



City of Ann Arbor

Formal Minutes

Planning Commission, City

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
[http://a2gov.legistar.com/
Calendar.aspx](http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx)

Tuesday, December 16, 2014

7:00 PM Washtenaw County Building, 220 N. Main St., board room

Commission public meetings are held the first and third Tuesday of each month. Both of these meetings provide opportunities for the public to address the Commission. Persons with disabilities are encouraged to participate in public meetings. Citizens requiring translation or sign language services or other reasonable accommodations may contact the City Clerk's office at 734.794.6140; via e-mail to: cityclerk@a2gov.org; or by written request addressed and mailed or delivered to: City Clerk's Office, 301 E. Huron St., Ann Arbor, MI 48104. Requests need to be received at least two (2) business days in advance of the meeting. Planning Commission meeting agendas and packets are available from the Legislative Information Center on the City Clerk's page of the City's website (<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>) or on the 1st floor of City Hall on the Friday before the meeting. Agendas and packets are also sent to subscribers of the City's email notification service, GovDelivery. You can subscribe to this free service by accessing the City's website and clicking on the 'Subscribe to Updates' envelope on the home page.

1 CALL TO ORDER

Chair Woods called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.

2 ROLL CALL

Planning Manager Wendy Rampson called the roll.

Present 7 - Woods, Adenekan, Clein, Briere, Peters, Mills, and Bona

Absent 1 - Franciscus

3 INTRODUCTIONS

4 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Adenekan, seconded by Peters, that the agenda be approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

[14-1760](#) City Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of November 18, 2014

Moved by Briere, seconded by Peters, that the November 18, 2014

minutes be approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

6 REPORTS FROM CITY ADMINISTRATION, CITY COUNCIL, PLANNING MANAGER, PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES, WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS

6-a City Council

Briere reported that at the previous night's meeting, Council approved at first reading a revised resolution to rezone 425 North Main Street, noting that it will come back to City Council at the first meeting in January along with the character district overlay rezoning, which will include public hearings for both items.

6-b Planning Manager

Rampson reported that Council also approved the Housing Commission Platt Road East project. She reported that funding had been granted for the North Maple Housing Commission site. She also explained that Avalon Housing had been successful in getting funding for their Arbordale Apartments, which is great news for our affordable housing stock.

Rampson reported that the next Planning Commission meeting would be on January 6th and would also be held in the County Building. She said the following week on January 12th there will be a joint Council/Planning Commission working session held at CTN studios on South Industrial Boulevard, which will replace the regular working session for the Planning Commission.

6-c Planning Commission Officers and Committees

Peters reported from the DDA Partnerships and Economic Committee that the AAATA is moving forward on their CEO search, and they heard a presentation from the Washtenaw County Office of Economic and Community Development on the Affordable Needs Assessment.

Mills reported that the Ordinance Revisions Committee met tonight with two items on the agenda; going back to the recommendations made earlier on the A2D2 Downtown Evaluation by working through the premiums section and coming up with a scope of work for ENP, as well as pulling out the R4C/R2A recommendations.

Clein reported that the Master Plan Revisions Committee met November 23rd where they reviewed the Re-Imagine Washtenaw project. He said the DDA Street Framework Plan, which has been renamed The Street

Design Manual, held their final technical policy meeting a week ago and the final plan should be coming before the Planning Commission end of January of early February 2015 for their review, recommendation and approval.

6-d Written Communications and Petitions

[14-1766](#) Various Correspondences to the City Planning Commission

Received and Filed

7 AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (Persons may speak for three minutes about an item that is NOT listed as a public hearing on this agenda. Please state your name and address for the record.)

8 PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT BUSINESS MEETING

9 REGULAR BUSINESS - Staff Report, Public Hearing and Commission Discussion of Each Item

(If an agenda item is tabled, it will most likely be rescheduled to a future date. If you would like to be notified when a tabled agenda item will appear on a future agenda, please provide your email address on the form provided on the front table at the meeting. You may also call Planning and Development Services at 734-794-6265 during office hours to obtain additional information about the review schedule or visit the Planning page on the City's website (www.a2gov.org).)

(Public Hearings: Individuals may speak for three minutes. The first person who is the official representative of an organized group or who is representing the petitioner may speak for five minutes; additional representatives may speak for three minutes. Please state your name and address for the record.)

(Comments about a proposed project are most constructive when they relate to: (1) City Code requirements and land use regulations, (2) consistency with the City Master Plan, or (3) additional information about the area around the petitioner's property and the extent to which a proposed project may positively or negatively affect the area.)

9-a [14-1761](#) Resolution in Support of Reimagine Washtenaw Corridor Improvement Study

Jeff Kahan presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Peter Eckstein, 2551 Londonderry, Ann Arbor, expressed concerns with the study. He presented visuals to the Commission of Washtenaw

Avenue, stating that there are thousands of commuters that use this main artery into and out of the City daily. He said a few years ago someone asked city planners if they had ever done a measurement of how many cars come onto this section of Washtenaw from US-23, to which they had responded they hadn't done that. He said how can you plan for this section of Washtenaw without knowing where your cars are coming from and where they are going. He said they have treated this as if it were a little bike ride or walk to Ypsilanti and that this is the major purpose of this highway, which it is not. He said reserved lanes for bikes and buses and wider medians can make the commute of the shopper slower and more arduous and more prone to accidents, but they are not going to cut down on the amount of traffic on Business 94. He said the theory might be that better bike paths will mean that people will take their bikes to the grocery store, hardware store and the auto repair shop, but the reality is far different. He said we had a test of that a few years ago, with a bike path coming from Tuomy Road to Whole Foods; the result was still a full parking lot and only a couple of bikes on the bike rack on a sunny day in June 2014. He said when you ask people why they don't shop along Washtenaw Avenue, they say, overwhelmingly traffic, traffic, traffic. He said we need serious plans to improve the flow of traffic and reduce gridlock along Washtenaw, not traffic calming and narrower lanes and fewer opportunities to make safe turns, adding that the more you restrict the flow the more you will endanger the businesses already there, the more they will die, the more you will force me and my neighbors to drive further and further away to do our shopping and eating, wasting gasoline, in order to meet our needs. He asked where the photo used for the Reimagine Washtenaw Corridor poster was taken. He said he believed it came from a super rich community in Southern California, and was what the song California Dreamin' referred to. He asked do you see anyone carrying grocery bags from Hillers or items from ACE or furniture from ARHAUS. He said you have to look very seriously at the realism of the plan under which this proposal is based.

