

From	Subject	Received	Size	Categories
Date: Monday				
HealthCare	HEALTHCARE CONFERENCE INVITATION	Mon 12/19/201...	22 KB	
HealthCare	HEALTHCARE CONFERENCE INVITATION	Mon 12/19/201...	22 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	31 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
LuAnne Bulli...	Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
snowshore@...	appointments	Mon 12/19/201...	15 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Erica	Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	
Chris Dixon	Newsletter and website for Dr. Antonia Caretto	Mon 12/19/201...	163 KB	
Portside Mo...	Reader's Responses Dec. 19, 2011	Mon 12/19/201...	42 KB	
Portside Mo...	Migrants' Rights Are Human Rights!	Mon 12/19/201...	36 KB	
Portside Mo...	Who's winning the abortion war?	Mon 12/19/201...	43 KB	
Portside Mo...	Inside the Russian elections	Mon 12/19/201...	49 KB	
Portside Mo...	Hundreds Rally in Support of Accused WikiLeaks Source	Mon 12/19/201...	33 KB	
suzanne mor...	FW: I'm a member, don't delete just pass it on...	Mon 12/19/201...	50 KB	
Brix, Andrew	RE: Quote for a2energy.org press release	Mon 12/19/201...	109 KB	
kathgdsn@a...	Fwd: Your bill is ready	Mon 12/19/201...	23 KB	
Smith, Sandi	Read: DC-4 correction	Mon 12/19/201...	11 KB	
Derezinski, T...	Read: DC-4 correction	Mon 12/19/201...	11 KB	
Gkrapohl@a...	LoBuPa Short term room rental for a medical student	Mon 12/19/201...	30 KB	
Anglin, Mike	Read: 12-19-11 Council Member Questions	Mon 12/19/201...	11 KB	
5x Technolo...	December 2011 Business Insights	Mon 12/19/201...	65 KB	
Julianna Smo...	Barack and Michelle	Mon 12/19/201...	26 KB	
msarosi@co...	RE: University Bank Revised PUD and site plan (Council Agenda Items B...	Mon 12/19/201...	41 KB	
Taylor, Christ...	Read: Final Agenda & Packet	Mon 12/19/201...	11 KB	
Taylor, Christ...	Read: DC-4 correction	Mon 12/19/201...	11 KB	
David Paris	slower cities...	Mon 12/19/201...	13 KB	
Thaddeus W...	[WBWC] Re: kmarche2	Mon 12/19/201...	36 KB	
Teall, Margie	Read: DC-4 correction	Mon 12/19/201...	11 KB	
Tom Harmon...	Catch Up On All Of Last Week's Community Development News	Mon 12/19/201...	27 KB	
Briere, Sabra	Read: Final Agenda & Packet	Mon 12/19/201...	11 KB	
Briere, Sabra	Read: DC-4 correction	Mon 12/19/201...	11 KB	
Congress.org	Pelosi's Expert Was Business Partner	Mon 12/19/20...	49 KB	
Beaudry, Jac...	DC-4 correction	Mon 12/19/201...	38 KB	

Corts, Carynne

From: LuAnne Bullington [redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 11:24 PM
To: Hieftje, John; Smith, Sandi; Briere, Sabra; Lumm, Jane; Derezinski, Tony; Taylor, Christopher (Council); Kunselman, Stephen; Higgins, Marcia; Teall, Margie; Hohnke, Carsten; Anglin, Mike
Cc: 'pdl'
Subject: Sue McCormick, AATA, Act 196 and the Fuller Rd Station

Sue McCormick sat on the AATA board. She and Jessie Bernstein appeared at the city council retreat to tell city council that once AATA became an Act 196 the AATA millage could be used to fund the Fuller Rd Station.

In talking to AATA staff if that happened it would devastate our local transit system.

In putting a city staff member that has a huge interest in obtaining AATA funding to fund one of the city's projects that the staff member is currently very involved with is a serious conflict of interest since the city has sued AATA in the past to obtain AATA funding.

LuAnne Bullington

Corts, Carynne

From: [REDACTED]@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 11:06 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Subject: appointments

sorry it did not pass -- not a surprise. Definite conflict --- the AATA and Fuller Rd and TMP--- will need watching. You may share this with other supporters.

