



City of Ann Arbor

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

Meeting Minutes City Planning Commission

Tuesday, December 6, 2011

7:00 PM

City Hall, 301 E. Huron Street, 2nd Floor

9-b 11-1491

Technical Amendments to Chapter 59 (Off-Street Parking) - Amendments are proposed to 1) revise the exceptions for the front open space parking limitation applied to sites with more than one front lot line; 2) add standards for driveways that serve drive-through windows; and 3) replace the option of providing a contribution in lieu of parking with the option of executing a contract for parking permits in the City public parking system for sites with the special parking district. Staff Recommendation: Approval

Kahan presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

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

Moved by Woods, seconded by Westphal, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the proposed technical amendments to Chapter 59 (Off-Street Parking) Sections 5:168 and 5:169 regarding front open space parking, driveways serving drive-up windows and special parking district options.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Giannola asked for examples of a site with more than three sides.

Kahan gave examples such as Plymouth Road Mall and Traver Village.

Briggs had concerns about the changes to the Special Parking District section that would require a developer to purchase parking permits for 15 years, since she felt it took away incentives for them to look for alternative options during that time.

Rampson explained the background and intent of the amendments, noting that they were as a result of discussions of the A2D2 Committee.

Bona said she has always been in support of payment in lieu of parking, not bundled to permits. She said that the DDA needs to ensure that the system is full. She would like to see contribution option stay in the ordinance, and have the contract parking option taken out but understands that there are various situations in the City that require the need for alternative options to be made available.

Woods asked for clarification on what the City Planning Commission was being asked to do with the item before them.

Rampson explained that the Commission is being asked to make technical language amendments to Chapter 59. She said that Bona's option of keeping a contribution option included is also a possibility for inclusion in the drafting of the language of the ordinance.

Moved by Westphal, seconded by Bona, that Section 5:169(3) be revised to

retain the option of a payment of a contribution in lieu of required parking, with the section now reading "The required bicycle or motor vehicle parking shall be provided on-site, off-site as described in this Chapter, through the execution of a contract for parking permits within the City's public parking system or by payment of a contribution in lieu of required parking consistent with the requirements adopted by City Council, or any combination thereof."

Derezinski asked staff how these alternatives work in practice and if they tend to push towards one direction.

Kahan said it depends on the project and the size of the project and what they can offer in terms of parking.

Derezinski asked staff if their experience showed that allowing flexibility was a good thing.

Kahan said it would make more sense.

Westphal asked if staff had discussed limiting parking on the side where there was more pedestrian traffic.

Kahan said that staff discussed implications of identifying the busiest street. He said that every site is unique and applying this may limit flexibility in design. He said it is also difficult to pick ways to measure such things as daily trips, traffic volumes and width of right-of-ways. He said it would become challenging with implementation as well.

Rampson said that it seemed logistically challenging and could become counterintuitive.

Westphal asked about drive-thrus, and what would be considered 'clearly identifies' for the pedestrian crossing, as written in the language.

Kahan said the City wanted to provide design flexibility, recognizing that there may be different ways to identify sidewalks, such as different building material, like brick or block, instead of asphalt or concrete, and a raised sidewalk or striped pavement.

Bona noted that the staff reports mentions 'raised' sidewalks but wasn't included in the draft copy of the amendments.

Mahler suggested inserting the word 'raised' between the words wide and sidewalk on pg 2, Section 5:168 Design of Off-Street Motor Vehicle Parking Facilities, (3), (e) (2) to read, "A minimum 5 foot wide raised sidewalk shall be provided across the driveway connecting the public right-of-way to the main entrance of the building. The portion of the sidewalk that crosses the driveway shall be designed in a manner that clearly identifies the pedestrian crossing."

Kahan said that the draft will be corrected to include this.

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

Yeas: 8 - Bonnie Bona, Eric A. Mahler, Wendy Woods, Tony Derezinski, Erica Briggs, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, and Eleanore Adenekan

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Evan Pratt

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

Yeas: 8 - Bonnie Bona, Eric A. Mahler, Wendy Woods, Tony Derezinski, Erica Briggs, Kirk Westphal, Diane Giannola, and Eleanore Adenekan

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Evan Pratt