Donald Salberg, 3105 Lexington Drive, Ann Arbor, stated that he supported the comments made by the previous speaker, adding that he raised issues that haven't been dealt well, by those who have planned the Reimagining Washtenaw Avenue. He said we have to be cautious with adding more crosswalks, along with the super bus stops and the impact those will have on traffic, which could be the same or worse than adding a stop light. He said he doubts that you want to have anyone left off half way between Huron Parkway and US 23, especially on the south side who then has to walk to the corner which might be several hundred yards to where there is a traffic light, cross, and then go back another couple hundred yards and then go about 1/8 of a mile into ArborLand to get to Hillers. He said certainly people who would not be interested in

this would be the elderly, those who have infirmities and those who have young children and those who need to carry more than two grocery bags at a time, which could be a considerable number of individuals. He said if you were going to make a crosswalk, it would need to accommodate those with infirmities and therefore take longer to cross Washtenaw and slow down traffic. He echoed Eckstein's request that there be a measure of traffic flow along Washtenaw. He suggested that traffic counting cables be put between Huron Parkway and US 23 exiting and another between US 23 and Huron Parkway entering. He said he guessed that there would be 80% or more leaving Ann Arbor. He said if you want to discourage this traffic he suggested we put big signs out at the perimeter of Ann Arbor, saying, "If you don't work in Ann Arbor, we don't want you to live here".

Michael Homel, 3473 Wooddale Court, Ann Arbor, said he was a board member of the Woodcreek Neighborhood Association. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to address the resolution, stating that in many ways the study seems positive, and is an example of governmental inter-cooperation, and has the endorsement of a lot of the expert planners, and includes a number of very positive recommendations, which include pedestrian sidewalks along Washtenaw Avenue, encouragement of bike lanes, and greater cognizance of the role public transit plays in this important corridor. He cautioned the Commission and later, City Council, to be skeptical of a blanket endorsement of the recommendations, which is what the resolution says. He said along with the positive things are things that seem to be in a planner's fantasy world, specifically dismissive of the crucial role the automobiles play in the necessity of our day-to-day lives. He said the endorsement of the resolution recommends narrow auto lanes, using one of the two traffic lanes to prioritize buses; he cautioned a blanket endorsement of the general concept as he said it could be possible that in the future, staff would use the endorsement to implement specific recommendations which you might not find so congenial. He said the real problem, besides design, is over-use of Washtenaw Avenue, and anything that could be done to improve auto movement on Washtenaw Avenue; such as synchronization of traffic lights, getting the bus stop out of the lane of traffic and into a cut-off, which has been done on east bound Washtenaw at Arborland, and moving any impediments to traffic would be helpful. He said the report has a grassy median in the middle of Washtenaw, and he wanted to know how it would work for those of us currently using the median to turn onto Chalmers as well as onto Washtenaw if there is no center turn lane. He said there are a lot of things that need careful consideration before endorsing the report.

Len Harding said he lives at the corner of Washtenaw and Sheridan and has lived there for some 30 years, said he recognizes that the traffic is

extremely heavy, but argued that auto and bus pollution is egregious and he fights the element carbon daily. He said it settles on his furniture in the house, and he has scrubbed it off his deck at length and is now down to the point where he has to refinish his deck every year. He said he has to scrub it on his hands and knees as a power washer will not get the carbon out of the wood grain. He said he is now putting an impervious coating on his deck, which he hopes will help. He said the fact is that elemental carbon at 2.5 microns in cells in your lungs causes lung cancer, which he doesn't appreciate. He said he would really like to see something done about the flow on Washtenaw Avenue, which is egregious and a major health issue in that entire area. He said the idea of putting in these major bus stops at the commercial centers is entirely erroneous since that is not where the riders are. He said the riders are up near Washtenaw and Stadium and Sheridan and near the church; he said he knows because he rides the buses all the time downtown and he attested that there is no standing room on those buses and sometimes the buses simply pass the bus stops because they are full.

Chair Woods closed the public hearing, unless the agenda item is postponed.

Moved by Bona, seconded by Clein, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the "Resolution in Support of the Reimagine Washtenaw Corridor Improvement Study," and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby adds the 2014 Reimagine Washtenaw Corridor Improvement Study to the list of planning documents to be used as resource information in support of the City Master Plan.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Bona asked staff to explain the difference between a resource document in support of the Master plan and the Master plan.

Kahan said that the Planning Commission annually approves a number of planning documents as well as a number of resource materials that can help provide them and City Council with information in making decisions about a variety of issues. He said master plans are approved visions for our community and include our land use plan and our parks and recreation open space plan. He said resource documents are pieces of information that may be intended to provide decision makers with technical information that can help broaden their understanding of issues. He said master plans are an endorsement of the way a community feels about a particular issue, whether land use or transportation or otherwise.

Bona asked for examples of other resource documents.

Rampson responded that the list contains approximately 12 items, such as the Northeast Area Transportation plan, the Flood Mitigation Plan, the Connecting William document. She said the Connecting William document involved a lot of good discussion and public input, but was not adopted into the Master Plan with its specific recommendations, but it is certainly something staff would bring forward when presenting projects in this area to the Commission. She said the corridor study is intended to be used as a resource as new development comes forward in this corridor. She said the document doesn't have the weight of the Master Plan, but simply gives a point of departure for their discussions.

Bona asked about possible next steps of the presented plan if it moves forward.

Kahan said he was extremely sympathetic to the comments heard tonight, and said it is safe to say that residents and commuters agree that the level of traffic along Washtenaw is extreme, and he believes that the study reflects a desire to do something better. He said to allow Washtenaw Avenue to continue as is, is unacceptable. He explained the study is a multi-jurisdictional effort that recognizes we have opportunities to improve land use and all modes of transportation in the corridor. He explained the study was a multi-year effort intended to provide recommendations on acquiring future right-of-way to ensure we have an adequate amount of space to create a more effective, more efficient transportation system for all users of the corridor. He said with information provided from the study, staff has already begin a GIS analysis of existing right-of-way lines, proposed right-of-way lines, existing and proposed center lines, since we would like to know precisely where the existing lines are and where they should be. He said discussion is starting with City transportation engineers on how best to incorporate the recommendations of the study for right-of-way into policy so that when future developers come before the City, we would be better equipped to request right-of-way that we believe is necessary to accommodate a more efficient flow of all modes of transit. He agreed with Bona that this effort would be a multi-decade effort to acquire right-of-way, making incremental improvements along the way, but ultimately have adequate right-of way to ensure that we have a more sustainable system of transportation along the corridor. He said this is just one initial effort and are not construction drawings nor a reflection of the City of any of the partners being ready to construct anything in the corridor at this point.

