' structure x 2 floors at least minus the stairs themselves?)
3. With regard to the 240 SF limit for an accessory storage building, is that based on roughly 12' wide x 20' long for a single car garage? (which is a little short from the 21'-10" interior length per Arch. Graphic Standards and a little narrow for a 9' door plus the structure required by code for the side short front walls at the doors) If it was an adequate single car garage, that would be a footprint of approx. 23' x 14' = 322 SF.
4. With regard to the up to 1000 SF outdoor patio or plaza requiring Planning Manager Review, I'm thinking of some outdoor patios for small office buildings that want to be able to meet their staff outside for a meeting (due to COVID or whatever). Something smaller than this, probably 200 SF at most would be enough for a gathering of maybe 10-12 people and it would be nice if that was "exempt". (thinking that a grading/impervious surface permit is not required on residential projects with additions less than 200 SF) This could also be useful for small cafes with minimal outdoor seating.

Thanks for considering these items and thanks for working to improve this process.

Theresa Angelini, AIA, NCARB, Partner
Angelini & Associates Architects
200 Huronview Blvd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48103
734-998-0735

From: Lenart, Brett <BLenart@a2gov.org>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 3:29 PM
To: Theresa Angelini <tangelini@angeliniarchitects.com>; Tom Covert (tjc@midwesternconsulting.com) <tjc@midwesternconsulting.com>; Damian Farrell (DFDG) <dfarrell@damianfarrelldesigngroup.com>; 'kathy keinath' <kjkeinath@yahoo.com>; Darren McKinnon <dmckinnon@firstmartin.com>; JB It <brad@jbradleymoore.com>; Dan Williams <dan@mavendevlopment.com>
Cc: Kowalski, Matthew <MKowalski@a2gov.org>
Subject: City of Ann Arbor Site Plan Standards

Hello-

I hope you're well, and wanted to share some progress on the City Planning Commission's evaluation of potential amendments to site plan review thresholds. The next consideration of these proposed changes will be at the Planning Commission's Ordinance Revision Committee (ORC) meeting of March 23rd. The meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m., and while not televised, is available for listening and/or audio public comments.

At this meeting we will be presenting an updated/reformatted version of the site plan review requirements, which is additionally attached here. If you have any thoughts that you would like to share via email, please do so, and/or if you are interested in providing feedback to the ORC, let me know that as well, and I can make such arrangements.

Sincerely,

Brett Lenart, AICP | Planning Manager
City of Ann Arbor Planning Services
301 E. Huron Street, P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

blenart@a2gov.org | Direct (734) 794-6000 #42606 | General (734) 794-6265 | www.a2gov.org