



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, May 17, 2016

7:00 PM

Larcom City Hall, 301 E Huron St, Second
floor, City Council Chambers

- 9-b 16-0766** 615 South Main Street Planned Project Site Plan for City Council Approval - A proposal to construct a 6-story, 229 unit apartment building to include 588 bedrooms, 174 parking spaces (11 at grade and 163 below grade) and 6,200 square feet of retail space. The 19th century brick building at the southwest corner of the site is proposed to be preserved and provide retail space. The petitioners are proposing a planned project to address requirements related to height and front setbacks along South Main Street. (Ward 4) Staff Recommendation: Approval
Jeffrey Kahan provided the staff report.

The Vice Chair read the public hearing notice as published.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Vince Caruso, Allen Creek Watershed Group, said if individuals would like to look at more details on the information that he presented earlier, they can visit his organization's website at acwg.org. He stated that his organization does not support this planned project on several grounds. He said it was indicated at one of the public meetings that three of the businesses have experienced flooding on this site, which could create a flooding hazard for cars parked below ground. He cited examples of flooding in northern Ohio where three people lost their lives as they were trying to move their cars from parking areas located in floodplains. Caruso referenced conversations he had with the floodplain manager for the City about the accuracy of the floodplain maps. He gave several examples of floodplain issues currently being experienced in the City: the City's floodplain manager considers the floodplain maps to be loosely calibrated; a homeless shelter was almost built in the floodway illegally and considerable money and time was lost redesigning it because of the City's negligence; the City allowed development in his neighborhood very close to the floodplain and shortly thereafter they had to come in and bulldoze a woodland, remove several landmark trees, and lastly, the North Main Avalon project was given the green light but after analysis it was revealed that it was in the floodway and had to be abandoned. He said he believes 32 affordable housing units had to be demolished due to

that. He stated that he believes this building is out of scale with the neighborhood, it will create a vortex of wind along with the building across the street. Caruso reminded the Commission of their duty to protect the public health, safety, and wealth fare of the public, and he believes flooding is a public safety hazard and they need to help to deter its effects. He said that they tried to get City Council to create a floodplain overlay zone but they denied it and didn't take it up during the budget discussions. He said it is not as though they only make these fights at site plan review; they have led the charge on the Green Streets initiative that the City has taken up, rain gardens and rain barrels.

Ethel Potts, 1014 Elder Boulevard, Ann Arbor, said this is a case we have been dealing with lately—planned projects. She said the setback from the front of Main Street will be a true public benefit, but the D2 zoning is inappropriate for the neighborhood. She echoed the concerns of Caruso regarding climate change and building at the edge of the floodplain. Potts said this is a very bad place to introduce new traffic; any turn in and out of this location will be very difficult. She said she waits a very long time to turn right to get to South Main Market and can't imagine turning left; she waits a very long time at the lights at Hill and at Madison. She said she understands that the back alleyway will be used to exit but has been in the alley and doesn't think people will be able to drive through it easily. She asked whether the alley will be public or privately owned. She said there are problems that cannot be solved with this development and does not recommend approval.

Ray Detter, Chair of Downtown Citizens Advisory Council, said his group has been involved with various meetings over the course of the project's history to try and make the outcome more favorable. He said they are not taking an official stance on the project because the citizens are making their opinions heard. He stated that he was asked by Rita Mitchell, 621 Fifth Avenue, Ann Arbor, to read portions of her statement to raise concerns she has. He read that she hoped the Commission would deny the project's planned project application because the tradeoffs for additional height are not worth the benefits provided; she is concerned about traffic and the way pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists will interact due to this development, in addition to safety issues related to traffic and sight distance.

Chris Crockett, President of Old Fourth Ward Association and member of Ann Arbor Preservation Alliance, said she wanted to discuss the petitioner's request to get credit for historic preservation. She cited Chapter 55 of the City's zoning code, reading a portion related to overlay

zoning districts: "The intent of this district is for infill development that preserves historic buildings' assets, supports downtown activities, and provides non-motorized connections through preservation of a system of public and common open spaces. New development along the Allen Creek Floodplain should be sited to provide green space on site, and be located in such a way that it will be connected with the green spaces of abutting properties." Crockett stated that this project meets none of these requirements. First, she said, they are calling historic preservation the retention of two walls; second, no common public green space is provided and the green space that is provided for residents is mostly occupied by a swimming pool. She said the swimming pool is a folly as Michigan has at best three months in which swimming is possible outdoors. Crockett recommended pulling the building further back from the sidewalk to create more publically accessible green space. She stated that this would also prevent a steep cliff-like wall from being created along Main Street by this development and its neighbor across the street. She added that doing so would create a better sense of pedestrian wellbeing and promote better opportunities for retail. Crockett urged the Commission to postpone the vote and send the developer back to work to make improvements: providing real historic preservation, more integrated commercial options, and removing the swimming pool.