Bona said for other resource documents, this process has given a

permanent place to issues with public input, noting that there are so many studies the City does and if they are not catalogued and given a place by this Commission they quickly collect dust and disappear, along with the valuable public input. She said this is not a Planning Commission generated document, but from her perspective this is an opportunity to put a public input conclusion into our catalogue, so we don't forget it. She felt it extremely important that all of the City's corridors become multi-modal, and the fact that Washtenaw is auto dominated is a problem to her. She said she didn't believe autos should be removed from Washtenaw Avenue but to find alternatives to everyone open to the using them. She said she was in support of the document and appreciated all the input that went into the robust and comprehensive document that she felt will help inform our other corridors that aren't as deeply challenged and will put us a lot further ahead.

Briere asked what role the Planning Commission is recommending City Council take with this document, given that the resolution recommends approval.

Kahan said if Council approves the document, the city staff will continue its work in identifying future right-of-way needs, which includes a technical component, and determine how best to incorporate the this future right-of-way into City policy. He said staff would ask developers to dedicate right-of-way along this corridor to accommodate future right-of-way needs. He said along this corridor, there is a significant difference in the width of right-of-way, and in the future the City would like sidewalks wider than five feet, vegetated lawn extensions, buffered bike lanes, at least two lanes of travel and a landscaped median than can accommodate Michigan lefts to expedite vehicular travel. He noted these improvements are items the City will work towards in years to come.

Rampson noted that the three other jurisdictions; Ypsilanti, Ypsilanti Township, Pittsfield Township have all approved this resolution in essentially the same form. She said if the resolution is not approved, it sends a strong message to staff that the right-of-way we have right now is sufficient and we won't be able to ask to for additional right-of-way because we won't have anything that guides us as to what to ask for. She said the visioning process was a way to figure out what will we need to incorporate all of those improvements, whether we later decide if they are the best for this corridor. She said the recommended right-of-way widths are pretty much the most that we might need. She said if we don't approve it, MDOT will probably work with the other three jurisdictions and not with us and might mean that they won't have funding available for us if we want to do improvements in this segment. She said the City would like to be a part of the improvements and have the access to grant

funding for such improvements.

Briere noted the public comments presented at the meeting touched on items that were beyond the right-of-way acquisition explained, and the resolution included several other recommendations that were equally as important. She asked how would that work as it is all inclusive in one document.

Kahan said the study on page 13 makes reference to current vehicular counts [average daily trips] along the corridor and shows that west of Huron Parkway, approximately 30,000 vehicles use that segment each day and east of Huron Parkway, we're looking at 42,000, and through the US 23 interchange there are approximately 46,000 vehicles which is a very congested corridor. He said in regards to mid-island crossings, we have been able to document that people are already crossing Washtenaw Avenue at all hours of the day and night and in our opinion it is quite hazardous, and we feel that if we were able to provide a mid-block crossing with an island, individuals would have a safer time crossing the corridor and therefore the recommendation includes one such mid-block crossing. He reiterated that this is not a Master Plan document, but a resource document that is not intended to be used by staff as they would use a Master plan document, and staff makes it very clear which documents they use when making staff recommendations.

Clein said he appreciated the public input presented, adding that it is needed if they have any hopes of improving our quality of life for the future. He said it is commendable in that this effort is a regional approach, knowing that traffic, smog, and air quality is something that is not confined to City limits but something that is shared with neighboring jurisdictions. He said he sees the envisioned hopes of the study to help modulate the flow of traffic and take away some of the problems with traffic, as well as create greater safety within the corridor through 'complete streets' that include non-motorized traffic as well as other forms of transit. He said the City of Detroit is doing this approach all over and it would be backwards for Ann Arbor not to be looking at 'complete streets' for its corridors, and this is seen as a sustainable approach to dealing with traffic issues in the future. He said current resource documents have remained as such and have been helpful for the Commission, and if this resource document were to become anything more than such, it would need to go through the Commission and City Council in becoming a part of the Master Plan. He asked if the document had been approved by MDOT.

Kahan said yes, that they were an active participant in the study's development all along and requested that the resolution be adopted by participating communities.

Clein said corridors like this offer a greater incentive for public housing and mixed use, adding that if more people were able to find affordable housing within our attractive City of Ann Arbor, we might see more of those people use bikes and buses instead of cars and we could continue the wonderful way of life we enjoy here. He said he was supportive of the resolution.

Adenekan said she too is in support of the resolution, but has listened carefully to the people who came out to speak. She said living close to the corridor, she agrees that the traffic is bad around 4 p.m. when one is stuck in traffic. She asked about the super-stops.

Kahan said that the study identified 2 super-stops within the corridor. He explained that a super-stop has higher amenities for the user and typically allows buses to pull off from the traffic lane, along with other amenities. He said AAATA is looking to add additional stops in the coming year.

Peters asked about MDOT's opinion of the traffic, given that they have supported this study.

Kahan explained that MDOT recognizes the challenges the corridor poses and also has a limited amount of right-of-way in which to work and limited resources for improvements that could potentially cost tens of millions of dollars. He said they recognize that widening partial stretches might not alleviate the over-all traffic issues. He said MDOT gets it that we need to provide better service, but they are also limited to what they can work with in this particular area.

Rampson said MDOT really understands and supports transit in the corridor, noting that this is a high demand corridor and has been for decades, and the recommendations are intended to allow for better bus service and increased bus service. She said MDOT also likes communities that get together and tell them what they would like to see, as it helps them figure out what is a better fix for those communities.

Mills said she has been both a driver as well as pedestrian taking the bus and trying to cross Washtenaw Avenue. She asked if Arbor Hills is allowing for any additional right-of-way.

Kahan said Arbor Hills is very close to the curb line and the developer worked with the City to provide a 23-foot City controlled easement which includes landscaping and the bus stop.