Nancy

Corts, Carynne

From: Erica [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 10:52 PM
To: Hieftje, John; Hohnke, Carsten; Briere, Sabra; Derezhinski, Tony; Smith, Sandi; Taylor, Christopher (Council); Teall, Margie; [REDACTED]; Kunselman, Stephen; Higgins, Marcia
Cc: Cooper, Eli; WBWC Board
Subject: Pedestrian Ordinance Revisions

I'd like to begin by thanking you for taking so much time to consider pedestrian safety and how to clarify our pedestrian ordinance. Through discussions with many of you, I know you value pedestrian safety and believe pedestrians should have the right-of-way at crosswalks. WBWC believes the revision to the pedestrian ordinance to remove the word "approaching" and insert "stopped at the curb..", will probably bring greater clarity to the ordinance for many, and thus it was a change we could support.

However, we have great concerns with the other change made to the ordinance tonight. We acknowledge the language below does provide greater consistency with the UTC and we appreciate that you were trying to honor staff recommendations. We generally agree with staff, but in this case we can not. The following language "*when the pedestrian is on the half of the roadway on which the vehicle is traveling or when the pedestrian is approaching so closely from the opposite half of the roadway as to be in danger*" has numerous problems. The UTC language:

1) **Creates a dangerous environment for pedestrians.** When you adopted the above language, I'm sure you were picturing Plymouth Road. On 4 lane roads with refuge islands, this language may make sense. Both the majority of our crosswalks do not occur on 4 lane roads & do not have refuge islands. Motorists are now only required to stop for a pedestrian traveling on their side of the roadway. For the distracted driver, this may be a helpful revision. For the pedestrian, the more vulnerable party, this means motorists are not required to stop until you are in the middle of the roadway. If there is no refuge island, which is likely as most crosswalks don't have them, this means you must be essentially standing on the yellow line before a car is required to stop. Is this reasonable to ask of kids, seniors, individuals in wheelchairs, or really, anyone? This new language doesn't improve pedestrian safety.

2) **Is inconsistent with our current education campaign.** For the past 9 months, the City & WBWC have been intensively educating citizens to stop for pedestrians at crosswalks, period. WBWC has noted through our crosswalk observations that this education is slowly working and more motorists are stopping. We know through crosswalk observations that motorists are more likely to stop at a crosswalk if one lane has already stopped, even an oncoming lane. Now, motorists will need to be re-taught. Stop for pedestrians.... well, only if they're on your half of the roadway. What happens to the attentive motorist who is now stopping at 7th & Washington for the middle school student heading to Slauson. I suspect if they stop when the student isn't on their half of the roadway, they are actually impeding traffic. I know this was not Council's intention, but I suspect that this is an unintended consequence. AAPD should be consulted on this issue.

3) **Does not provide greater clarity and did not move us forward in our community efforts to become more walkable.** In fact, it makes the whole ordinance more confusing. We intentionally moved away from the UTC language in 2010 because it was both confusing and not consistent with protecting pedestrian rights. We spent months drafting new language & in the matter of a week, with no stakeholder meetings, this language was thrown back in. I suspect you were not intending to weaken pedestrian rights, but inadvertently you have.

Collaboration & stakeholder engagement helps to eliminate this type of issue from occurring. We encourage you to develop a pedestrian safety committee charged with monitoring this ordinance and bringing forth recommendations to council regarding education, enforcement, engineering and evaluation efforts. You have

passionate citizens and groups in the community concerned with making Ann Arbor more walkable. Utilize the current momentum and energy the city has to achieve strong compliance with this law. Unlike some issues where you're wishing for more public engagement, you already have it on this issue. We hope you will use your community knowledge and passion, as well as your staff expertise as we move forward.

Please let us know your reaction with our above thoughts/concerns.

Sincerely,

Erica Briggs
WBWC Board Member
www.wbwc.org

Corts, Carynne

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 7:56 PM
To: Lumm, Jane
Subject: RE: University Bank Revised PUD and site plan (Council Agenda Items B-1 and DB-1)

Jane,

Thank you so much for following up on our questions. Between your information and following up with Chris Cheng, my questions have been answered. Tough time of year to have a meeting where one can break away to attend. As I said with you on the phone, we are trying to be good neighbors with the University Bank and wish that this will lead to their longstanding viability in the Hoover mansion. Hopefully they will reciprocate to make sure there is minimal short and long term impact from this project.

