



City of Ann Arbor

100 N. Fifth Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

Meeting Minutes City Planning Commission

Tuesday, January 4, 2011

7:00 PM
220 North Main Street County Administration Bldg Board Room

PLEASE NOTE NEW TEMPORARY LOCATION

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. Accommodations, including sign language interpreters, may be arranged by contacting the City Clerk's Office at 734-794-6140 (V/TDD) at least 24 hours in advance. 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 5th 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 red envelope at the top of the home page.

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).

1 CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Mahler called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Present 8 - Bona, Mahler, Carlberg, Woods, Derezinski, Briggs, Westphal, and Giannola

Absent 1 - Pratt

2 ROLL CALL

Rampson called the roll.

Present 8 - Bona, Mahler, Carlberg, Woods, Derezinski, Briggs, Westphal, and Giannola

Absent 1 - Pratt

3 INTRODUCTIONS

4 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

None

5 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was Approved as presented.

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

None.

b City Council

Derezinski reported that the City Council had approved the Area, Height and Placement ordinance at the second reading on January 3.

He also stated that the City Council had adopted the changes to the Motor Vehicle Code, which provide more flexibility to the City to set speed limits based on their own findings. He noted that the City Council had been approached by several individuals who felt the speed limits were too low in some areas and cases were being litigated, which led the City to review and take action on how they could better handle these situations in the future. He explained the 85% rule and how speed limits should be set to the speed that 85% of the drivers are driving in a particular area.

Derezinski reported that the City Council had discussed the Medical Marijuana licensing at great lengths and decided to keep it at First Reading because of the number of amendments proposed.

c Planning Manager

Rampson reviewed the list of January 2011 meetings. She mentioned two neighborhood participation meetings that would be held in January; one for the Ann Arbor Hotel proposal at 202 S. Division and the other is for a mixed use proposal at the Georgetown Mall site. She noted that the Georgetown Mall site developer had been waiting on was the Area, Height and Placement amendments to be finalized.

Rampson informed the Commission that staff will be setting up committee meetings for the Citizen Outreach Committee, the Ordinance Revisions Committee, which will be looking at the Landscape Ordinance Amendments, and the Master Plan Review Committee, which will be discussing the State Street Corridor Planning effort. She said that the Citizen's Outreach Committee met in late November about the evaluation that needs to be done on the citizen participation ordinance. She noted that Connie Pulcifer from Systems Planning will be assisting Planning staff in that effort.

Rampson reported that the other evaluation staff will be doing will be on the A2D2 zoning, and they will be looking for feedback from the Commission before it goes on to the City Council.

January Meetings

Approved as presented

d Planning Commission Officers and Committees

Westphal reported that the Downtown Design Guidelines Committee is meeting tomorrow evening at 5:15 PM at the offices of Mitchell and Mouat. A draft of the ordinance will be going before City Council next week at a working session.

e Written Communications and Petitions

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.)

None

8 PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT BUSINESS MEETING

8-1 [10-1338](#) A public hearing on the following items will be held by the Ann Arbor City Planning Commission at the Ann Arbor District Library, 343 South Fifth Avenue, Basement Conference Room, Ann Arbor, Michigan on Thursday, January 20, 2011 at 7:00 p.m.
1500 Pauline Site Plan for City Council Approval
Sander Annexation and Zoning

Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity Special Exception Use and Site Plan for Planning Commission Approval

Chairperson Mahler read the Public Hearing Notice.

Received and Filed

- 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.)

10-1337

Resolution to Approve FY 2012-2017 Capital Improvements Plan as the Basis for the FY 2012 Capital Budget (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 8 Yeas and 0 Nays)

Cresson Slotten and Connie Pulcifer from the System Planning Unit presented the staff report and explained the CIP FY2012-2017, which can be viewed in full length at;

http://www.a2gov.org/government/publicservices/systems_planning/capitalimprovements/Pages/CapitalImprovementsPlan.aspx.

Woods asked if alleys are in the DDA area, would it be possible to use DDA funds for needed construction of those projects.

Slotten responded, yes and that is how the alleys have been reconstructed over the past several years; through the use of DDA dollars.

Derezinski asked if there were a new business district created downtown, could that district then fund construction projects in the alleys.

Slotten said he wasn't sure, but he believed that if they were in a designated district, then he was quite sure they could fund such projects as well.

Noting no speakers, Mahler declared the Public Hearing closed at 8:17 PM.

10-1337

Resolution to Approve FY 2012-2017 Capital Improvements Plan as the Basis for the FY 2012 Capital Budget (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 8 Yeas and 0 Nays)

Moved by Derezinski, Seconded by Westphal, that,

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 FY2012-2017 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 January 4, 2011;

Resolved, That the City Planning Commission hereby approves the FY2012-2017 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 FY2012-2017 Capital Improvements Plan as the basis for the FY2012/2013 Capital Budget.