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

Yeas: 7 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sarah Mills, and Bonnie Bona

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

9-b [14-1762](#) FY 2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) - The FY2016-2021 CIP is comprised of updated financial data for FY2016 contained in the approved FY2015-2020 CIP. Upon adoption by the City Planning Commission, the CIP becomes a supporting document for the City’s master plan. The CIP is also used as the source document for the City’s capital budget planning. Staff Recommendation: Approval
Deb Gosselin presented the Capital Improvements Plan to the Commission.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chris Hewett, 553 South Seventh Street, Ann Arbor, spoke on behalf of the ‘Save Our Streets Ann Arbor Group’, stating that their group has documented the Stadium corridor from Miller to Seventh Street, noting that the traffic count on Seventh Street was 10,000 cars a day, and while they realize they can’t cut out traffic, they would like quality of life issues addressed immediately on Seventh Street and that wouldn’t cost very much; he mentioned such measures as a few more stop signs being installed and at least one pedestrian crossing added. He said they would like to see those items added to the CIP.

Chair Woods closed the public hearing, unless the agenda item is postponed.

Moved by Adenekan, seconded by Peters, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission approve the following resolution:

Whereas, Section 1:185 of the Ann Arbor City Code requires that the City Planning Commission annually prepare a Capital Improvements Program, identifying public improvements that will be needed within the ensuing six years, in the general order of priority;

Whereas, The FY2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) has been drafted by City asset category teams and reviewed by the City Planning Commission’s Capital Improvements Plan Committee; and

Whereas, A duly-noticed public hearing on the draft plan was held

by the City Planning Commission on December 16, 2014;

Resolved, That the City Planning Commission hereby approves the FY2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan as a supporting document for the City's Master Plan; and

Resolved, That the City Planning Commission recommends that City Council approve the FY2016-2021 Capital Improvements Plan as the basis for the FY2016/2017 Capital Budget.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Bona asked about the prioritization tool and why the Seventh Street project didn't end up in fiscal year 2021.

Gosselin explained that for the past 7-8 years, the City has used a formal method of prioritizing each project that is proposed to go into the Capital Improvements Plan [CIP] with specific goals that each item is rated by. She said one of the prioritization items that projects are rated by is the City's Sustainability Framework Goals and each project can gain anywhere from 1-10 points for how it scores on that prioritization list. She said another one on the prioritization list is safety and preparedness funding for those items that might be able to move faster due to available funding. She explained that the City's Master Plan is used for prioritization for rating as is the City's Parks and Recreation Plan [PROS Plan] as well as other strategic documents. She explained how the criterion is used in placement of projects in various years within the CIP.

Bona said she felt the Commission's priority should be in fine-tuning the prioritization tool over time, versus picking and choosing individual projects to move around because the Commission felt they were 'mis-scored'. She said she wanted those living on Seventh Street to know that their project got a very high priority even if it is in 2018 and that the issue in moving it up is a funding issue, which is a City Council issue and not a prioritization issue.

Bona asked about the grand totals listed in the staff report and how the City figures out how much can be spent each year on capital improvement projects.

Gosselin said that some of the asset groups are pretty straight forward and are affectionately referred to as having 'buckets of money' each year. She explained that given the projections made by the City's

financial staff each year the amounts can vary and are based on the City's financial situation and financial data. She said most of the funding comes from City revenue and from the bills that most of us pay to the City. Funding for the streets can come from the street millage as well as County revenue. She noted that some items, such as alternative transportation, have uncertain funding, and can vary greatly depending on the size of project. She said sometimes there is alternative funding available that can be used for projects such as STP funding. She said the funding varies from year to year because the funding sources themselves are uncertain.

Bona said she felt the Commissions involved in the Sustainability Framework could work towards giving staff a better tool to work with.

Gosselin said she looks forward to getting information and input from the Planning Commission on tweaking the tool and making the process better.

Peters echoed Bona's comments and thanked Gosselin and City staff for all their work on the CIP.

Adenekan thanked staff for responding to questions the Commission had presented at their December 9th Working Session.

Briere asked about question 7 on the list from the Commission, if the CIP contains a traffic study for the Nixon/Green/Dhu Varren corridor. She said it was valuable to her to learn it was considered a low priority corridor even with the proposed construction of three large multi-family housing complexes along Nixon Road. She asked, even with a Transportation Master Plan, how the value to the community is reassessed.

Gosselin responded that in contrast to the intersection study, which is actively going on and was included in the CIP, the traffic study for the Nixon/Green/Dhu Varren corridor didn't even come up for discussion because it got eliminated from the CIP in 2010 and therefore didn't make it to the forefront to be looked at again. She explained that if the Commission felt that the item should be re-added to the CIP they could move in that direction.

Briere said she felt the item would be returning because Council had heard multiple people speak about the need to look at the traffic on Dhu Varren Road, Green Road as well as Nixon Road as a whole, and not just the intersection itself.

Rampson commented that if the Commission anticipated the item

returning for further discussion and there is sentiment to add a corridor study, this would be an appropriate time to do so before it moves on to Council.

Mills thanked staff for their helpful responses to the Commission's questions. She said she would like for the Commission to be able to have some input on how the items are weighted as well as the allocation of points to projects.

Clein thanked Gosselin for her clear and concise explanation of the CIP and the process involved. He too hoped that the Commission could weigh in on how the City's Sustainability Framework Plan is used in ranking projects, noting that maybe if the Framework was better used it could help with the particular project of energy improvements at City Hall and safety projects might rank higher; thereby saving the City money over time. He acknowledged that there are always more projects than there is available funding.

Woods also thanked Gosselin and staff for the presentation. She said Seventh Street was near to her heart and she hoped it was in the CIP.

Gosselin confirmed it was.

Gosselin suggested that if the corridor study is reintroduced into the CIP, that it go as a placeholder in fiscal year 2018 and that they give it a project cost of \$200,000.

Moved by Briere, seconded by Peters, that the draft 2016-2021 CIP be amended to add a new project for the Nixon/Dhu Varren/Green corridor study, with a project cost of \$200,000 to be scheduled for FY2018, and further, that the project be ranked by the Alternative Transportation asset management team prior to distribution of the CIP to City Council.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION ON THE AMENDMENT:

Bona expressed her desire for the added CIP project to be ranked by the prioritization process and that the current activity in the surrounding area would hopefully move the item up.

Friendly amendment added by Bona. Accepted.