Alan Haber, 531 Third Street, Ann Arbor, expressed concern about having sufficient parking for the proposed development. He said in the ideal world for which we all hope, the automobile will be secondary in people's mobility, but currently it is still primary. He stated that one level of underground parking is not sufficient; it sends people out to park in the neighborhoods, which are becoming congested. He also voiced concern over increased traffic due to the development; stating that traffic is already bad in this location. Haber echoed previous comments that the development should accommodate more retail in a location so close to downtown. He also commented on the floodwaters that can occur in his neighborhood, relating to the 221 Felch project, citing a huge geyser that he has seen. Haber said climate change is something that cannot be ignored.

Brandt Stiles, Collegiate Housing Partners, Saint Louis, Missouri, thanked everyone on the Planning Commission, staff, and in the audience for their time and input. He stated that he appreciated the feedback they received at their last development review and said they have been working diligently to address concerns. He said their application qualifies as a planned project for two reasons; the first is for setbacks and the second is for height. He stated that they are trying to

increase their setback from the maximum allowed to provide a public benefit. With regards to height, Stiles explained that the site is an irregular shape and restricts the way they can structure the building, so additional density is needed. He stated that the primary public benefit they are offering with their development is first floor retail; they are offering the same square footage of retail as currently exists on the site. He said he is happy that a beloved retailer currently on site will be able to have space in the new development. He added that rebuilding the historic buggy factory, providing 10 feet of additional setbacks off of Main Street, additional parking above the minimum required, a community-wide car share hub, a community-wide bike share hub, increased sustainable design elements, providing a public access easement along the east side of the property for the future Allen Creek Greenway if it occurs, and snowplowing on Main Street are other public benefits provided by the development. He said they could not be more excited about the project and is happy to answer any questions.

Brad Moore, architect, said he has representatives with him tonight from Midwestern Consulting who can answer questions about the traffic impact analysis. He said he wanted to point out a few changes that had been made to the design since the last time the project appeared before Commission. He pointed to additional landscape they have provided along the east alleyway. He noted that they have located their shared parking spots outside of their garage, so any shared vehicle service member can access them. He explained that they lost parking spaces due to the shared vehicle spaces counting for four spaces when they were inside their parking garage. Moore noted that because the shared vehicle spaces will be along Main Street, the DDA informed them that they will need to repave that section of the street and maintain the snow plowing during the winter months; they have agreed to do so. He indicated the location of the shared bicycle parking spaces in a rendering of the development and noted the additional landscaping that will be done near the townhouse units along Main Street. He held up an additional rendering of the interior courtyard for the building. Moore expressed confidence that their pool will be well used as the pool at the development across the street gets plenty of use. He then displayed a graphic showing the floodway and floodplain in relation to the site; showing that their property lays completely outside of the floodplain.

Noting no further public speakers, the Vice Chair closed the public hearing unless the item is postponed.

Moved by Briere, seconded by Peters, that The Ann Arbor City Planning Commission hereby recommends that the Mayor and City

Council approve 615 South Main Planned Project Site Plan and Development Agreement subject to Public Services approval of the traffic impact study.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION:

Briere said she didn't understand how the traffic count at peak hour in the evening is an issue; she would think peak hour in the morning would be the problem. She asked for clarification from staff.

Kahan responded that during the evening there will be extensive outbound or southbound trips, those heading south to the freeway that work downtown, creating congestion backing up from Stadium for quite a few blocks. He said it is true that the inverse will also be congested, northbound trips in the morning.

Mike Cool, Midwestern Consulting, said although you might get more people leaving the site in the morning, there are more people headed southbound in the evening, which causes more delays for people trying to turn left out of the site.

Briere asked whether the traffic impact study only looks at left turn delays.

