

City of Ann Arbor

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES-PLANNING DIVISION 301 East Huron Street 1 P.O.Box 8647 1 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107-8647 p.734.794.6265 f. 734.994.8312 planning@a2gov.org

Ann Arbor Design Review Board Application

Section 1: General I		
Project Name:	Elroy's Place	
Project Location and/or Address:	321 North Main Ann Arbor, MI 48104	
Base Zoning District, Character Overlay District, and Building Frontage Designation:	Zoning District = D2 Character Overlay District = Kerrytown Building Frontage Designation = Main Street	
Type of Site Plan Petition (check):	 O Site Plan for City Council approval O Site Plan for Planning Commission approval O PUD Site Plan O Planned Project Site Plan O Administrative Amendment with facade change 	
Developer:	Atlantes, LLC 440 South Main Ann Arbor, MI 48104	
Property Owner:	Moving on Main, LLC	
Property Owner's Signature:	Peter Woolf, Moving on Main LLC	
Developer's interest in property if not owner:	Purchase and Development	

	Robert Darvas Associates InSite Design Washtenaw Engineer Clark Trombley Randers A3C Christman Constructors
Contact Person (name, phone number and email of one person):	Erik Majcher, S.E., P.E. Atlantes, LLC 440 South Main Street Ann Arbor, MI 48104 734-761-8713 emajcher@robertdarvas.com

Section 2: Project Details		
Project Specifics:	Site size (sq. ft.): 8,225 Square Feet	
	Total floor area (sq.ft.): Approximately 32,893 Square Feet	
	Number of stories: <u>6</u>	
	Building Height (ft.):64'-0" To Parapet – 66'-8" to Elevator	
	Ground floor uses: Retail / Spa	
	Upper floor uses: Business, Exercise, Residential	
	Number dwelling units: Eighteen (18)	
	Number off-street parking spaces: 16 automobile	
	Open space (sq. ft.): 2,443 Square Feet (29.7%)	

Below are the comments from the previous submission to the Design Review Board, along with responses.

1. Make the street façade more symmetrical. Reducing the south bay by one story would help the symmetry.

The main street façade was redesigned based on many of the comments from the design review board. The retail entry was made more prominent, and the street elevations were reduced to correlate with zoning and relate to the size of the adjacent parcels.

2. Consider planters at the top of the trellises with plants growing down, to balance the vines growing up.

The renderings show the vertical landscaping that is intended around the office/residential entry. The intent is to incorporate additional vertical landscaping on other surfaces with the exception of the retail entrance. Based on my conversation with the Landscape Architect, the best solution for landscaping at the main street balconies is sweet potato vine, and the intent is to provide planters at those balconies as well.

Due to time constraints, all of the vegetation could not be rendered.

3. Refine the street façade to have more of a pedestrian or human scale. The 15-foot opening on the north bay is more than twice the height of an average person. Specific suggestions include a grander entry and matching the large openings from the north and south sides.

The street façade was refined to create a more prominent entry for the retail area. The prominent entry for the office and residential entry is still intended, but the entry will be obscured and softened with the steel trellis and vertical landscaping.

4. Minimize (relocate or eliminate if possible) the ventilation opening in the front of the building.

The intent is still to use passive systems whenever possible, however the ventilation opening has been reduced in size along main street.

5. Bear in mind that this development will set the pattern for the future redevelopment of the block. This development should both consider the precedent Elroy's Place will establish (deciding whether this is a good or bad thing), and how redevelopment of the adjacent lots with a similar scale building would impact Elroy's Place.

This point was considered for some time and my opinion is that the city needs more density, and a mixture of uses that activate the sidewalk is important. A soft transition from downtown to the smaller residential buildings is appropriate; i.e. taller, larger buildings closer to the D1 area, smaller buildings further away. The building along this stretch of main street should be set back a bit further from the street than the typical urban environment to allow pedestrian congregation on the sidewalk and "breathing room" between buildings is appropriate. The changes to the design attempt to balance that, and the direction that was taken in response was to lower the main street wall and align the building with the adjacent structures. MDOT has a significant right of way from the sidewalk, so once this is taken into account the building is still set back from the sidewalk approximately 14'-3". In addition the north and south facades of the building are setback approximately 3'-8 " and 3'-4", respectively, however no setback is required.

6. Re-evaluate whether the proposed design reinforces the positive characteristics from adjacent sites, and whether this site is more appropriate as a midblock development rather than a prominent corner focal point.

It is difficult to define specific positive characteristics from the immediate adjacent sites. The buildings represent a very eclectic mix of designs, sizes, and scales; the characteristics of one are often the opposite of its neighbor. The characteristics that I see looking at the sites as a whole include that eclectic nature, and that the buildings are typically set back from the street more than in the D1 zone and there is more landscaping and greenery, providing a transition in and out of the city.

7. Give careful attention to how the trellises may look in the first years of the development and in winters when there are no plantings or leaves on the majority of those structures.

The trellises were reduced in scale and set into the outline of the building.

8. Include a site plan with the revised design plan.

A site plan has been included.

Please see attached sheets for additional information.