Briere thanked Rampson for making the recommendation to move the project forward.

Peters thanked Bona for adding the amendment to have the corridor study project ranked by the process that is currently in place.

On a voice vote, the Chair declared the amendment carried.

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

Yeas: 7 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sarah Mills, and Bonnie Bona

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

10 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

10-a [14-1763](#) Nixon Farm North, 3381 Nixon Road for City Council Approval - A proposal including several related petitions necessary to develop a 68-acre site at the northwest corner of Nixon and Dhu Varren Roads for multiple-family residential use with 208 attached dwelling units in 51 buildings, with community clubhouse and pool, storm water management and park donation. Petitions include Zoning (to R4A Multiple-Family Dwelling), Site Plan and Natural Features Open Space Activity authorization, Landscape Ordinance modification request and Wetland Use permit. Ward 1. Staff Recommendation: Approval
DiLeo presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Ward Bissell, 5 Northwick Court, Ann Arbor, spoke about the building record of the Toll Brothers stating that the internet is full of records showing their history of violations of building codes as well as the Clean Water Act. He said he realizes that the City can't pick and chose which developers come into Ann Arbor but asked if the City's inspectors will be sufficient in number and have the time to monitor Toll Brothers with the intense scrutiny that the checkered history of Toll Brothers demands. He said he hopes so, otherwise the City will end up with 470 problems on their hands.

Maris Vinovskis, 13 Westbury Court, Ann Arbor, said he has lived there for 35 years and expressed that the traffic issue that is before the Commission is a serious problem and is not something new, and with the new developments we have an accident waiting to happen at Nixon Road. He said because of the busses that he rides daily to his job at the University of Michigan where he teaches, it is very difficult for him to navigate crossing the street because the traffic is going very fast and not following the speed limit and it is absolutely dark, He said with the snow

coming and the ice and if he were ever to fall a car would not be able to stop. He said even without adding any more cars, it is impossible for anyone to cross Westbury, so why isn't the City doing anything about it. He said he doesn't believe that the issue is ready to be discussed because it hasn't been reviewed and discussed in detail. He said most of the residents are in favor of some form of development but you don't have to develop it to this degree. He said you have heard what the people said about the consultant not listening to the neighbors and their input when the Master Plan was drawn up for this area, and that lots has changed since the plan was written and you have heard from us and what we think. He said for the first time he saw Barclay Place and was shocked that somebody allowed something like that to be built in this City, adding that it was embarrassing to see as one drives around the development. He said he hopes that it will not be repeated in this scenario.

David Reuss, 16 Westbury Court, Ann Arbor, said his main concern is with moving the traffic study ahead for both the Toll Brothers as well as the residents and that it be done before any ground is broken. He said with the narrow setbacks that are currently there and the narrow road, they have to walk down the bike path and when the double-bottom trucks or busses come by they are very, very close to pedestrians and bikes. He said when they can, they move over into the other lane, but that is not always possible. He asked where is the property going to come from since the setbacks are narrow, and with another lane coming in where is it going to go. He said the traffic on the western side of the development the sidewalks can only go down to available sidewalk south of the site, and if you are going faster than 30 miles per hour you can't see them to stop in time. He said the traffic issue needs to be addressed and corrected before ground is broken and more homes are added to the Nixon corridor. He hoped that the traffic study could move ahead.

Mary Vinovskis, 13 Westbury Court, Ann Arbor, read from a prepared statement, calling upon the Planning Commission to re-evaluate the Nixon projects North and South. She said to rely on an outdated Master Plan removed the current residents' concerns and wish for real consideration. She said it was the Commission's job to represent them now in the present and not from a flawed view from the past and what might have been fine in the past doesn't represent reality today. She said the traffic with current density is horrendous and with population growth will only make it worse. She said the City's own traffic study shows that the streets are at full capacity. She said the architecture of the proposed project should resonate the physical appearance of the existing structure of the area. She said the very tall stacked design for the south Nixon section is completely inappropriate and the brownstone

might fit in downtown Ann Arbor but doesn't fit in suburbia. She said a mandatory visit to Barclay Park should be required by each Commissioner before voting on these projects and you would quickly see how unsuitable 3-4 story structures are and how they loom over walkways and drives and create a crowded and cramped feeling to the area. She said reconciling the South Nixon project with the area should be the priority, adding that she appreciates that the structures backing up to the street have been lowered and the rest of the structures should be a re-design to reduce their heights so they can blend into the existing neighborhood. She said the roads need to be widened to help with the traffic issues.

Jeff Brainard, 29665 William K. Smith Drive, Suite B, New Hudson, MI, representative for Toll Brothers, thanked everyone in the Planning Department for all the countless hours they have spent on the project. He said they are glad to be in the market in Ann Arbor as it is a great place to live, with great schools and the universities and world class healthcare, and most of all it has a sense of community. He said both he and Vice President Jason Minock live in Ann Arbor, and chose to raise their families here and most of their senior staff are products of the University of Michigan so they have a close connection to Ann Arbor. He said they believe the projects fit into the theme and the surrounding neighborhood, as well as the Master Plan, and they are pleased to have received the recommendation for approval from the City staff. He said they have accepted the responsibility of the intersection role and are aware of the improvements needed, and they are happy and excited for this project and would be happy to see it thrive in the community. He said they respectfully hope to gain the Commission's support tonight and they are available to answer any questions from the Commission.

Chair Woods closed the public hearing, unless the agenda item is postponed.

Moved by Briere, seconded by Adenekan, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the request for R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) zoning designation for the Nixon Farm North site; and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Nixon Farm North Site Plan and Development Agreement.; and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the proposed modifications to the interior landscaping requirements for Nixon Farm North, in accordance with Chapter 62 (Landscape and Screening Ordinance), Section 5:608(2)(c); and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Wetland Use Permit for the Nixon Farm North development; and

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby authorizes activity in the natural features open space for the Nixon Farm North development.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Clein said he hadn't seen any exterior elevations showing the Commission what kinds of materials are being proposed.

Brainard said the exterior materials would be full brick, fiber cement siding [hardi plank] and in some applications they will have cultured stone and asphalt shingles and aluminum fascia in order to try to keep it as maintenance free as possible.

Clein asked Rampson about the development agreement, noting that in past agreements he has seen clauses to the extent that should the petitioner make material changes, they must come back for re-approval. He said oftentimes as developers are getting into the project, material changes must be done. He asked about the appropriateness of having such a clause in the agreements.