Cool responded that left turns drive the longer delays.

Briere said that in the morning, when many cars are coming into Ann Arbor, if a driver is attempting to leave Mosley by turning South, they would have to cross the heavy incoming traffic.

Cool said yes, but there are less cars traveling southbound in the morning, so the calculations show the delay is less in the morning than in the evening for that scenario.

Briere said it would have been helpful to include peak hour morning and evening left and right turns in the staff report, as the traffic impact analysis report is very dense.

Mills said she was the one with lots of traffic questions last time, but has less this time, as the report addressed many of them. She said she believes as this development will be market rate, many of the residents will be associated with the university, and as such, won't need to rely on cars to get there because it is two blocks away, so she is not as worried about traffic. She expressed concern over the east driveway and how

people will be using it and whether parking will be necessary there. Mills said it would be a far better benefit if it were entirely pedestrian focused, especially given its proximity to the Allen Creek Greenway.

Moore said they are envisioning the alleyway more as a shared pavement; the amount of vehicle trips will be minimal as only eleven vehicles will be assigned to this space. He said they received considerable feedback from neighbors about having enough parking for the development on site so that it doesn't spill over into the rest of the neighborhood, and the use of the alleyway for parking is a response to that. Moore stated that the pathway is marked with brick pavers, so it will be perceived as more of a pedestrian, non-motorized walkway, and it will be landscaped on both sides.

Stiles said in regards to enforcement of the restrictions on vehicles in the pathway, from an operational perspective, the spots will be leased so as to monitor who uses the pathway. He added that the easement agreement with the gas station only allows the egress of tenants, which is another reason to restrict access via a gate.

Mills asked if the easement allows public pedestrian access.

Stiles responded that the easement agreement with the gas station does not speak specifically to pedestrian access, but as they are allowing the developer to install a six feet paved walkway through their property, they are allowing pedestrian egress through their site. He added that they are allowing public access through their portion of the pathway.

Moore added that they are clearly delineating the space for pedestrians versus the space for cars with color stamped pavers.

Mills said she is on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Allen Creek Greenway project and has walked through that area and finds it very difficult to navigate as a pedestrian. She said the idea of paving that to demarcate it for pedestrians makes sense and appreciates that effort. She expressed appreciation for the developer taking the time to listen to concerns and by providing additional parking. She stated that they are still above the parking requirement even without the eleven spaces in the pathway. Mills asked if there was any other reason to allow vehicular access in that pathway because she would prefer to see it as a non-motorized pathway. She stated that to her, the community benefit would be greater if it were more of a green space than just an alley, and thus, the project would be more appropriate for the planned project

approval.

Stiles said that is a difficult question because they want to provide a pedestrian thoroughfare adjacent to the Allen Creek drain. He stated that the vehicular traffic from those eleven leased spots will be next to nothing.

Moore said the pathway they have designed is the compromise they are most comfortable with.

Mills asked what they feel the compromise is that they are making.

Moore said they are meeting the additional need for parking expressed by neighborhoods while providing a pedestrian pathway.

Mills stated that she appreciates that effort but does not feel the eleven parking spaces will make much of a difference. She said having a completely pedestrian pathway, and a pervious one, given the location, might be a better use of the space.

Clein said Mills make a strong point. He added that the pathway does not connect to anything and it sounds as though there is not actually a public access easement going all of the way to Madison, which is what he thought was the case the last time this project appeared before the Commission.

Peters asked whether the petitioner could address their response, or lack of response, to the comments received from the Design Review Board (DRB). He stated that the DRB had asked about opening up the courtyard to the public and breaking up the massing of the building. He also asked about the courtyard and whether it will be located on top of a parking structure, at street level, and the possibility of having more space for retail.

Moore responded that the site slopes downwards as you move away from Madison, so you are almost five feet above grade at the corner of the site toward Madison, and inches from grade near Mosley. He said you drive in at the first floor level and descend into the basement level. He stated that the courtyard is elevated. Moore explained that the building is designed to sort of cocoon the courtyard from the noise of traffic on Main and the noise from the industrial and railroad uses on the other side.

Peters said he liked the comments given by the DRB about breaking up the massing on Main Street and allowing for more retail frontage to make

the pedestrian experience better, but understands why the developer had to design the building the way they did.