Merry Christmas,

Mike and Kimm Sarosi

----- Original Message -----

From: Jane Lumm <JLumm@a2gov.org>
To: Christopher Cheng <CCheng@a2gov.org>, Sandi Smith <SSmith@a2gov.org>, Sabra Briere <SBriere@a2gov.org>, Stephen Kunselman <SKunselman@a2gov.org>, Margie Teall <MTeall@a2gov.org>, Marcia Higgins <MHiggins@a2gov.org>, Carsten Hohnke <CHohnke@a2gov.org>, Mike Anglin <MAnglin@a2gov.org>, John Hieftje <JHieftje@a2gov.org>
Cc: Steve Powers <SPowers@a2gov.org>, Tony Derezinski <TDerezinski@a2gov.org>, Christopher Taylor (Council) <CTaylor@a2gov.org>, MSarosi@comcast.net, bobphoto@ameritech.net, Sumedh Bahl <SBahl@a2gov.org>, Kevin McDonald <KMcdonald@a2gov.org>, Stephen Postema <SPostema@a2gov.org>
Sent: Mon, 19 Dec 2011 22:04:02 -0000 (UTC)
Subject: RE: University Bank Revised PUD and site plan (Council Agenda Items B-1 and DB-1)

Thanks very much, Chris. This is very helpful, and you've answered all my Q's. -Jane

From: Cheng, Christopher
Sent: Mon 12/19/2011 4:41 PM
To: Lumm, Jane; Smith, Sandi; Briere, Sabra; Kunselman, Stephen; Teall, Margie; Higgins, Marcia; Hohnke, Carsten; Anglin, Mike; Hieftje, John
Cc: Powers, Steve; Derezinski, Tony; Taylor, Christopher (Council); [REDACTED]@comcast.net, bobphoto@ameritech.net; Bahl, Sumedh; McDonald, Kevin; Postema, Stephen
Subject: RE: University Bank Revised PUD and site plan (Council Agenda Items B-1 and DB-1)

Hi Jane,

The site plan Photometric Plan (Sheet C-9) shows no lighting run-off from this property as required by code. The petitioner has agreed to shield these lights from the adjacent neighbor and adjust the height of the lamps if necessary. The petitioner is also open to removing invasive species, but in previous neighborhood meetings, the adjacent neighbors preferred all existing landscaping remain to provide additional parking lot screening. Removal of these invasive species is not required by code and remain (as requested by adjacent neighbors).

The setbacks listed in the supplemental regulations are for the Hoover Mansion (not the parking lot). Any future building addition or building use not listed in the Supplemental Regulations would require City Council approval. Finally, Item F lists the Beneficial Effects of the PUD and is not intended to be a regulation. Hopefully this answered your questions or concerns. Please do not hesitate to contact me if further explanation is needed.

Chris Cheng, AICP

City Planner

Planning and Development Services

301 E. Huron Street, PO Box 8647

Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8647

(734) 794-6000 x42616

ccheng@a2gov.org

From: Lumm, Jane

Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 11:59 AM

To: Smith, Sandi; Briere, Sabra; Kunselman, Stephen; Teall, Margie; Higgins, Marcia; Hohnke, Carsten; Anglin, Mike; Hieftje, John

Cc: Powers, Steve; Derežinski, Tony; Taylor, Christopher (Council); Cheng, Christopher; MSarosi@comcast.net; bobphoto@ameritech.net

Subject: FW: University Bank Revised PUD and site plan (Council Agenda Items B-1 and DB-1)

FYI -Jane

From: Lumm, Jane
Sent: Mon 12/19/2011 11:42 AM
To: Lumm, Jane; Rampson, Wendy; Cheng, Christopher; Powers, Steve
Cc: [REDACTED]; Taylor, Christopher (Council); [REDACTED]; Dereziński, Tony
Subject: RE: University Bank Revised PUD and site plan (Council Agenda Items B-1 and DB-1)

(Mr. Paup and Tony were inadvertently not cc'd on the note below.) Thanks again, Jane

From: Lumm, Jane
Sent: Mon 12/19/2011 11:41 AM
To: Rampson, Wendy; Cheng, Christopher; Powers, Steve
Cc: [REDACTED]; Taylor, Christopher (Council)
Subject: University Bank Revised PUD and site plan (Council Agenda Items B-1 and DB-1)

Dear Chris/Wendy/Steve, (with copies to Mike Sarosi, 2109 Tuomy, and Robert Paup, 2104 Brockman)

I'm writing to follow-up on some remaining neighborhood concerns re: the Univ. Bank site plan revisions, and have some clarifying questions in advance of tonight's public hearing. Thanks for your assistance.