Rampson said in the past they have used such clauses for downtown projects that the Design Review Board reviews. She said if the Commission would like to add such a clause, they could do so along with the consultation of the developer present.

Clein commented that the development agreement clearly states that the various improvements in the area must be completed before the developer receives any Certificate of Occupancy, which is crucial to the developer in receiving money from the buyers who can't move in. He said he felt confident that these stipulations would be carried out knowing that the City has had success with fulfilling other such agreements in the past.

Clein asked if there has been discussion about donating parkland to the City.

DiLeo said currently the site plan for Nixon North shows 2.6 acres to be dedicated to the City and Nixon South shows an area of 3.4 acres to be dedicated to the City. She said the total was calculated using the PROS plan. She said on the North parcel there are 20-30 acres of good natural

area, which is counted toward the open space on the site plan, and the petitioners are willing to make that a park, but the specific boundary of how much would be City owned is still under discussion. She explained that the park donation transaction would occur after the site plan is approved if the development moves forward.

Woods asked if the large portion of open space is buildable.

DiLeo said, yes, some of it is, and the code says that natural features should be disturbed to a minimum, but the impact is left open for interpretation.

Peters asked the developer if they have had discussion with AAATA about what impact the development would have on bus service in the area.

Brainard said he had reached out to Mr. White at the AAATA offices a year ago, asking what their proposed development could do to help the transportation route in the area. White's response at the time was that he was aware of the project but it was too early for him to comment on the matter. Brainard said the door is still open for discussion.

Peters asked about the development agreement and possibly incorporating findings from a larger corridor study.

DiLeo said the Commission could approve a site plan with any number of stipulations; however, she cautioned that it could be problematic to add items related to the corridor study because it is not a project yet and would be tying this project to a significant unknown future. She offered to look into the matter, adding that the development agreement already included language that covered special assessments in the area, should that become necessary. She explained that improvements to the intersection have to be tied to the development agreement, since the intersection does not have capacity for added traffic, while the existing corridor itself does.

Peters said it seems that from what he has been made aware of, there is some disagreement on the level of available service within the corridor, when listening to public comments made in comparison to staff comments.

Mills asked about the vehicular area landscape modifications, noting that she appreciated the added trees to the area. She asked how the storm water coming off the roads will be handled.

DiLeo said the storm water coming off the roads would be handled by

the development's storm water system, which is designed to meet the infiltration element of the new WCWRC rules. She said there are no bioswales lining the roads since there is the infiltration element.

Mills asked if the storm water will be managed by the site fully and not go into the City's system, since she felt that would be the most ideal.

DiLeo said it will only go into the City's system after it has gone through the site's storm water management system.

Bona said according to the staff report, the proposed project would have 3 dwelling units per acre while the Master Plan calls for a density of 10 dwelling units per acre. She said in order to support transit, we need 6 dwelling units per acre, so the proposed 3 dwelling units per acre raises a major red flag for her. She said in looking at the surrounding zoning districts she sees R1C and R2A, noting that Northbury is zoned for 10 dwelling units per acre. She asked about required lot sizes in the R1C zoning district.

DiLeo said R1C requires the minimum lot size to be 7,200 square feet, which would equate to about 6 dwelling units per acre.

Bona pointed out that the proposed density of the project is at half that of R1C, which is the single-family development to the east of the proposed project, and one third of the R2A zoning of Northbury. She said since the density is not supporting transit, this means it is an auto-oriented development, and with the existing problems on Nixon Road now, the added autos will not help. She said she had concern with the staff recommendation statement; '...because it complies with all applicable local, state, and federal ordinances, standards and regulations; it will not cause a public or private nuisance; and it will not have a detrimental effect on public health, safety or welfare...' She said she thought we were headed in the wrong direction, and therefore was inclined not to support this project, because it is actually contributing to the auto congestion on Nixon Road, not helping alleviate it. She said the Nixon Farms South development was different, as it had a higher density. She said this is only the second development that she has seen, since being on the Planning Commission, where the developer is proposing a lower density than allowed. She said she would be more comfortable if the density was at least at 6 dwelling units per acre because it would be supporting transit.

Bona said she wished the solutions for Nixon Road complete streets were more straightforward, but she can't see a safe way for anyone crossing Nixon Road if wanting to catch a bus in the afternoon or evening. She reiterated that having a project that doesn't move our

options for alternatives to cars does not move us forward and is an expensive mistake for one of the few valuable properties that we have left. She said she was in agreement with the development agreement amendment as mentioned. She said she felt the landscape modification was an excellent recommendation and she would rather see the existing landscaping there. She also expressed support for the natural features open space proposal, adding that she felt it was a preferable compromise and better solution.

Clein said he supports higher density in order to get transit but also felt that they needed to look at the larger picture.

Briere said she had enquired of Rampson about the density and found that the Nixon Farm North site is 39 acres after the removal of the parkland, which comes out to a density of 5 dwelling units per acre, which still doesn't reach the benchmark of 6 dwelling units. She said the Nixon Farm South site is 37 acres of gross acreage and 24 acres after the removal of dedicated parkland, which changes it from 7 dwelling units to 11 dwelling units per acre. She said were they to count the 5 dwelling units per acre on the North, we would also have to consider the 11 units per acre on the South site and those 11 units are a lot more dense than the Master Plan calls for. She said she didn't think that Bona was off-base, adding that she thought that many would have preferred to see a mix of dwelling unit styles for both sites, which she felt would have balanced the density more attractively and could have provided an opportunity for more diverse housing options, which they currently are not getting.

Bona said the Master Plan uses the whole site so she didn't agree with the parsing off of the parkland contribution, since the contribution could have been in the form of money. She said this is a clustering of development on a site where the decision has been made to not spread the development evenly. She said if the units were spread out and not clumped together they would still be at 3 units per acre and has nothing to do with the parkland contribution, from the Master Plan perspective. She said while she had looked at both sites together, she still felt that this site went too far in going with less than half of what they need and far less than their neighbors. She said the perspective that this development is denser than what exists out there is not true.

Briere asked about parkland contribution.

DiLeo reviewed the proposed parkland dedication under discussion, which would allow connection to the existing park system.

Briere asked about safe egress from Barclay Street and how close

together traffic control devices may be in order to allow people to enter and exit a busy corridor.