Franciscus said she likes what is being proposed for this site far more than what is currently on the site. She expressed the desire to have the old buggy factory better preserved but is glad it is being retained at all. She said she can appreciate the DRB's concerns but now understands the desire to create a sort of oasis for residents with the courtyard; she believes this will be of great value to them. Franciscus said she is pleased that there will be abundant retail space on site. Overall she finds the proposal improved from last time.

Milshteyn asked how much of the buggy factory is being preserved.

Moore stated that they are preserving the two-story façade section that faces Mosley; there will be a new structure built about ten feet back from that plane so it is not just a stage set type of preservation. He said on the Main Street, they are keeping the original façade without the aluminum addition that was added when the site was a car dealership, and restoring certain features that were removed through the years. He stated that on the Main Street side the new building will be set about seven feet back from the original façade. Moore added that there will be space for outdoor seating on both sides.

Milshteyn asked whether the interior will be preserved at all.

Moore responded no, because the interior is structurally dubious.

Milshteyn asked about entrance and egress from the site through the gated alleyway and whether only those who were assigned parking spaces there.

Moore responded in the affirmative.

Milshteyn asked whether that alleyway is also the pedestrian walkway.

Moore explained that the one way drive is a shared pedestrian-vehicular pathway. The pavers will be on the one-way drive, showing where people will walk versus where the cars will park.

Milshteyn asked whether there will also be a gate at the end.

Moore responded in the affirmative.

Milshiteyn asked how many parking spaces will be located in the alleyway.

Moore said there will be eleven spaces.

Milshiteyn echoed the comments of Mills, he wonders how safe the shared pathway will be, and how comfortable pedestrians will be walking right next to cars.

Bona said she was not present the first time this development went before Commission and apologizes for any redundant questions she has pertaining to the requirements for a planned project. She referred to the staff report and cited the usable open space requirement. She said she shared concerns that the private interior courtyard does not qualify as open space as a public benefit; she said that open space is required for an apartment complex anyway. Bona also said she is skeptical about the desirability of the courtyard as it is enclosed and will not receive as much sunlight as a courtyard open on one side would. She asked staff whether a planned project has exceptions for setbacks as well as height.

Kahan said yes.

Bona said it seems like they are asking for an additional setback as a planned project deviation, but then also citing that as a public benefit, which is illogical. She stated that in the D2 district, they don't like big setbacks because they want an urban environment, so giving additional setback is not necessarily a benefit; strategically locating a setback she might be able to accept. With regards to the natural feature preservation, she asked whether they are doing something for stormwater preservation in excess of what the City is asking for; she said all projects that come before them are already required to improve stormwater management, but a planned project should be going beyond that.

Moore said they are offering improvements by decreasing perviousness on site and doing stormwater retention for their impervious area.

Bona said yes, but you are not going beyond what you would be required to do on this site without the planned project status.

Moore said they are having more open space and therefore having more infiltration.

Bona said yes, they are improving stormwater management on site, but

not to the level necessary for conferring planned project status, in her opinion. As for preservation of architectural features, she stated that she found the ten foot setback on the buggy factory lame, and not quite enough to constitute preservation. She said she does not know what they mean by solar orientation and readiness; having a flat roof and putting a few mechanical units on the building makes any building solar oriented and ready. Bona stated that she would like to see more specification on how the building will be solar ready, the kilowatts of those mechanical units and how that relates to energy usage, for example. She stated that their intention to be 15 percent better than the ASHRAE standards of 2007 is not impressive as there are many communities in this country that are under the ASHRAE standards of 2013 as their base minimum in code. She urged them to reconsider that number or consider meeting the 2013 standard, which would be progressive for the State of Michigan. She said she is trying to find a public benefit that justifies the height and added setbacks. Bona stated that pedestrian-oriented design is a given on this site due to its proximity to downtown and is not an added benefit. She asked what percentage of the building's total footprint will be devoted to retail. She said the shared vehicles are a very good thing. She asked whether they are providing any EV charging stations.

Moore said yes.

Bona said you might want to consider adding more conduits so that number can be increased. She echoed Mills' desire for the back alley to be pedestrian only. She asked staff whether there is residential permitted parking in the neighborhood surrounding this site.

Kahan responded that the City has a residential parking permit program in the Old West Side.

Bona said there is no parking issue in this neighborhood then relative to this development, as you can't get a permit in those neighborhoods.

