

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES STAFF REPORT

For Planning Commission Meeting of October 4, 2011

**SUBJECT: University Bank PUD Supplemental Regulations and PUD Site Plan
(2015 Washtenaw Avenue)
File Nos. Z09-028 & SP09-029**

PROPOSED CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION

The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City Council approve the University Bank Planned Unit Development (PUD) Supplemental Regulations and Site Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed PUD supplemental regulations, because the proposed revisions to the occupancy and parking lot provide an overall beneficial effect for the City by supporting the continued viability of this adaptive reuse of an historic building.

Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed PUD site plan as it limits the impact on both landmark and woodland trees to a minimum necessary to make a reasonable use of the land, as required by the review criteria of Chapter 57, Section 5:129.

STAFF REPORT

On September 8, 2011, the Planning Commission postponed this petition to allow the petitioner an opportunity to revise their site plan and address neighborhood concerns.

Revised Parking Lot Layout

The revised parking lot layout has been shifted an additional nine feet toward the building, for a new setback of 24 feet from the eastern property line. A continuous six-foot tall wall is proposed to be constructed along the eastern and southeastern property lines, screening the parking lot from 2021 Washtenaw Avenue and 2107-2109 Tuomy.

Three parking spaces fronting the bank building are proposed to be removed to meet Fire Department turning radius requirements for a new parking total of 50 spaces. A "No Parking Sign" is proposed along the north side of the entrance drive across from 2021 Washtenaw Avenue.

The petitioner proposes removing two landmark and 19 woodland trees totaling 186 caliper inches for construction of the screening wall, 14-space parking lot and connection drive. By shifting the parking lot an additional nine feet away from the woodland, a reduction of 46 caliper inches is proposed when compared with the previous mitigation plan. The petitioner proposes to exceed the required tree mitigation by planting for 223 caliper inches. These mitigation trees are to be planted throughout the site.

Public Benefits

The original PUD was approved to allow an adaptive reuse of an historic residential building, thereby preserving the building that was not protected by historic district designation. The proposed changes allow for the continued viability of the historic building on the site. In addition, the petitioner has added new non-motorized improvements, including a five-foot wide walkway located along the northern property line connecting Washtenaw Avenue to the parking lot, and five new Class C bicycle spaces.

The petitioner proposes to mitigate for all trees removed due to the parking lot construction, not just the two landmark and 19 woodland trees. This landscape mitigation exceeds the minimum required. Along with this increase in landscaping, 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 the neighbors. These landscaping mitigation, setback, height and length increases are beyond that required by code and have been incorporated into the PUD supplemental regulations.

DEPARTMENT COMMENTS PENDING OR UNRESOLVED

Land Development – As required by Chapter 57, section 5:126(3) an alternatives analysis has been provided in the plan set (Sheet C-8). The alternative shows a layout that realistically preserves all of the landmark and woodland trees, and reduces the total amount of impervious surface necessary to install the parking. The proposed plan removes two landmark trees and 19 woodland trees for a total of 186 caliper inches of regulated removals. The proposed plan (not the alternative) therefore has not justified that the natural features impact is limited to the minimum necessary, as required by the review criteria of Chapter 57, Section 5:129.

Planning – Staff supports the proposed parking lot layout with increased side setbacks and screening walls from the adjacent neighbors. The revised location of the new parking lot has less impact on the woodland trees from the previous proposal and over-mitigates for the removal of these landmark and woodland trees. Based on commentary at earlier meetings, the alternative for constructing the new parking lot in the large lawn area in front of the building was considered to be undesirable. 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.

Prepared by Chris Cheng
Reviewed by Wendy Rampson

Attachments: 10/19/10 Staff Report
9/8/11 Staff Report
Revised Site Plan Reduction
Revised Landscape Reduction

Building
City Attorney
Project Management
File No. SP09-029 & Z09-028