DiLeo reviewed the internal sidewalk portion for Nixon Farm North, noting that Woodbury Club Apartment's sidewalks and Nixon Farm's sidewalk wouldn't align perfectly.

Briere said one of the biggest concerns she has heard from neighbors is that they would like to continue enjoying the natural features of the site and have major concerns with the traffic issues. She asked Rampson if the traffic issues that would be contributed by the new development were enough of a concern to merit not supporting the project. She said she thought that the traffic was something beyond the responsibility of the developer. She asked if withholding approval because the traffic problem can't be resolved is rational or legal.

Rampson said Attachment D to the Land Development Regulations makes a statement that Council may deny a project that does not comply with the traffic requirements if the infrastructure is not in place. She said this is not how we have done it for the 30+ years this requirement has been in place. She said we have requested, for instance in the case of the Plymouth Green intersection that had many, many properties contributing traffic to the intersection, that new developments share the costs, and then the City looked for means of additional funding to complete the improvement. She said the City has given the option to the developer to either bring up the level of service or don't proceed. She said once a development meets the traffic impact requirements, Council would be obligated to approve the project.

Clein asked about the density, noting that the staff report comments that the density is in keeping with the Master Plan yet Bona saying it does not.

DiLeo said the staff recommendation was based on the site plan foundation plan and below, adding that the development layout is appropriate and places development where it is appropriate, and preserves area that should be preserved. She said the over-all picture of the building footprints, amenities provided, open space, storm water, pedestrian access and sidewalk networks substantially met the elements of our Master Plan. She said they could go beyond meeting the requirements but staff felt that they met them to the extent that staff felt comfortable recommending approval. She explained that the Master Plan is a guide and the density is an element of the many guiding elements.

Rampson said in the past, residential developments that haven't been topped out for density have been accepted. She said the R4A zoning is

consistent with the Master Plan, with the 'up to 10 dwelling units per acre', allowed. She said that the developer chooses not to get to that top density doesn't mean it doesn't meet the requirement, because the City doesn't have a minimum density. She said that topic might be of interest to the Commission at a future discussion on Master Plan recommendations.

Moved by Bona, seconded by Clein, that the site plan and development agreement motion be separated from the other motions. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Moved by Clein, seconded by Mills, that the draft development agreement be revised to include a clause requiring the developer to maintain materials as specified on the submitted elevations.

DISCUSSION ON AMENDMENT TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT MOTION:

Briere commented that she remembers materials were included in the Council approval of the Foundry project.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT MOTION:

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

Yeas: 6 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Sarah Mills, and Bonnie Bona

Nays: 1 - Jeremy Peters

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

COMMISSION BREAK

VOTE ON NIXON FARM NORTH SITE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT MOTION, AS AMENDED:

On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion failed due to the lack of six affirmative votes.

Yeas: 5 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Jeremy Peters, and Sarah Mills

Nays: 2 - Sabra Briere, and Bonnie Bona

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

COMMISSION DISCUSSION ON ZONING DESIGNATION, MODIFICATIONS TO INTERIOR LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS

AND WETLAND USE PERMIT, ACTIVITY IN THE NATURAL FEATURES OPEN SPACE:

Chair Woods noted that Planning Commission does have the final decision on the natural features open space motion.

Peters commented that the natural features of this site are currently not useable by the neighborhood and the changes will allow more access and enjoyment to those natural features. He voiced his support for the interior landscape modifications that the made the most sense making use of the existing landscaping.

Briere said as she hears from people who are concerned about losing agricultural land, she reluctantly has come to realize that with the City's size there will not be much agriculturally zoned land left in Ann Arbor in time. She said in reading the Master Plan, this proposed site was never intended to be annexed into the City as agricultural land. She said she is supporting the R4A as it fits in with the expectations for this area.

NIXON FARM NORTH-VOTE ON ZONING DESIGNATION, MODIFICATIONS TO INTERIOR LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS, WETLAND USE PERMIT, ACTIVITY IN THE NATURAL FEATURES OPEN SPACE:

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

Yeas: 7 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sarah Mills, and Bonnie Bona

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

Chair Woods asked if the Commission wanted to extend the meeting and take up further business.

Moved by Clein, seconded by Adenekan, to continue the meeting past 11 p.m. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

10-b [14-1764](#)

Nixon Farm South, 2999 Nixon Road for City Council Approval - A proposal including several related petitions necessary to develop a 40-acre site at the southwest corner of Nixon and Dhu Varren Roads for multiple-family residential use with 264 attached dwelling units in 51 buildings, with storm water management and park donation. Petitions include Zoning (to R4A Multiple-Family Dwelling), Site Plan and Natural Features Open Space Activity authorization, Landscape Ordinance

modification request and Wetland Use permit. Ward 1. Staff
Recommendation: Approval

Moved by Peters, seconded by Clein, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the request for R4A (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) zoning designation for the Nixon Farm South site.

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Nixon Farm South Site Plan and Development Agreement.

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the proposed modifications to the conflicting land use buffer and interior landscaping requirements for Nixon Farm South, in accordance with Chapter 62 (Landscape and Screening Ordinance), Section 5:608(2)(c).

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the Wetland Use Permit for the Nixon Farm South development.

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby authorizes activity in the natural features open space for the Nixon Farm South development.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Briere asked about the proposed alignment of Haverhill Street and Nixon Road and if staff felt the issue should be brought back to the traffic engineers to further review.

DiLeo said she could bring it back to the traffic engineers, but noted that they have reviewed every aspect of the plan. She said they have noted in regards to the sight distances that they do meet the standards. She said she would ask them if there was a difference between the alignment meeting national standards and local expectations.

Briere asked about the proposed sidewalk along the property on the western edge of the parcel that would end at the property edge. She said there are several houses along that stretch and to Traver Road along Nixon where people would have to walk in the street because there the sidewalk ends. She asked if the developer could help cover the cost of building the sidewalk.

DiLeo said they had held that conversation with the developer saying if it was a straight shot from their development to the next segment they

wouldn't hesitate, but it is not a straight shot given the existing berms and ditches along Nixon and they would need the City's help in possibly obtaining the necessary right-of-way and possible grading easements to make this a reality. She said the discussion is still on the table and the developer seemed open to work with the City on the matter in previous discussions.