9-1 [10-1337](#)

Resolution to Approve FY 2012-2017 Capital Improvements Plan as the Basis for the FY 2012 Capital Budget (CPC Recommendation: Approval - 8 Yeas and 0 Nays)

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Carlberg asked what will happen with the East Stadium bridges, and when will the work start.

Slotten responded that the project is moving forward and MDOT is reviewing the plans. He noted that construction is scheduled to start later this year and is fully funded under the highly competitive Federal transportation funding program, Tiger 2.

Slotten explained that City staff has learned how important it is to package their projects when looking for funding. He noted that there is a water main in the East Stadium bridges area that needs to be upgraded and replaced at the same time the bridge reconstruction is being done, and has therefore been included into the project's overall costs.

Carlberg asked how the bridge reconstruction will affect the street funding.

Slotten answered that since the bridge project is fully funded, the City will not have to use any of the street funds for the project. He noted that those funds will now be able to go back to the street fund to be applied to the major streets projects like Dexter Avenue, Miller Avenue, South State Street, and Eisenhower Parkway.

Slotten explained that the streets millage will be coming before the voters this fall and is a key funding source for the major part of the proposed projects. He said this will give the City a chance to ask the community about the best way to utilize the funding to meet the needs of the community.

Derezinski asked where the CIP survey results might come into play in the proposals themselves.

Slotten responded that he saw the greatest value in the survey as we move forward. He said that, as the CIP process evolves even further, staff will use the feedback that came from the survey to identify needs where staff haven't recognized them, as well as suggested approaches for engaging the public. He said the process is similar to a funnel, with input from several sources being refined into the plan, including from master plans which incorporated significant public feedback.

Derezinski asked whether projects that have low priority and don't get funded in a specific year would get a higher priority in the next year. He asked if there will be some unpopular projects that will never get funded because they always will receive

a low score.

Slotten responded that the Prioritization Model is a tool for the staff and the Commission to use when focusing on issues. He said that those unpopular projects need to be brought to the forefront if and when there truly is a need so they can identify funding.

Derezinski asked about the Prioritization Model in relationship to emergencies that might occur, such as a bridge or a water main that might need immediate attention.

Slotten said that the model helps them move less popular projects to a higher priority and in so doing move other projects to future years.

Pulcipher stated that there is a newly-formed staff group that will assist with the CIP process; the Core Pre-Planning Team, who will monitor the plan throughout the year, after it has been approved by the City Council. She noted that they will look at the feasibility and complexity of projects and in so doing, make sure the projects are assigned to correct groups. Pulcipher said she sees this team taking the results of the survey and bringing them down into the details of the projects.

Derezinski asked if a group such the AATA or the Washtenaw Corridor Improvement team would have a chance to review the priority plan before it was adopted or afterwards.

Slotten responded that he believed it would be afterwards, but he noted that through the newly-formed staff team there could be on-going improvements to the input from such groups.

Derezinski asked how the City's CIP plan works with entities and schedules such as MDOT in resurfacing major streets that are under their plans and schedules.

Slotten stated that staff such as Homayoon Pirooz in the Project Management Unit work with MDOT on the resurfacing program, along with reviewing other major projects that are included in the City's CIP program, to coordinate various needs and schedules.

Briggs asked if funding had been identified for all the projects listed for the 2012-2013 fiscal year.

Slotten answered that there are few projects that still remain unfunded.

Briggs asked what happens to projects that don't receive approval from the City Council. She asked if they are removed from the CIP and if they become replaced.

Slotten responded that if a project is unfunded they will make adjustments to prioritizing projects. He explained that if there is a need for the project they will not eliminate it from the CIP but it might be bumped back in anticipation of approvals or funding.

Slotten said that each year in reviewing the CIP they have to determine if there still truly is a need for the project, then rescoring it utilizing the tools of public input and feedback, while looking for alternate funding to address the need.

Westphal shared his appreciation of the staff efforts with implementing the CIP program. He felt staff was using a progressive tool and had worked very hard to meet the needs of the City while balancing the financial cycles of funding.

Westphal asked if there is any risk management approach taken when looking at prioritizing projects. He mentioned the possibility of energy costs increasing and asked if any of the discussions included possibly looking at front-end spending in order to mitigate the potential risk of drastically higher energy costs in the future.

Slotten responded that two of the criteria touch on that issue; the Environmental Goals and Energy Costs. He noted that the City's environmental coordinator, Matt Naud, has been brought into the discussion to assist with these evaluations. He said that Naud had requested that each item on the CIP be reviewed to quantify if they do or don't assist us towards meeting our environmental goals in reducing our carbon footprint.