Moore said he takes the concerns voiced by those neighbors at face value. However, he said he will make a note to see if the eleven parking spaces in the pathway can be deferred so they would not be installed unless needed.

Bona said that would be a good solution and something she would consider to be a public benefit on this project.

Moore said three percent of the development will be devoted to retail.

Bona stated that she was extremely disappointed in such a low number. She said there was a real opportunity to provide more retail than already existed on site with this development.

Gibb-Randall said car access was smartly designed with regards to the floodplain. She asked how much higher the drive is compared to the flood fringe.

Moore said four feet.

Gibb-Randall said the building is a bit fortress-like being completely enclosed. She said there is a section of the building along the Mosley side, to the east of the driveway, where they could open up the building. She said it would provide solar access to the courtyard and would feel more porous to the community. She also clarified that the project across the street, 618 South Main, was approved for 85 feet but was built at 75 feet. She said the reasoning the petitioner gave in their comments was incorrect; their open space was actually put on the other side not to keep it away from Main Street but to ease the transition into the Old West Side. Gibb-Randall said she knows what this project is facing on Mosley Street is backyards, but it is still residential; she asked them to consider those same issues with regards to open space.

Briere said as a planned project, this development fits into the restrictions of D2; but several members of the Commission clearly have an issue with the building, whether it is the lack of openness, the irregular setbacks, or the lack of pedestrian amenities. She said she wanted to give an additional rationale for opening the courtyard; the part of the building that bothers her most is that it is a capsule, not open to the broader community, except for the small corner retail spot. She said that ideally when adding residential within D2 zoning the goal is to enhance the residential neighborhood experience. Briere said that she wants those from the Old West Side walking past the building to enjoy it and feel good about it. She said that this area is not the central downtown; it is a neighborhood with parks and schools. She stated that the design of this building intentionally protects residents from experiencing the neighborhood and becoming integrated into the Ann Arbor community. She added that she also takes issue with the unvarying height; she would prefer to see the building shorter along Main Street and taller near the railroad tracks. Briere said the unvarying height creates a monolith. She stated that she would prefer to see a better use of a planned project.

Bona asked if they could ask the petitioner if they would be interested in taking more time to revise the project.

Clein said yes, but he wanted to make a comment first. He echoed the sentiment of Briere that the Commission hopes to have every building they approve enhance the quality of life in Ann Arbor. He said the discussion that has taken place tonight is not searching to find a reason to shoot the project down but trying to identify what benefits the project will bring to the community. Clein said other than the eleven deferred parking spaces, he does not see an overwhelmingly huge benefit that justifies this planned project and the added height it is asking for. He stated that the treatment of the buggy factory is not ideal and it is possible that depending on how they build, they might not be able to save those two walls. He asked the petitioner if they have interest in having more time to respond to comments.

Moore said they have contractual obligations that do not permit them to delay further. He stated that they are willing to make that eastern pathway more pedestrian-focused.

Mills said she does not have a sense of whether we should postpone or not. She stated that the deferment of eleven parking spaces does not give her confidence that this alleyway will be a community benefit for posterity and as such does not meet the criteria for a planned project in her opinion.

Moore said the gates would not be installed if the parking were deferred.

Stiles asked where Mills needed clarification still.

Mills said her concern is that if it is built as if there is a possibility for future vehicular access then it will look different than if it were designed for pedestrian use only.

Stiles responded that the design will be determined by whether there is a vehicular easement on the gas station site to the north or not. He agreed that from a public benefit perspective it makes more sense to have a pedestrian only alleyway. He explained that they were attempting to appease multiple parties by putting more parking onsite and there is a financial loss by eliminating those parking spaces, but he would be open to removing them permanently.

Clein said commissioners will have to decide if that concession warrants

a sufficient public benefit for planned project approval.

Peters asked if someone would be able to calculate how much this pedestrian only pathway would increase the perviousness on site.

Mills said about 2,750 square feet of additional perviousness.

Gibb-Randall said if it became a pedestrian walkway there would be additional landscaping as well.

Moore clarified that by removing the parking spaces there would be 6,000 square feet less imperviousness on site.

Briere asked whether the eastern façade could be changed due to this green walkway, because she finds it uninspiring. She asked if there is a rendering showing the vegetation currently planned.