Briere encouraged staff to continue working with the developer on the issue, noting that if there is no sidewalk continuation people will walk in the street or venture to cross Nixon, neither of which is a desirable outcome. She said she felt now was the time to get into a more urban feel in that area. She asked about lighting along Nixon Road.

DiLeo said she would have to defer to the City's Public Services Department.

Briere said the small amount of parkland proposed to be dedicated is appreciated to assist in the linkages, but she felt it is too small given that it is the minimum.

Mills asked about the current right-of-way on Nixon Road and what it might allow for.

DiLeo said she was fairly confident that the right-of-way is 66 feet which is a typical width. She said she has been told by the engineers that 66 feet is adequate space to allow for a sidewalks and lawn extension on both sides of the street as well as 2 to 3 travel lanes. She said the issue becomes how much work would need to be done to transform a country road into a City road.

Mills asked about the northeast corner of the property and the bypass lane, noting that it looks quite close to the intersection.

DiLeo said the buildings would have a minimum of 15 foot setback from the future right-of-way line and the site plan configuration would fit with the possible round-about and the by-pass lane, in the intersection. She said the intersection study has not gotten close to final design, but everything fits and is compliant.

Mills asked about parkland, noting that the staff report stated that the parkland on the North site was preferred.

DiLeo said the Natural Area Preservation [NAP] staff have expressed interest in the natural features on the North site, because there are more overlapping natural features there, such as wetlands and contributories, woodlands and landmark trees. She said NAP, which is under Parks and

Recreation, is interested and willing to take that into their inventory and maintain it. She said NAP feels that they could not adequately maintain the area on the South site; however, the question remains if Parks and Recreation would prefer the land on the South site for a public park. She confirmed that discussion is on-going for a win-win outcome for everyone.

Adenekan asked about unanswered questions at the citizen participation meeting. She said one of the questions was; Will the road be paved from Traver Road to Leslie Golf Course?

Brainard said they had never considered that.

Adenekan re-asked the unanswered question if any green space will be preserved along Nixon Road.

Brainard said just the right-of-way.

Adenekan re-asked if a tree line will be established at 2950 Lakehurst Court to screen buildings.

Brainard asked if Lakehurst Court is in Fox Ridge.

Adenekan said, yes.

Brainard said he believed that they had depicted that, pointing to the site plan map, noting that there would be open space that was screened.

Adenekan asked if the target market would be for young adults what was going on for the aging community.

Brainard said he thought that for the South development, the target would be 35-45 year olds, but that they market to a broad spectrum beyond that age range.

Adenekan asked if they are included.

Brainard said, yes, on the North side.

Adenekan asked about the traffic coming out on Bluett.

Brainard said TDA Traffic Engineers had conducted a separate traffic study to include Bluett and the results are consistent with what Opus had discussed at the public meeting.

Adenekan said she doesn't like to see concerned citizens in the

community coming out and asking questions and not getting any response and that is why she wanted to get answers to those questions that had been asked by citizens in the community.

Briere said she noted that some of the units on the North site had master bedrooms on the first floor level, adding that she lives in a house that doesn't do master bedrooms and so it always seems plantation like to her. She said she realizes that master bedrooms on the first floor are appealing to a certain demographic who are not wanting to climb stairs all the time. She asked what the income demographics were.

Brainard said the North site would be household incomes of \$140,000-150,000 and the Southern site would be household income of approximately \$110,000.

Briere said the median income for a single adult in Ann Arbor is about \$60,000, adding that this development doesn't do anything to help address the broad community need for the working class.

Briere asked about the playground on the South parcel.

Brainard said they have an area designated for the playground, but they have not designed it yet, adding that it will have all of the safety standard certifications.

Briere asked if they would do anything for universal access to that playground.

DiLeo explained that the City's Park's Planner has been reviewing the playground for the minimum required barrier free access.

Briere said given all the comments about their lack of quality in their developments, she asked about quality control measures that are in place at the Toll Brothers, outside of inspections.

Brainard said they have their own quality assurance department that services all of their developments, and they give a non-biased report on them which goes to all of their senior managers and since they are publically traded goes to the Board and that is their check on their own staff. He said they make all of their production staff be storm water certified, so they follow all the best practices for erosion control. He said they are also required to be OSHA 10 trained.

Bona moved to separate out the site plan motion and vote on it last. Seconded by Mills. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Moved by Clein, seconded by Adenekan, to amend the site plan motion to add the same language as on the Nixon Farm North site plan motion regarding material; that the draft development agreement be revised to include a clause requiring the developer to maintain materials as specified on the submitted elevations. On a roll call, the vote was as follows, with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Yeas: 7 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sarah Mills, and Bonnie Bona

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

NIXON FARM SOUTH-VOTE ON ZONING DESIGNATION, MODIFICATIONS TO INTERIOR LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS, WETLAND USE PERMIT, ACTIVITY IN THE NATURAL FEATURES OPEN SPACE:

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

Yeas: 7 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sarah Mills, and Bonnie Bona

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

NIXON FARM SOUTH-VOTE ON SITE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT MOTION, AS AMENDED:

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

Yeas: 7 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sarah Mills, and Bonnie Bona

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

11 AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (Persons may speak for three minutes on any item.)

None

12 COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

12-a 14-1765 Resolution Designating a Planning Commission Representative to the Environmental Commission

Woods relinquished the Chair to Clein.

Clein read the proposed resolution to designate Wendy Woods to the Environmental Commission.

Moved by Briere, seconded by Adenekan, that the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission designates Wendy Woods as the Planning Commission representative to the Environmental Commission for a term of one year.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Peters said he was looking forward to Woods awesome representation on the Environmental Commission.

Clein thanked Woods for volunteering to serve on the Environmental Commission, noting the importance of her role on that Commission.

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

Yeas: 7 - Wendy Woods, Eleanore Adenekan, Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sarah Mills, and Bonnie Bona

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Sofia Franciscus

13 ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Peters, seconded by Mills, to adjourn the meeting at 11:34 p.m. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.

Wendy Woods, Chair
mg

These meetings are typically broadcast on Ann Arbor Community Television Network Channel 16 live at 7:00 p.m. on the first and third Tuesdays of the month and replayed the following Wednesdays at 10:00 AM and Sundays at 2:00 PM. Recent meetings can also be streamed online from the CTN Video On Demand page of the City's website (www.a2gov.org).

The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at www.a2gov.org/ctn, or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.