Woods asked if there was another possible way of looking at the questions we ask in order to tease out responses that might be coming back to us because of prevalent items in the news, such as the Stadium bridge, or political feedback, such as renovating City Hall.

Pulcifer answered that the survey was a first attempt by staff at matching the asset categories. She felt that there will be benefits revealed in two years as staff drill down deeper into the details with the community through different ways, such as focus groups. She agreed that it is very important to make sure they are asking the questions in the right way and realize that some responses will be self evident based on projects that are current in the news.

Bona thanked Slotten and the staff for their work on the complex CIP Prioritization Model. She stated that she was very excited about being able to elevate the discussion to what the priorities are and then see the projects fall naturally into place where they should. She wondered if there might be people who are interested in reviewing and giving feedback on the criteria list used for CIP projects.

Bona agreed with Westphal and said she would really like to see how the Energy category is used. She said from her observation it look like the category is evaluating how much energy is expended in implementing a project instead of how much energy is used. She said that in looking at the environmental goals she sees that the Parks and Recreation has a very high score and new streets has a low score; yet streets and how we use them have a huge impact on the environment.

Bona stated that in regards to the Energy category it would be nice to see the sophistication taken up a notch. She noted that there is a huge improvement from previous years and she would like to see more involvement in the CIP from Matt Naud and Andrew Brix.

Mahler thanked the staff for their presentations as well as the CIP sub-committee who put a lot of work into the program. He questioned if staff had heard anything on possible funding for the alternative transportation projects that received a fairly high Prioritization Model score and rank.

Slotten responded that the key staff person on transportation for the City is Eli Cooper. He explained that through the various components in the CIP they have chosen to separate each of these projects with the specific purpose of looking at the possibility of getting the funding in chunks and implementing smaller pieces.

Slotten noted that the feasibility study for the transit connector is underway, with the City, the DDA, the University of Michigan, and AATA as the project partners. He said that through the feasibility study, they are looking at what can be done and what

might be possible. Slotten said that further on there will be an opportunity for the policy makers and staff to make the decision if we head towards a specific type of transit method.

Mahler said that he asked because the Non-Motorized Plan has been identified in the survey results as something that the public wants to spend their money on. He noted that it is also an integral part of our Master Plan and the alternative transportation system and it concerns him that it's such a large part of the unfunded Capital Improvements Plan.

Mahler noted that the CIP showed the number one model rank under the Alternative Transportation Section to be the Washtenaw Avenue Interchange Shared Use Path. He asked for clarification on the boundaries of the project or if there was a possibility that the costs could be shared by the other communities involved.

Slotten responded that the project is one that expands outside of the City limits, with the City's share of the portion being the smallest. He stated that a large portion of the funding would be coming from MDOT, and Washtenaw County Road Commission, and the Township.

Mahler said that the public might be interested in knowing that the Argo head-race and water amenities are a project that has been funded.

Slotten responded, yes, this project has been funded.

Woods asked if the City was a part of the roundabouts and funding for the ones built on Geddes Road and US 23.

Slotten answered yes, and that the funding was to a lesser degree. He explained that the need for an alternative approach in that area was one of those items that had been in the CIP and when MDOT approached the City with a much larger project in that same area, it was the right timing for the City to accomplish the fulfillment of the project as previously outlined.

Woods asked if Slotten had received any feedback from users of the roundabout and specifically about their comfort levels of using it.

Slotten responded that he, personally, had not received any feedback. He mentioned that maybe the engineers in Project Management might have heard something, but he felt that since he hadn't heard any major complaints he believed it was working well. He stated that in discussions with the Project Management Unit, they thought that as people are getting more used to roundabouts in their area their comfort levels adjust accordingly.

Derezinski commented that initially there had been an outcry over the roundabouts in his ward, especially when the one was installed on Nixon Road, and people predicted the accidents that would occur. He said that Homayoon Pirooz from the Project Management Unit provided great statistics on roundabouts, as well as alternatives to the design. He stated that the safety improvements associated with roundabouts were amazingly good.

Derezinski said that after the roundabout was built and people got used to them the complaints totally ceased. He believed that there was accident data also collected on that roundabout.

Derezinski felt that the previous traffic backlogs on Geddes Avenue were less

frequent now with the roundabouts, as well as the added pedestrian overpass. He mentioned that before the construction of the roundabouts, he used to receive many complaints, as a Councilmember for that area.

A motion was made by Councilmember Derezinski, seconded by Vice Chair Westphal, that the Resolution/Public Hearing be Recommended for Approval to the City Council, due back on 2/7/2011. On a roll call, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

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

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Evan Pratt

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

None

11 COMMISSION PROPOSED BUSINESS

12 ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Eric Mahler, Chair
mg