Moore replied that he did not.

Briere said she would not find this pedestrian walkway to be a sufficient amenity unless it were also attractive and felt more like a place people wanted to be than an alleyway behind a building. She acknowledged the petitioners concessions to take care of the snow removal on Mosley and to move the shared vehicles outside of the parking garage so they are accessible to the larger community, but stated that if the eastern façade is not improved she still does not see sufficient public benefit to grant approval of their planned project.

Stiles said there is landscaping proposed against the building. He said by removing the parking spaces they would add more landscaping. He stated that the intent is for it to be a very attractive thoroughfare.

Briere stated that she hopes the gates would be removed.

Stiles responded that without cars the gates would be removed.

Clein said the question before them is whether this pedestrian walkway is a sufficient public benefit for them to approve the planned project status.

Gibb-Randall asked to see the aerial to get a sense of how the site connects with other streets in the neighborhood. She said as a biker she finds it uncomfortable to bike down Main Street, so she can envision biking to Mosley then taking the pathway and continuing onto Fourth from

Madison. She stated that she does not feel that it is part of a future greenway, but it does provide utility.

Clein stated that if the greenway does develop there, this alleyway would be an enhancement, but without the greenway, this pathway feels a bit isolated. He said on his list as a public benefit is the preservation of the buggy factory in a more significant way, but he doubts whether the petitioner would be willing to so dramatically alter their design.

Briere added that doing so would add the varied height along Main Street that she is looking for.

Clein wondered if they will look back and think wow, it's great that we constructed this pathway, or will it be like Ashley Mews, a little traversed public space.

Mills asked if staff can explain further how the Allen Creek Greenway could link with this pathway.

Kahan said it would be premature for him to say how this pathway would link with the greenway. He stated that the Allen Creek Greenway planning process is in its initial stages. He explained that the closest thing they have to a determination of the location for the greenway is in the City's non-motorized plan which shows a thin line along the railroad right of way that is identified as the future site of the Allen Creek Greenway. He stated that if this pathway had permanent pedestrian access that would be a plus. Kahan reminded the Commission that the gas station has a role to play as well, it sounds like they are willing to give a 20 foot vehicular access easement and potentially a pedestrian easement for residents.

Stiles clarified that if there were no vehicular access along the pathway, the easement with the gas station would be eliminated.

Clein said the implication of that statement is that there would be no pedestrian access easement along the gas station site.

Stiles responded yes. He said they wanted to be fully transparent about this.

Clein thanked Stiles but said that information diminishes the public benefit of the alleyway as it will not connect to Madison.

Moore noted that the Drain Commission have an easement across the

gas station property to maintain the Allen Creek Drain, so there already is a public access easement of sorts over that section of the path.

Bona said she is thinking very hard about how the pathway can satisfy the benefit for this project. She said she cautions the Commission to be shortsighted about the lack of connectivity, twenty or thirty years from now things may be different and if we don't set up this pathway we will have missed an opportunity. She said she believes this may get connected sooner than that given the energy behind the Allen Creek Greenway project. She explained that even if the greenway ends up being on the other side of the tracks, this pathway could provide a pedestrian connection for the people living in the Old West Side. Bona said she would have liked to see a landscaped plan, but suggested that in the memo to City Council the Commission should stress that Council should look carefully into landscaping.

Clein echoed the statements of Bona and advised the petitioner to present a landscaped plan to Council as well as consider how they might vary the height of the building, preserve more of the buggy factory, and let more light into the courtyard by opening up the building.

Mills proposed to amend the motion as read “and subject to redesign of the eastern drive as a pedestrian amenity and to eliminate vehicular access.”

Moved by Briere, seconded by Milshteyn, to amend the motion as read “and subject to redesign of the eastern drive as a pedestrian amenity and to eliminate vehicular access.”

COMMISSION DISCUSSION OF AMENDMENT:

Briere said this pathway could be characterized as an amenity, but the question remains whether it is a sufficient amenity to warrant approval of the planned project. She stated that creating a positive pedestrian experience for tenants is a positive opportunity and is happy the petitioner is taking it.

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

Yeas: 8 - Kenneth Clein, Sabra Briere, Jeremy Peters, Sofia Franciscus, Sarah Mills, Bonnie Bona, Alex Milshteyn, and Shannan Gibb-Randall

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Wendy Woods