As you are aware, several neighbors have expressed concerns with, essentially, having a parking lot "in their backyard", and I've received questions re: the final revisions that are being proposed to minimize the impact on the neighboring homeowners. Specifically, I am writing to confirm that (1) the supplemental regulations address the previously discussed and requested low level lighting, six foot privacy wall and screening with evergreens/bushes, and removal of the non-native invasives and (2) this zoning and site plan revision will/not increase or contribute to the possibility of further commercialization of the residential neighborhood (Mr. Paup's and others' concerns).

I've read the supplemental regulations and note that the screening/landscape buffer speaks to six foot masonry screening and use of Chapter 62 required plant material (assume non-invasive mat'ls.). I do not see language that addresses removal of non-invasives or language that requires low level lighting for the parking lot. Under "Section 3: Beneficial Effects", paragraph "F", I note that it states that "Mitigation efforts *may* include but are not limited to, landscape screening, directional lighting and improved storm water retention."

The staff report further indicates that, "... the petitioner agreed to increase the required 15-foot conflicting land use buffer to 24-feet and increase the conflicting land use wall from 3 feet to 6 feet in height and extend the eastern screening wall approximately 28 additional feet to provide additional screening for hte neighbors. These landscaping mitigation, setback, height and length increases are beyond that required by code and have been incorporated into the PUD supplemental regulations." And that, "At the September 1, 2011, meeting between the bank and neighbors, both parties indicated they were satisfied with the proposed new parking lot being

located further away from the woodland and residential properties and with the proposed increase in landscaping and screening." My take-away on this is all positive and I appreciate that the bank, neighbors and staff met to address these concerns and improvements to the site plan were made, and that the petitioner is exceeding the required tree mitigation. But, I do not see anything that specifically speaks to low level lighting (just *may* include directional lighting) and removal of non-native plant material along the privacy wall. Could the supplemental regulations be amended, and would the petitioner be amenable to amending to say "will" instead of "may" and that non-native plant material will be removed/replaced? (Feel free to share this note with Steve Ranzini -- I do not have his email address.)

Also would like to confirm that the set-back on the eastern property line (by the Tuomy addresses) is 24 feet? I also note that the rear and side minimum setback requirements are 50 and 30 feet respectively. Some neighbors, in receiving their notification of tonight's public hearing, would like clarification on the set-backs.

As you know, Mr. Paup, Mr. Sarosi and others have expressed concerns about how approval of these site plan changes may increase the likelihood of commercialization/future degradation of this residential neighborhood. In answer to the Q, "What's going to happen years down the road?" I have only suggested that should the current property owner sell the property, the current zoning and regulations would be applied to the new property owner, and I note that under Section 4: Regulations of the Supplemental Regulations, permitted uses are, essentially, limited to business offices/services. Is my reading of this correct, and would any proposed change in use (e.g., further commercialization) require a new site plan?

Thanks for your assistance and follow-up on these neighborhood concerns.

Jane

Corts, Carynne

From: Beaudry, Jacqueline
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2011 7:24 PM
To: Anglin, Mike; Beaudry, Jacqueline; Bowden (King), Anissa; Briere, Sabra; Crawford, Tom; Derezinski, Tony; Hieftje, John; Higgins, Marcia; Higgins, Sara; Hohnke, Carsten; Kunselman, Stephen; Lumm, Jane; Postema, Stephen; Powers, Steve; Satterlee, Joanna; Schopieray, Christine; Smith, Sandi; Taylor, Christopher (Council); Teall, Margie; Walker, Nancy; Wondrash, Lisa
Subject: DC-4 correction

Council:

The packet download did not include the complete text of DC-4, which was added this afternoon. The corrected report has been added to the packet and can be downloaded now using the link.

Jackie

Jacqueline Beaudry, City Clerk

Please Note: The City Clerk's Office has relocated back to City Hall.

City Clerk's Office | Guy C. Larcom City Hall | 301 E. Huron, 2nd Floor · Ann Arbor · MI · 48104

734.794.6140 (O) · 734.994.8296 (F) |

jbeaudry@a2gov.org | www.a2gov.org



Think Green! Please don't print this e-mail unless absolutely necessary.